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

Roll Call

Tom Maher, John Malone, John Linton

Others Present

Brent Skipper, McKay Edwards, Heather Jackson, David Lifferth, Tiffany Ulmer, David Adams, Kerry Snow

Staff Present

Planning Director: Peter Spencer
City Planner: Mike Hadley
City Engineer: Chris Trusty
Planning Coordinator: Jenalee Cheever

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Tom Maher led the Commission and Audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None

3. Status Report from City Council

Peter Spencer explained that Colonial Park 2 & 3 was approved for final plat by the City Council.

Mr. Spencer explained that a land disposal plan was presented to the City Council and that the same presentation would be made to the Planning Commission at this meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes

None

5. Development Items

A. Cedar Valley Plat B, Final Plat – Action Item

Mr. Spencer explained that this development was previously submitted as Hidden Valley North but has been changed to Cedar Valley. Mr. Spencer explained that Plat A was approved a few months ago.

Mr. Spencer explained that Cedar Valley Plat B was 24.96 acres, with 77 lots.

Mr. Spencer explained that the single family lots in this development will be required to maintain 55 feet of lot frontage and that the required setbacks for the single family lots will be as follows:

Front Yard	15' (22' driveways required)
Rear Yard	20'
Side Yards	15' total (min 5' on one side)
Corner Lots	15' on the front and corner side

Mr. Spencer explained that the 4 foot path on the landscape plan needs to be shown as an 8 foot asphalt trail and that it needs to extend throughout the entire park area.

Mr. Spencer explained that the improved are of the park shown on the landscape plan would need to be expanded.

Mr. Spencer explained that there were some minor redline comments on the plat that would need to be addressed.

Mr. Spencer explained that the dry utility and construction plans also have some minor redline comments that need to be addressed.

Mr. Spencer explained that condition regarding the parks being complete has been revised. Mr. Spencer stated that the new condition would be worded as follows:

Prior to 50% of the total lots of A & B have been built the entire park area must be completed, inspected and approved before the development can continue on.

Mr. Spencer explained that discussion took place with the applicant and that the applicant has explained that Plats A and B would be recorded simultaneously which is why this particular condition has changed.

Mr. Spencer explained that staff recommends approval of Plat B to the Planning Commission.

MOTION:

John Linton moved that the Planning Commission recommends approval to the City Council for the Cedar Valley Plat B final plat, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. PLAT. That all redline comments are addressed and approved.
- 2. LANDSCAPE PLAN. That all redline comments are addressed and approved.
- 3. DRY UTILITIES. That all redline comments are addressed and approved
- 4. CONSTRUCTION PLANS. That all redline comments are addressed and approved
- 5. SID. That the City Engineer verifies that this plat encompasses all of the assessed SID acreage.
- 6. E-FILES. That e-files are submitted for the plat and construction drawings.
- 7. TIMING OF PARK IMPROVEMENTS. Prior to 50% of the total lots of A & B have been built, the entire park area must be completed, inspected and approved by Staff before the development can continue on.

John Malone seconded the motion. Ayes: 3, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

B. Oquirrh Mountain West, Preliminary Plat – Public Hearing, Action Item

Mr. Spencer explained that Oquirrh Mountain West is located directly south of the Lone Tree subdivision.

Mr. Spencer explained that the applicant for this project decided to skip the concept plan process and go straight to the preliminary process. Mr. Spencer explained that Staff has had little time to review with the applicant this project and that there are several major issues with the plat as it is currently proposed, that need to be reviewed with the applicant.

Mr. Spencer explained that this item would not be on the agenda tonight, but that notices were sent out and because of those notices this item had to stay on tonight's agenda.

Mr. Spencer explained that Staff's recommendation would be to table the item as well as the public hearing.

MOTION:

John Linton moved that the Planning Commission table the Oquirrh Mountain West Preliminary Plat and Public Hearing to allow for imperative revisions for the project to take place.

John Malone seconded the motion. Ayes: 3, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

C. Sweetwater Preliminary Plat – Public Hearing, Action Item

Mr. Spencer explained that this project is located directly between Eagle Point A & B and Sweetwater Road, south of Eagle Mountain Boulevard. Mr. Spencer explained that the application proposes 239 single family lots over 33.474 acres and that the overall density for this project is 7.14 units per acre.

Mr. Spencer explained that included in the text of the Eagle Mountain Properties Master Development Agreement is language that ensures that, at any time in the future, any land included in the overall Master Development Plan may exercise the option to be reviewed under either the current City Code at the time, or the Eagle Mountain interim Development Code dated September 30, 1997. Mr. Spencer explained that because this plat is located within the overall Eagle Mountain Properties Master Development Plan, the applicant has the option, and has submitted with a

written request, to have this preliminary plat reviwed under the 1997 interim code. Mr. Spencer stated that this project has been entirely reviewed under the 1997 Interim Code, not the current development code.

Mr. Spencer explained that the Sweetwater Preliminary Plat is located just to the west of a large detention area. Mr. Spencer explained that the detention are has been identified on the Eagle Mountain Properties Mater Plan as an 8 acre land area that must be dedicated to the City. Mr. Spencer explained that the project is required to provide a total of 1.49 acres of improved open space to serve as a Neighborhood Park for the development.

Mr. Spencer explained that the proposed Sweetwater project will actually be dedicating 1.11 acres of improved open space adjacent to the 8 acres detention pond/regional park. Mr. Spencer explained that rather than dedicating the remaining .38 acres, the applicant is taking the cost of that land and using the money saved to provide further improvements in to the 8 acre site.

Mr. Spencer explained that the proposed plat's landscape plan contains the following:

- 38 parking stalls for the future regional park
- 2 pavilions
- Connecting 4 foot sidewalk
- Swing set
- Picnic tables
- Tot lot
- Park benches

Mr. Spencer reviewed the following conditions of approval with the Planning Commission:

- 1. That the street names are verified and approved by City Staff.
- 2. That the landscape plan redlines are addressed and approved by City Staff.
- 3. That the construction plan comments are addressed and approved by City Staff.
- 4. That the 8 acre detention pond/regional park is dedicated with the first plat. That the entire additional park area (1.11 acres) as well as a road to access the property (Shadow Drive) be dedicated to the City with the recordation of Phase 1.
- 5. That applications proposed standards are required for all future final plats.

Mr. Maher asked what condition number five was talking about.

Mr. Spencer explained that it means each future plat or phase will each have to take their turn in installing park amenities. Mr. Spencer stated that each phase would be assigned an portion of the park improvements for the large park.

Mr. Adams explained that the actual overall density of the area is 5.5.

Mr. Adams explained that the staff report said that the setbacks were 15 feet for the front and 20 feet for the back. Mr. Adams explained that what has been proposed is actually a 15 foot front setback to the living area and a 20 foot front setback to the garage. Mr. Adams explained that the rear would be 15 feet, Mr. Adams stated that it is on the plat.

Mr. Adams explained that the yards would be hydro seeded and have sprinkling systems installed.

Mr. Adams explained that the ordinances states that an access be dedicated right up front to the park so that if the developer were ever to default, the park would still be available. Mr. Adams suggested that Shadow Drive be stubbed, dedicated and improved to that point.

Mr. Adams explained that they would be required to landscape a portion of sweetwater and that it is fairly heavy landscaping such as, trees, watering, gravel, 8 foot asphalt trail. Mr. Adams asked if this be a requirement with the first phase and that the park improvements be divided between the rest of the phases, so that the developer is not overburdened with improvements on the first phase.

Mr. Adams explained that the 1997 Code does not give specifics on park amenity requirements, so therefore the current Development Code was used for park amenities.

Mr. Linton asked how many phases there were with this project.

Mr. Adams stated that there would be six phases for this project.

Mr. Adams explained that the entire park would be dedicated to the City with the first phase.

Mr. Spencer explained that a minimal risk for the City would be to allow and approve the building for 75 lots of Phase 1 and that there is no surety that any amenities will be put in, and that burden would become the City's who does not have the funds to improve the park.

Mr. Spencer explained that the request being made is for Phase 1 to be recorded without any park bonding.

Tom Maher opened the Public Hearing at 6:40 p.m.

Shawn Hamlin explained that if all of the yards were going to be hydro seeded that they be hydro seeded in a fescue rye mix instead of blue grass because it uses about half of the water and that the park be low maintenance.

David Lifferth stated that he liked the park and the design. Mr. Lifferth asked if it would reduce the amount of park that Patterson development would have to put in.

Mr. Spencer explained that it would not reduce the amount for Patterson.

Mr. Dunn stated that they had plans that would soon be coming to the City for a development next to this project.

Mr. Dunn stated that another access has always been planned, but that they don't necessarily want to do it.

Mr. Malone stated that the decision should be left up to the Fire Chief.

Tom Maher closed the Public Hearing at 6:52 p.m.

MOTION: Jo

John Linton moved that the Planning Commission approves the Sweetwater Preliminary Plat subject to the following conditions:

- 1. STREET NAMES. That the street names are verified and approved by City Staff.
- 2. LANDSCAPE PLAN. That redlines are addressed and approved by City Staff.
- 3. CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS. That all redline comments are addressed and approved by City Staff.
- 4. PHASING. That the 8 acre detention pond/regional park is dedicated with the first plat. That the entire additional park area (1.11 acres) as well as a road to access the property (Shadow Drive) be dedicated to the City with the recordation of Phase 1. That Shadow Drive be dedicated to the City with recordation of the second phase.
- 5. ADDITIONAL STANDARS. That the applications proposed standards are required for all future final plats.
- 6. That the park improvements be split among the five phases of the project.

John Malone seconded the motion. Ayes: 3, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

D. Sage Park, Preliminary Plat – Public Hearing, Action Item

Mr. Hadley explained that Sage Park is located along Eagle Mountain Boulevard, just northwest of the Eagle Park subdivision.

Mr. Hadley explained that this submittal is composed of 398 lots over 125.62 acres, with an overall density of 3.16 units per acre. Mr. Hadley explained this would bring the entire project under the Tier II Residential Development Standards.

Mr. Hadley explained that the Future Land Use and Transportation Map shows a future collector road which is planned to bisect the center of the project along the parcel lines. Mr. Hadley explained that this future collector road is designated as a minor collector, with a 76 foot right of way.

Mr. Hadley reviewed the following conditions of approval with the Planning Commission:

- 1. That the gas, water, and electricity systems are looped.
- 2. That the landscape plans shows required landscaping along Eagle Mountain Boulevard that is approved by City Staff.
- 3. That a 6 foot privacy fence is required along all collector roads.
- 4. That the volleyball courts are replaced with another amenity with equal value and similar in nature (basketball courts).
- 5. That Eagle Mountain Boulevard requires A-cel and D-cel lanes into the subdivision.
- 6. That as the subdivision is phased out, there will be a need to allow for secondary access for all phases. That all the park area is dedicated to Eagle Mountain City with the recordation of the first plat.
- 7. That all of the fire code items be addressed.
- 8. That lots 125 and 126 are relocated to create a large park area.
- 9. That cross gutters are installed on the long stretch of the road to the east.
- 10. That the sewer and water lies are on opposite sides of the road.
- 11. That a 20 foot walkway is installed between lots 4 and 5 to access the park.
- 12. That the required amount of buildable open space is dedicated and the park amenities are approved by City Staff.
- 13. That all street names are approved by City Staff.
- Mr. Linton asked if the 20 foot dedication had been discussed with the developer.
- Mr. Hadley explained that the developer had agreed to dedicate that.
- Mr. Dunn explained that the road on the north end of the project has been changed to accommodate a future school that will be built.
- Mr. Dunn explained that the open space will be centralized to the Pony Express Trail.
- Mr. Hadley explained that the equestrian and urban trails would be flopped so that the urban trail is the one that goes by the houses.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 7:01 p.m.

Tiffany Ulmer explained that she had noticed that there was not any off-road parking for this park. Mrs. Ulmer also explained that she would like to see a variety of the style of homes in stead of just vinyl siding.

- Mr. Maher asked what the plan was for the elevations.
- Mr. Dunn explained that 75% would be masonry exteriors, such as stone, brick, and stucco.
- Mr. Adams asked that any applicable SID and connectors agreement be reviewed so that the developer can adequately plan for those.

McKay Edwards explained that SITLA owned land adjacent to this project and that to the North East of the project it has been determined that a High School will be going in. Mr. Edwards explained that SITLA would like to file an

objection to this preliminary plat on several grounds the first being that, the overall density is too high. Mr. Edwards explained that if a project is going to be approved with this high of density they should be providing a lot more improved open space, or community benefits. Mr. Edwards explained that SITLA would propose to decrease the overall density or asking for more from the development. Mr. Edwards explained that there was an objection to the Pony Express National Historic Trail and that they prefer that it was not dug up and relocated.

Heather Jackson explained that she did not agree with the moving of the Pony Express Trail because it is a historic landmark.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 7:11 p.m.

Mr. Spencer explained that there will be fencing and landscaping required for buffering.

Discussion took place concerning the Pony Express Trail.

Mr. Trusty explained that the Staff will work with the applicant regarding the Trail.

Mr. Spencer explained that at the final plat stage on the landscape plan is where the trail can be readjusted, before approval and that it can be added as a condition of approval.

Mr. Malone stated that moving the trail from its original path is a concern for him and that he would like to preserve it.

Mr. Spencer explained that he would like to mention that there is a lack of a church site but that it is possible if the church wanted to take 4 or 5 lots and create a site, that it would be a possibility.

MOTION: John Linton moved that the Planning Commission approves the Sage Park Preliminary Plat subject to the following conditions:

- 1. UTILITIES. That the gas, water, and electricity systems are looped.
- 2. LANDSCAPE. The landscape plan shows required landscaping along Eagle Mountain Blvd that is approved by City Staff.
- 3. FENCING. A 6 ft privacy fence is required along all collector roads.
- 4. PARK AMENITIES. The volleyball courts are replaced with another amenity with equal value and similar in nature (basketball courts).
- 5. A-CEL & D-CEL LANES. Eagle Mountain Blvd. requires A-cel and D-cel lanes into the subdivision.
- 6. PHASING. As the subdivision is phased out there will be a need to allow for secondary access for all phases. That all the park area is dedicated to Eagle Mountain City with the recordation of the first plat.
- 7. FIRE CODE. All fire code items are addressed.
- 8. LOTS. Look at the removal of lots 125 & 126 in order to create a large park area with consideration given to the pony express trail
- 9. CROSS GUTTERS. Cross gutters are installed on the long stretch of the road to the east.
- 10. SEWER & WATER. The sewer and water lines are on opposite sides of the road.
- 11. PARK ACCESS. A 20 ft walkway is installed between lots 4 & 5 to access the park.
- 12. PARKS & OPEN SPACE. The required amount of buildable open space is dedicated and the park amenities are approved by City Staff.
- 13. STREET NAMES. All street names are approved by City Staff.
- 14. That the north/south road be continued up between lots 322, 323, 344 & 345. That the north/south road between lots 319, 320, 347 & 348 be removed.

John Malone seconded the motion. Ayes 3, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

E. Amendment to the Eagle Mountain City Development Code – Public Hearing, Action Item

Mr. Hadley explained that back in December, Mr. Kerry Snow, residing at 9784 N Shiloh Way, submitted a business license application to the planning department for an orthodontic business in his home. Mr. Hadley explained that the submittal was not allowed under current City Code, therefore the application was denied.

Mr. Hadley stated that upon receipt of the denial, Mr. Snow, appealed the Planning Director's decision to the City Council. Mr. Hadley explained that on February 6, 2007, the City Council reviewed the appeal and made a motion to return the business license application to the Planning Department, instructing us to amend the Development Code to allow for orthodontics as a home business.

Mr. Hadley explained that in preparation for this amendment, staff contact several other municipalities as well as other organizations to determine whether our current ordinance is appropriate.

Mr. Hadley reviewed the following list with the Planning Commission:

- 1. Utah State Health Department: No specific regulations.
- 2. Utah County Heath Department: No specific regulations.
- 3. Department of Environmental Quality: Allows for the x-ray machines in a home as long as it complies with the local cities zoning.
- 4. Pleasant Grove City: Not addressed, may be approved with conditions.
- 5. American Fork: Not addressed, may be approved with conditions.
- 6. Orem: Not addressed, may be approved with conditions.
- 7. Lehi: Not addressed, may be approved with conditions.
- 8. Salt Lake City: Prohibited.
- 9. Saratoga Springs: Prohibited.

Mr. Hadley explained that the American Dental Association had also been contacted. Mr. Hadley explained that the A.D.A said that in the past a lot of orthodontists used to work out of their homes but recently have been more focused on getting into office buildings because of marketing reasons.

Mr. Hadley explained that he has found four places in Utah that have orthodontists that conduct business out of the home. Mr. Hadley stated that they were Price, Holdem, Salina and Enterprise.

Mr. Hadley stated that Staff is recommending approval of the change to the code.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

Tiffany Ulmer explained that approving this change will open the door for other commercial businesses to try and operate out of residential areas. Mrs. Ulmer stated while the profession itself may not be hazardous compared to others but where do you draw the line. Mrs. Ulmer suggested that the health business section be removed from the code and that in its place allow for people in situations like these to obtain a 12 month temporary permit which allows the operation out of a home while searching for a commercial location for the business.

Dr. Kerry Snow explained that he has been actively since October been trying to find a commercial location for his business. Mr. Snow explained that there are no bio hazards, material hazards etc. that go along with his businesses.

Mr. Malone asked what length of time Mr. Snow planned on having this business in his home.

Mr. Snow explained that he is currently looking for a permanent location, and that has been looking since October. Mr. Snow explained that opening his home business would provide him with the income that he needed, but also provide these services for residence so they don't have to go to Saratoga Springs. Mr. Snow explained that looking for a commercial location could take him any where from a 1 year to 24 Months.

Mr. Snow explained that his home is certainly not the size to sustain a full on practice. Mr. Snow explained that 5 clients a day would be enough to sustain his practice.

Mr. Spencer explained that if this amendment is approved Mr. Snow will still have to make sure his business stays incompliance with the rest of the Home Business chapter in the Code. Mr. Spencer explained that the current way the code is drafted this would not be a conditional use permit, so the Planning Commission could not add other specific conditions to his business, rather Mr. Snow would just need to follow what is written in the Code.

Mr. Malone asked if the business license could be revoked by the Planning Director if the traffic issues become a concern.

Mr. Spencer stated that Mr. Snow would have to follow the Code and typically what happens is neighbors will call the Planning Department to make complaints and then the Planning Department would go out and do an investigation on the traffic an so forth.

David Lifferth asked if this type of business situation was happening anywhere else in Utah.

- Mr. Spencer explained that it there are businesses like this in Price, Holdem, Salina and Enterprise.
- Mr. Lifferth asked if they were home orthodontics business being operated.
- Mr. Spencer stated that according to the A.D.A. Director they are.
- Mr. Linton asked if signage was addressed.
- Mr. Spencer explained that it is explained in the Home Business Chapter as well as many other issues.

Mr. Snow explained that being a newer City, there is not a lot of economic growth going on right now. Mr. Snow explained that he does not intend to operate his business out of his home forever because it is not good for his business.

Discussion took place regarding changing the current home business ordinance to be more specific in regulating the different types of businesses.

Mrs. Jackson explained that she agrees with the issue on making the home business more of a temporary thing.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 7:50 p.m.

MOTION: John Malone moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the following proposed amendments to the Eagle Mountain City Development Code:

1. TITLE 1, CHAPTER 13. That Section 13.7 is amended as drafted in the staff report.

John Linton seconded the motion. Ayes: 3, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

F. Maverick Convenience Store & Gas Station, Site Plan – Public Hearing, Action Item

Mr. Hadley explained that the Maverick Convenience Store and Gas Station parcel is located at the southwest corner of The Ranches Parkway and SR 73 intersection.

Mr. Hadley has proposed a signage plan that does not comply with current City standards. Mr. Hadley explained that they have proposed a 30 foot pole sign.

Mr. Spencer explained that this issue has been discussed with the applicant prior to the meeting and that staff and the applicant will work through the issue.

Mr. Hadley explained that the hours of operation need to be discussed to determine what the hours will be.

Mr. Hadley reviewed the following conditions of approval with the Planning Commission:

- 2. STORM WATER. That the storm water calculations and storm water detention detail be submitted and approved by the City Engineer.
- 3. SIGNAGE. That any proposed signage meet city standards and are approved by City Staff.
- 4. SIDEWALK. The sidewalks are along entrances into the store are stamped.
- 5. WATERWAY. That a 6 ft. waterway is installed on both entrances onto Ranches Parkway.
- 6. UTILITY DEMANDS. That utility demands be submitted for water, sewer, gas, and phone and verified by City Staff.
- 7. LIGHTING PLAN. That a lighting plan be submitted. Building lighting shall be shielded and directed downward so that the light source is not visible from beyond the property where the structure is located. Lighting shall not project above structures or flagpoles, or beyond the property line.
- 8. LANDSCAPE PLAN. The landscape plan redlines are addressed and approved by City Staff.
- 9. ELECTRIC. The electric facilities plan is approved by City Staff
- 10. SCREENING. That the mechanical equipment areas are designated on the plan and that these areas receive proper screening treatments. That a screening detail of the proposed dumpster is submitted.
- 11. EMERGENCY SHUT OFF. That the emergency shut off for the gas pumps is identified.
- 12. SNOW STACKING. That there is snow stacking capacity of a 4" base over the entire parking lot. This needs to be shown on the plans.
- 13. FIRE CODE. All fire codes items are addressed.
- 14. E-FILES. That pdf files of the construction and landscape plans are submitted.

Mr. Hadley explained that after the staff report had been written staff came across an additional condition that would need to be added to the list of conditions. Mr. Hadley explained that it was concerning corridor preservation along S.R. 73, for future widening of that road.

Mr. Spencer explained that S.R. 73 is the only exit and entrance to the Cedar Valley as of today. Mr. Spencer explained that meetings have been held with UDOT and that the City has asked UDOT what we can do to make sure that S.R.73 down the road serves as a facility for heavy traffic.

Mr. Spencer explained that the City and UDOT have looked at ways to have the continuous flow of traffic without having to stop at a stop light. Mr. Spencer explained that they are trying to make S.R. 73 meet the needs of today as well as those to come in the future.

Mr. Spencer explained that UDOT's future goal is to have a 6 lane freeway, three lanes in both directions, and that it is up to the City to have the middle corridor landscaped as well as the buffering on the sides.

Mr. Spencer explained that the current right-of-way along S.R. 73 is 150 feet. Mr. Spencer explained that UDOT was asked how many feet they would need of right-of-way to make this eventual change, and UDOT asked for 300 feet

Mr. Spencer explained that the City has 275 feet of that right of way that UDOT is asking for, but the additional 25 feet would cut into the northern side of this proposed sight plan. Mr. Spencer explained that the City wants to make sure that this right-of-way will be here in the future so that problems don't arise when UDOT wants to expand S.R. 73.

Discussion took place concerning the 30 foot pole sign. The applicant expressed that they would like to have the sign because in the future if S.R. 73 does become a major highway visibility of the gas station may be reduced.

The Commission expressed that the City does not want large billboard signage.

The applicant explained that they usually keep the business open 24 hours, then depending on business they will change if they don't get any customers.

Mr. Maher asked what the elevation and landscaping would look like.

The applicant explained that it would be very similar to the Maverik that opened up by Thanksgiving Point.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 8:13 p.m.

Mrs. Jackson explained that she would like to see the signs stay the way they are.

Mr. Lifferth asked if the corridor land would be condemned to preserve the corridor.

Mr. Spencer explained that if the City does not take action now in preserving it, it would have to be condemned in the future.

Tiffany Ulmer asked if a deceleration lane is necessary for in front of the Maverick so the traffic does not get backed up.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 8:15 p.m.

MOTION: John Linton moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council for the Maverik Convenience Store & Gas Station subject to the following conditions:

- 1. STORM WATER. That the storm water calculations and storm water detention detail be submitted and approved by the City Engineer.
- 2. SIGNAGE. That any proposed signage meet city standards and are approved by City Staff.
- 3. SIDEWALK. The sidewalks are along entrances into the store are stamped.
- 4. WATERWAY. That a 6 ft. waterway is installed on both entrances onto Ranches Parkway.
- 5. UTILITY DEMANDS. That utility demands be submitted for water, sewer, gas, and phone and verified by City Staff.
- 6. LIGHTING PLAN. That a lighting plan be submitted. Building lighting shall be shielded and directed downward so that the light source is not visible from beyond the property where the structure is located.
- 7. LANDSCAPE PLAN. The landscape plan redlines are addressed and approved by City Staff.
- 8. ELECTRIC. The electric facilities plan is approved by City Staff.
- 9. SCREENING. That the mechanical equipment areas are designated on the plan and that these areas receive proper screening treatments. That a screening detail of the proposed dumpster is submitted.
- 10. EMERGENCY SHUT OFF. That emergency shut off for the gas pumps is identified.
- 11. SNOW STACKING. That there is snow stacking capacity of a 4" base over the entire parking lot. This needs to be shown on the plans.
- 12. FIRE CODE. All fire code items are addressed.
- 13. E-FILES. That PDF files of the construction and landscape plans are submitted.
- 14. That the corridor preservation be evaluated and discussed with Maverik & UDOT and that the entryway be considered to widen.

John Malone seconded the motion. Ayes: 3, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

G. Land Disposal Ordinance - Discussion Item

Mr. Spencer reviewed the following items with the Planning Commission:

- 1. Three exhibits were added to the Ordinance itself:
 - A. A list of potential costs so any potential applicant is clear with the road ahead.
 - B. An actual 'Land Disposal Application' that will help formalize the entire process including a nonrefundable \$150.00 fee (to offset staff time in processing)
 - C. Maps Signifying which areas of city-owned land is even available for disposal all other city-owned land will not be available for disposal.

- 2. Rather than submitting the application to the Recorder's office, the application will be submitted to the Planning Department.
- 3. Clarification was added regarding the recommendation from city staff and the Planning Commission.
- 4. A requirement was added that any money collected from the sale of land will be restricted to the construction or improvement of city parks throughout the city.
- 5. An acknowledgement statement was added that requires all applicants to read through the ordinance and become fully aware of the potential future costs of finishing an approved disposal.

Mr. Spencer explained that when the City has land dedicated to it, there is usually a purpose behind it, such as for parks, trails etc.

Mr. Spencer explained that this plan is to come up with a way to dispose of the open to residence without creating jagged lots lines etc.

Mr. Spencer explained that maps had been created that will show which land can be disposed of and which land will be kept and owned by the City.

Mr. Spencer explained that any money collected would go into a fund to help construct and maintain future parks. Mr. Spencer explained that the maps have been created by staff and that a provision was written in the ordinance stating that if something has been looked over or missed, that the City can go back at any time and change it.

Discussion took place regarding language that would allow the City Council to use their digression to decided whether or not they could dispose of the green areas on the map, if a resident made case to the council.

6. Other Business

Discussion took place regarding the Home Business Ordinance.

Mr. Maher asked that the Home Business Ordinance be reviewed and possible redrafted to discourage having permanent businesses located in homes.

Mr. Maher read excerpts from the Home Business Chapter to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Linton stated that he would not like to see any home businesses allowed that deal with bodily fluids, and that orthodontics is pushing the line.

7. Adjournment

Tom Maher adjourned the meeting at 8:41 p.m.