

Planning Commission Chair: Tim Petty
Planning Commission Vice-Chair: Todd Burton
Commissioners: Robert Guillen
Scott Dixon
Glen Woolsey
Secretary: Crystal Western
City Council Representative: Greg Johnson

UINTAH CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, January 24, 2017
7:00 PM



2191 East 6550 South – Uintah, Utah 84405

(801) 479-4130 Fax: (801) 476-7269

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Called to Order by Tim Petty at 7:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance led by Todd Burton.

Roll Call: Present - Tim Petty, Scott Dixon, Robert Guillen, Todd Burton. Excused –Glen Woolsey.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest: None.

Attendees: Crystal Western, Mayor Flitton, Gordon Cutler, Michelle Roberts, Stu Boyd, Marnie Boyd, Aaron Stuart, Michelle Loveland, Kyle Loveland

Agenda Items:

1. **Public Comment (2 minutes per person) *(recording: 00:00:53)**
 - None
2. **Approval of minutes for the Planning Commission meeting held August 23, 2016. *(recording: 00:01:16)**

Presenter: Tim Petty

 - Tim Petty asked if there were any questions or comments on the minutes.
 - Todd stated that he was not in attendance at that meeting, but he was glad to see that the comments he left for the meeting were brought up. He thanked Tim for doing that.
 - There was some discussion with those in attendance as to why it had been so long since minutes were posted on the City's website. It was explained that there had been a few cancelled meetings at the end of 2016.
 - Robert asked for clarification on when the Chapman's will be back in for review.
 - Tim answered that they will come in again before they have another camp.
 - Scott Dixon made a motion to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes for August 23, 2016 as written.
 - Seconded by Todd Burton.
 - All in favor, motion passed.
3. **Approval of minutes for the Planning Commission work session held October 25, 2016. *(recording: 00:05:00)**

Presenter: Tim Petty

 - Tim Petty asked if there were any questions or comments on the minutes.
 - Tim said he wasn't sure why there were two sets of minutes to approve at this meeting.
 - Crystal answered that minutes can't be approved at a work session meeting, and this is the first non-work session meeting held since August 2016.
 - Scott said that he was not in attendance at this meeting, and asked if input had been taken from the individuals listed on item one to update the General Plan.
 - Tim answered that yes, they were on a committee and helped put it together.
 - Todd asked if any action had been assigned, in regards to storm water, to regulate that all future developments are in compliance with State and Federal regulations. He said that he asks because the City used to require that the swells in subdivisions were maintained. He said they used to be in compliance on that, but no longer are. He asked who oversees or maintains that compliance for storm water.
 - Tim answered that no, there are not regulations in the General Plan.

- Scott said that it is probably only inspected at the time of construction and not regulated afterwards. He said that would typically be the job of a City Engineer. Tim agreed that there is currently not enforcement for it.
- Robert suggested that they talk about this more when they reach the General Plan item on tonight's agenda. The other commissioners were in agreeance.
- Tim asked if there were any edits to be made to the minutes. There were none.
- Robert Guiller made a motion to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes for October 25, 2016 as written.
- Seconded by Todd Burton.
- All in favor, motion passed.

4. Discussion/Action on appointment of a Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for 2017. *(recording: 00:03:45)

Presenter: Tim Petty

- Tim asked the other commissioners if they would like to hold a vote, or if they would like to keep things the way they are.
- Scott said that he feels Tim and Todd are doing a great job and their efforts and time spent are appreciated.
- Scott Dixon made a motion to keep Tim Petty as the Planning Commission Chair and Todd Burton as the Vice-Chair.
- Seconded by Robert Guiller.
- All in favor, motion passed.

5. ***PUBLIC HEARING*******

Discussion/Action on changes to the Uintah City General Plan. *(recording: 00:10:10)

Presenter: Tim Petty

Tim explained that one of his main objectives to updating the General Plan was to create a plan that was easy to follow, was clear and concise, and that could be easily updated in the future. He said that the General Plan is not complete, and it is open for change. He said it is built in sections to make future changes to the plan easier. He said it is meant to be a living document.

Motion to close the planning commission meeting and open the public hearing was made by Scott Dixon, 2nd by Todd Burton. All in favor, none opposed.

- Gordon Cutler: *(recording 00:12:00) "Speaking on behalf of myself, not as a City Council member, I want to tell you thanks for everything you've done on the General Plan, especially you Tim. I think you spent probably more time than what Becky wanted you to be away from family and kids to get that done. I'm happy to see how it's been broke down in different areas. We had an individual approach us in City Council meeting last week about secondary water. So I was excited to see that there was a section there where you address secondary water. It's an issue that's going to face the City somewhere down the road. Thanks for all that you do, I appreciate your time on behalf of the citizens, so thank you."
- Michelle Roberts: *(recording 00:13:12) "I too am speaking as just a citizen, not as a City Council member. A couple of things, first I just want to say thank you. I think you spent a lot of time and energy. This has been, since I have been working with the City, something that has been trying to get done, and just never did. I think that it's awesome that we have something in front of us that is easy to read and easy to understand. One question I had was on the Section 7, Pathways. It's about three-quarters a way down the page. It talks about "The City could consider providing encouragement to developers for providing pathway access by allowing an increase in allowable housing density". I just wanted a little further explanation.

- Tim Petty: Can we address it after the open hearing? I will make a note here, ok? We'll talk about it.
- Michelle Roberts: That's just my question for you. Also, I thought it was in the park section I really appreciated the fact that it was, that we don't necessarily as citizens want a traditional park but we want to preserve open space. I think that that's important and I think that as I've heard from the citizens too that that is something that is very valuable, and I appreciate that being in there. So, that's all my comments. Thank you.
- Michelle Loveland: *(recording 00:14:50) "I appreciate the time you put into this too Tim, because I know that there's been a lot of comments and a lot of opinions and everything on there. My only concern was just on the roads, and it sounds like you're saying that this is something that isn't set in stone so it could possibly change and that was just my biggest concern; where they're currently set to land, and how that will effect property values, and just the privacy for our cul-de-sac for example. But even for the road that goes behind the Booth's and the Tesch's and connects up to the S-curve there, I just have some concern on how that all ties in together. And I don't know, I guess my question would just be on all these open spaces if you're just going to do it on a case-by-case as a developer comes to develop the open space? If you look at how they're developing and where they're putting the houses? Because where those roads are may affect their best use and their possibility and the owners and so I just wanted to be sure that was something that could be moved around. Because I think that those are things to consider. But I think on the North side of 6600 South I can see where those existing roads are and there's open space there, and I can see like that would make more sense on some of those. But that was just my biggest concern is look at, depending how that all lays out it will limit certain capacities and will affect the citizens as well."
- Stu Boyd: *(recording 00:17:03) "I have a dream. My dream is that, thinking on the future of our community, it goes well beyond a half-acre lot, sewer, and a secondary water system. I'm sitting on part, along with my neighbor Scott, of about 35 acres of buildable land or better. I don't know what the total dimension is. We have river access, we have open spaces, we have places for trails, there's a road that's got to go through there. And we're going to all go on to Heaven someday, and each of us will sell our property off and it will go on piecemeal and we'll have another city of half-acre lots and cul-de-sacs. I would like to see the City of Uintah talk to the owners of the 35 acres down there and try to put together some kind of plan for the development in totality. I don't know how you do that. I'm sure if I were a developer and someone were to turn over 35 acres of land that I could probably build a pretty impressive community friendly area. But, if I turn over my 15 acres, and Scott you turn over what you have, and Ruland turns over what he has, and Aaron turns over what he has, we're going to wind up with a postage stamp community forever. My son grew-up, lives in, a community in Colorado where they took a large open space and built affordable housing, high-end housing, parks, trails, ponds, access to recreation, and built it as a development. I think that is possible in Uintah. It takes however, someone more than Stu Boyd talking to Scott, or talking to Aaron, or talking to Bobby, or anybody and saying it takes a community desire to do that. It's a vision. So I guess what I'm sharing with you is my vision of what I'd like Uintah to look like. I'd like to see that piece of property down there be something that people would be proud to live in and be would be proud to be part of; rather than just see it go the way I know it's going to go when I go or when Scott goes, or whatever happens to us all. So my encouragement in the Master Plan, which thank you Tim, you did a great job on pulling together a bunch of us; especially cantankerous guys like me that have visions and live with visions. But I'd like to see it happen. So I can't really comment on the Master Plan, but I can share with you my idea for the future. Tim thank you for giving me time."

Motion to close the public hearing and reopen the planning commission meeting made by Scott Dixon, 2nd by Robert Guiller. All in favor, none opposed.

6. Discussion/Action on changes to the Uintah City General Plan. *(recording: 00:20:38)

Presenter: Tim Petty

- Tim explained that the General Plan is meant to allow for growth and change in the future. He said that does not mean it would all happen now. He said that some things wouldn't even be possible without other changes happening first.
- Tim responded to some of the questions and comments from the Public Hearing.
 - Pathways: Since some residents want pathways and others don't, they thought it best to put the pathways into new developments of large properties, rather than add them to already developed properties. One of the main goals would be to give pedestrians and bikes a safer alternative route to 6600 S.
 - Scott commented that everyone seems to be in support of pathways, yet no one is really in support of having it on or near their land.
 - Robert stated that we need to be careful, and make sure that a small minority of people aren't making decisions for the majority of the citizens on this issue. He said it sounds like most citizens want to make this happen, and only a minority of people are against it and holding it up. He thinks when projects like this come up, we should be looking at Uintah as a whole.
 - Large Community Project: A project like this would have to start as a land owner initiative. As a starting point, the plan does allow for multiple property owners to work together on a larger scale project. Overall, building to a certain density is required. There are many reasons why the overall population of Uintah needs to be targeted; connection to the water, sewer, transportation, etc.
 - Stu Boyd commented that he still feels that the City should come up with a plan for future development of the 35-50 acres on and around his property, then hold a meeting presenting their ideas to the property owners.
 - Roads: (Referencing the road map included with the General Plan) The main idea is that when land is developed they need to provide interconnectivity separate from 6600 S. The roads on the map are not permanent, and they are open to changes before the General Plan updates are accepted. When land is developed, the land owner and the developer can work together to decide the best way to get a road from point A to point B.
 - Open Space: The majority of people interviewed and surveyed prior to this General Plan update said they wanted Uintah to keep a rural atmosphere. Hopefully this General Plan allots for that. However, "rural atmosphere" can mean different things to different people; large lots, small lots with more open space, river access, etc.
 - U-Dot Property Purchase: If the City has the opportunity to purchase this property, therefore providing river access to the entire community, it is wrong not to. The citizens which are opposed to this are few in number. Their arguments against it are crime and traffic. The City roads do not need to be published as pathways through Weber Pathways. Removing the proposed bridge on this property connecting the path south of the river to the north path, is a reasonable solution. Traffic is not a reasonable argument, because the City's existing General Plan has always shown a road through that area. There is nothing about the development of that road that would imply that road would not continue on someday. The updated General Plan does show this property as a possible future recreation property. It is not to be developed as a park. The only change to how it sits now would be to provide access to the river with a fire department approved turn-around and parking. There is also another piece of property shown on the map that would be an option for river access as well, if the City could acquire it in the future.
 - Todd asked if there had been discussion on how the City would acquire the land, since it is worth a lot of money.

- Tim responded that there would not be a cost for the City to acquire the UDOT land. He said there would be improvement costs, and those would come out of the City's budget for park impact fees.
 - Robert reiterated that we need to be doing what is best for the majority, not only the minority. He feels that providing the entire community with river access is what is best for the majority.
 - Todd commented that one of the areas is actually already being used for river access right now.
- Transportation: When Scenic Development comes in with their development site plans, some traffic studies will have to be done. These studies will give the City some information that can be used for planning in regards to 6600 S.
 - Robert said that he would like to see some facts from an actual study to help remove people's emotional reactions to this.
 - Todd asked if 6600 S. is wide enough to stripe or add a bike lane. He also asked about widening the road.
 - Tim said it is definitely wide enough to stripe, and is probably wide enough for a bike lane. He said that being able to widen the road would really depend on dealings with the rail road company.
 - Scott mentioned that adding a bike lane would probably require a lowering of the speed limit.
- Future Growth: If a study is done by Weber-Morgan Health Department, it could lead to tighter restrictions on home sizes.
 - Todd said he would like to see data that shows what the limiting item in the infrastructure would be.
 - Tim responded that one of the limiting items is the culinary water system.
 - Todd listed: culinary water used to water lawns, 6600 S., and storm water drainage as possible items limiting future growth.
- Tim reminded everyone that things in the General Plan are there to show possibilities for future growth and change, they are not guaranteed to happen. However, if things are not included in the General Plan, they won't be options in the future even if opportunities arise.
- Scott said that he feels that the Planning Commission members and the public should have some time to study and reflect on the comments and conversations from this meeting.
- Todd suggested having a work session before the next meeting to discuss this item further.
- Scott asked for clarification between the maps, zoning, land use, and US Census data.
 - Tim said he will need to change the wording. The General Plan requires a land use map. He did not include the US Census data.
- Robert asked if they could go over the storm water regulations at the work session meeting.
 - Tim explained that the General Plan should not be laying out ordinances or regulations. He said he will reword it to say that if changes come, they will continue to rely on the City Engineer to notify the City.
- Todd Burton made a motion to table the changes to the Uintah City General Plan until the next scheduled Planning Commission Work Session and Meeting.
- Seconded by Robert Guiller.
- All in favor, motion passed.

7. Commissioner's Responsibility Reports and follow-up from previous meeting. *(recording: 00:50:00)

Presenters: Tim Petty

- CUPs – Robert Guiller
 - Said his only concern was Chapman's CUP, and they'd already gone over it earlier in the meeting.

- Commercial Building – Scott Dixon
 - Nothing to report.
- Training – Glen Woolsey
 - Excused from this meeting.
- Nuisance – Todd Burton
 - Nothing to report.
- Other – Tim Petty
 - Nothing to report.

8. Discussion on Planning Commissioner's responsibilities for the 2017 year. *(recording: 00:50:19)

- Tim asked the commissioners if they would like to leave the assignments the same this year as last year. They all agreed they would.

9. Meeting adjourned. *(recording: 00:52:04)

- Todd Burton made a motion to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting for January 24, 2017 at 7:55 p.m.
- Seconded by Robert Guiller.
- All in favor, motion passed.

APPROVED by the Planning Commission this 28 day of February, 2017.



 Planning Commission Chair