

APPROVED MINUTES

1
2
3 AMERICAN FORK CITY
4 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
5 JUNE 2, 2021

6 The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on June 2, 2021, at the
7 American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 pm.
8

9 Present: Chairman John Woffinden
10 Cristine Anderson
11 Harold Dudley
12 Rod Brocious
13 Jenny Peay
14

15
16 Absent: Chris Christiansen
17

18
19 Staff Present: Adam Olsen, City Planner
20 Ben Hunter, Engineer
21 Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant
22 Scott Sensanbaugher, Public Works Director
23

24
25 Others Present: Shawn Poor
26

27
28 Chairman Woffinden led the “Pledge of Allegiance.” He then asked our newest commissioner to
29 introduce herself.
30

31 Ms. Jenny Peay said that her background is in zoning, she works for the Cedar Hills Planning
32 and Zoning Department and also does code enforcement. She has been an American Fork
33 resident for 27 years and is happy to serve on the Planning Commission.
34

- 35
36 1. Hearing, review and action on the Walton Townhome Planned Community Development
37 Project located at 781 East Quality Drive in the PC Planned Community zone
38

39 Mr. Olsen informed commissioners that the property was annexed in 2019 as part of the Vest
40 Annexation. A concept plan approval followed, designating this area as higher density
41 residential. A subsequent development agreement was approved, allowing an overall
42 development parking ratio of 1.8 stalls per unit.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 This proposal is for a site plan and final plat. Access to the project will be off Quality Drive. 54
2 units are proposed, with internal circulation providing access to each unit. Units will either face
3 outward toward Quality Drive to the north and west, or inward toward open space areas. Parking
4 is provided at 2.26 spaces per unit; well above the allowed 1.8 stalls per unit as approved in the
5 development agreement. Renderings of the proposed townhomes as well as landscape plans are
6 provided in the submittal materials. Adjacent properties to the south, east and north have recently
7 been approved for higher density residential (apartments). The subdivision plat proposes one lot
8 over the entirety of the site plan.

9 While Planning staff can recommend approval of the proposal, the Engineering Division has
10 concerns that must be addressed prior to the project proceeding on to Council and will
11 recommend the project be “tabled”. Planning supports Engineering in this recommendation.

12 Mr. Hunter indicated that Engineering staff have worked closely with the applicant. The reason
13 for their recommendation to table is that there were a few outstanding comments to be addressed
14 in the TRC process. The Engineering staff have not had a chance to review the updated plan sets
15 to be sure all comments were addressed. Storm water detention facilities were one area that
16 needed work to finalize. The required infrastructure along Quality Drive is in place except for the
17 north side of the road where the main utilities are also in place. He recommended tabling until
18 they can be sure all comments have been addressed.

19 Mr. Shawn Poor, representing Brighton Homes, stated that they have worked closely with
20 engineering staff and understand their concerns. Nevertheless, he would like to ask for
21 consideration to move forward as the outstanding comments are relatively minor. The storm
22 detention area and public utility easement issues have been taken care of. He understands the
23 policy of having zero outstanding comments before passing a preliminary plat, but they are
24 asking for a variance. Typically other cities will allow projects to go through and still have some
25 work to do on the plans. They at least look forward to hearing commissioners’ thoughts on the
26 project.

27 Chairman Woffinden clarified that this is not a change in policy, it has always been city policy to
28 have no outstanding comments before approval. Everyone is held to the same standards, we have
29 to act in the best interests of the city.

30 Mr. Dudley replied that the planning commission is just a recommending body, the project will
31 still go to council. He asked for an explanation of why these things cannot be addressed between
32 now and time it goes to the city council.

33 Mr. Hunter explained the TRC (Technical Review Committee) process from beginning to end.
34 Initially a submittal is reviewed to make sure it is a complete submittal. Once it has been deemed
35 to be complete, staff will provide review comments. At that point the project gets added back
36 into the queue. This proposal was resubmitted just this last week and has not made it back
37 through the queue, the fire department has not had a chance to re-review it yet either. City staff
38 do not have the ability to skip over projects next in the queue to this project to verify that all

APPROVED MINUTES

1 comments have been addressed. We have not been able to finalize this review yet. We cannot
2 give a positive recommendation without all the information.

3 Chairman Woffinden added that city staff have a full plate of plans to review and it is not fair to
4 staff to have this back on their agenda in a rush.

5 Mr. Dudley asked how they were able to get on the agenda. Mr. Olsen indicated that it was at the
6 developer's request.

7 Ms. Anderson asked when this project will be back on the TRC schedule.

8 Mr. Hunter responded that he was not sure, he thought that they are about 4-6 weeks out. At the
9 time Mr. Greene requested to be put on the agenda, he was advised that staff would recommend
10 tabling since the final TRC review had not taken place.

11 Chairman Woffinden added that the Engineering Division just lost another engineer this week,
12 they will be very short-staffed.

13 Mr. Dudley sympathized with Mr. Greene, as he has been in both situations and can see both
14 sides. Everyone has deadlines and rising costs. The commissioners like to help where we can. He
15 also understands the staff and the chairman's position.

16 Mr. Brocious indicated that if there are no design changes and if comments are minor he wishes
17 that the process were expedited.

18 Mr. Poor clarified that because of a conflict in our city code they had to make a change. The
19 number and placement of units has not changed, he feels that the changes have been minor.

20

21 **Public Hearing Opened**

22 No comments were received.

23 **Public Hearing Closed**

24

25 **Mr. Brocious moved to table action on the project based on the Engineering Division**
26 **completing review and giving approval.**

27

28 **Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

29

30 **Chairman Woffinden Aye**

31 **Christine Anderson Aye**

32 **Harold Dudley Aye**

33 **Rod Brocious Aye**

34 **Jenny Peay Aye**

35

The motion passed.

APPROVED MINUTES

1
2 **Mr. Dudley explained that his vote to table will move the project along faster than no**
3 **action at all.**

4
5 **Ms. Anderson agreed, and wished the applicants well.**
6
7

8 2. Hearing, review and action on amendments to the General Plan by providing a
9 recommendation on the 2021 Transportation Master Plan Map
10
11

12 Mr. Hunter shows a diagram in the master plan, this particular update is the master transportation
13 map itself. This update reflects some changes for the benefit of the city by identifying a new
14 description of “legacy” roads. The main purpose behind this new classification is that legacy
15 roads are identified where infrastructure and rights-of-way are already in place and development
16 is already there. Cross-sections may have been changed updated, legacy roads function in the
17 same way as other descriptions though there may be existing limitations and a need for
18 additional allowances. The map portion of the transportation element will be updated.
19

20 Ms. Anderson asked if this would come into play mostly with roads that are facing new
21 development and allow them to not have to meet the same requirements.
22

23 Mr. Hunter said that is a possibility, it allows us to recognize that existing conditions may have
24 to be worked around or tweaked in order to meet the classification needs of that particular
25 roadway.
26

27 Ms. Anderson asked if the proposed change is a specific set of rules or just extra leeway.
28

29 Mr. Hunter said that the change just gives city staff extra flexibility. He used an example that an
30 existing minor collector road cross-section specifies a 72 ft-width, whereas a legacy road may be
31 68 ft wide. The new classification would acknowledge that curb, gutter, and sidewalk may
32 already be in place and the cost to remove and replace may not justify the benefit. This change
33 would give leeway for such existing conditions. Areas not developed yet are not impacted, those
34 roads would not have the same leeway.
35

36 Ms. Anderson asked if there are any roads that are currently identified as legacy roads.
37

38 Mr. Hunter said there are no such identified roads currently. He gives another example of an
39 existing road between two subdivision lots that is already in place, it might not make sense to

APPROVED MINUTES

1 require additional right-of-way when improvements are already there and it is functioning as it
2 needs to.

3

4 Ms. Peay asked when the last traffic study was done.

5

6 Mr. Hunter believes it was done in 2018. This map change will bring some of the modeling from
7 the traffic study into the master plan document.

8

9 Chairman Woffinden added that the city's master plan is a living document and will change over
10 time.

11

12 Ms. Anderson asked about 700 North. It could be designated as a legacy arterial with five lanes,
13 but currently it has only two lanes of traffic.

14

15 Mr. Hunter stated that identifying it as a legacy road gives staff flexibility to deal with traffic
16 numbers and provide allowances to ensure functionality. Some roads will have extra space in
17 shoulders, bike lanes, a median turn lane, etc. Generally there won't be parking on arterial roads.

18

19 Ms. Anderson asked if she votes to approve, does that mean that she agrees to all roads having
20 the number of lanes specified?

21

22 Mr. Hunter replied that roads will be classified according to their level of service. By identifying
23 it as a legacy road they will gain the flexibility to determine what level of service gives the
24 desired functionality without causing traffic delays. In some instances, roads will still function as
25 desired by changing an intersection configuration. This proposed change makes a classification
26 of a four or five lane road possible with fewer travel lanes by use of traffic calming devices, etc.

27

28 Mr. Brocious noted that such new classifications may give flexibility, but the city should still
29 recognize the need that such roads have to carry the correct amount of traffic. A five-lane road
30 may be what is needed to provide the appropriate traffic-carrying capacity.

31

32 Chairman Woffinden added that he lives right off 700 North and it could not become a five lane
33 road without buying up a lot of properties.

34

35 Mr. Hunter said that a legacy road can possibly function similarly to a larger road without having
36 to have five lanes. The legacy classification gives the city the ability to require that a road be
37 able to function in the needed capacity by possibly changing the structure of the required impact
38 fees.

39

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Brocious indicated that impact fees are analyzed to account for this and charged so that
2 when the time comes, the city has the money to buy the required properties.

3
4

5 **Public Hearing Opened**

6 No comments were received.

7 **Public Hearing Closed**

8

9 **Mr. Dudley moved to approve the amendment to the map in the Transportation Element of**
10 **the General Plan.**

11 **Mr. Brocious seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

12	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
13	Christine Anderson	Aye
14	Harold Dudley	Aye
15	Rod Brocious	Aye
16	Jenny Peay	Aye

17 **The motion passed.**

18
19
20
21
22

23 3. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 17.8.304 of the American Fork
24 City Municipal Code entitled Project Streets and Sidewalks

25 Mr. Hunter stated that as changes are made to the city code, staff identifies house-cleaning items
26 that aren't applicable anymore, or modifications that need to be made. With the recent TOD code
27 changes allowing for minimal setbacks, a reduced right-of-way width doesn't have any
28 application anymore. The identified sentences also contradict other sections of code.

29

30 **Public Hearing Opened**

31 No comments were received.

32 **Public Hearing Closed**

33

APPROVED MINUTES

1 **Ms. Anderson moved to approve the code text amendment to Section 17.8.304 Project**
2 **Streets and Sidewalks.**

3

4 **Mr. Dudley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

5

6 **Chairman Woffinden Aye**

7 **Christine Anderson Aye**

8 **Harold Dudley Aye**

9 **Rod Brocious Aye**

10 **Jenny Peay Aye**

11

The motion passed.

12

13

14

15

16 4. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 15.01.110 of the American Fork
17 City Municipal Code entitled Easements

18

19 Mr. Hunter stated that this proposed amendment relates to the TOD. This is also a house-
20 cleaning item that needs to be made consistent throughout the code for areas where there are
21 reduced setbacks. This amendment provides for a continuous utility easement, but can be
22 modified at the discretion of the city engineer. It will also give better clarification of when and
23 where certain easements can exist.

24 Mr. Brocious clarified that if this is approved, the city engineer is granted discretion to make sure
25 there is sufficient easement access. He feels that sometimes sufficient easement can be granted
26 but code requirements may hold a development hostage. He approves giving engineers discretion
27 to review.

28 Mr. Hunter agreed, the city engineer would need to feel comfortable with what is provided.
29 Proposals can be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

30 Mr. Dudley asks if the power and utility companies have had input on proposed changes.

31 Mr. Hunter indicated that utilities are included in the TRC process, staff also require a utility
32 notification form to be signed off as a development progresses.

33 Mr. Dudley asked if utilities have had any input on the changes.

34 Mr. Hunter isn't sure, he does not think they have sent any particular special notification to the
35 utility companies.

36 Mr. Dudley is very concerned, these issues can become a problem for utility companies.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Hunter reiterated that the TRC process tries to include utilities, they have the opportunity to
2 give input at that level. The TRC review level is where utilities make their needs known.

3 Mr. Brocious suggested calling it a public utility easement instead of the generic easement term.
4 Mr. Hunter agreed with that recommendation.

5 Mr. Dudley replied he would feel more comfortable if staff had discussed this with the utility
6 companies beforehand. They should know that this change is being made.

7 Mr. Sensanbaugher clarified that standard practice is that utilities are in the front, the
8 overwhelming majority of utility easements are in the front. This proposed change only applies
9 to back easements.

10 Mr. Dudley said that he misunderstood and was concerned that we were changing all easements.

11

12 **Public Hearing Opened**

13 No comments were received.

14 **Public Hearing Closed**

15

16 **Mr. Dudley moved to approve the code text amendment related to Section 15.01.1110**
17 **Easements, and recommend substituting “public utility easement” for “easement.”**

18

19 **Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

20

21 **Chairman Woffinden Aye**

22 **Christine Anderson Aye**

23 **Harold Dudley Aye**

24 **Rod Brocious Aye**

25 **Jenny Peay Aye**

26 **The motion passed.**

27

28

29

30 **5. Other Business**

31

32 Mr. Olsen told commissioners that he is happy to have a full commission with the addition of
33 two new commissioners. He also mentioned that the city council would like some further
34 clarification from planning commissioners regarding architecture and building materials in the
35 CC-1 zone.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 6. Site Plan Committee Report
2

3 Mr. Olsen reviewed the items for the upcoming Planning Commission meeting to be held on
4 Wednesday, June 16, 2021. It will be a fairly short meeting, with a zone change near the golf
5 course and an amended plat that adjusted a property line and is requesting altered side setbacks
6 for 3rd car garages.

7
8 7. Review and action on the minutes of the May 19, 2021 Planning Commission Regular
9 Session
10

11 **Ms. Anderson moved to recommend approval of the minutes of the May 19, 2021 Planning**
12 **Commission Regular Session.**

13 **Mr. Brocious seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

14 Chairman Woffinden	Aye
15 Christine Anderson	Aye
16 Harold Dudley	Aye
17 Rod Brocious	Aye
18 Jenny Peay	Abstain

19 **The motion passed.**
20

21 8. Adjournment
22

23 **Mr. Brocious motioned to adjourn.**

24
25 **Ms. Peay seconded the motion. All voted in favor.**
26
27
28

29 Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.
30
31

32 

33
34
35 Lisa Halversen
36 Administrative Assistant