

APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
JULY 21, 2021

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on July 21, 2021, at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 pm.

Present: Chairman John Woffinden
Christine Anderson
Jenny Peay
Bruce Frandsen
Geoff Dupaix

Absent: Chris Christiansen
Rod Brocious
Harold Dudley

Staff Present: Adam Olsen, City Planner
Wendelin Knobloch, Planner
Scott Sensanbaugher, Public Works Director
Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant

Others Present: McKay Quinn, Ginger Romriell, Steve Tate, Joe Brown

Chairman Woffinden led the "Pledge of Allegiance."

1. Hearing, review and action on the site plan and plat for the Walton Townhome Planned Community Development Project located at 781 East Quality Drive in the PC Planned Community zone

Mr. Olsen informed commissioners that this item was tabled at the June 2nd meeting in order for the applicant to address some outstanding engineering concerns. Those have been addressed and the item is now being brought back for Planning Commission consideration and recommendation.

The property was annexed in 2019 as part of the Vest Annexation. A concept plan approval followed, designating this area as higher density residential. A subsequent development agreement was approved, allowing an overall development parking ratio of 1.8 stalls per unit.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 The 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 or to the north and west, or inward toward open space areas.
4 Parking is provided at 2.26 spaces per unit; well above the allowed 1.8 stalls per unit as approved
5 in the development agreement. Renderings of the proposed townhomes as well as landscape plans
6 are provided in the submittal materials. Adjacent properties to the south, east and north have
7 recently been approved for higher density residential (apartments). The subdivision plat proposes
8 one lot over the entirety of the site plan.

9 Mr. Frandsen asked about the cross-sections, some of the grades are raised significantly against
10 adjoining property lines. How do commissioners ensure that encroachment on neighbors is
11 minimized?

12 Mr. Sensanbaugher responded that if they're staying on their own property the grade is generally
13 acceptable. To make development work sometimes the grade needs to be raised. The plans are
14 reviewed by city staff to make sure they meet code and don't cause a significant issue.

15 Chairman Woffinden asked about drainage problems between differing grades.

16 Mr. Sensanbaugher replied that this is part of the review process, they look at it case by case, There
17 is not a blanket answer.

18 Ms. Peay asked about the slope transition in general and what the maximum allowable slope is.

19 Mr. Sensanbaugher indicated that when the next-door property chooses to develop, they may have
20 to raise their grade as well. He was not sure about what the maximum allowable slope is.

21

22 Public Hearing Opened

23 Shawn Poor, representing Brighton Homes, expressed excitement about building in American
24 Fork. They have been working on this project for quite a while. The slope and drainage issues
25 were addressed during review. He feels they will make a nice streetscape with three-story homes.

26 Public Hearing Closed

27

28 **Ms. Anderson moved to recommend approval of the site plan and final plat of the Walton**
29 **Townhome Project, with the findings listed in the staff report and subject to any findings,**
30 **conditions and modifications listed in the engineering report.**

31

32 **Ms. Peay seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

33

34 **Chairman Woffinden Aye**

APPROVED MINUTES

1 **Christine Anderson** **Aye**

2 **Jenny Peay** **Aye**

3 **Bruce Frandsen** **Aye**

4 **Geoff Dupaix** **Aye**

5 **The motion passed.**

6
7
8 2. Hearing, review and action on a commercial site plan for Key Bank/Crossroads at AF Phase
9 2, located in the vicinity of 607 West Main Street in the SC-1 Planned Shopping Center zone

10
11 Mr. Olsen said that the site plan covers the vacant space directly west of Zupas and north of In-N-
12 Out. Key Bank proposes a structure on the site. In addition, the drive-thru for In-N-Out will be
13 reconfigured, adding additional stacking along the southwest and northwest periphery of the site.
14 This will alleviate stacking that at times backs onto Main Street. No additional access to Main
15 Street is proposed. The existing, signalized access will remain and provide access to the expanded
16 site. Renderings of the proposed bank and landscape plans have been provided in the submittal
17 materials. Additional landscaping will be provided for the expanded drive-thru stacking for In-N-
18 Out.

19
20 Ms. Anderson asked about the traffic pattern displayed on the site plan material. Mr. Olsen
21 indicated that it was the drive-thru for the bank.

22 Mr. Dupaix expressed concern about an entrance point between the 2 drive-thru stacking areas.

23 Mr. Steve Tate, developer, said that In-n-Out required that as an emergency escape as it will be
24 the longest drive-thru in their portfolio. This drive-thru will stack close to 40 cars before they enter
25 the shopping center area.

26 Mr. Dupaix asked if there will be signage so that drivers do not enter at that point.

27 Mr. Tate said that this will be an education process. In-n-Out committed to have employees
28 outside, striping, cones, etc. to educate the public, especially in the beginning.

29 Chairman Woffinden said that this is also confusing to him. He believes that signage will be
30 required.

31 Mr. Tate responded by saying that employees will be directing traffic, they will have A-frame
32 signs if needed.

33 Chairman Woffinden asked how the drive-thru would function during construction.

34 Mr. Tate said that they have had discussions with the contractor and there is a 3 ft grade change
35 on the south. They plan to build the new drive-thru entirely before they open the new pattern. They

APPROVED MINUTES

1 will phase it to avoid traffic situations and retain full function of their existing drive-thru until the
2 new drive thru is ready. Then they will just remove the black rail fence and the new pattern will
3 be ready.

4 Ms. Anderson asked about the parking configuration for the bank, she hopes the In-n-Out drive-
5 thru will be done before the bank's. Mr. Tate affirmed that this would be the case.

6 Ms. Peay said she has a concern with where the exit from the bank drive-thru intersects with the
7 In-n-Out drive-thru.

8 Mr. Tate responded that the contractor has offered to put in some type of barrier to keep them
9 separate. He said that the Centerville location, the busiest in Utah, routes theirs around the
10 perimeter and uses the barriers to educate customers. He said In-n-Out will put 10 employees out
11 there if they have to. There is a big problem currently with cars going out into Main Street. This
12 will hopefully solve the problem that's been an issue since 2007.

13 Mr. Sensanbaugher said that the city is glad to have this help with the traffic problem in the area.
14 The developer has answered all of staff's comments and concerns, the Engineering Division
15 recommends approval.

16 Mr. Dupaix asked if there was a cross-contact agreement in writing, and Mr. Tate affirmed that
17 there is an agreement that will be recorded.

18

19 **Public Hearing Opened**

20 No comments received

21 **Public Hearing Closed**

22

23 **Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the site plan for Key Bank/Crossroads at AF**
24 **Phase 2, with the finding listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions and**
25 **modifications listed in the engineering report.**

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

27 **Chairman Woffinden Aye**

28 **Christine Anderson Aye**

29 **Jenny Peay Aye**

30 **Bruce Frandsen Aye**

31 **Geoff Dupaix Aye**

32 **The motion passed.**

33

34

APPROVED MINUTES

1 3. Hearing, review and action on an agreement for the Silverado Annexation, consisting of
2 26.04 acres at approximately 1000 West 150 South

3 Mr. Olsen stated that the Silverado Annexation consists of approximately 26.04 acres and is
4 located in the area of 1000 West 150 South, directly west of the Front Runner station. The
5 parcels lie within the TOD Mixed-Use Core sub-district. The property is slated to be zoned
6 “TOD” and will develop under the parameters of the Mixed-Use Core sub-district. This area is
7 intended to have the highest densities and intensities of use within the TOD area; a component of
8 mixed-use being required for higher density residential projects.

9 Mr. Frandsen asked if rights-of-way and easements would be required. Mr. Olsen affirmed, and
10 added that there will also be a water agreement.

11 Mr. Frandsen asked if the city requires water for road projects.

12 Mr. Sensanbaugher said that the code distinguishes between culinary and pressurized irrigation.
13 Roads are not in either category, so they don’t require any water.

14 Ms. Anderson confirmed that this area is mixed-use and high-density, and she wants to make
15 sure the developer is aware of the requirements. She feels this needs to be a highly visible
16 example of the mixed-use code and will set a good precedent.

17 Mr. Olsen affirmed that the developer knows what the TOD mixed-use requirements will be and
18 is willing to abide by them.

19
20 **Public Hearing Opened**

21 No comments received

22 **Public Hearing Closed**

23
24 Mr. Joe Brown, Silverado applicant, is excited to build near the front-runner and maximize the
25 retail and residential uses. They’ve been working on concepts and ideas and are excited to bring
26 them to the commission and council. This will be a collaborative effort with the city staff.

27
28 **Mr. Frandsen moved to recommend approval of the Silverado Annexation Agreement.**

29
30 **Mr. Dupaix seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

31		
32	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
33	Christine Anderson	Aye
34	Jenny Peay	Aye

APPROVED MINUTES

1 **Bruce Frandsen** **Aye**
2 **Geoff Dupaix** **Aye**

3 **The motion passed.**
4
5

- 6 4. Hearing, review and action on an agreement for the AF Utah LLC Annexation, located at
7 approximately 1000 West 200 South

8 Mr. Olsen told commissioners that the AF Utah LLC Annexation consists of approximately 19.4
9 acres and located in the area of 1000 West 200 South. The parcels lie within the TOD Mixed-Use
10 Core sub-district. The property is slated to be zoned “TOD” and will develop under the
11 parameters of the Mixed-Use Core sub-district. This area is intended to have the highest densities
12 and intensities of use within the TOD area; a component of mixed-use being required for higher
13 density residential projects. This area is just to the south of the annexation just approved.
14

15 **Public Hearing Opened**

16 No comments were received.

17 **Public Hearing Closed**
18

19 **Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the AF Utah LLC Agreement.**
20

21 **Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**
22

23 **Chairman Woffinden** **Aye**
24 **Christine Anderson** **Aye**
25 **Jenny Peay** **Aye**
26 **Bruce Frandsen** **Aye**
27 **Geoff Dupaix** **Aye**

28 **The motion passed.**
29
30

- 31 5. Hearing, review and action on a preliminary plan and final plat for Stonecreek Plat G,
32 located at approximately 350 West 900 South in the PR-3.0 Residential zone
33

34 Mr. Olsen informed commissioners that Stonecreek Plat G is a 25-lot phase of an overall 143-acre
35 development. The preliminary plan is being processed concurrently with the final plat. The final
36 plat is consistent with terms of a preliminary plan approval.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Plat G is located at the southern portion of the overall development. An annexation currently in
2 process will add property directly south of Plat G and will be a continuation of the overall
3 development. Access to Plat G is provided off 840 South.

4 Conservation Subdivision Projects within the PR-3.0 zone must adhere to certain parameters.
5 Subdivisions must have a minimum project area of five (5) acres, and a maximum density of 3
6 units per acre. Plat G is the seventh phase in a 143-acre development, with an overall density of 3
7 units per acre; falling within the parameters of a Conservation Subdivision project in the PR-3.0
8 zone.

9 As with plats A, B, C, D, E and F, the applicants request Planning Commission consideration and
10 allowance for modification of building site requirements, allowing the ability to average lot sizes
11 in order for greater overall consistency. This modification is allowed pursuant to Sections
12 17.7.401, allowing the “harmonizing (of) development within a project”. The Planning
13 Commission may, but is not required, to make this finding. A finding allowing the modification
14 is offered below.

15 Conservation Subdivisions within a PR-3.0 zone require 25% open space. The overall project area
16 provides for 26% open space upon buildout. Plats A, B, C, D, E and F provided dedication of
17 land. Plat G continues this dedication; further dedications occurring as the property to the south
18 is annexed.

19 Ms. Anderson asked if there are requirements to plan trees in the open space. Mr. Olsen said no,
20 there’s not a requirement for trees specifically, just improvements. Ms. Anderson felt that trees are
21 important in general for temperature control, etc.

22 Mr. Dupaix is concerned that the street trees will grow too big and be a visibility hazard when fully
23 grown along 250 and 290 West. He is concerned about the large number of trees and the closer
24 spacing that would be required.

25 Ms. Peay noted that it is important to have the trees trimmed up to a certain height.

26 Mr. Sensanbaugher said that a previous geotechnical question was answered and the Engineering
27 Division now recommends approval.

28

29 **Public Hearing Opened**

30 No comments received

31 **Public Hearing Closed**

32

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Ms. Ginger Romriell, representing Woodside, said the Stonecreek plats will go up to I. She
2 added that they plan to put in about 20 trees in the open spaces. The HOA is in charge of
3 maintaining and trimming the trees.

4 **Mr. Frandsen moved to approve the preliminary plan and recommend approval of the**
5 **final plat of Stonecreek Plat G, with the findings listed in the staff report and subject to any**
6 **findings, conditions, and modifications listed in the engineering report.**

7 **Mr. Dupaix seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

8

9 **Chairman Woffinden Aye**

10 **Christine Anderson Aye**

11 **Jenny Peay Aye**

12 **Bruce Frandsen Aye**

13 **Geoff Dupaix Aye**

14 **The motion passed.**

15

16

17

18 6. Review and action on a site plan for Lake City Flats located at approximately 95 North
19 Barratt Avenue in the CC-1 zone

20

21 Mr. Olsen indicated that this item was tabled at the July 7th meeting in order for the applicant to
22 address outstanding Engineering concerns. Discussion also centered on the proposed parking ratio
23 of 1 stall per unit and the pros and cons of such a proposal. While the applicant proposed
24 justification for a reduced number, staff is still concerned that the proposal of 1:1 is too low and
25 therefore recommends denial.

26 Lake City Flats is a proposal for a 5-story, 109 studio/micro unit project at the north end of Barratt
27 Avenue and Pacific Drive. The site consists of 1.35 acres and the resulting density is approximately
28 80 du/ac. The CC-1 zone was recently amended to allow higher density residential uses. There is
29 no cap in density provided that required parking be provided. In addition, there is no height
30 limitation in the zone; again, provided that required parking is provided.

31 Lake City Flats proposes a parking ration of 1 stall per unit, well below the City requirement of
32 2.25 stalls per unit. An argument provided by the applicant is that these “micro units” will not need
33 the required 2.25 stalls per unit as tenants will likely have one vehicle, at most. Additionally, as
34 the project lies in the path of a future bus-rapid transit corridor, tenants will be able to use public
35 transit. While it may be true that there will one day be a bus-rapid transit system in the vicinity,
36 there is no timeline from UTA on the construction of such a system. If it proves to be successful
37 in reducing the need for parking on-site for this project, an alternative would be to reduce the
38 number of units in order to provide the required number of parking stalls, until such time as the
39 transit system is in place. Then, at that future time, and if the parking demand is decreased,

APPROVED MINUTES

1 additional units could be constructed on site. Staff has concern with the low number of parking
2 stalls provided. The applicant has submitted a parking study in support of this low number, and
3 staff has provided a professional opinion in reply. Both are provided in the submittal materials. As
4 it stands, staff cannot recommend approval with such a low parking stall request.

5 As currently written, the CC-1 zone requires that “a variety of compatible exterior materials
6 (minimum 4), colors and design shall be used on all buildings. Architectural style shall consider
7 historical precedent and material used within the downtown area and complement that precedent”.
8 Staff is unclear how this is being addressed from the submittal materials presented. The materials
9 illustrate four complementing colors, but it is unclear how the proposed materials complement
10 historic precedent or materials used on existing historic structures downtown. The applicant is
11 likely to come with changes that better address this requirement and speak to it at the meeting.
12 This would be five stories, and the highest building in downtown American Fork, but we don’t
13 have the current transportation to support reduced parking.

14 Until the items outlined above are addressed, staff recommends this item be “tabled”. If the
15 reduced parking request remains, staff recommends “denial”

16 Mr. Sensanbaugher stated that concerns about adequate parking are not in the Engineering
17 Division’s purview. The applicant has been working with him on engineering issues, they are close
18 to resolving them. All comments appear to have been addressed but he hasn’t personally verified
19 this. Changes to the intersection will be reviewed as well in the next few days to verify that signage
20 and striping requirements will be met. He received an email on Monday which he assumes is a
21 response to comments. He is confident that the comments were minor and can be easily addressed.
22 He thinks they are very close.

23 Mr. Frandsen asked if there are legal requirements to meet to be able to close access on the north
24 end of Barratt. Mr. Sensanbaugher was confident that there aren’t any outside agencies that we
25 need to get approval from. He has discussed this with the city administrator and fire department.
26 There will be two points of egress and ingress, it will comply with code and improve safety. He
27 views this as an interim solution, a long term solution would be more substantial. We are beginning
28 the process of pursuing removal of the tracks, that would free up a lot of options. It just takes a lot
29 of time and this temporary solution is necessary in the meantime.

30 Mr. Frandsen stated that he just wanted to be sure there weren’t any legal issues with blocking
31 access, and Mr. Sensanbaugher assured him there were not. Mr. Sensanbaugher noted that he has
32 discussed this matter with the city attorney as well. He feels confident in the legal standing.

33 Mr. Dupaix added that UDOT code specifies that this is a matter of city jurisdiction.

34 Mr. Diego Carroll and Mr. Chad Pollard, applicants, recognized that this proposal has taken a lot
35 of time. They have a presentation ready, but if the commission prefers to postpone they are happy
36 to do so.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Chad Pollard said that they worked as quickly as they could but couldn't meet the engineering
2 deadlines. They would prefer to withdraw until the Engineering Division has had a chance to look
3 at comments.

4 Mr. Olsen said regardless of the decision to hear the presentation or withdraw and wait until
5 engineering concerns are met, his recommendation to deny will not change. The fastest way to get
6 it in front of council is to deny the project tonight.

7 Mr. Carroll said that if commissioners are going to deny, they would miss the opportunity to hear
8 all the information.

9 Chairman Woffinden asked them to present their information to commissioners.

10 Mr. Carroll said that they are confused, they keep hearing that this project is what the city wants.
11 They wouldn't have moved forward if they thought that the commission wasn't open to their idea
12 of reduced parking. He displayed a power point and reiterated that they came before the planning
13 commission a year ago and were heard as a discussion item. He thinks this is a great opportunity
14 to work with the city. As an example of collaboration, at an initial review there was a concern
15 about having 5 stories. They met with the council members about the height and made a pitch
16 regarding data in support of reduced parking. In a study of American Fork renters based on census
17 information, the average number of vehicles owned is 1.5. This project is smaller, like a hotel room
18 and accommodates professionals. He displayed pictures of a Salt Lake City development they're
19 doing. He believes it utilizes a very good use of space. All units are leased out. They are a great fit
20 for downtown American Fork and an example of mixed-use. There are two grocery stores in the
21 area to support the project. He displayed pictures of the current home and residence. They are
22 willing to be flexible and collaborative with their architectural style. This plan doesn't assume
23 redevelopment in area or other conditions. He showed a memo stating that all firefighting
24 requirements are met. Hales Engineering confirmed that they met all the requirements and were
25 satisfied with their methodology. He believed that a parking standard of less than one car per unit
26 is reasonable.

27 Mr. Carroll said that they are happy to be flexible and come to an agreement on exterior finishes.

28 Mr. Pollard said they are trying to develop an architectural style that fits into the downtown area.
29 He added that they intend to control parking on-site by charging for parking, Hales Engineering
30 said that would help allay their concerns.

31 Mr. Carroll said his process has been based on data and facts about current transportation elements.
32 It is not based on future transportation elements that may or may not come. Mr. Pollard also said
33 they were caught off guard that they do not meet the parking requirement. He expressed confusion
34 that staff is not supportive of the reduced number of stalls. He disagrees with the fire marshal's
35 concerns and feels that his analysis isn't data-based.

36 Chairman Woffinden asked if they were open to possibility of an underground parking structure.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Carroll said that they have considered the possibility of building 6 stories, with the bottom
2 level being parking. He feels that they are trying to be sensitive to the city's concerns but he thinks
3 our staff isn't used to dealing with urban development. He doesn't know how to find a solution
4 that works for the city. Parking is a huge deal. He believes that underground parking may make it
5 so that it's not accessible to fire apparatus. He doesn't see how vertical parking could work. They
6 are trying to be an affordable housing option. Impact fees are high as well. He is very frustrated
7 that there is no way to appeal a difference with the city fire marshal. He feels that there is a lot of
8 data to support their position that one parking space per unit is sufficient.

9 Ms. Peay asked if they can address guest parking, is that included in the one parking space per unit
10 or is there additional guest parking? Mr. Carroll stated that there won't be much guest visitor
11 parking needed, but it is included in the one parking space per unit. They included data from Orem
12 that utilized on-street parking.

13 Mr. Frandsen said that charging for parking adds an additional burden, and the developer is not
14 giving any guest or visitor parking. It's not fair to the city or neighborhood to have to deal with
15 problems caused by a problem that should have been addressed during development.

16 Mr. Carroll said that policies regarding private property already forbid parking in your neighbor's
17 driveway and there are many other solutions to the parking issue. They could even designate some
18 of the parking to be short term or visitor, but he doesn't feel there is data to back up a need for
19 visitor parking. On-street parking would still be a solution.

20 Mr. Pollard added that not everyone who lives here will use a vehicle. He gives an example of a
21 young professional who doesn't have a driver's license.

22 Ms. Anderson initially thought that charging for parking was a good idea, but it seems to
23 incentivize people to park on the street because no one will want to pay for a stall.

24 Mr. Carroll stated that they could maybe provide 5 parking spaces per unit, but the issue would
25 still be a problem. Demand will outstrip supply if parking is free and not limited. They would be
26 happy if the city limited nearby parking. He gave examples of similar developments in Holladay
27 (1 parking spot per unit), Clearfield, and Midvale, (multifamily units with 1 parking spot per unit).

28 Mr. Olsen clarified that this parking ratio is allowed in the TOD area, but he said that developers
29 are choosing to not go that low for parking even though they could. He likes the concept of the
30 micro apartments but thinks the discussion needs to shift to council.

31 Mr. Dupaix is not opposed to building another story vertically, would it help to have the ground
32 floor as parking? What is the likelihood there could be a middle ground where we explore options
33 of ground level parking and building up another story? He suggested shifting the incentive to
34 reward those who don't have a car instead of penalizing those who do.

35 Mr. Olsen stated that he has to follow the city code. His role is not to find a middle ground, he has
36 to follow the city code. He can't make up arbitrary numbers, that is left for council.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Carroll expressed frustration that they have spent a lot of time and money trying to address
2 this.

3 Ms. Anderson said that this has been a really tricky thing to figure out because she likes the product
4 so much and the affordability it creates. She would love to see it work. The only check that the
5 city has on projects in the downtown is parking requirements, not height requirements. If you can
6 park it you can build it. This project is not quite close enough, we have an obligation to the code.
7 If we allow this reduced ratio, we set a precedent.

8 Chairman Woffinden said that the parking is the fatal flaw, it is less than half of what is required.

9 Mr. Olsen said if it the project is denied here, they can appeal to council.

10 Mr. Dupaix agreed that staff is constrained by code, he understands that this is a new type of
11 development. He is trying to understand why the developers don't want to move forward with a
12 denial if it helps them get to where they need to be faster. A denial escalates their appeal to council.

13 Mr. Pollard feels that the city is not using objective data but anecdotal evidence to back up their
14 requirements for 2.25 stalls.

15 Chairman Woffinden replied that the developer still has not given a viable solution to the parking
16 issue and guest parking.

17 Mr. Carroll stated that the Planning Commission has the ability to approve this project outright.

18 Mr. Dupaix replied that it is a non-starter as currently proposed, it is in both parties' interests to
19 bump it up to council to make the call. Denial is the best course of action to move it forward.

20 Mr. Carroll disagreed, he felt that the council will consider the Planning Commission's
21 recommendations and discussion. He asked if there is a way to convey to council that they would
22 like to be considered with a clean slate.

23 Chairman Woffinden said that if the commission recommends denial, his phone will be ringing
24 with council members wanting to know why it's been denied. They will certainly have the chance
25 to explain. This happened with American Eagle Ready-Mix, the council chose not to follow the
26 Planning Commission's lead.

27 Commissioners feel it would be wasting their time to table the project and bring it back later. Mr.
28 Dupaix suggests denying without prejudice. They like the product a lot and it is a tough discussion.
29 They are not necessarily against the project, they just want to make sure that the parking problem
30 is solved.

31 Chairman Woffinden called for a motion. He stated that the developers have not addressed his
32 guest parking concerns and at this point they are at an impasse. Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Carroll
33 if he has a preference between denying and tabling the motion. Mr. Carroll stated again that the
34 commission has the authority to approve and that is what they are asking for.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 **Mr. Dupaix moved to deny the site plan due to parking concerns and that the proposed ratio**
2 **of 1 stall per unit is insufficient, nor does it meet the City's requirement of 2.25 stalls per**
3 **unit. He added that city council should consider the matter without prejudice.**

4 **Ms. Peay seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

5	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
6	Christine Anderson	Aye
7	Jenny Peay	Aye
8	Bruce Frandsen	Aye
9	Geoff Dupaix	Aye

10 **The motion passed.**

13 7. Other Business

14 Mr. Olsen told commissioners that the annual summer dinner will be coming up after school starts.
15 He also told new commissioners that their families get a free pass to the rec center.

16 Chairman Woffinden requested group training in water rights for the commissioners and also felt
17 that it might be good to involve the city council.

18 Mr. Sensanbaugher wanted commissioners to be more specific in their questions about water rights
19 so he knows who he needs to bring in to help answer them. He asked commissioners to email him
20 their questions. Chairman Woffinden replied that they would like answers to general questions,
21 beneficial use, etc. and asked staff to please set up a training.

22 Ms. Anderson asked if is worth looking at adjusting the parking code for studio apartments.

23 Mr. Olsen said that the council's decision will determine where we will go on the issue.

24 Mr. Dupaix stated that he will be stepping away from the planning commission due to work and
25 family responsibilities.

26 Mr. Frandsen expressed his thanks and appreciation for Mr. Dupaix, Ms. Anderson concurred.

28 8. Site Plan Committee Report

30 Mr. Knobloch reviewed the items for the upcoming Planning Commission meeting to be held on
31 Wednesday, Aug 4, 2021. It should be a relatively light meeting.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 9. Review and action on the minutes of the July 7, 2021 Planning Commission Regular
2 Session
3

4 **Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the minutes of the July 7, 2021 Planning**
5 **Commission Regular Session.**

6 **Mr. Frandsen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

7	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
8	Christine Anderson	Aye
9	Jenny Peay	Aye
10	Bruce Frandsen	Aye
11	Geoff Dupaix	Abstain

12 **The motion passed.**

13 10. Adjournment
14

15 **Mr. Dupaix motioned to adjourn.**

16 **Mr. Frandsen seconded the motion. All voted in favor.**
17

18 Meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm.
19
20

21 

22
23 Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant