

APPROVED MINUTES

1
2
3 AMERICAN FORK CITY
4 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
5 OCTOBER 20, 2021

6 The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on October 20, 2021, at
7 the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 pm.

8
9 Present: Chairman Woffinden
10 Bruce Frandsen
11 Jenny Peay
12 Harold Dudley
13

14
15 Absent: Chris Christiansen
16 Christine Anderson
17 Rod Brocious
18

19
20 Staff Present: Rob Shelton, Councilmember
21 David Bunker, City Administrator
22 Scott Sensanbaugher, Public Works Director
23 Rebecca Andrus, City Engineer
24 Ben Hunter, Engineer
25 George Schade, Communications
26 Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant
27

28 Others Present: Keaton Morton, Dave Morton
29

30
31 Chairman Woffinden led the “Pledge of Allegiance.” He then stated that items 1 and 2 would be
32 discussed together but voted on separately.
33

- 34
35 1. Hearing, review and action on a land use map amendment for property located in the area
36 of 100 West 1100 South from the Resort to the Design Industrial designation
37

38 Mr. Hunter stated that the original proposal was for approximately 90 acres but has been modified.
39 The applicant is currently proposing to amend the land use and zone map designations for
40 approximately 10 acres of land as shown on the attached map. The engineering report will detail
41 needs for roads and trails which would be conditions of approval. The proposed changes would
42 modify from its current Resort designation/Marina M-1 zone to the Design Industrial land
43 use/Planned Industrial PI-1 zone.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 There is a sewer lift station in the southwest corner, that parcel is not part of this proposal. The
2 surrounding property to the north and to the south are not annexed, the property to the east is zoned
3 Planned Industrial. This proposal is proposed to be zoned PI-1 so it would match the zoning and
4 land use with the neighboring property. The applicant has provided a conflict-of-interest statement.

5 Mr. Bruce Frandsen, applicant, said that his plan is to do something similar to what has been going
6 in in that area, perhaps tilt-up concrete buildings. The north sliver of the property on the north side
7 of the road is the only portion that is realistically zoned for resort activity, the odor near the lift
8 station makes it difficult to do resort activities in that area as it is currently zoned for.

9

10 **Public Hearing Opened**

11 No comments received.

12 **Public Hearing Closed**

13

14 **Ms. Peay moved to recommend approval of the land use map amendment subject to any**
15 **findings, conditions, and modifications found in the Engineering Report.**

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

17	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
18	Bruce Frandsen	Aye
19	Jenny Peay	Aye
20	Harold Dudley	Aye

21

22 **The motion passed.**

23

24

25 2. Hearing, review and action on a zone map amendment for property located in the area of
26 1100 South and 100 West from the M-1 Marina to the PI-1 Planned Industrial zone

27

28

29 **Public Hearing Opened**

30 No comments received.

31 **Public Hearing Closed**

32

33 **Ms. Peay moved to recommend approval of the zone map amendment subject to any**
34 **findings, conditions, and modifications found in the Engineering Report.**

APPROVED MINUTES

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

2	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
3	Bruce Frandsen	Aye
4	Rod Brocious	Aye
5	Jenny Peay	Aye

6 **The motion passed.**

7
8
9 3. Hearing, review and action on a preliminary plan and final plat for Beck Hillside Estates
10 consisting of 15 lots, located in the area of 760 North 200 East in the R-1-9,000 zone

11
12 Mr. Hunter told commissioners that Beck Hillside Estates proposes 15 lots on 5.49 acres, with an
13 overall density of 2.7 du/ac. The property recently had a zone change and was given a zone
14 designation of R1-9,000. Access to Greenwood Creek is provided off 200 East. All lots meet or
15 exceed the requirements of the R1-9,000 zone.

16 Staff recommends denial of the preliminary plan and of the final plat based on the plan set that
17 City Staff provided to the applicant on October 5, 2021 with outstanding TRC comments that
18 must be resolved in order to meet City requirements. The applicant submitted additional
19 documents on Thursday, October 7, which did not give City Staff a reasonable amount of time to
20 review the submittal and confirm that all TRC comments have been addressed.

21 Chairman Woffinden asked if the city has received the geotechnical report yet, as he has not seen
22 it. Mr. Hunter indicated that the third-party engineer has reviewed it, and there are outstanding
23 comments that need to be addressed. The developer submitted an updated report that is currently
24 being reviewed by the third-party to ensure that all concerns were addressed.

25 Chairman Woffinden reminded city staff that he is a licensed geologist and is supposed to
26 receive all geotechnical reports for review as well. He has not seen a copy of this report yet.
27 Further, he was very displeased upon hearing that the applicant considers the planning
28 commission merely an obstacle to be overruled by the city council. He stated that he is getting
29 very tired of developers coming before the commission with their project before they are ready.
30 This practice is a waste of staff's time and the commissioners' time. He explained that the
31 engineering and planning divisions are very short on staff at the moment and developers will not
32 help themselves by trying to push their way on the agenda when they aren't ready. He suggests
33 tabling the motion until the proposal is 100% complete.

34 Mr. Dudley said that this issue of proposals that aren't ready has come up before, it is his
35 understanding that it was at the request of the applicant that they are on the agenda tonight. Mr.
36 Hunter confirmed. Mr. Dudley felt that the developer should be given some time to explain their
37 position.

38 Mr. Dave Morton, developer, apologized to the commissioners. He indicated that their goal
39 wasn't to try and push things through in an incorrect manner. This proposal is their second set of

APPROVED MINUTES

1 plans and has very few redlines. He explained that the goal was simply to get a conditional
2 approval based on staff having sufficient time to review. He was sorry for any misunderstanding.

3 Chairman Woffinden reiterated that this is not the first development to want to push their way
4 through when they aren't ready, his comments are a culmination of the frustration of several such
5 incidents in the recent past.

6 Ms. Peay asked how much time is reasonably expected for staff to review a project.

7 Mr. Hunter explained that the review process includes the fire, engineering, planning and
8 sometimes the legal departments. Staff distributes the different components of submitted material
9 to the relevant departments during the TRC process. As staff receives resubmittals, they are
10 reviewed in the order they are received. Staff have distributed their responses to the various
11 parties and should hear back in the next week or so if this meets the departments' concerns or
12 not. He believes that this project is getting close. He knows that the planning department had a
13 couple of outstanding comments and the fire department had some concerns regarding
14 accessibility for the proposed cul-de-sac. The engineering division has issues related to a third-
15 party peer review as well as utilities. He believes that the project may be ready for a positive
16 recommendation at the point that all comments have been addressed, maybe next month.

17

18 **Public Hearing Opened**

19 No comments received.

20 **Public Hearing Closed**

21

22 Mr. Dudley felt that this applicant clearly has not met the city timelines. He stated that he was
23 previously a city planner and that if a proposed development was not ready for the agenda it
24 would not be placed on the agenda. He has assumed that projects coming before this commission
25 have been ready for approval. He apologized for this oversight, but he cannot recall a time that a
26 developer was put on an agenda before the minimum requirements were met. He added that a
27 denial from planning commission speeds up the process by sending it directly to city council. He
28 is afraid that he may have been unintentionally guilty of allowing a project to go through when
29 they were not ready because he assumed that if an item was on the agenda that it was ready.

30 Chairman Woffinden stated that the city has requirements and deadlines for a reason and he feels
31 the need to hold to that. He further stated that if this proposal is tabled then it will come back to
32 the planning commission and he cautioned that it will not be voted on to city council until it is
33 completely ready.

34

35

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Ms. Peay moved to table the preliminary plan and final plat for Beck Hillside Estates.

2 Mr. Frandsen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

3	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
4	Bruce Frandsen	Aye
5	Jenny Peay	Aye
6	Harold Dudley	Aye

7
8 The motion passed.
9

10
11
12
13

- 14 4. Hearing, review and action on a commercial site plan for Goldfish Swim School, located
15 at 348 South 500 East in the GC-2 General Commercial zone

16
17
18
19
20
21

Chairman Woffinden said that this item was pulled from the agenda at the developer's request.

22
23
24
25

- 22 5. Hearing, review and action on a preliminary plan, final plat and site plan for Deer Park
23 Subdivision consisting of two lots, located in the area of 9 West 1100 South in the PI-1
24 Planned Industrial zone

26
27
28
29
30

Chairman Woffinden said that this item was pulled from the agenda at the developer's request.

31
32
33
34

- 31 6. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 15.01.1430 of the American Fork
32 City Municipal Code entitled Cul-de-Sac

35
36
37
38
39
40
41

Mr. Hunter said that in order to be consistent with the City's 8' wide park strip and 5' wide sidewalk standard, an update to the cul-de-sac detail was required. This amendment replaces the old detail with the new one reflecting those standards. This is a clean-up item as the current standard drawing detail for cul-de-sacs still reflect the old park strip and sidewalk standards. The main change you will see is the cul-de-sac head, the old radius used to be a 60 ft radius but now the radius has been changed to 63ft. Everything else is the same and is what the fire department requires.

42

APPROVED MINUTES

1 **Public Hearing Opened**

2 No comments received.

3 **Public Hearing Closed**

4

5 **Mr. Dudley moved to recommend approval of the proposed code text amendments related**
6 **to Section 15.01.1430 Cul-de-Sac.**

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

8	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
9	Bruce Frandsen	Aye
10	Jenny Peay	Aye
11	Harold Dudley	Aye

12

13

The motion passed.

14

15

16

17 7. Other Business

18

19 Mr. Dudley gave a tribute to all who are veterans and thanked them for their service.

20

21 8. Site Plan Committee Report

22

23 Mr. Hunter said that there are a lot of projects in the review pipeline, there may be a code text
24 amendment and a subdivision plat ready at the next meeting. He told commissioners that the
25 Engineering Division has been shorthanded since May. They have recently filled some of the
26 positions so that may help with the backlog.

27

28

29 9. Review and action on the minutes of the October 6, 2021 Planning Commission Regular
30 Session

31

32 **Mr. Dudley moved to recommend approval of the minutes of the October 6, 2021 Planning**
33 **Commission Regular Session.**

APPROVED MINUTES

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

2	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
3	Bruce Frandsen	Aye
4	Jenny Peay	Aye
5	Harold Dudley	Aye

6
7 **The motion passed.**

8
9 Chairman Woffinden addressed the city administrator, Mr. Bunker, and asked him to comment
10 back to the mayor regarding developers pushing onto the agenda before their project is ready. He
11 stated that he had the support of the previous mayor in requiring a project to be ready for approval
12 before it was placed on the agenda so that the commission would have the necessary information
13 to make a good decision. The commissioners would appreciate a little more support from the
14 administration in this matter. He asked why the city has requirements and deadlines if they aren't
15 willing to enforce them? It is unfair to staff, commissioners and other applicants.

16 Mr. David Bunker, city administrator, responded to the chairman. He clarified that applicants have
17 a legal right to ask to be placed on the agenda after a certain period of time for review, which is 45
18 days. The Planning Commission is within its rights to determine that the project is incomplete and
19 to table or deny it. He pointed out that even though the applicants have not complied with city
20 code, they can request to be heard after 45 days. Staff will recommend a denial or tabling if the
21 project is incomplete. The city will stand within the legal requirements and allow them to be on
22 the agenda. It is frustrating, but the commission is doing its work by denying or tabling when a
23 project is not ready. The rules apply to us a city as well as the developers. It is not part of the
24 commission's job to tell the applicant what they need to do to be ready, that is the applicant's job
25 to figure out. He will pass along the chairman's comments to the mayor and there is also a council
26 member in attendance to provide feedback. Things will have to slow down until we have planning
27 staff in place.

28
29 **10. Adjournment**

30 **Mr. Dudley motioned to adjourn.**

31 **Ms. Peay seconded the motion. All voted in favor.**

32
33 Meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.

34
35
36
37
38 Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant