

**TOOELE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
47 SOUTH MAIN STREET, TOOELE, UTAH 84074
(435) 843-3160**

BUSINESS MEETING

January 5, 2005

The Tooele County Planning Commission Meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Chairman Doug Atkin.

Roll Call / Members in attendance:

Bill Bergner Marlene Thomas Craig Anderson Doug Atkin
Sharon Grgich George Mattena Dennis Rockwell

Staff:

Nicole Cline Richard Clark Mary Dixon

1. Approval of meeting minutes from December 15, 2004:

Sharon made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from December 15, 2004. The motion was seconded by George. All concurred.

2. Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for 2005:

Doug opened the nominations for chairperson. Sharon made a motion to nominate George for chairperson. The motion was seconded by Bill. All concurred. Bill made a motion to close the nominations for chairperson. The motion was seconded by Sharon. All concurred.

George opened the nominations for vice chairperson. Craig made a motion to nominate Bill for vice chairperson. The motion was seconded by Marlene. All concurred. Craig made a motion to close the nominations for vice chairperson. The motion was seconded by Marlene. All concurred.

Adjournment:

With no further comments Sharon made a motion to adjourn the business meeting. The motion was seconded by Doug All members concurred. The business meeting adjourned at 7:10p.m.

APPROVAL:

Chairperson, Tooele County Planning Commission

WORK MEETING

1. **PUD #003-99 Village at Country Crossing Phase 2A Plat 5 (Preliminary Phase):**

Richard gave a history of the development so far, and explained where it was located in the Stansbury area. Richard also gave a brief background of the surrounding area developments that exists. Richard explained who had been notified in regard to this item. Richard stated that this phase of the development is consistent with the master plan that is in place. George asked who would be in charge of the open space area. Nicole stated that the service area district would. Benson Whitney explained that this phase of the development is the last piece of the puzzle for this area. Bob Shields asked how all of the asphalt and the other improvements could be in place before this was even approved. Nicole explained that the developer takes the risk if they lay them before they are approved. Doug explained that the concept was approved previously and this is just a preliminary phase of a portion of that development.

Doug made a motion to move PUD #003-99 Village at Country Crossing Phase 2A Plat 5 (Preliminary Phase) to the next business meeting. The motion was seconded by Sharon All concurred.

2. **PUD #1007-04 Stansbury Place Concept Phase (The Boyer Company):**

Richard explained where this development would be located in the Stansbury area. Richard stated that this is a concept phase and it is only an outline of what the applicant proposes to do. Richard stated that the total land area was 311.62 acres, 230.90 acres would be residential. Richard explained that 53.44 acres would be other entities in the development. Richard stated that this development would be done in five different phases. Richard explained that there had been some questions about the roads and how they would be laid out. Richard explained that on January 5, 2005 the engineering office received a petition signed by nineteen residents of the adjacent area to the east protesting Windsong Dr. being directly connected to Village Blvd. Richard stated that the applicant had received a will serve letter from the Stansbury Park Improvement Dist and approvals from both Utah Power and Questar. Richard stated that the current zoning is R-1-10. Doug asked Richard to explain the R-1-10 zoning. Nicole explained to the commission what the R-1-10 zoning was. Troy Sanders explained how the roads would be laid out and how they would be connected. Troy Sanders also explained that the other marks on the map were water ways that already exist. George asked how many lots there would be in this development. Richard Moffat stated that the figures are just estimates because this is just a concept plan and not a preliminary. Dennis asked if the school property would be donated to the school district or not. Richard Moffat stated that they have not addressed this with the school district. Dennis and Doug both expressed concerns with the lot size. Nicole explained that the planning commission can control how large the lots are because this is a planned unit development. Dennis asked if the parks would be used for retention.

Richard Moffat stated that they would be. Richard Moffat stated that they would look at making the lots 8000 square feet lots. Marlene asked what the zoning was next to this development. Charlie War stated that it was currently zoned A-20. Craig asked about the right of ways along Village Blvd. Richard Moffat explained what they would be doing with the right of ways and explained that they would be eighty foot right of ways. Doug asked if the commission could see a traffic study on this development. Nicole explained

that the county would do a traffic study and they will be able to see the final results. Gary Ziser explained that the Stansbury Park Improvement dist. has given input to the Boyer Company on how this development could be laid out. Russ Small stated that he had some concerns with Windsong going all the way through. Nicole stated that as far as she knew Windsong would remain as platted. Larry Shumway stated that he is in support of this planned unit development, and he likes the way it has been laid out for this concept phase of the development. Bob Shields explained that they have given a will service letter to this development how ever there are lot of contingences that are hooked to this. Bob stated that they will have to prove that they have water rights for this development. Dave Lawrence stated that he would like to have some more uniformity for the landscape in the Stansbury area. He also expressed concerned with the open space area and it being a weed patch. There is not any place to store a recreational vehicle or even a storage unit in the area to store items in. Benson Whitney explained how they would like to realign the roads in the area to accommodate this development. Randy Jones expressed concerns with the road layout and the size of the lots; he would like to see the lots larger. Walter Plum explained that all of the developments that Boyer Company has done throughout the state are great. Scott Tompkins explained that he had concerns with the lot sizes and would like to have larger lots. Charley Warr stood and explained to the commission the water rights in the area and how much water flow each have. He has some concerns with the water rights and his own water flow in the area. Charley also explained that some of the area is not fit to develop and is considered wetlands and is under water in the Spring. Richard Moffat stood and addressed some issues that have been brought up. Richard Moffat also explained that he will come back with a different concept with all of the ideas and concerns that have been brought up placed in a new concept plan. Richard Moffat asked if Boyer Company needed to proceed with a planned unit development or something else, what would the commission like to see done with this development. The commission stated that they would like the lot sizes changes and no commercial in the development. Nicole asked if we could do a development agreement. Richard Moffat stated that he would like to do a new concept plan and then possibly do an agreement. George explained that they need to work out the issues that the surrounding land owners have and redo the lot sizes. Richard Moffat explained that the trails that are located in the development will have water that flows along the side of them. Scott Glen stated that he would like to see larger lot sizes.

Sharon made a motion to table PUD #1007-04 Stansbury Place Concept Phase (The Boyer Company) until they bring in a new concept plan. The motion was seconded by Dennis All concurred.

3. **AMZ #1016-04 Amendment to Chapter 16 Sideyard setbacks for accessory buildings:**

Nicole explained the changes that would be made to this chapter in regard to the sideyard setbacks. **R-1-8** – Main building, eight feet and accessory buildings, three feet providing that they do not encroach on any easement. **R-1-10** – Main building, eight feet and accessory buildings, three feet providing that they do not encroach on any easement. **R-1-12** – Main building, ten feet and accessory buildings, three feet providing that they do not encroach on any easement. **R-1-21** – Main building, ten feet and accessory buildings, three feet providing that they do not encroach on any easement. **R-M-7** – Main building,

six feet and accessory buildings, three feet providing that they do not encroach on any easement. **R-M-15** – Main building, six feet and accessory buildings, three feet providing that they do not encroach on any easement. **R-M-30** – Main building, six feet and accessory buildings, three feet providing that they do not encroach on any easement. Craig expressed concerns with the utility easement that is along the side yard. Nicole explained that the county does not require utility easements along a sideyard. Nicole explained that these changes give the land owner more flexibility with where they can place there accessory buildings.

Marlene made a motion to move AMZ #1016-04 Amendment to Chapter 16 Sideyard setbacks for accessory buildings to the next business meeting. The motion was seconded by Doug. All concurred.

4. **Acquisition of land per Utah Code Annotated 17-27-305:**

Nicole explained that under Utah state code it requires the county to get the recommendation from the planning commission to acquire land. Nicole explained where each of the properties were located in the county and gave a brief background about each property.

Doug made a motion to move Acquisition of land per Utah Code Annotated 17-27-305 to the next business meeting. The motion was seconded by Sharon. All concurred.

5. **PUD #0013-02 Ponderosa Estates Design Phase Plat 2:**

Richard explained where this development was located in the Stansbury area. Richard stated that this is phase 2 of this planned unit development; he also explained how it would be laid out. Sharon asked if all of the corrections had been made that needed to be made. Richard explained that they had.

Sharon made a motion to move PUD #0013-02 Ponderosa Estates Design Phase Plat 2 to the next business meeting. The motion was seconded by Doug All concurred.

Adjournment:

With no further comments Sharon made a motion to adjourn the work meeting and reopen the business meeting. The motion was seconded by Doug All concurred. The work meeting adjourned and the business meeting was reopened at 9:05 p.m.

Sharon made a motion to recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners AMZ #1016-04 Amendment to Chapter 16 Sideyard setbacks for accessory buildings. The motion was seconded by Bill.

Verbal Roll Call:

Bill yes Marlene yes Craig yes Doug yes
Sharon yes Dennis yes George yes

Sharon made a motion to recommend approval to the board of county commissioners of Acquisition of land located as explained to the commission per Utah Code Annotated 17-27-305. as described. The motion was seconded by Bill.

Verbal Roll Call:

Doug yes Craig yes Marlene yes Bill yes
Dennis yes Sharon yes George yes

Sharon made a motion to approve PUD #0013-02 Ponderosa Estates Design Phase Plat 2.
The motion was seconded by Dennis.

Verbal Roll Call:

Sharon yes Dennis yes Doug yes Marlene yes
Bill yes Craig yes George yes

Sharon made a motion to adjourn the business meeting. The motion was seconded by
Doug. All concurred. The business meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

APPROVAL:

Chairperson, Tooele County Planning Commission