

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

PUBLIC MEETING

September 3, 2008

Chairman Doug Atkin called the Tooele County Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

Roll Call / Members in attendance:

Doug Atkin yes, Joy Clegg yes, William Hogan no
Bill Bergener yes, Judy Jameson yes

Staff:

Vern Loveless, Kerry Beulter, Kent Page, Mary Dixon

1. Approval of meeting minutes from August 20, 2008:

Doug explained that on page two on line six it reads aliquant trash facilities, it should read adequate trash facilities. With the correction as noted, Bill made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from August 20, 2008. The motion was seconded by Joy. All concurred.

2. Tooele County Annexation Zone Policy:

Kerry explained that this is a plan that the engineering office has implemented. An annexation policy plan is required by State Code (10-2-401.5), to allow a municipality to annex an unincorporated area of the county. The request for density increasers the need for an annexation policy. Tooele City does have an annexation policy in place. Grantsville city may. Kerry stated that the county is getting pressure from developers to develop in some of our annexation area. Some of the concerns that staff has with development in the annexation area are, infrastructure, services, resident expectations, creation of county pockets, restriction of future growth of incorporated areas, maintaining annex-ability of developed area, consistency between developments. Kerry explained that the annexation zone policy was implemented to manage growth, it is the goal of Tooele County to limit densities within the unincorporated areas of the County. High-density development should occur only within incorporated cities or towns. Existing densely developed unincorporated areas should be encouraged to plan for future incorporation. In an effort to limit densities within the unincorporated areas of the County and not hinder the growth of cities or towns, the Tooele County Engineer's Office strongly discourages residential development at a density greater than RR-5 within identified annexation zones. For subdivisions in annexation zones proposing density greater than RR-5, which are not minor subdivisions, the Engineer's Office will request written comment, in conjunction with 10-2-402 of the Utah Code, from the municipality on the proposed subdivision, including a statement of the municipality's current intent to pursue annexation or not. If the municipality currently intends to annex, the Engineer's Office will withhold processing an application pending the result of annexation proceedings. For all subdivisions in annexation zones proposing density greater than RR-5, the Engineer's Office recommends the project include community water and sewer systems, sidewalk, curb, gutter and other infrastructure similar to and compatible with what would be provided within the adjacent city or town. In the general plan, the county wants to limit density in the county and encourage density in the cities. This policy agrees with the general plan in the aspect that it will discourage lower density in the county. With this policy, the county can be more consistent in their decisions. This policy is from the engineering office staff, we would like to make the planning commission aware of it. Kerry

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

PUBLIC MEETING

September 3, 2008

stated that staff did have the attorney's office read through it and they were ok with it.

3. CUP #08-00100014 Beaver Creek Investments –Del Taco:

The applicant for this conditional use permit is Beaver Creek Investments, the representative is Cary Dunn. This permit would be within the Travel Influence District, and any permit in this district requires approval from the planning commission. This type of use is permitted in the under laying zones which is C-H. This development will be within eight and nine hundred feet from the interchange. It will be located in the southeast corner from the Speedco development. Kent explained some questions that the planning commission needed to ask themselves in considering their decision. Is this use, density, acceptable for unimpeded traffic flow? Is this use harmonious to adjacent lands? Will this use insure attractive and orderly views of adjacent properties from the freeway? Is the visual image safe, convenient, comfortable to the freeway driver? Landscape plan for pole and monument signs required unless exempted by the Planning Commission. Pole Sign Height: Locations that are adjacent to a freeway overpass or similar view-obscuring structure may request an additional height allowance from the planning commission, which shall only minimally give enough height to provide reasonable visibility above the view-obscuring structure. Placement of monument sign. Must be placed not less than 25% of the total distance from either of the side boundaries as measured along the frontage unless allowed by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission must approve a sign on a third wall. The applicant is asking for sixty feet for their signs. It is out of the clear view zone. Kent explained what the exceptions were that the applicant was asking for. The commission was concerned with making the sign 60 feet tall, they were afraid that all of the businesses would want higher signs. Doug stated that he feels like there is a way to market the restaurant rather than with a sixty foot sign. Joy stated that she feels like there is a highway safety issue with there being too many signs along the highway. Doug stated that he felt like they had to go by the sign ordinance. Paul Hitzelberger stated that sixty-five percent of their business would be off from the freeway. They would like the public to notice them. Mr. Hitzelberger stated that it does not need to be sixty feet high he would just like the sign high enough for the public to see. Mr. Hitzelberger stated that he was confused with the sign ordinance if they need to move the sign they can. If they go back further on Arimo road the public would nto be able to see it. Doug stated that some of the confusion might be becaue this is a corner lot. About safety with the sign there has not been any incidents in the united stated as per the companies study. Mr. Hitzelberger asked the planning commission to be fair about the other signs located in the area. The sign would be located southeast of the Speedco sign. Mr. Hitzelberger asked the commission if they would consider a sign that would be just higher than the ordinance, possibly a thirty-foot pole with a fifteen-foot sign. Mr. Hitzelberger stated that he felt like the parking requirements were a lot higher than other cities in Utah.

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

PUBLIC MEETING

September 3, 2008

Bill made a motion to approve CUP#08-00100014 Beaver Creek Investments –Del Taco, with staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Joy.

Verbal Roll Call:

Bill yes Joy yes Judy yes Doug yes

Bill made a motion to recess the public meeting and open the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Joy The public hearing opened at 8:50 p.m.

5. PUBLIC HEARING

a. REZ #08-03000005 George Lee –RR-1 to C-G Section 35, Township 1 South, Range 4 West:

The location of this rezone was explained to the planning commission. The applicant would like to place a hotel / motel on this property. The C-G zone does permit a hotel or motel. The property is vacant right now; the property surrounding this parcel is zoned residential. The property is not located next to the highway therefore it cannot use the C-H zone. The access to this property will be off from Sage lane and then it turns into Meadow Lark road. There are not road connections that head north from this property to connect with Saddleback blvd. The commercial traffic will have to go through a residential area. Kerry explained that the C-G zone is not out of the ordinary there is not the infrastructure to support it. Staff recommends denial of this zone change. George Lee explained that UDOT told him that they would open Meadowlark lane, if they can line up with Arimo road. Mr. Lee explained that he was told by UDOT that they would put a light at the T intersection. Mr. Lee stated that he had spoken to Flying J and they will not give him access to the road that runs alongside their business. The commission asked how wide Meadowlark was. Staff explained that it was 60 feet wide. The commission asked about some roads in the area and if they were private or not. Doug stated that without access it is not fair to the residents to upgrade the zoning in the area.

b. AMD General Plan #08-03500001 Tooele Valley Road Plan Chp 13 pg 3

Vern explained that after he took this plan to the planning commissions he put together all of the comments and tonight's presentation would show the commission those changes. Vern explained the changes to the planning commission, and why the changes were made. The new language that will be included in this chapter was also explained to the planning commission.

Bill made a motion to adjourn the public hearing and resume the public meeting. The motion was seconded by Joy. All concurred. The public hearing adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

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

PUBLIC MEETING

September 3, 2008

6. REZ #08-03000005 George Lee –RR-1 to C-G Section 35, Township 1 South, Range 4 West:

Joy made a motion to recommend denial of REZ 08-03000005 George Lee –RR-1 to C-G Section 35, Township 1 South, Range 4 West to the board of county commissioners due to inadequate access to the commercial area. The motion was seconded by Judy.

Verbal Roll Call:

Joy yes Bill yes Judy yes Doug yes

7. AMD General Plan #08-03500001 Tooele Valley Road Plan Chp 13 pg 3

Joy made a motion to recommend approval of AMD General Plan #08-03500001 Tooele Valley Road Plan Chp 13 pg 3, to the board of county commissioners. The motion was seconded by Bill.

Verbal Roll Call:

Joy yes Judy no Bill yes Doug yes

Adjournment:

Joy made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Doug All concurred. The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

APPROVAL:

Chairperson, Tooele County Planning Commission