

**PLAIN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
22 MARCH 2007**

The Plain City Planning Commission convened in a meeting on Thursday, 22nd March 2007, in the Council Chambers of the Plain City Hall at 7:05 p.m. Present showed the following: Chairwoman Artie Pearce, Vice Chairman Buddy Sadler, Members: Al Drummond, Brandon Stokes, Bob Spencer arrived at 7:20 p.m., Alternate Jarod Maw, and Secretary Kathy Hancock. Also present: Mayor Jay Jenkins, Public Works Director Mitch Willson, Byron Krenek, Celeste Canning, and Carl Miller. Chairwoman Pearce conducted the meeting and Mr. Stokes gave the invocation.

Discussion and/or Motion – Streetlight Ordinance – Public Works Director Mitch Willson

Mr. Mitch Willson explained that he has received some information from Rocky Mountain Power and Mountain States Lighting. Mrs. Pearce suggested tabling any motions until the next meeting so the commission has had time to review the new information. The commission asked Mr. Willson to explain what information has been passed out. The information from Mountain States Lighting is more of a sales pitch. They were asked for information as to how much it would cost to install the lights and have an electrician to maintain them. The schedule from Rocky Mountain Power is broken down to how much per light per month including maintenance and energy and for just energy. Right now we use schedules 11 and 12. Schedule 13 just shows how much per month the cost is for just energy. Schedule 11 is for the lights on light poles. Schedule 12 is for the decorative lighting. All bulbs will be either 100 watt sodium vapor or mercury vapor bulbs. Schedule 13 shows that the cost per month is \$43.32 if the power company pays to install the light, maintains it, and the energy cost. The current ordinance says we will own and maintain the lights. If anything breaks down the city is suppose to fix it. That would mean keeping at least two light poles on hand at all times at a cost of about \$1100 per pole, plus an electrician on staff to fix them. With this ordinance we would only pay Rocky Mountain for energy at about \$2.32 per month for 100-watt sodium vapor bulbs.

Mr. Willson is concerned with the maintenance. He would like to go back to the old ordinance that requires lights by intersections or every 600 feet. The new ordinance requires lights every 200 feet on alternating sides of the road. Right now the approximate cost is \$2,200 - \$2,400 per light installed by Mountain States Lighting if the trenches are open. Rocky Mountain will charge approximately \$1,200 per light if the trenches are open, if not an extra \$9 per foot. The Rocky Mountain poles are 14 feet high. There was a question as to how far the lights will shine. Mr. Maw thought the distance lights shine is 4 times the pole height. That would only make it roughly 60 feet. The commission discussed not having a dark sky. It was suggested leaving the minimum as 200 feet and reducing the bulb size to 70 watt. The cost difference for a smaller wattage is only \$1.40 per month. The original ordinance was designed for public and pedestrian safety. Mr. Spencer arrived. The commission needs to decide how far apart the lights need to be. A big concern Mr. Willson has is the maintenance with the current ordinance. Mr. Sadler explained that the way the ordinance was suppose to be is the city would sell the lights to the developer at a higher cost and make enough money to put lights in other areas of the city. It was mentioned that might not be legal to do that. The money right now comes out of the general fund for the maintenance and energy costs. Mr. Willson is concerned that his budget couldn't handle the extra cost to maintain.

The commission asked Mr. Willson to get the figures in writing as to what the costs would be with using Mountain States Lighting and us maintaining, and Rocky Mountain Power maintaining the lights we own if possible and their different costs. The commission would also like to know how far the Rocky Mountain Power lights shine and the light warranty information. It was suggested getting other company prices as well. Mrs. Pearce asked Mr. Maw to get some dealer information concerning lighting to the commission. **Mr. Drummond moved to table the Street Light Ordinance until Mr. Willson can provide them with more information on costs and operations. Seconded by Mr. Spencer. Vote: Mrs. Pearce, Mr. Sadler, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Spencer, and Mr. Stokes. Motion carried.**

Discussion and/or Motion - Amending PRUD Ordinance

The commission discussed the ordinance. The ordinance states 20% open green space is required in a PRUD. Certain things are only counted at 50% like power line corridors and wetlands. There is a PRUD that has been submitted that doesn't meet this requirement of 20%. Amending the ordinance to waive the open space requirement has been discussed because there is an amenity that is beneficial to the city. According to the ordinance amenities allow for more density. This subdivision doesn't want the allotted density. The planner and the developer's attorney have discussed amending it to add, "unless the maximum density allowed is not requested", and "The 20% open space requirement may be reduced when less density is requested than what could be allowed based on the merits of the project, and exceptional amenities or an amenity of City-wide importance is proposed." It was suggested defining what a citywide benefit would be so all future PRUDs don't request it. Each PRUD will have to be looked at on a case by case basis to see if they qualify for less open space. The city would really have to want the amenity for it to be considered. It was mentioned that Homeowner amenities shouldn't count as amenities that would count toward the less open space. There was a concern that there needs to be a minimum open space required with the ordinance change. The commission needs to decide on an amendment to the ordinance, then set a public hearing, and pass it on to City Council. The details could be spelled out in the Development Agreement and Conditional Use Permit. The size of the development might also need to be considered. The commission decided to set a public hearing and a decision can be decided after the public hearing as to what the amendment might need to say.

**PLAIN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
22 MARCH 2007**

Mrs. Pearce explained that the Parkvale PRUD requested to be on the agenda tonight. She chose not to put them on after talking to the City Attorney, Brandon Richards, and his suggestion of not putting the Parkvale PRUD on the agenda until the ordinance has been changed. The new plans were brought in on Tuesday and there wasn't time to get comments back from the City Engineer and City Planners by today. Mrs. Pearce read an email from John Janson mentioning that it is difficult to do their best work when they are asked to rush or given a short time frame to do comments. He also mentioned a new law requiring comments to be given to the applicants three days prior to the meeting. Mrs. Pearce asked Celeste Canning the developer's Attorney what was delivered to the planners. It was stated that they received the whole packet with plans and Development Agreement. **Mr. Sadler moved to set a public hearing to amend the Subdivision Ordinance 11-6-4a concerning PRUDs on April 12th 2007, to get comments from the citizens. Seconded by Mr. Drummond. Vote: Mrs. Pearce, Mr. Sadler, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Drummond, and Mr. Stokes all ayes.** Mrs. Pearce will contact the City Attorney to see if different verbiage needs to be added.

Discussion and/or Motion - Mixed Use Zone

Pearce explained that she would still like to see a mixed-use zone with about 40% 1/3-acre and 60% 1/2-acre zone or maybe even a 20% 80% split. It would be done with a conditional use permit and a development agreement. She wants the commission's opinion on it. Other cities have a mixed-use zone, but they have commercial with it. The planners and Ms. Cindy Gooch think it is a great idea but have not seen anything like it. Another issue is we need to start going by density instead of acreage in our zones as recommended by Ms. Gooch. In the General Plan it will go under areas that allow 1/2 acre or smaller. It was mentioned that this is what the PRUD does and the city gets amenities. There was a concern this would just create more cul-de-sacs instead of straight roads with different lot sizes. One concern is the PRUD doesn't spell out minimum lot sizes and some of the lots are getting as small as 6,000 sq. ft. It was suggested just fixing the PRUD ordinance because the city receives amenities. It was mentioned that PRUDs are like a city within the city and that may not be the way this city should go. Another change to the PRUD ordinance is allowing them in R-1-11 zones. The commission may want to look at having more of the amenities public instead of private. The commission needs to designate at what phase the amenities will be done. The Hawkeye Development (4-mile Parkway) has spelled out in the conditional use application when the amenities will be done.

Discussion – April 12th Agenda

Ms. Celeste Canning asked that her client be put on the next agenda. Mrs. Pearce mentioned the amendment to the PRUD ordinance wouldn't be done yet. She asked the commission what they thought and reminded the commission what the attorney recommended. The commission had some concerns that everything would be done by then and the ordinance should be passed before. Mrs. Pearce stated that after talking to the Attorney, engineer and planners she would make a decision and contact the commission members with her decision.

Approval of Minutes – 8 March 2007

Mr. Sadler moved to approve the minutes of 8 March 2007 with adding on page three paragraph two after only “as a courtesy because this parcel wasn't annexed into the city yet”. Seconded by Mr. Drummond. Mrs. Pearce and Mr. Spencer noted that they weren't present but voted. **Vote: Mrs. Pearce, Mr. Sadler, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Drummond, and Mr. Stokes voted aye. Motion carried.**

Schedule for Attending the City Council Meeting

Pearce	Sadler	Spencer	Drummond	Stokes	Maw
	Apr 19	May 3	May 17	Jun 7	Jun 21
Jul 5	Jul 19	Aug 3	Aug 16	Sept 6	Sept 20
Oct 4	Oct 18	Nov 1	Nov 15	Dec 6	

Mr. Stokes moved to adjourn at 9:30 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Spencer. Vote: Mrs. Pearce, Mr. Sadler, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Drummond, and Mr. Stokes voted aye. Motion carried.