

Sugar City Planning & Zoning Meeting

September 17, 2020

Commissioners in Attendance: Dave Thompson, Christine Lines, Paul Jeppson

Others in Attendance: Chase Hendricks (City Attorney), Quinton Owens (P&Z Administrator), Barbara Lusk

Meeting was called to order at 7:25 by Chairman Dave Thompson

Prayer given by Quinton Owens

Pledge of Allegiance

Comments from Public on agenda: Barbara Lusk stated the city council was in favor of the East Parkway Corridor staying on existing roads and utilizing Digger Dr. as a dike to protect Sugar City from flooding to minimize homeowner's flood insurance costs. She was also expressed concern about not only the completion of landscaping when residences become occupied but also lighting that was agreed to be installed in Old Farm Estates. She is concerned about the light coverage of the newest street lights being installed.

Report from P&Z Administrator:

Meeting was held regarding what would be required for phased construction of Teton Heights Apartments. The owners want to start with two buildings along 5th South. This is a normal process for large projects to complete the buildings in phases. The first buildings would be expected to be completed around August of 2021. A site plan has been submitted for the Frito-Lay building in the business park.

Report from Design Review:

Design Review addressed four concerns on the Sun Glo addition site plan. Parking spaces were far fewer than called for in city code. Showing net usable area and witnessing the occupant load may resolve parking concerns. If the building were to be sold and used for a different purpose, the new owner would have to reapply for the parking variance or meet the requirement. Lighting is planned on the building but is not included in the parking lot other than light from the building. The lighting plan was approved with stipulation that adequate lighting is provided for parking lot safety. Odors have been an ongoing issue and the city would like to know that the proper regulatory agencies have given approval. Sun Glo has claimed to be building the addition to eliminate high pile storage and not for increasing production. The 30/70 finish material split was noted as required and the owners wanted to appeal for variance on this item and have included substantial landscaping on the north, east, and south sides of the building as compensation for the requested variance. Compacted gravel is intended on the east side of the addition, but paving will be provided for parking and traffic lanes on the north side from building to 3rd South.

Maupin storage request was on the agenda but had not submitted a landscape design yet. Block 12, Lot 8 shops in the Business Park was reviewed over two years ago and made it through Design Review and P&Z with conditions but was never acted on by city council for approval since the changes were never submitted. The project will now be reviewed starting with the Business Park Review Committee which was not done with last review.

The need to document agreements through plans and meeting minutes was emphasized for the use of legally enforcing those agreements. No previous approved landscaping plans have been found to enforce, but a new plan has been submitted for review at the next B.P.

Report from Chairman: Past discussion has included interest in finding a person to serve as secretary to assist in taking minutes and other miscellaneous duties. P&Z has the budget and can do so but wants to run it by city council. The intent is to free up time for the administrator to spend on items needing more attention as well as duties as Building Official.

An individual has approached the city with interest of an internship working in planning, especially on the comprehensive and transportation plans. Kurt Hibbert has also been considered for possibly consulting with P&Z on larger projects. Other names were mentioned as possibly serving on sub-committees.

Discussion of Impact Area: (9:07) Salem residents have prepared a comprehensive plan for their area that Sugar City could use in creating an impact area in Salem. The interest Salem expressed in previous meeting was to support a Sugar City impact area along Highway 20 that would buffer Salem from Rexburg. County code 105.5 allows for revising the impact area at the request of property owners “when the city feels that impacting will help implement the vision outlined in its Comprehensive Plan.” Sugar City’s Comprehensive Plan objective in chapter 14 is “to zone the impact area to provide for its expansion and preventing incompatible land uses.” County Code’s definition of area of impact (105.1) support the idea of this proposed expansion.

Area of city impact means an unincorporated area bordering a municipality, governed under coordinated standards, mutually agreed upon by all affected local governments, to:

- Ensure protection for municipalities and landowners against adjacent, incompatible development;
- Plan for orderly and consistent development where annexation is anticipated;
- Organize and manage growth; and
- Minimize undue environmental degradation and loss of open space. Area of city impact boundaries can accommodate changes in growth patterns and growth rates, natural and environmental constraints and concerns, and community interests.

This process may only require Sugar City and County’s involvement without other jurisdictions.

Discussion of Comprehensive Plan: (9:28) P&Z is still waiting for feedback from City Council on the survey and would like to have the survey ready by next meeting. Some progress has been

made on possible changes. A link to a shared file of the Comprehensive Plan will be provided to the commission so everyone can add input to the same document.

Discussion on East Parkway Corridor: Public comments were directed to the East Parkway Corridor. The commission was going to wait for survey results before setting the town meeting.

Discussion on objectionable conditions: (9:43) Other regulating agencies such as DEQ, Health District, FDA, IDWR, Fire Districts should be called on as needed to check on compliance. A sample dark sky ordinance was found for Ketchum, Idaho, and distributed to the commission for review as Sugar City looks to adopt lighting regulations. It is becoming more common for children to grow up in highly populated areas and never see the stars, and the city is interested in protecting the night sky as a natural resource.

Paving requirements in the past have been relaxed for a period, not permanently. Methods of ensuring paving compliance were discussed to ensure later compliance with temporary variances. Certain conditions might warrant amending code to relax paving requirements for certain conditions or in certain zones. Gravel conditions also create more wear on the roads as it attaches to tires.

Dangerous conditions should also be identified addressed where possible. It is difficult to remedy every possible situation.

Discussion on secretary or intern position:

Motion made by Commissioner Jeppson that under consideration of the P&Z Chair, Mayor, City Attorney and P&Z Administrator that the city obtain the intern with a specified project.

Seconded by Commissioner Lines

Motion passed unanimously

Motion made by Commissioner Jeppson to select a secretary for planning and zoning, design review and other assignments through posting and other selection processes with Mayor & City Council approval.

Seconded by Commissioner Lines, **Motion passed** unanimously

Review of meeting minutes: (10:17) Minutes were discussed for proposed edits.

Motion made by Commissioner Jeppson to approve the minutes from P&Z meeting on June 4, 2020 as amended.

Seconded by Commissioner Lines, **Motion passed** unanimously

Motion made by Commissioner Jeppson to approve the minutes from P&Z meeting on July 16, 2020 as amended.

Seconded by Commissioner Lines, **Motion passed** unanimously

Motion made by Commissioner Lines to table the minutes from P&Z meeting on September 3, 2020

Seconded by Commissioner Jeppson, **Motion passed** unanimously

Motion made by Commissioner Lines to adjourn the meeting
Seconded by Commissioner Jeppson, Voting in favor: Unanimous
10:52 pm Meeting adjourned