



**Springville**

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
FEBRUARY 26, 2013 – 6:00 PM**

Commissioners in attendance: Frank Young; Craig Huff; Carl Clyde; Brad Mertz; Brent Packard; Michael Clay and Joyce Nolte (6:07 PM)

Staff in attendance: Director Fred Aegerter; Planner Brandon Snyder and Secretary Darlene Gray

Council Representative: Rick Child

**Call to Order:**

CM Huff called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

**Approval of Agenda**

CM Clyde moved to approve the agenda as written. CM Packard seconded the motion. The vote to approve the agenda was unanimous.

**Approval of Minutes: January 22, 2013 and February 12, 2013**

CM Huff asked if the Commissioners had the opportunity to review the meeting minutes. CM Young moved to approve the meeting minutes of January 22, 2013 and February 12, 2013. CM Clay seconded the motion. The vote to approve the meeting minutes for January 22, 2013 and February 12, 2013 was unanimous.

**Consent Agenda**

CM Huff asked if any of the Commissioners would want to remove this item from the Consent Agenda. With none, CM Huff reviewed the Consent Agenda process.

Litefoot Investment LLC seeking final approval for the Boulder Springs Estates Subdivision, Plat B, located at approximately 1150 South 1200 East in the R1-10, Residential Single Family zone.

CM Mertz moved to recommend approval of the final plat for the Boulder Springs Subdivision, Plat B, to be located at 1150 South 1200 East in the R1-10 zone, contingent upon addressing all DRC and Post-DRC comments. CM Young seconded the motion. The vote to approve the Consent Agenda was unanimous.

**Legislative Session**

Nothing

**Administrative Session**

Discussion regarding street requirements for schools.

Director Aegerter approached the Commissioners. He explained that the report he has distributed regarding street frontage in connection the schools was for information only. He explained that staff

looked at the ITE Trip Generation; specifically at traffic generated by each of the schools. Director Aegerter reviewed the Utah Code 10-9a-305 regarding State Code involving the City not being able to impose restrictions on landscaping, fencing, aesthetics, etc. Director Aegerter reviewed the current information on each of the City's elementary schools. CM Huff indicated that the drop off for the Art City Elementary School was in the church parking lot. Director Aegerter reported that the School district has purchased additional land by Art City Elementary for additional frontage. He indicated that the issue would be to have street frontage on two streets at school locations.

Director Aegerter indicated that staff would ask the Commission if consideration for some type of standards for street frontage should be included to ensure adequate traffic flow and safe access for schools. He indicated that any subdivision having more than 12 homes would be required to have a second access point. He stated that the School District has a legitimate concern because of cost, but the City has the concern of safety associated with the school.

CM Packard asked if the City produces some type of Code or description on the street frontage would this become a legal situation with the School District. Director Aegerter indicated that it could be and he referred to the State Code. CM Packard stated that access has been a safety issue for a long time. Director Aegerter reported that the new junior high would be on a minor collector, which is good, but this is something that there would be a meeting with the school district. If the Commissioners feel that one access is good planning that would be good enough. He suggested they think about the 1,000+ trips a day on the road and stated that there is concern regarding what is taking place. Director Aegerter commented that CM Clay might have insights because of his background in transportation.

CM Clay referred to the ITE Trip Generation, PNA; Production and attractions. He indicated that schools are called special generators and every trip in means a trip out; meaning there would be over 1,000 trips every day. He stated that Sage Creek Elementary is an unsafe situation and this is one of the reasons why he wanted to look at this. He added that for traffic engineering, schools are a very special case and the numbers on the report provided by Director Aegerter are actually half the number of trips.

CM Clyde asked what the frontage would be for the new junior high school. Director Aegerter reported that the frontage was about 1,000 to 1,100 feet. Cl. Child asked if that would include the parking lot. Director Aegerter indicated that it would. Cl. Child reported that the trend now is to build in the parking lot of the existing school and then tear down the old school because of land price.

CM Huff stated that every school except Cherry Creek has adequate frontage for dropping off students. Director Aegerter indicated that most often the schools are located on minor collector streets. He stated that a lot of the schools have more than one frontage; i.e. Provo High, West High; etc. He stated that the challenge is that more and more parents drive their children to school. He indicated that the second frontage could provide additional access to the site, possibly additional parking, etc. He reported that the ideal situation would be to have a school, church and a park all within the block. Director Aegerter reviewed the Village Center presentation; the SmartCode. CM Young asked if that was why cities were looking at the SmartCode. CM Huff commented that the Art City and Brookside schools were built next to a church.

Director Aegerter asked for direction from the Commissioners. CM Mertz stated that the Commissioners needed to look at this specific to access. CM Huff asked if it were regarding larger streets, multiple frontage, etc. CM Mertz replied yes to all.

CM Clay referred to Safe Routes to School referring to their website. He reported that the site reviews traffic, street design, etc. CM Mertz asked if it was too late to request changes to the new junior high school. Director Aegerter indicated that it was, but added that the school district has some property in the Westfields.

CM Nolte asked if the City could request School District met with the traffic engineers. Director Aegerter indicated that the school district would not be required to conduct a traffic study. He referred back to the State Code. CM Young suggested presenting photographs of schools where things work or don't work.

CM Packard indicated that the City could make a statement regarding its concern for the students and the neighborhood. He asked if requiring a 1,000 foot frontage would be legal. Director Aegerter stated that this would be discussed with legal counsel and the school district. He indicated that the question would be if the street frontage would be adequate. CM Packard asked if CM Clay could draft a situation for the Commissioners to look at. CM Clay responded that he could look at what other cities have done. His feeling was that most school districts don't want to pay an architect for the structures at each location. He indicated that no one was trying to tell the school district how or where to built their schools, but where in the city would be the most traffic generator in the City. CM Mertz stated that the City has not much of a say where the school can be built, but they do have a say regarding safety, etc. CM Mertz asked to be excused at 6:42 PM.

CM Nolte asked if schools were required to provide safety crosswalks. She explained that in California they have crossing guards at every corner with flags and whistles who had the authority to stop traffic for the children. She asked if that was an option. CM Clay explained that there is problem at Sage Creek Elementary School because the parking lot is roped off and the parents have to park on the street causing the children to dart across the street.

Ms. Ifediba explained that, when built, Sage Creek School had no homes around it. CM Clyde stated that it would be a hard situation for the school districts to find the ideal parcel. He reiterated the direction given by State law regarding traffic hazards, including consideration of the impact between the new school and future highways; and maximizing school, student and site safety.

Director Aegerter explained that the junior high school would involve 20-acres. He also displayed the other properties that the District is considering to have a school. CM Huff asked if each of the parcels were a standard block. Director Aegerter indicated that it was a Salt Lake block, not a Springville standard block.

CM Huff stated that if the minimum for an elementary school is ten-acres and thought two street frontages should be required. CM Nolte and Packard agreed. CM Huff stated that they could not anticipate alleviating congestion. He stated that in the Westfields, the School District would not want to build a school there now because of the lack of development. Director Aegerter agreed.

CM Huff asked Director Aegerter what he thought his direction would be. CM Young stated that he would like some images of things that are working and things that are not; e. g. two drop-off points. CM Nolte agreed. CM Packard stated that bus traffic would also have to be considered. He referred to Mapleton Elementary School and the traffic problems there. Director Aegerter indicated he would gather other examples outside of Springville. CM Huff asked Director Aegerter to look at the new school in Spanish Fork north of the baseball fields; the old Dixon Jr. High that has been converted to an elementary school; one in Saratoga Springs on the hill to the northwest side on Orchard. CM Nolte thought the website might have examples of ideal situations. CM Young suggested looking at Alpine School District's Vineyard School. Director Aegerter thanked the Commissioners.

With nothing further to discuss, CM Packard moved to close the Work Session. CM Young seconded the motion. The vote to close the Work Session was unanimous. CM Huff closed the Work Session at 7:09 PM.