

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, February 9, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, UT 84005

**Roll Call**

Tom Maher, John Linton, Karleen Bechtel, Preston Dean, Bonnie ElHalta

**Staff Present**

Steve Mumford, Planning Director  
Mike Hadley, Senior Planner  
Lianne Pengra, Planning Coordinator

**Others Present**

McKay Edwards, SITLA

Commissioner Maher called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**1. Pledge of Allegiance**

**2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**

None

**3. Status Report from City Council**

**A. General Plan Amendment and Commercial Rezone**

Mr. Mumford said the City Council held a public hearing for the rezone and General Plan amendment at the last City Council meeting. He said there were two or three comments from the public and the City Council approved both items.

**B. Temporary Garage/Yard Sale Sign Development Code Amendment**

Mr. Mumford said there was a lengthy discussion on yard sale and garage sale signs. He said they went back to create an easy way for residents to register their yard sale signs, while limiting staff and public time spent. He said staff proposed to have a registration online where residents could pay a small fee, staff recommended \$5.00, and register their yard sales. This would allow three signs to be placed in the right of way. He said the Code Enforcement Officer would print out the list of sales on the website and could easily distinguish between approved and not approved signage. He said City Council tabled the item to be brought back as a discussion item for the first meeting in March. He said the City Attorney recommended the item be brought back to the Planning Commission if significant changes are made.

Commissioner ElHalta asked if the temporary signage is being broken into two sections to deal with commercial and residential sales. Mr. Mumford said they are separate issues. He said the commercial retail and special event signage portion was approved at a previous meeting.

### **C. New Wastewater Treatment Facility Status**

Mr. Mumford said the system is up and running now. Commissioner Maher asked how the project came in as far as budget and time. Mr. Mumford said they had a few contract amendments, but he thinks the total project stayed under budget. He said they completed it close to the original timeline, but the contract amendments added a bit of time to the overall project.

### **6. Approval of Minutes**

#### **A. January 12, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Linton moved to approve the January 12, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, with an adjustment to page 7: the "9" be changed to "0" on the Nays.*

*Commissioner ElHalta seconded. Ayes: 5, Nays: 0. Motion passed.*

### **7. Development Items**

#### **A. Amendment to the Future Land Use and Transportation Corridors Map – Public Hearing, Action Item**

Mr. Mumford said there are a few minor changes to the plan since the Planning Commission saw it at the last meeting. He said the Capital Facilities Plan is currently being updated, along with an updated Transportation Master Plan, and both are close to completion. He said this plan sets up a budget and priority list for the larger transportation projects. He said Horrocks Engineers have done extensive traffic modeling, discussions have taken place with Mountainland Association of Governments, the Westlake Vision Study was taken into account, as were the existing master plans and Future Land Use Plan. Mr. Mumford said that landowners and developers who would be impacted by this plan were consulted, as well.

Commissioner Maher asked if staff spoke with all impacted land owners. Mr. Mumford said that this item does not require a direct mail notice, but they did get the information out and spoke with many of the affected land owners. He said the notice also went in the paper ten days in advance.

Mr. Mumford said this plan is vital to the future growth of the City. He said it helps with the City's planning, residents' planning, and funding for future projects. He showed the proposed map and said the designations are now in lanes, rather than in feet for each right of way. He showed the existing map and pointed out the main roads in Pole Canyon, the location of SR-73, and the major roads into Saratoga Springs.

Mr. Mumford said that the Cedar Valley Freeway is the major freeway in and out of Eagle Mountain. He said they are including it in future plans in order to get it on the State Transportation Improvement Program to get state funds for its completion. He said staff has met with Camp Williams to discuss the proper alignment of the freeway.

Mr. Mumford showed Airport Road and said it will be a major north/south road through Eagle Mountain. He showed the location for Pole Canyon Blvd. and said it will be a major East/West road through the City.

Mr. Mumford said the Hidden Valley Highway is new to the plan. He said this is a five-lane arterial road. He explained it came about from discussions with PRI and FRI. He said they have approached Eagle Mountain City, Saratoga Springs, and MAG to get a freeway going through the Hidden Valley area and south into the valley. He explained that the city has decided to propose this road as an arterial, rather than a freeway. He said this is due to the affect it will have on the Hidden Valley project, as well as the scarring on the hillside; this will need significant cut and fill for a freeway. He explained that with a highway, it would be easier to control and plan the access points than it would be with a state-funded freeway. He explained that PRI discussed having no access points through Hidden Valley, so the benefits would be limited for the City.

Commissioner Maher asked if the Hidden Valley highway would be built within twenty years and what the benefit is to building it. Mr. Mumford said that the LDS Church has significant land holdings in Utah County and in Elberta and a freeway south would benefit any development there. He explained that the LDS Church has let the City know that they would like a freeway, not a highway.

Commissioner ElHalta asked if a lighting plan was associated with the different street designations. Mr. Mumford said that there are City standards for lighting and UDOT most likely has standards for their roads, as well.

Commissioner Linton asked what the right of way is for SR-73. Mr. Mumford said they have 150 feet total. He said the freeway cross section is about 300 feet. Commissioner Linton asked what kind of commercial signage would be allowed along the freeways and highways and if there is any way for the City to reduce or limit the number of billboards along the state roads. Mr. Mumford said they can look into what would be allowed. He explained that they can't do much to restrict billboards.

Mr. Mumford showed the location of a few roads, including the major collector that connects Lone Tree up to SR-73, an east-west minor collector in the North Ranch area, and a minor collector running through the Hidden Valley area. He said they changed the alignment on a few roads running north-south to line up with regional plans.

Mr. Mumford said the east-west minor collector in the middle of the map was changed back to the original Future Land Use Plan location. He explained that an approved plat showed the location of that minor collector as what was previously approved on the Future Land Use and Transportation Corridors Plan. He explained that the Public Works Director felt that was an oversight when Horrocks tried to match up the roads.

Mr. Mumford said the other change was in the width designation key. He explained that the minor arterial road cross section should be five lanes, not three. Commissioner Linton asked if the major and minor arterials are both five lanes. Mr. Mumford said that the speed and the buffer distances are different between the major and minor designations, but the number of lanes for each is the same.

Mr. Mumford went over future projects and possible costs of those projects.

Commissioner ElHalta asked if emergency evacuation and growth were factored into the plan. Mr. Mumford said they were. He explained that the plan only goes out twenty years, but that it can be changed and updated as needed. He said he doesn't know if specific studies were done on emergency evacuation routes. He said the City administration can use examples like the large snow storm to highlight the need for routes in and out of the city in order to get county, state, and federal funding.

Commissioner Maher opened the public hearing at 6:37 p.m.

McKay Edwards, SITLA. Mr. Edwards said they support the proposed transportation plan. He said they have worked with City staff and with Horrocks and they believe it is a good plan. He said that they do not want a highway through Hidden Valley, but they think a highway is better than a freeway. He said that a new version of Hidden Valley may be coming in due to the highway. He said a property owner with land in Saratoga Springs and Goshen Valley would benefit from a freeway, but he does not believe that idea does not pay attention to terrain.

Commissioner Linton said that the Planning Commission had an onsite meeting at Hidden Valley site and they found that the view is what makes Hidden Valley so special.

Mr. Edwards said they staked out a possible grading option onsite and found it would take large pieces out of the hillsides, possibly ½-acre cuts.

Commissioner Maher closed the public hearing at 6:45 p.m.

Commissioner ElHalta said the plan is a good plan. She would like people to keep lighting and signage in mind when planning the roads.

Commissioner Dean said he likes the proposed roundabouts and proposed street lights on the plan.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Linton moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the proposed Future Land Use and Transportation Corridors Map.*

*Commissioner Dean seconded. Ayes: 5, Nays: 0. Motion passed.*

**B. Development Code Amendment: Chapter 5.05 Business License – Public Hearing, Action Item**

Mr. Mumford said this is a basic change. He said the Consolidated Fee Schedule was amended in August, 2009 to change business license fees. He said the Development Code was not updated at the same time. He explained that staff is proposing to remove the set fee from the Development Code and have it refer to the Consolidated Fee Schedule.

Mr. Mumford said that the current code differentiates between home-based and commercial seasonal and temporary businesses. He explained that there are not home-based seasonal or temporary businesses, so staff is proposing to remove that designation.

Commissioner Maher opened the public hearing at 6:48 p.m. and closed it due to lack of comments.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Linton moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the amendment to the Development Code, Chapter 5.05 Business Licenses, as proposed.*

*Commissioner Bechtel seconded. Ayes: 5, Nays: 0. Motion passed.*

**C. Development Code Amendment: Chapter 17.65 Home Businesses – Public Hearing, Action Item**

Mr. Mumford said currently all exceptions to home-based business licenses have to be denied with the appeal coming to the Planning Commission. He said the proposal is to amend that to allow staff to approve minor exceptions. He explained that a minor exception can only be approved by the Planning Director if it doesn't adversely affect the surrounding properties or the residential characteristic of the neighborhood.

Mr. Mumford said that a case came to the Planning Commission because the business wanted two part-time employees and the Code limits it to one employee. He explained situations like that are considered minor. He said another minor example would be going 30 minutes before or after the allowed operation time.

Commissioner Maher opened the public hearing at 6:52 p.m. and closed it due to lack of comments.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Linton moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the amendment to the Development Code, Chapter 17.65, Home Businesses, as proposed.*

*Commissioner ElHalta seconded. Ayes: 5, Nays: 0. Motion passed.*

**D. Development Code Amendment: Chapter 17.25 Residential Zone – Public Hearing, Action Item**

Mr. Mumford said there have been several accessory structures which had to be approved according to the Development Code, but have caused problems with residents. He said one was very large, one was a two-story building used for storage that appears to be a home, and another situation was due to the number of structures on a lot. Mr. Mumford said the proposal limits the number of structures to two in the residential zone. He said the base density areas did not have a size limitation. He explained that the proposal for Tiers I and II states that the total combined square footage of the accessory structures cannot exceed 50% of the square footage of the footprint of the home.

Mr. Mumford said that in a scan of the aerial photos of the city, it was difficult to find lots with more than two accessory structures. Commissioner Dean asked if lots over one acre would be

affected by the amendment. Mr. Mumford said they would be limited to two structures, but not limited on the size. He explained that the number limit came from the Building Department and an issue with a home with numerous accessory structures.

Commissioner Linton said that he did not see how someone with seven acres could have the same number limitation as those in much smaller lots. He said there needs to be a mechanism in place to allow for those who own larger lots to have more freedom in the use of the property.

Commissioner Dean asked if there was an Agricultural/Residential zone. Mr. Mumford said that there is an agriculture zone, but most of the homes here are in the residential zone.

Commissioner Bechtel asked if Commissioner Linton felt an additional one or two structures per lot was reasonable. Commissioner Linton said he would like to send it back to staff because any changes they make would require a re-write of the proposal.

Mr. Mumford said one of the main issues is the size, rather than the number. He said the Building Department really wanted a limit on the number. He said if the Planning Commissioners would not like to limit the number of accessory structures, that section can be taken out.

Commissioner Dean asked if there have been concerns from neighbors relating to the number of accessory structures and crowding property lines. Mr. Mumford said there hasn't been.

Mr. Mumford said that the other part of the proposed amendment allows agriculture- and farm-related accessory structures in the Base Density and Tier I to be up to fifty feet in height, and all other accessory structures to be up to twenty feet tall.

Mr. Mumford said the other change would be that accessory structures to be used for storage would only be allowed to be one story. He said this relates to the two-story storage building in Meadow Ranch that looks like a home and could possibly be used as a second house, rather than for storage.

Commissioner Dean said that the Building Code should deal with the storage issue. Mr. Mumford said it doesn't restrict storage to certain levels. He said it does restrict the type of storage, such as flammable materials.

Commissioner Maher asked the height restriction needed to be 50 feet. Mr. Mumford said the fifty feet limit is for structures such as silos and windmills.

Commissioner Dean asked what is considered an accessory structure. Mr. Mumford said an accessory building would be a barn, windmill, or farm-related building. Commissioner Maher said that they would like to remove the fifty foot allowance from the code. He said since windmills and silos are basically the only structures to reach fifty feet, those can be dealt with on another ordinance. Mr. Mumford said a windmill ordinance will be coming in the next three months.

Commissioner Maher said they would like the ordinance broken down by lot size, rather than tier.

Commissioner Maher opened the public hearing at 7:13 p.m. and closed it for lack of comments.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Linton moved to table the amendment to the Development Code, Chapter 17.25, Residential Zone, and continue the public hearing to the next scheduled Planning Commission meeting.*

*Commissioner Dean seconded. Ayes: 5, Nays: 0. Motion passed.*

## **8. Other Items**

### **A. City Center Open Space Improvement Plan – Discussion Item**

Mr. Mumford said the project has gone through some changes in the trails section due to the new elementary school being built. He said an open house was held last week specifically for the subdivisions affected by the new elementary school. Residents gave input on possible walking routes for the students in those areas.

Mr. Mumford showed the first priority in the trail section (Shadow Drive to Sweetwater). He also showed the trail that the school district will construct before the 2010-2011 school year. He showed the second priority trail through Pony Express Park for the children in Autumn Ridge and Eagle Park.


Mr. Mumford showed the next priorities for the trail system and explained how they will help the students get to the new elementary school.

Mr. Mumford showed the cost and material breakdown for each trail on the priority list.

## **9. Adjournment**

Commissioner Maher adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2010.

  
Steve Mumford, Planning Director