

EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY MAY 9, 2017 AT 6:00 P.M.
Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers; 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, UT 84005

6:00 P.M. - Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Policy Session

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Matthew Everett, John Linton, and Mike Owens.
MEMBERS EXCUSED: Daniel Boles and Muriel Xochimitl.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Mike Hadley, Senior Planner; Steve Mumford, Community Development Director; and Johna Rose, Deputy Recorder.

ELECTED OFFICIAL PRESENT: Colby Curtis

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Linton led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes
A. April 25, 2017

MOTION: *Matthew Everett moved to approve the April 25, 2017 meeting minutes. Mike Owens seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, John Linton, and Mike Owens. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

4. Action and Advisory Items (Recommendations to the City Council)

A. Kieffer Accessory Apartment, Public Hearing, Action Item

Mike Hadley explained that the request is to increase the square footage of an accessory apartment for more than is currently allowed by City Code. The accessory apartment is located on Lake Mountain Road.

Commissioner Linton opened the public hearing at 6:09 p.m.

Mike Kieffer, applicant, stated that he does not want to be a landlord. The apartment is for his mother. In order to accommodate his mother's needs the apartment needs to be one level, which is why he is requesting the increase in square footage.

Commissioner Linton closed the public hearing at 6:10 p.m.

MOTION: *Matthew Everett moved to approve the Kieffer accessory apartment. Mike Owens seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, John Linton, and Mike Owens. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

B. Evans Ranch MDP Amendment & Preliminary Plat, Public Hearing, Action Item

Mr. Hadley stated that the proposal is to amend the Evans Ranch Master Development Plan. The developer is moving the pool to a new location and making changes to the open space improvement plan. The applicant has also proposed that the Master Development Plan map serve as the preliminary plat for the remainder of the project.

Commissioner Linton opened the public hearing at 6:14 p.m.

Drew Anderson, Evans Ranch resident, asked the developer how he could opt into the use of the pool if he already has a set HOA fee.

Nate Shipp, applicant, explained that the current Evans Ranch residents will be able to opt in and use the new pool facility. The new residents will automatically be required to pay the fees to use the clubhouse and pool facilities, if they want to opt out there will be a grace period.

Commissioner Linton closed the public hearing at 6:18 p.m.

MOTION: *Matthew Everett moved to recommend approval of the Evans Ranch MDP amendment. Mike Owens seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, John Linton, and Mike Owens. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

MOTION: *Matthew Everett moved to recommend approval of Evans Ranch to use the master development plan as the preliminary plat to the City Council. Mike Owens seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, John Linton, and Mike Owens. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

C. SilverLake 16 Preliminary Plat, Public Hearing, Action Item

The proposed preliminary plat is for a 31 lot (30 residential lots and 1 church lot) development located along SilverLake Parkway, south of the Tickville wash on 15.37 acres.

Mr. Hadley explained that this item was tabled on April 25, 2017 due to concerns with the slope stability study and the location of the homes adjacent to the Tickville Wash. The tabling of this project gave more time for the City Engineer to review the project and meet with the applicant. The City Engineer has provided a map and a letter that recommends approval of the project.

Commissioner Linton opened the public hearing at 6:24 p.m.

Colby Curtis, resident, asked the Planning Commission to find way to increase the amenities in the SilverLake area (Plats 8, 9, and 11-16) per the master development agreement. He stated that there were very few amenities in the Woodhaven area of SilverLake. Steve Mumford explained that he has contacted the developer and is trying to work on getting a larger park for this area of SilverLake.

Commissioner Linton closed the public hearing at 6:29 p.m.

Commissioner Everett encouraged the applicant to look at open space and to do a better job in planning the parks.

MOTION: ***Matthew Everett moved to recommend approval of the SilverLake 16 preliminary plat to the City Council with the following conditions.***

- 1. Applicant shall comply with any conditions required by the City Engineer to mitigate risk factors of building near the Tickville Wash. A mitigation plan shall be approved prior to being heard by the City Council.***
- 2. Applicant shall provide midblock pedestrian access from SilverLake South Boulevard to the Tickville Wash Trail.***
- 3. Applicant shall provide details of proposed arterial/collector road fencing to staff, and staff shall approve fencing prior to construction.***
- 4. The City Council shall be provided in their packet a copy of the City Engineer letter and the Tickville Wash grading proposal.***

Mike Owens seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, John Linton, and Mike Owens. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

D. Skyline Ridge Phase 2 Plats 5, 6, & 7 Amended Preliminary Plat, Public Hearing, Action Item

Mr. Hadley requested that the Planning Commission table the item so that City staff has adequate time to review the project. The project is a 64.70 acre preliminary plat located southwest of Golden Eagle Road, west of Kiowa Valley. The applicant has proposed two separate preliminary plat options; the first proposes 51 residential lots, and the alternative plan proposes 47 residential lots. Also the project has cul-de-sacs that do not comply with the City's connectivity code. Staff recommends that these lengths be reduced to comply with current City Code.

Commissioner Linton opened the public hearing at 6:40 p.m.

Jill Bayles, resident, was concerned about the blasting the builder will have to do in order to lengthen the cul-de-sacs. She stated that the builder is already blasting in the area and it has caused major damage to her home and rock retaining wall. She said that the builder and/or the blasting company will not take responsibility for the damage. She also stated if the City can't stop them from blasting maybe they could lessen the amount the builder is allowed to blast.

Sarah Carroll, resident, attached email.

Paul Molnar, resident, stated that he was not aware that there would be continued building and blasting in the area when he bought his home. He felt that the City should have made them build all the lots for the subdivision before any homes were built. He also felt that the builder should be required to post blasting safety signs. Mr. Mumford explained that the City has now required the builder to prep for all building lots before a building permit is pulled. He explained that it will be hard to regulate, because there is nothing in the City Code requiring the builder to prep each lot before building. The City has to allow the builder to blast on their property as long as the builder meets UFA required limits to blast. The City is willing to help out as much as possible as long as it is in the City's legal right to do so.

Eric Lundell, resident, stated that there are ways to build without blasting. He said that he would like to see changes to the City Code that would help protect existing residents. He was also concerned with the slope, steep roads, and the cul-de-sacs not meeting code. He felt that the builder was also mining the material on the property.

Torren Philips, resident, felt that the builder was going unchecked. He was concerned about not having a second access out of the development.

Additional attached resident emails.

Commissioner Linton closed the public hearing at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Everett felt that the developer should start over with the planning of this development.

Commissioner Owens requested some changes to the City Code that could help protect the current residents. He also asked if there was anything in the Code about material processing in residential areas during building. Mr. Mumford said that the builder is allowed to process the material as long as they are using it on site.

MOTION: *Matthew Everett moved to table the Skyline Ridge Phase 2 Plats 5, 6, and 7 amended preliminary plat to no earlier than the June 13, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. Mike Owens seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, John Linton, and Mike Owens. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

5. Next scheduled meeting: May 23, 2017

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON MAY 23, 2017



Steve Mumford, Planning Director

Here are some comments from a resident (Adam Olsen) concerning the Skyline Ridge proposal on tonight's agenda. Thanks.



EAGLE
M O U N T A I N



Steve Mumford, AICP
Community Development Director
SMumford@Emcity.org
801-789-6616
www.eaglemountaincity.com

From: Adam Olsen [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2017 11:44 AM
To: Steve Mumford
Subject: Skyline Ridge

Steve,

Could you pass this along to the Planning Commission for tonight's meeting? I am not able to attend but wanted to give some thought on the proposed preliminary plan amendments for Skyline Ridge.

I feel the Planning Commission and ultimately City Council should hold with the approved preliminary plan. This plan keeps the units clustered at the base of the hills and keeps the hillside open. Eagle Mountain is in a unique position where we have many open hillsides. Clustering at the base of those hillsides leaves them preserved as City open space and really contributes to our "sense of place". Continuing this focus on and protection of open hillsides can be a real community asset.

Option 1, which is the developers preferred option, will severely impact the hillside with scarring, cuts and fills, and ultimately, homes on ridge-lines. Additionally, it cannot work under current City code as it relates to cul-de-sac length. There is also uncertainty as to whether the road can work with grade limits currently in place. If it can work, there will certainly be numerous cuts, fills and severe degradation of hillside. Do we want to turn our backs on the hills and have them resemble Draper and Lehi, as they have done with the Traverse Mountains?

Option 2 still offers cul-de-sac lengths in excess of current City code. If deviation from current code is allowed, the question can be asked "why is this even code?". While Option 2 better preserves the hillside, I feel it should be turned down due to excessive cul-de-sac lengths.

Again, the originally approved preliminary plan does the best at preserving hillsides while keeping with current City code. Please strongly consider NOT approving either option and holding the developers to the original plan. In this case, the original plan is the best option and should be adhered to.

Thank you for your work on the Planning Commission.

Adam Olsen
[REDACTED]

Eagle Mountain

Johna Rose

From: Sarah [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Steve Mumford; Michael Hadley; Tayler Jensen
Subject: Planning Commission Item D, Skyline Ridge Plat Amendment
Attachments: 20170508_202517.jpg; 20170508_202535.jpg; 20170508_202710.jpg; 20170508_202853.jpg; 20170508_203025.jpg; 20170508_203431.jpg; 20170508_203652.jpg

Steve, Mike, Tayler,

I'm writing in opposition to the proposed plat amendment for Skyline Ridge Phase 2, Plats 5, 6, and 7.

My concerns are that the proposed plat amendment options do not comply with the cul-de-sac length requirements in the code and that two cul-de-sacs are proposed that exceed the 250' limit in the code.

This brings to light other issues in this location.

1. There have been wild fires near this spot in the past and the surrounding neighborhoods have been evacuated. By extending the cul-de-sacs beyond what is allowed by the code, the future residents of these homes will be at greater risk in the event of a wildfire and could even become trapped in the cul-de-sac in option 1.
2. The grading and blasting up to this point is egregious. There are massive piles of dirt that are larger than the two story homes. The jagged rocks left after the blasting are now becoming someone's back yard. When the wind blows the entire neighborhood is covered by a dust storm. We've heard that the massive amount of grading and blasting is causing financial issues for the developer because the development of the lots isn't cost effective. I've attached photo's of the current situation related to grading. This is a gravel pit operation in our neighborhood.

In summary, allowing the plat amendment will violate the Code and will continue to cause distress to the surrounding homes in the form of blasting, massive piles of rocks and sand, jagged rock back yards and so on. The long cul-de-sacs also create a potential safety issue in the event of a wildfire.

I request that the Planning Commission recommend denial due to the proposed code violations.

Sincerely,

Sarah Carroll
[REDACTED]

Eagle Mountain, Utah













