

EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2011 AT 6:00 P.M.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 East Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, Utah 84005

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

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Karleen Bechtel, Preston Dean, Bonnie ElHalta, John Linton and Tom Maher.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Steve Mumford, Mike Hadley and Jenalee Harper

Commission Chair Tom Maher called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None

3. Approval of Minutes

A. May 10, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

MOTION: *John Linton moved to approve the May 10, 2011 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Karleen Bechtel seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Karleen Bechtel, Preston Dean, Bonnie ElHalta, John Linton and Tom Maher. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

4. Development Items

A. Master Development Plan Amendment -- SilverLake; Action Item, Public Hearing

Mr. Mumford explained that the existing master plan contains 1,545 remaining residential units and that 53.9 acres are designated as multi-family which comes to a maximum of 583 units. He said that the proposal includes a total of 1,800 residential units, an increase of 255. He explained that it removes all multi-family attached products from the plan and has the single family density at an average of 6.77 units per acre for the entire project. He stated that the applicant is able to do this by moving the school site and increasing the density slightly.

Mr. Mumford explained that the development agreement for this plan was also re-written because the original included a lot of language regarding multi-family units which are now being removed with the new proposal. He explained that the applicant has agreed to comply with the following criteria in regards to single-family areas:

1. Maintain a lot width of 55 feet at the front yard building setback line for all single-family homes (not for cluster or cottage homes).
2. Provide a variety of lot sizes in each neighborhood, with proper transitioning. Small lots (under 6,500 square feet) shall not be clustered together in groups of more than 65 lots.
3. Construct an upgraded entryway into each subdivision.

4. Provide fencing of all open space along major roads, constructed of cedar or other durable or treated wood, masonry, or composite. Also provide six-foot high privacy fencing along rear lot lines of all lots with a rear lot line abutting an arterial or collector road.
5. Provide upgraded street signs, similar to those seen in the Ranches.
6. Pay a fee of \$475 per lot to the City upon issuance of a building permit for street trees.
7. Exterior materials shall include stone, brick and hardiplank siding. Stucco may also be used as an exterior material, provided that the stucco shall not exceed 25% of any front elevation and elevation facing a public street. Such masonry materials shall be wrapped onto side exteriors a minimum of 18 inches. No vinyl siding is permitted.

Mr. Mumford said that the master plan map must include a minor collector road stubbing to the east in the middle of the plan.

Mr. Mumford explained that to the east of this development there is a large amount of property that contains the Saratoga Springs City Center District Area Plan. He said that this project contains six different proposed concept maps. He said that there is a proposed freeway and an area that shows rail. He said that the City will be meeting with the Mountainland Association of Governments, Saratoga Springs and Lehi, to discuss this railway. He said that they have vocally agreed to not send railway right through the Ranches area. He explained that two of the maps designate the area immediately adjacent to SilverLake as "town neighborhood" and "traditional neighborhood." He said the density of these uses ranges anywhere from 5 to 34 du/ac. He stated the other maps show the area as "business park." He explained that these maps are conceptual at this time and that the future of the property is unknown.

Mr. Maher asked how a district area plan is possible with multiple land owners.

Mr. Mumford explained that this particular land is all owned by one person, Property Reserve Inc.

Mr. Mumford explained that the amphitheater and Smith Ranch Parks are community parks which take in most of the SilverLake area. He said that there are no neighborhood or pocket parks. He said that the total required parks & open space for SilverLake is 42.29 acres with 15.4 acres of existing parks which leaves 26.89 acres remaining. Mr. Mumford said that 11.58 acres of neighborhood and pocket parks would be required and 15.32 of community and regional parks. He said that these will all be planned in more detail as the area is actually developed.

Mr. Mumford reviewed a concept of an expansion of the amphitheater which mainly included parking area/open space. He also explained that master plan map contains a 12 acre school site. He said the new map does not contain this school site, and instead provides potential locations for a school and two churches, with underlying density.

Mr. Mumford stated that staff has three recommended conditions of approval for this plan. They are:

1. That the master plan map must include a minor collector road stubbing to the east in the middle of the plan.
2. Phasing of development should occur in a way that SilverLake Boulevard and SilverLake Parkway are connected as soon as possible, along with Pony Express Parkway.

Mr. Mumford said that there is only one access point into and out of SilverLake. He stated that the more the area develops, the more nervous the fire chief gets.

Mr. Maher asked if this condition should be worded differently so that it is more specific.

Mr. Mumford stated that the Planning Commission could make a recommendation, and that there was no traffic study for the City to use to word this condition.

3. The developer or property owner must resolve existing water right accounting issues with the City prior to City Council approval.

Mr. Mumford explained that there is an issue with water rights for a previous plat that would need to be resolved before the City Council could give any approvals.

Mr. Linton asked Mr. Shipp what he envisioned for the connection of SilverLake Parkway and SilverLake Boulevard.

Mr. Shipp said that the cost of crossing the wash makes it much more advantageous for him to develop the land north of there because it will cost him the least amount of money.

Mr. Linton said that he would like to see the road requirement be tied to density and growth.

Mr. Shipp said that he would want the requirement to be that the road be built once the land south of the wash crossing is developed. He suggested that wording be included in the agreement that states all phases shall have two or more points of access.

Mr. Maher asked if there were enough church sites.

Mr. Shipp explained that he would try to provide as many as needed and that potential sites have been included in the plan. He said that churches would purchase the areas needed.

Mr. Maher asked how the exterior materials on buildings would be monitored to make sure they are built according to the proposed conditions.

Mr. Mumford explained that the plans examiner in the building department would receive a copy of the guidelines and would review each building permit as it is submitted. He said if necessary they can be reviewed by the planning department as well.

Mr. Shipp said that existing residents have expressed concern with parking and that they would like to see a community RV pad storage area. He said that they have discussed possibly approaching the City about having a temporary area built up against the open space which would be fenced and have some lighting installed. He said that this will need to be discussed further on in the process. He explained that the CC&R's allow for storage but it has to be enclosed and not be seen.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 6:50 p.m.

Calvin Barnum, Lot 44 in SilverLake, stated that he was originally told that a large park and school site would be next to his property. He feels that being put next to a higher density would

decrease his property value. He stated that the roads are going to become congested and that the roundabout next to his lot is going to see a lot of traffic.

Mr. Mumford said that he agreed that most of the traffic would head towards that roundabout causing potential traffic problems.

Mr. Shipp asked that another condition be added that moves the school site back next to the proposed park. He stated that there is not much he can do about road congestion until all of the roads are built. He explained that when they are all completed the congestion will go away and that there will be adequate enough roads.

Ms. ElHalta stated that in her subdivision the school causes the most traffic congestion problems. She said that when the school is built in the SilverLake area it is going to need a road that can handle all of that traffic.

Mr. Shipp said that having the school by the park with SilverLake Boulevard finished should alleviate traffic problems.

Mr. Mumford said that if the school were to go in before any development it would come back to the City and developer to figure out how to get the road completed.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 6:57 p.m.

MOTION: *John Linton moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the proposed amendments to the SilverLake Master Development Plan subject to the following conditions:*

- 1. The master plan map must include a minor collector road stubbing to the east in the middle of the plan (approximately adjacent to the "open space area").*
- 2. All development phasing must include two or more points of access.*
- 3. The developer or property owner must resolve existing water right accounting issues with the City prior to City Council approval of the master development agreement.*
- 4. The school site shall be returned to the original location (adjacent to the park, north of Tickville Wash).*

Preston Dean seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Karleen Bechtel, Bonnie ElHalta, Preston Dean, John Linton and Tom Maher. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

B. Significant Land Disposal – Cedar Trails; Discussion Item with a Recommendation to the City Council

Mr. Hadley explained that the City has received an application from residents requesting disposal of significant land. He explained that the property the residents are interested in acquiring is open space between the homes on Frontier Street and Saddle Horn Drive. He explained that it is the homeowners on the east side that have expressed interest in purchasing the property. He explained that this property does have a trail but that it has no connectivity

and that residents have complained about it in the past. He said that the property has been inspected for future utility needs and that there are not any.

Mr. Maher said that he would like to see the homeowners on the west side notified so that they can have an opportunity to purchase some of the land as well.

Mr. Hadley explained that a notice was sent out to all of those homeowners about the public hearing.

Mr. Maher asked how the City would coordinate the selling of this land with 14 people.

Mr. Hadley explained that there are policies in place that would require the homeowners to come in and purchase all at once before the City would record and deed any property over.

Mr. Maher said the only concern he has would be that if these homeowners don't improve the property then it could possibly create problems for the City in trying to get 14 homeowners to clean up the property.

Ms. ElHalta asked if this would create an issue with setting a precedent.

Mr. Maher said that it should be a good thing for the City because it helps clean up some of the open space property.

Mr. Mumford said that this would be the first piece of property to be sold that has "improvements" on it.

MOTION: *John Linton moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the sale of the proposed significant parcel of land. Bonnie ElHalta seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Karleen Bechtel, Preston Dean, Bonnie ElHalta, John Linton and Tom Maher. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

5. Additional Items

None

6. Next Scheduled Meeting: June 28, 2011

7. Adjournment

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

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON JUNE 28, 2011.



Steve Mumford, Planning Director