

EAGLE MOUNTAIN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
Eagle Mountain City Offices 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, UT 84043
Tuesday October 25, 2005

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

Roll Call:

Commissioners Present: Tom Maher, Chris Kemp, John Malone, Matt Weir

Others Present:

Jennifer Edwards, Dan Ford, Heidi Gray, Debbie Hooe, Jody Hooley, Bud Jorgensen, Monte Kingston, Scott Kirkland, James McMurray, James Taylor

City Staff:

Planning Director: Adam Lenhard
City Planner: Peter Spencer
Planning Coordinator: Jenalee Cheever

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Tom Maher led the Commission and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None

3. Status Report from City Council

Mr. Lenhard explained that the City Council had tabled the Development Code and General Plan changes because the City Council wanted more time to review them.

Mr. Lenhard explained that the City Council approved the Cedar Corners Rezone.

Mr. Lenhard explained that the Alternate logo for the ladder signs in the Ranches was also approved by the City Council. Mr. Lenhard stated that this new logo would be used on all signs in the Ranches area.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. October 11, 2005

MOTION: *Chris Kemp moved that the Planning Commission approve the minutes of October 11, 2005.*

Matt Weir seconded the motion. Ayes: 4, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

B. August 23, 2005

MOTION: *Chris Kemp moved that the Planning Commission approve the minutes of October 11, 2005 and August 23, 2005.*

Matt Weir seconded the motion. Ayes: 5, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

5. **Development Items**

A. **Heatherwood (R1 N22) Preliminary Plat and Site Plan, Public Hearing – Action Item**

Mr. Spencer explained that the Heatherwood subdivision is located in between the Eagle's Gate and Anthem on the Green subdivisions in The Ranches.

Mr. Spencer explained that the homes in this area will have motorcourt areas or connected driveways. Mr. Spencer stated that the Staff has determined that the driveway widths should be at least thirty feet so that there is room to maneuver a car around.

Mr. Kingston explained that the motorcourt areas have been examined and that 28 feet was found adequate enough for vehicles to back up.

Mr. Kingston explained that if the driveway width was pushed back to thirty feet it would eliminate the open space areas such as the walking and running paths.

Mr. Ford explained that the walking paths excluding the sidewalks equal about 1 ½ miles. Mr. Ford explained that they would rather have a large central community activity area and if the driveway widths are enlarged to 30 feet, it would eliminate the large park area.

Mr. Lenhard explained that all areas that a building is not located on such as park strips must be landscaped, and that these landscaped areas can not be included in the 2 acres required of improved park area.

Mr. Maher asked what the exteriors would be composed of.

Mr. Ford explained that the exteriors would be composed of stone, stucco, and hardy plank. Mr. Ford explained that there would be two car garages instead of one car garages.

Mr. Ford explained that there would be good lighting on the garage and that motion sensors would be installed for security reasons.

Mr. Lenhard explained that some type of motion sensor lighting would need to be installed so that the motorcourts are not completely black at night.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 6:26 p.m.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 6:26 p.m.

MOTION: *Chris Kemp moved that the Planning Commission approve the Preliminary Plat and recommend approval of the Site Plan to the City Council for the Heatherwood subdivision subject to the following conditions:*

1. ***DRIVEWAY WIDTH.*** *That the minimum width between opposite-facing driveway doors is 28 feet.*
2. ***UTILITIES LOOPED.*** *That the gas, water, and electricity systems are looped.*
3. ***NEIGHBORHOOD PARK AND TRAILS.*** *That the applicant provides the equivalent of two acres of Neighborhood Park.*
4. ***MONUMENT SIGNS.*** *That entryway monuments are provided.*
5. ***UTILITIES.*** *That staff comments on the construction drawings are addressed.*
6. ***ROAD B CONFIGURATION.*** *That the configuration of Road B is shown on the plat as designed in the new construction plans.*
7. ***DESERT CANYON ROAD.*** *That sidewalks are provided on both sides of the road and that a transition is provided between the 5' monolithic sidewalks in Anthem on the Green and the 4' walks with park strips in Heatherwood.*
8. ***SIDEWALKS.*** *That the sidewalks around the perimeter of the buildings are extended to the front entrance of each unit and shown on the landscape plan.*
9. ***TRAFFIC STUDY.*** *That the traffic study is submitted and approved by the Engineer.*

10. **PLAT.** *That the PC signature block is removed. That County book and page are added for adjacent parcels.*
11. **ROAD NAMES.** *That names are assigned to the roads.*
12. **VISITOR PARKING.** *That visitor parking is provided along "Road A" by the clubhouse and pool instead of, or in addition to, the parking along "Road B" by the park.*
13. **CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS.** *That all comments on the construction drawings have been addressed and rectified with the City Engineer.*
14. **EXTERIOR LIGHTING.** *That exterior lighting is provided within motorcourts, alleys, and walkways around each building to ensure nighttime visibility and safety.*

Matt Weir seconded the motion. Ayes: 4, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

B. Spring Valley Site Plan and Final Plat, Public Hearing – Action Item

Mr. Spencer explained that Spring Valley is located just south of S.R. 73 and on the north-eastern edge of the city. Mr. Spencer explained that the developer has come back with a new builder and new product that they would like to build.

Mr. Spencer explained that the subdivision would consist of four plexes, three plexes and two plexes and that the majority of the subdivision would be four plexes.

Mr. Spencer explained that the garage had changed from a one car to a two car garage.

Mr. Spencer explained the condition of approvals to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Spencer stated that the landscape plan that has been provided for the meeting has been reviewed and approved by City Staff.

Mr. Spencer explained that in the north portion of the property there is a main entrance that the applicant has agreed to put a significant amount of landscaping and trees in along the border as well as a 6 foot privacy fence to be installed by the developer.

Mr. Kirkland explained that one major change from the previous plan to the new one was the burming. Mr. Kirkland explained that in this new plan the buildings are a lot bigger than before so therefore there is not a lot of room to build a burm.

Mr. Kirkland explained that they have been speaking with UDOT to see if there is something they can do to fill the open area. Mr. Kirkland explained that right now if a fence was installed it would be installed in a very deep hole. Mr. Kirkland stated that they were hoping that UDOT would let them fill and level that hole out so that a fence could be installed.

Mr. Kirkland stated that the golf course fencing would be the type of fencing used.

Mr. Kirkland explained that as each building is built out the landscaping around it would be completed all at once.

Mr. Maher asked what materials the exteriors would consist of.

Mr. Kirkland explained that it is hardy plank with rock, and that there would be some wood features.

Mr. Maher asked about the rear elevations.

Mr. Kirkland explained that the rear elevations must be enhanced if their backs face a public road or the golf course and that they can be less enhanced if two backs face each other.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 6:46 p.m.

Debbie Hooge explained that she was displeased with the noticing for this particular subdivision. Mrs. Hooge explained that she as well as other residents were displeased that the parks in Mt.

Airey were not completed. Mrs. Hooge explained that the residents would like to know that there is a guarantee that parks will be completed instead of being left undone.

Heidi Gray explained that she and her husband owned a trucking company that had done some work for the park but were never paid due to some bankruptcy issues on the builders part. Mrs. Gray stated that she and the other residents would really like to see the park finished completely. Mrs. Gray explained that she would be willing to donate to help construct the park.

Tom Maher asked about the public noticing issues.

Mr. Lenhard explained that envelopes come back to the City sometimes due to information from the county that has not been updated. Mr. Lenhard explained that when the notices come back they are usually put in a folder but in this particular case the returned envelopes were hand delivered to the home owners in Mt. Airey. Mr. Lenhard stated that the Code requirements had been met in regards to noticing.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 6:55 p.m.

MOTION: ***Matt Weir moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council for the Spring Valley Site Plan & Final Plat subject to the following conditions:***

- 1. PLAT. That all graphical portions of the plat are completely labeled. That all roads are shown to be dedicated as either public or private. That the Planning Commission Signature Block is removed. That specific addresses identified by the City Engineer are added to the Plat. That the Acknowledgement and Owner's Dedication language is amended. That County book and page are added for adjacent parcels.***
- 2. CONSTRUCTION PLANS. That all of the construction plan redline comments are corrected as per staff recommendations.***
- 3. FIRE DEPARTMENT APPROVAL. That the locations of the hydrants are approved by the Fire Chief.***
- 4. E-FILES. That e-files are submitted for the plat, dry utilities, and construction drawings. That engineer's estimates are provided for civil and dry utilities.***
- 5. UTILITY CONFLICTS. That there are no utility conflicts.***
- 6. SID PAYMENTS. That the City Engineer determines the amount of SID payments due, and that the payment is made prior to recordation.***
- 7. STORM DRAIN CALCULATIONS. That the storm drain calculations are resubmitted and approved; that they include inlet and roadway spread capacities.***
- 8. FEES. That the total amount of \$3,000.00 for application & processing fees be paid prior to recordation.***
- 9. LANDSCAPING PLAN. That the landscape plan is reviewed and approved by City Staff. That all fencing and landscaping are called out as developer/builder improvements and bonded for.***

John Malone seconded the motion. Ayes: 4, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

C. Mt. Airey E Preliminary and Final Plat, Public Hearing – Action Item

Mr. Spencer explained that Mt. Airey E is located along the north side of Mt. Airey Drive adjacent to the Spring Valley town homes.

Mr. Spencer explained that this subdivision would be subject to the park fee-in-lieu even though there is only one lot.

Mr. Spencer explained that there were some minor changes that needed to be made to the plat and that the SID payment and park fee-in-lieu would need to be paid prior to the recordation of the plat.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 6:58 p.m.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 6:58 p.m.

MOTION: *Matt Weir moved that the Planning Commission approve the Mt. Airey E Preliminary Plat and recommends approval to the City Council of the Final Plat subject to the following conditions:*

- 1. PARKS. That this subdivision is subject to the park fee-in-lieu.*
- 2. DISPOSAL OF MT. AIREY ROW. That the disposal process and road vacation are completed.*
- 3. PLAT. That the Planning Commission block be removed from the plat. That the discrepancy between the written boundary description and the geographical boundary description is resolved. That book and page information for adjacent property owners is identified.*
- 4. CONSTRUCTION PLANS. That the existence and actual location of water and sewer laterals are verified and approved by the City Engineer.*
- 5. LANDSCAPE PLAN. That the indicated streets are installed.*
- 6. SID PAYMENT. That the City Engineer determines the amount of the SID payment due and that the payment is made prior to recordation.*
- 7. FEE-IN-LIEU. That the Neighborhood Park fee-in-lieu is paid prior to recordation.*
- 8. ADDRESS. That the address is added to the plat.*

Chris Kemp seconded the motion. Ayes: 4, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

D. Cedar Valley Master Development Plan, Public Hearing – Action Item

Mr. Lenhard explained that the Cedar Valley Master Development Plan is located in the Town Center just north of the Pioneer Addition subdivision, between Sweetwater Road and the future Airport Road arterial.

Mr. Lenhard explained that this plan contained 3 parcels and a portion of a fourth parcel.

Mr. Lenhard stated that the applicant has submitted a master development application as well as a land use map. Mr. Lenhard explained that the land use map went in to detail of what areas would be used for what.

Mr. Lenhard explained that the calculations of acreage and number of dwelling units on this plan do not work. Mr. Lenhard explained that it is staff's recommendation that this item be tabled until the submittal materials contain more accurate calculations of the acreage and the number of dwelling units.

Mr. Lenhard explained that the applicant is requesting a higher density so therefore it would put them in a tier 3 which requires a 10% improved open space area. Mr. Lenhard explained that this is why 13.54 acres of improved open space is required.

Mr. Lenhard explained that the current code requires that there be buffering or transitioning between the different areas. Mr. Lenhard explained that the power line corridor serves as a good buffer and that it is about 600 ft wide and that a trail would be put through the corridor.

Mr. Lenhard reviewed the following conditions of approval with the Planning Commission:

1. LEGAL DESCRIPTION. That the legal description is verified.
2. TRAFFIC PLAN. That the traffic plan is reviewed and approved by the City engineer.
3. PARKS & OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS. That the Developer provides the land required by the Development Code as Improved Open Space (10% of total project area – 13.54 acres – since gross density is Tier III). That the developer meets the Neighborhood and Community Park requirements (at 789 units – 7.83 acres of Neighborhood Park and 4.61 acres of Community Park – total 12.44 acres in improved parks). The remaining 1.10 acres must be provided in some form as approved by the Planning Commission and City Council (suggest

- improving the trail corridor under the power lines as part of Cedar Valley Regional Trailway).
4. UTILITY CORRIDOR. That the utility corridor is ineligible for inclusion as improved open space, except as provided for in the Title 1, Section 14.9 of the City's Land Use Ordinance.
 5. GEOTECH REPORT. That a geotech report is submitted and approved by the City Engineer.
 6. CAPITAL FACILITY PLAN. That the Capital Facility Plan may need to be amended to include costs for Airport Road and Bobby Wren Boulevard.
 7. STORM DRAIN SYSTEM. That potential locations for storm water detention ponds are identified.
 8. FINANCING INFRASTRUCTURE. That a determination of the method of financing infrastructure be completed with the amending of the Capital Facilities Plan.
 9. BOBBY WREN BLVD. That Bobby Wren Blvd consists of a 136 ft. right-of-way (Area Collector) to be shared by Eagle Mountain Properties' Pioneer Addition development.
 10. AIRPORT ROAD. That Airport Road consists of a 190 ft. right-of-way (Arterial Boulevard).
 11. WATER RIGHTS. That the Developer demonstrates that they have the access to the required water rights as required by Title 2 Section 2.7.2.3 of the Development Code.
 12. ENTRYWAYS. That the Developer identifies the areas for the required entryway improvements. That sign typicals are submitted for review.
 13. DENSITY CEILINGS. That density granted through the Master Development Plan process is not a guarantee of density; rather it is a density ceiling. Other Development Code standards may reduce the amount of density that can be platted.
 14. TIER III ZONING STANDARDS. That Tier III subdivisions require a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan.
 15. BONUS DENSITY STATEMENT. That the Applicant submits a signed statement of intent to provide the required amenities and improvements in exchange for their respective Bonus Densities.
 16. Economic Analysis – 2.2.3 Economic Analysis – Funding Mechanisms. Funding mechanisms to provide for all off-site utilities and other public infrastructure; (post-application)

James McMurray explained that they were aware of the issues with the numbers and that they will work with the City on those.

Mr. McMurray explained that as the site was reviewed they felt that the power line corridor provided an excellent opportunity to be the start of a really fantastic trail system for the City.

Tom Maher opened the Public Hearing at 7:22 p.m.

James Taylor explained that he was unhappy with having a commercial area next to residential lots.

Jennifer Edwards explained that she was concerned with having a major road running next to her property because she teaches horseback riding lessons and that she would be concerned for the safety of her students. Mrs. Edwards stated that the power line corridor runs straight down the middle of her property and asked if the trail would then be running down the middle of her property.

Mr. Lenhard explained that it is up to the landowners' whether or not they want to provide an easement. Mr. Lenhard stated that if they don't the trail would just run behind the property.

Jody Hooley suggested that the Development Code be changed so that larger lot areas get a certain amount of people notified so that everyone gets noticed. Mrs. Hooley explained that she felt like it was time to plan for the future and that the residents should be heard. Mrs. Hooley

explained that she did not want to see this City turn into a “West Valley” City. Mrs. Hooley explained that she did not want to see small lots or commercial areas next to these big 5 acre lots.

Tom Maher stated that the public hearing would be continued into the next Planning Commission meeting.

MOTION: *John Malone moved that the Planning Commission table the Cedar Valley Master Development Plan until the submittal materials contain more accurate calculations of acreage and the number of dwelling units.*

Chris Kemp seconded the motion. Ayes: 4, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

6. Other Business

None

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.