

MINUTES OF THE EAGLE MOUNTAIN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Eagle Mountain City Offices 1680 E. Heritage Drive, Eagle Mountain, UT 84043
Tuesday, March 22, 2005

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

Roll Call

Commissioners Present: Tom Maher, Chris Kemp, Matt Weir, Mike Hansen

Others Present

Bobby Colson, Ranches/Sage Group; Carilee Sorenson, Little Learners Preschool; McKay Edwards, SITLA; Skip, Aspen Resource

City Staff

City Council Liaison: Vincent Liddiard
City Planner: Adam Lenhard
City Engineer: Chris Trusty
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

Adam Lenhard explained that the City Council took action on the Sage Valley Master Development Plan and made a motion to approve it with a few recommendations. Mr. Lenhard explained that the 14400 West Road Closure and the Valley View Plats A and B were tabled. Mr. Lenhard explained that the Council wanted to evaluate the alignment of it. Mr. Lenhard stated that he would anticipate it to be on the next City Council agenda to be approved at the next City Council meeting. Mr. Lenhard explained that the City Council took a tour of the new City Utility Administration Building. Mr. Lenhard stated that the Planning Commission would also be taken on a tour at a later date.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. March 8, 2005

MOTION: *Chris Kemp made a motion to approve the minutes of March 8, 2005.*

Matt Weir seconded the motion. Ayes: 3, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

5. Development Items

A. Little Learners Preschool, Home Business Application, Public Hearing – Action Item

Mr. Lenhard explained that the Little Learners Preschool Home Business is located at 2106 E Ficus Way in the Lone Tree B Subdivision. Mr. Lenhard stated that the applicant has agreed to all of the conditions of approval and all regulations regarding home businesses.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 6:08 p.m.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 6:08 p.m.

MOTION: ***Matt Weir moved that the Planning Commission approve the Little Learners Preschool Home according to the following conditions:***

- 1. That background checks may be required for additional employees.***
- 2. That the Home Business application may be reviewed and subjected to additional conditions or revoked by the Planning Commission upon future reviews. If a complaint is filed by surrounding property owners the Planning Department will perform an investigation and place the item on the Planning Commission's agenda for additional consideration.***

Chris Kemp seconded the motion. Ayes: 3, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

B. Development Code and General Plan Amendments, Public Hearing – Action Item

Mr. Lenhard discussed with the Planning Commission the following proposed changes to the development code:

That parking areas have a maximum slope of 5%.

That Tier 1 lots with sizes from one-half to three-quarters of an acre have a minimum lot frontage of 125 feet instead of 100 feet.

That there is not an absolute disallowance of counting Constrained or Unbuildable Lands in approved open spaces.

That there is a provision that allows for the requirement of open space to be paid as a fee in lieu.

That there is clarification stating that neighborhood and community parks must be developed on Buildable Lands and improved with sod and irrigation systems and that the timing of the Community Park fee in lieu is required at recordation.

That Master Development Plans be required to go through the Concept Plan process.

That the definition of the side yard setbacks be amended to exclude window wells for the setback requirements and that basement stairwells be subject to the setback requirements. That Tier II side yard setbacks remain the same but a landscaping and draining channel are required when the setback is 5'. That the City Council may reduce the total side yard requirement of 15' with a special approval.

That the right-of-way table be amended to adjust the right of way and trail widths.

That the lot size transitioning standards are clarified.

That lots containing slopes in excess of 25% or other Unbuildable Lands may be smaller than one acre.

That the requirement to post a public notice sign on the property for which a public hearing will be conducted be removed. The direct mail notice will remain the same of 600' and at least 25 property owners.

That there is clarification given regarding the issuance of Building Permits for model homes.

That the letter of credit is eliminated as a security option for public improvements.

That the requirement to submit a fiscal analysis is deleted as a submittal requirement for the Master Development Plan.

That an updated zoning map be adopted.

That eligible businesses for directional/advertising signs be clarified and that Model Home signs limit each builder to one 16" x 64" slot per sign. Mr. Lenhard explained that a Home Business could not advertise on these signs.

That the parking stall length be changed from 20' in depth to 18' in depth.

That the driveway length in all Zones and Tiers be reduced from 24' to 22'. Mr. Lenhard explained that very rarely is a 24' drive necessary.

That the rear setbacks be reduced in the Residential Zone Tier II category from 25" to 20".

That additional signage locations are approved as shown on Map 15.1

Mr. Lenhard explained that the following items were the proposed changes to the General Plan Text and Maps:

That the Future Land Use and Transportation Corridor Map be amended to show additional transportation corridors as shown on approved master development plan maps; insert allowable traffic light locations on SR 73; correct master development plan boundaries and other amendments as shown.

Mr. Lenhard explained that an agreement was signed with UDOT in which five locations were found to be suitable for traffic lights.

That the policy regarding amending the General Plan be amended to state several months that the Plan can be amended.

That the Regional Parks and Trails maps be adopted.

Mr. Lenhard explained to the Commission that just the main trails would be shown on the map.

That Map 3 is amended and adopted.

Mr. Lenhard explained that the City has a new website that will soon be available to residents and that this website would have the new maps on it.

Tom Maher asked Mr. Lenhard what the flexibility is with Tier 1.

Mr. Lenhard explained that in the past developers/land owners have been given a minimum and that has become a standard.

Mr. Maher explained that he agreed and that he did not want to lower the minimum but in terms of flexibility what is the Commission allowed to do.

Mr. Lenhard explained that one option would be to make a recommendation to the City Council that there be some type of provision written in the text that would allow for some flexibility.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 6:38 p.m.

Bobby Colson explained to the Commission that he was here on behalf of Brian Haskell. Mr. Colson explained that Mr. Haskell gave him a letter and asked that it be submitted to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Colson read the letter to the Commission.

The letter explained that Mr. Haskell did not want the letter of credit option eliminated from the Development Code.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 6:43 p.m.

MOTION: *Chris Kemp moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the following proposed changes to the Development Code Titles 1 and 2 and the General Plan Text and Maps:*

Development Code:

- 1. PARKING LOT SLOPES. That parking areas have a maximum slope of 5 percent (Title 1 Create a new section numbered 10.4.8)***
- 2. TIER 1 LOT FRONTAGE. That Tier 1 lots with sizes from one-half (1/2) to three-quarters (3/4) of an acre have a minimum lot frontage of 125 feet instead of 100 feet (Title 1 Sections 5.9 and 14.9).***
- 3. OPEN SPACES & CONSTRAINED LAND. That there is not an absolute disallowance of counting Constrained or Unbuildable Lands in approved open spaces (Title 1 Sections 5.9 and 14.9).***
- 4. FEE IN LIEU – OPEN SPACE. That there is a provision that allows for the requirement of open space to be paid as a fee in lieu (Title 1 Sections 5.9; 5.10.8; 5.11.3; 5.12.2; 5.13.2; 5.14.2; 6.7.2; 6.7.3; 6.8).***
- 5. PARKS. That there is clarification stating that neighborhood and community parks must be developed on Buildable Lands and improved with sod and irrigation systems (Title 2 Tables 7.3 and 7.4). That timing of the Community Park fee in lieu is required at recordation (Title 2 section 7.12).***
- 6. MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLANS – CONCEPT. That Master Development Plans be required to go through the Concept Plan process (Title 2 Section 3.2 and Title 2 Section 2.6).***
- 7. SIDEYARD SETBACKS. That the definition of the side yard setbacks be amended to exclude window wells for the setback requirements and that basement stairwells be subject to the setback requirements (Title 1 See setbacks). That Tier II side yard setbacks remain the same (5' minimum with a total of 15') but a landscaping and draining channel are required when the setback is 5'. That the City Council may reduce the total side yard requirement of 15' with a special approval. (See Title 1 Section 5.12.3.3).***
- 8. TABLE 7.2 ROW STANDARDS. That the right-of-way table be amended to adjust the right of way and trail widths.***
- 9. LOT SIZE TRANSITIONING. That the lot size transitioning standards are clarified (Title 1 Section 11.15; standards remain unchanged but section is rewritten for clarity).***
- 10. ONE ACRE LOTS & UNBUILDABLE LAND. That lots containing slopes in excess of 25% or other Unbuildable Lands may be smaller than one acre (Title 1 Section 11.15).***
- 11. PUBLIC NOTICE – SIGNS. That the requirement to post a public notice sign on the property for which a public hearing will be conducted is removed. The direct mail notice will remain the same of 600' and at least 25 property owners (All chapters that contain a public hearing provision).***
- 12. MODEL HOMES. That there is clarification given regarding the issuance of building permits for model homes (Title 2 Section 1.10.4.1).***
- 13. LETTER OF CREDIT. That the letter of credit is eliminated as a security option for public improvements (Title 2 Section 6.7.2 and 6.7.3).***

14. **FISCAL ANALYSIS.** *That the requirement to submit a fiscal analysis is deleted as a submittal requirement for the Master Development Plan (Title 2 Section 2.5.1.4).*
15. **ZONING MAP.** *That an updated zoning map be adopted (Title 1, Map 1.1).*
16. **SIGNAGE.** *That eligible businesses for directional/advertising signs be clarified (home businesses specifically prohibited), and that Model Home signs limit each builder to one 16" x 64" slot per sign.*
17. **PARKING STALLS.** *That the parking stall length be changed from 20' in depth to 18' in depth (Title 1, Table 10.1)*
18. **DRIVEWAY LENGTH.** *That the driveway length in all Zones and Tiers be reduced from 24' to 22'.*
19. **REAR YARD SETBACKS.** *That the rear setbacks be reduced in the Residential Zone Tier II category from 25" to 20".*
20. **MAP 15.1 APPROVED OFF – PREMISE SIGNAGE LOCATIONS.** *That additional signage locations are approved as shown on Map 15.1.*

General Plan Text and Maps:

1. **FUTURE LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR MAP.** *That the Future Land Use & Transportation Corridor Map be amended to show additional transportation corridors as shown on approved master development plan maps; insert allowable traffic light locations on SR 73; correct master development plan boundaries and other amendments as shown.*
2. **GENERAL PLAN TEXT AMENDMENTS.** *That the policy regarding amending the General Plan be amended to state several months that the Plan can be amended (Page 1:7).*
3. **REGIONAL PARK AND TRAILS MAP.** *That the Regional Parks and Trails maps be adopted (this will require some of the references in the Plan to combine Map 7 – Regional Parks & Map 8-Trails into one map which will be referred to as Regional Parks and Trails – Map 7).*
4. **MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLANS MAP.** *That Map 3 is amended and adopted.*

Mike Hansen seconded the motion. Ayes: 4, Nays: 0. Motion Passed.

C. SITLA Regional Park – Action Item

Mr. Lenhard explained that McKay Edwards would be presenting this project to the Commission tonight.

McKay Edwards explained that he was the project manager for SITLA.

Mr. Edwards explained that SITLA has dedicated to the city 110 acres of land. McKay Edwards explained that 58 acres would be the SITLA Regional Park, 10 acres of which would be a civic/municipal center.

Mr. Edwards explained the plans being presented are not final and that not all of the park would be developed at once but it would be developed in phases because of funding.

Mr. Edwards explained that the park would include four baseball diamonds, some basketball courts, tennis courts and a skate park as well as other items. Mr. Edwards stated that the design team wanted to have a unique central feature that would tie the park together. Mr. Edwards explained that Aspen Resource had created an interpretive center which would feature things about the Eagle Mountains History such as the Pony Express Trail.

Skip with Aspen Resource explained that the interpretive center was a main feature that they had hoped would tie the park together.

McKay Edwards and Skip with Aspen Resource continued in explaining the layout of the SITLA Regional Park.

Mr. Edwards explained that the native vegetation would not be left as it is now, it would be replaced with native grass and shrubs.

Discussion took place regarding the skate park.

Mr. Edwards explained that the Skate Park would be a half a mile east of Sweetwater Road.

The Planning Commission expressed concern with having the skate park being so far away from the road. The Commission suggested moving the skate park closer to Sweetwater Road to prevent vandalism being done.

McKay Edwards explained that one item that they layout did not show was lighting. Mr. Edwards stated that in a previous meeting with City staff the lighting issue was discussed and it was decided that lighting would be added to the baseball fields as well as the parking lots and by the concession stand.

Skip explained that the lighting would be installed from the savings of not installing the pond up front.

Tom Maher suggested that there be two adult softball diamonds that could double as the little league fields instead of four large baseball diamonds.

Tom Maher suggested that information be gathered from other cities to see what they have found that works the best.

Mr. Edwards stated that it could possibly work and that it would free up a lot of space so that the skate park could be moved around.

Tom Maher asked what kind of an impact the bond for 2 ½ million dollars would have on the residents.

Mr. Lenhard stated that for a home in the price range of \$160,000 to \$170,000 it would cost them approximately \$7.00 to \$8.00 per month.

The Planning Commission explained that they would like to see more lighting, a lot of trees, having the skate park moved closer to the road, having two softball diamonds and possibly a swimming pool.

MOTION: *Mike Hansen moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the SITLA Regional Park to the City Council subject to the following conditions:*

- 1. That the four baseball diamonds be changed to two softball diamonds.*
- 2. That consideration be taken in moving the skate park closer to Sweetwater road to prevent vandalism.*
- 3. That there be more lighting added around the restroom facilities, skate park and softball diamond areas instead of installing the water feature.*
- 4. That the access on the gravel road on airport road be looked at.*

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

D. Jonathan Celaya Sign Permit Application – Action Item

Adam Lenhard explained that Mr. Celaya is requesting consideration of three new Model Home Signs located on the Ranches Parkway at the intersections of Campus Drive and Ranches Parkway, Franklin Drive and Ranches Parkway, and Braxton Drive and Ranches Parkway, as well as three locations along Pony Express Parkway on the way to Silver Lake.

Mr. Lenhard explained that these were just potential locations for the signs and that it is completely up to the Planning Commission and City Council whether or not they want the signs in the proposed places.

Mr. Lenhard explained that these signs would be solely for the builders to use as directional signs for their developments.

Mr. Lenhard explained that the builders have been concerned that they are not getting adequate coverage for the people who are coming through their subdivisions.

Mr. Lenhard explained that at the time when the sign ordinance was being drafted, that the staff felt like the existing signs were not being filled so why add additional locations. Mr. Lenhard explained that since then the signs have been filled up and there now seems to be an adequate reason to have more signs put up.

Mr. Lenhard explained to the Commission one sign would be built and then whether or not the sign slots are filled then the next one may or may not be constructed.

Mr. Lenhard explained that the signs would need to be consistent with the earthtone colors on the existing signs and that the Ranches logo would need to be replaced with Eagle Mountain City's logo.

Mr. Colson asked Mr. Lenhard if there was a restriction on how much the sign slots could be leased for.

Mr. Lenhard stated that there was a restriction and that the maximum lease amount that could be charged is \$50.00 per slat per sign a month.

Mr. Maher asked how the signage would be controlled.

Mr. Lenhard stated that the ordinance allows for staff to review any signs before they are inserted and that only the logo and a directional arrow would be allowed on the slats. Mr. Lenhard explained that the staff's recommendation would be for signs two through six to be approved at this time.

MOTION: *Mike Hansen moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of Jonathan Celaya's Sign Application to the City Council subject to the following conditions:*

- 1. CAPACITY.** *That the Applicant demonstrates that there is sufficient need for additional sign capacity. That the capacity on the first sign must be filled before another sign may be installed.*
- 2. SIGN CONSTRUCTION.** *That all signage is constructed in accordance to the dimensions specified in Title 1, Chapter 15 of the City's new Development Code (see Schematic 15.1- Model Home Signage). That the signage is similar in color (earth tones) to that of the signs in The Ranches area.*
- 3. LOCATIONS.** *That the Planning Department identifies the exact locations with the applicant prior to installation (so that clear visions triangles are observed etc.)*
- 4. LEASE AGREEMENT.** *That the City Council approves the lease agreement specifying copy control, insurance, maintenance, time frames, and mechanics liens. That the sign lease fees are paid in full - \$300 per sign per year.*
- 5. SIGN COPY.** *That the applicant may not advertise on the sign for leasing spots available. That each builder is limited to one 16" x 64" spot per sign.*
- 6. SIGN 1.** *That the City Attorney and City Council determine the availability of Sign No. 1 prior to approving this sign location for Mr. Celaya's application.*

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

6. Other Business

A. Name Plates

The Planning Coordinator asked the Planning Commission how they would like their names to appear on their new name plates.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

