

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**  
**Eagle Mountain City Offices 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, UT 84043**  
**Tuesday, September 27, 2005**

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

**Roll Call:**

Tom Maher, Chris Kemp, John Malone, Michael Hansen, Matt Weir

**Others Present:**

James McMurray, Bud Jorgensen, Bill Peperone

**City Staff:**

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

**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 vest-pocket for Lone Tree Plat C was approved by the City Council and that they required that the vest-pocket be installed.

Mr. Lenhard explained that Spring Valley Plat C was also approved by the City Council with no additional conditions.

Mr. Lenhard explained that the Rock Creek Condos Phase 2 was also approved by the City Council and that the developer agreed to the conditions in regards to the fencing around the tot lots.

**4. Development Items**

**A. Hidden Valley Concept Plan - Discussion Item (on-site)**

The Planning Commission and staff met on-site at the Hidden Valley location. Mr. Lenhard showed a map of the area to the Commissioners and explained the layout to them.

The Planning Commission discussed the site and the layout of the project.

*(After the site visit the Planning Commission and staff returned to the Eagle Mountain City offices for the remainder of the meeting.)*

Mr. Peperone explained that the property had been entitled for 795 dwelling units but the proposal being present tonight was for 367 and that this was a 54% reduction in units being allowed on the property.

Mr. Maher asked Mr. Peperone who owned the land.

Mr. Peperone explained that Nathan & Stan Ricks with Hidden Valley, LLC owned the property. Mr. Peperone explained that the plan being presented has 158 lots in what is being called phase 2. Mr. Peperone explained that the grade could be brought below 25% and the plan could be redesigned so that the hillside would not be developed.

Mr. Maher asked if any lots were exceeding the 25% grade.

Mr. Peperone explained that some lots go into the 25% grade but that they do have buildable areas on those lots that are below the 25% grade. Mr. Peperone explained that this would be determined before the preliminary plat is submitted.

Mr. Maher explained to Mr. Peperone that the Planning Commission did not like this plan.

Mr. Peperone explained that he would meet code but that in order to get the value out of the property then they would need to see those 367 lots developed.

Mr. Malone asked if there was any way that this project could be marketed with larger lots.

Mr. Peperone stated that in order to get value out of the property than the 367 lots would need to be developed.

Mr. Maher asked how much a half acre lot would have to sell for if they layout of the plan were to change.

Mr. Peperone stated that he would have to sit down and go through the figures but that he would get those to the Planning Commission.

## **B. Cedar Corners Concept Plan - Discussion Item**

Mr. Spencer explained that Cedar Corners is located in the City Center north of Eagle Point Plats G and H. Mr. Spencer explained that the City's General Plan categorizes the parcel's future land use as Mixed-Use Residential and that the applicant is proposing a 200-lot single-family detached subdivision on a 40 acre parcel in the City Center just north of Eagle Point Plats G and H. Mr. Spencer explained that this parcel is currently zoned Agriculture, but the applicant has submitted an application for a Rezone to Residential. Mr. Spencer explained that at a gross density of 5.0 dwelling units per acre, this project would be required to meet all standards of the Tier II Residential zone.

Mr. Spencer explained that the following items were discussed and reviewed with the applicant in the DRC meetings.

- That an all weather secondary access is provided for the project.
- That the gas, water and electricity systems are looped.
- That two acres of park are provided (two tot lots, two pavilions, etc.). That electricity and lights are provided to the park.
- That the driveways are a minimum of 22' long from the property line.
- That entryway monuments for the project are provided.
- That the following setbacks are required in Tier II Residential: front 15, sides 15 total, rear 20, rear on alley 15.
- That the new Tier II Lot Frontage standard is proposed to be 60 ft. instead of 50 ft. (the City Council will vote on this at the October 18 meeting)
- That the trail corridor between lots 11 and 12 is removed (trail no longer planned behind those lots)
- It is recommended that no part of a lot extends into the utility corridor without plan reviews by Kern River Gas and Utah Power and Light.
- That the open space area between lots 34 and 35 is relocated away from the perimeter of the project. Suggest moving to southwest corner to proved storm

- drainage detention area.
- That the southwest corner of the project area should be reserved as a detention area.

Mr. Spencer explained that one issue that Staff would like to discuss is the lot frontages. Mr. Spencer explained that the plan that is being presented has a 50 foot frontage on the lots. Mr. Spencer explained that recently the Planning Commission had approved the Development code which had proposed a change to the lot frontages making it a 60 foot minimum. Mr. Spencer explained that they had spoken with the City Attorney and asked if there would be any vested rights that this project would have in regards to the minimums, and that the City Attorney had told them that there would not be, because the applicant had been informed previously that the code would be changing depending on the City Council's approval.

Mr. McMurray explained that he was a consultant with Northern Engineering and he was here representing his client. Mr. McMurray explained that he had questions about the 60 foot lot frontage.

Mr. Lenhard explained that this was a concern for staff when the applicant first presented their submittal with the 50 foot lot frontages. Mr. Lenhard explained that they had spoken with the City attorney and asked him if there was any vesting and that the attorney had said no.

Mr. McMurray explained that the current plan shows a garden court lot with the center lots facing the garden court and that the homes would be accessed through an alleyway.

Mr. Kemp explained that it was a good layout and that it would be a good and safe environment for children to go out and play where there parents can keep an eye on them.

Mr. McMurray asked the Commission and Staff what they thought of landscaping or improving the power line corridor.

Mr. Lenhard explained that UPNL and Kern River will give recommendations to the City as to what they would and would not like to see done to the power line corridor.

Mr. Trusty explained that no permanent structures would be allowed and that elevation would be a concern, that nothing could come within 10 feet of the power line. Mr. Trusty explained that the companies would also have to have access to their facilities.

Mr. McMurray explained that the open space in front of the homes was put there rather than behind the homes because if put behind it would just become cluttered and trashy because no one would be able to see it.

Mr. Peperone explained that he felt that having the open space in front of those homes would serve as a nice park area and that it would be maintained rather than left unkempt because you can see it.

## **5. Other Business**

Mr. Lenhard explained to the Planning Commission that the November 8<sup>th</sup> meeting had been canceled due to elections and that if possible Staff would like to reschedule the meeting for November 9<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Lenhard also explained that there would be meetings held on November 22, and December 20, unless there were no items to go on the agenda then those meetings would be canceled.

## **6. Adjournment**

Tom Maher adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.