CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Tuesday, August 16, 2016 - 6:30 P.M.
City of Saratoga Springs City Offices
1307 North Commerce Drive, Suite 200, Saratoga Springs, Utah 84045

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA

1. Wildflower Village Plan 1

2. Mt. Saratoga – Rezone, General Plan Amendment, Community Plan, Master Development Agreement

3. Agenda Review:

   a. City Council policy agenda items.
   b. Future City Council policy and work session agenda items.

4. Adjourn to Policy Session.

Councilmembers may participate in this meeting electronically via video or telephonic conferencing.
The order of the agenda items are subject to change by order of the Mayor.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify the City Recorder at 766-9793 at least one day prior to the meeting.

Kimber Gabryszak, AICP
Planning Director

City Council Memorandum

Author: Kimber Gabryszak, AICP
Memo Date: Tuesday, August 9, 2016
Meeting Date: Tuesday, August 16, 2016
Re: Wildflower Village Plan, Work Session

Background
The Wildflower Community Plan (CP) and Rezone and MDA were approved February 24, 2015. The CP allocated a total of 1465 Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs) to the property, for an overall density of 2.46 units per acre including the future Mountain View Corridor (MVC). This density was allocated to the remaining property east and west of the MVC.

The CP also allocated Regional Commercial zoning along State Road 73. The overall development plan, as approved in the CP, is outlined in Exhibit 1.

The CP contained standards and guidelines for density, lot size, phasing, road networks, open space and parks, design and development standards, housing types, fencing, signage, and other topics. These standards and guidelines are to be further clarified in Village Plans, and density allocated to areas within the CP. Following Village Plan approval(s), specific subdivision plat and site plan applications may be submitted.

Request
The applicant, DAI, has submitted a request for Village Plan 1 (VP1), as part of the Wildflower development west of Harvest Hills. The overall use map is contained in Exhibit 2, and the complete detailed draft VP is contained in Exhibit 3.

VP1 contains all of the property to the east of the future MVC, excepting ~7 acres to be used for a MVC stormwater pond. VP1 assigns 571 ERUs to this property, as anticipated by the CP.

Process
A public hearing will be noticed and held with the Planning Commission at a future date, and following a recommendation by the Planning Commission, a public hearing will be noticed and held with the City Council.

Recommendation
Staff recommends that the City Council review the Village Plan and provide feedback on the proposal in preparation for a future public hearing. The Planning Commission held a work session on July 14th, and gave informal feedback to the applicant as well, and the applicant will respond to both PC and CC feedback at the public hearings.

Exhibits
1. Wildflower Community Plan Layout (page 2)
2. Wildflower Village Plan Draft Layouts (pages 3-4)
3. Complete Wildflower Village Plan 1, Draft (pages 5-98)

EXHIBIT TWO: Land Use Master Plan





LEI
ENGINEERS
SURVEYORS
PLANNERS
3302 N. Main Street
Spanish Fork, UT 84660
Phone: 801.798.0555
Fax: 801.798.9393
office@lei-eng.com
www.lei-eng.com

WILDFLOWER
SARATOGA SPRING, UTAH
MASTER PLAN

REVISIONS
1 .
2 .
3 .
4 .
5 .

LEI PROJECT #: 2013-0902
DRAWN BY: BLS/TJP
CHECKED BY: GDM
SCALE: 1" = 500'
DATE: 2/25/2015
SHEET 1

RESIDENTIAL LEGEND

LAND USE	AREA*	ERUs*
RESIDENTIAL	±287 ACRES (84.2%)	1,026
MOUNTAIN VIEW HOUSING	±61 ACRES (15.8%)	442
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS	±92 ACRES	--
MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR	±145 ACRES	--
TRAIL	--	--
MASTER PLANNED ROADS (NO NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS)	±10 ACRES	--
TOTAL	±595 ACRES	1,468

*ALL AREAS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE, FINAL AREAS TO BE DETERMINED BASED ON FINAL ALIGNMENT AND BOUNDARY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR. ERU COUNT FIXED AT 1,468 ERUs.

COMMERCIAL LEGEND

LAND USE	AREA*
REGIONAL COMMERCIAL	±160 ACRES
MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR	±40 ACRES
MASTER PLANNED ROADS	±3 ACRES
TOTAL	±203 ACRES

OPEN SPACE TABULATIONS

MOUNTAIN VIEW TRAIL	±19 ACRES
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS	±92 ACRES
MOUNTAIN VIEW HOUSING OPEN SPACE	±22 ACRES
TOTAL OPEN SPACE	±133 ACRES (30%)

DAI
1099 W. SOUTH JORDAN PARKWAY
SOUTH JORDAN, UT 84095
(801) 495-3414

RESIDENTIAL LEGEND

LAND USE	AREA*	ERUs*
RESIDENTIAL VILLAGE 1	±148 ACRES	571
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS VILLAGE 1	±15 ACRES	--
MASTER PLANNED ROADS (NO NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS)	±5 ACRES	--
TOTAL	±168 ACRES	571

*ALL AREAS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE, FINAL AREAS TO BE DETERMINED BASED ON FINAL ALIGNMENT AND BOUNDARY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR.

Uses within a Planned Community District shall be guided but not limited to the following section of the Land Development Code (19.04.13):

R-3 Permitted Uses: Apiary; Chickens; Church; Dwelling, Single Family; Production of Fruit and Crops; Public Parks, Playgrounds, Recreation Areas, or Other Park Improvements; Residential Facilities for Persons with a Disability; School, Charter; School, Public; and Temporary Sales Trailer.

R-3 Conditional Uses: Bed & Breakfast; Cemetery; Child Care Center; Educational Center; Golf Course; Preschool; Public & Private Utility Building or Facility; Public Building or Facilities (City-Owned); Residential Facilities for Elderly Persons.

Buffering: Proposed land uses are compatible with neighboring land uses, including uses within and outside of Village Plan Area 1. Fencing will be used to buffer between residential areas, open space, and the church site (see the Fencing Plan in Section 5.)


VILLAGE PLAN AREA 1 BOUNDARY
PROPOSED LAND USES
SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
OPEN SPACE
OPEN SPACE FUTURE VILLAGE PLAN PHASE
CHURCH
FUTURE VILLAGE PLAN PHASE
MOUNTAIN VIEW TRAIL
UDOT DETENTION AREA
Mountain View Corridor
0
500'
1000'
SCALE IN FEET
NORTH

VILLAGE PLAN AREA 1

June 20, 2016

DRAFT

WILDFLOWER

AT SARATOGA SPRINGS

A DAI Community

VILLAGE PLAN

Prepared By:

DAI

Landmark Design

LEI

Hales Engineering

Table of Contents

SECTION 1: Legal Description ..... S 1 - 1
SECTION 2: Detailed Use Map ..... S 2 - 1
SECTION 2 (cont'd): Detailed Use Map ..... S 2 - 2
SECTION 3: Detailed Buildout Allocation ..... S 3 - 1
SECTION 4: Development Standards ..... S 4 - 1
SECTION 5: Design Guidelines ..... S 5 - 1
SECTION 5a: Fencing Plan ..... S 5 - 14
SECTION 6: Associations ..... S 6 - 1
SECTION 7: Phasing & Maintenance Plan ..... S 7 - 1
SECTION 7a: Phasing Plan ..... S 7 - 2
SECTION 8: Lotting Map ..... S 8 - 1
SECTION 9: Landscape Plan & Plant Palette ..... S 9 - 1
SECTION 10: Utility Plans ..... S 10 - 5
SECTION 10a: Culinary Water Plan ..... S 10 - 6
SECTION 10b: Secondary Water Plan ..... S 10 - 7
SECTION 10c: Sewer Plan ..... S 10 - 9
SECTION 10d: Storm Water Drainage Plan ..... S 10 - 10
SECTION 10e: Capital Facility Upgrade Plan ..... S 10 - 11
SECTION 11: Vehicular Plan ..... S 11 - 1
SECTION 12: Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan ..... S 12 - 1
SECTION 13: Density Transfers ..... S 13 - 1
SECTION 14: Additional Detailed Plans ..... S 14 - 1
SECTION 14a: Neighborhood Names ..... S 14 - 2
SECTION 14b: Signage Plan ..... S 14 - 3
SECTION 14c: Grading Plan ..... S 14 - 7
SECTION 14d: Open Space Management Plan ..... S 14 - 8
SECTION 14e: Natural Resources Inventory Plan ..... S 14 - 26
SECTION 14f: Wildlife Mitigation Plan ..... S 14 - 27
SECTION 14g: Sensitive Lands Protection ..... S 14 - 28
SECTION 14h: Fire Protection Plan ..... S 14 - 29
SECTION 14i: Traffic Study ..... S 14 - 30
SECTION 14i: Traffic Study (cont'd) ..... S 14 - 31
SECTION 15: Site Characteristics ..... S 15 - 1
SECTION 16: Findings ..... S 16 - 1
SECTION 17: Mitigation Plans ..... S 17 - 1
SECTION 18: Offsite Utilities ..... S 18 - 1
SECTION 19: Master Development Agreement ..... S 19 - 1

SECTION 1: Legal Description

ENGINEERS
SURVEYORS
PLANNERS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
PREPARED FOR
DAI
Job No. 13-0902
(April 27, 2016)

VILLAGE PLAN LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A Portion of the West Half of Section 10 and the South Half of Section 3, Township 5 South, Range 1 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, described as follows:

Beginning at the North 1/4 Corner of Section 10, Township 5 South, Range 1 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence S0°11'02"W along the Quarter Section Line 3688.23 feet; thence N89°48'58"W 491.89 feet; thence N15°21'47"W 459.85 feet; thence along the arc of a 4440.00 foot radius curve to the right 2668.32 feet through a central angle of 34°26'00" (chord: N1°51'13"E 2628.34 feet); thence N19°04'13"E 684.52 feet to the southerly line of that real property described in Deed Entry No. 3238:2014 in the official records of the Utah County Recorder; thence along said real property the following six (6) courses: S18°26'38"E 1.65 feet; thence S25°22'31"E 60.27 feet; thence N89°45'50"E 164.03 feet; thence N0°02'37"E 198.17 feet; thence S89°57'58"W 121.39 feet; thence S64°33'09"W 20.59 feet to the proposed easterly right-of-way line of Mountain View Corridor; thence along said right-of-way line the following eight (8) courses: along the arc of a 3000.00 foot radius non-tangent curve to the right (radius bears: S67°52'05"E) 409.38 feet through a central angle of 7°49'07" (chord: N26°02'28"E 409.06 feet); thence along the arc of a 8140.00 foot radius curve to the left 1433.58 feet through a central angle of 10°05'27" (chord: N24°54'18"E 1431.73 feet); thence along the arc of a 750.00 foot radius curve to the right 974.95 feet through a central angle of 74°28'49" (chord: N57°06'00"E 907.74 feet); thence S85°39'35"E 665.49 feet; thence along the arc of a 1500.00 foot radius curve to the left 438.11 feet through a central angle of 16°44'05" (chord: N85°58'22"E 436.56 feet); thence N77°36'20"E 298.85 feet to the East Line of Section 3, Township 5 South, Range 1 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence S0°05'10"E along the Section Line 1023.87 feet; thence N89°51'58"E 547.97 feet to the East Bank of the Jacob Welby Canal; thence along the said East Bank the following six (6) courses: S16°33'17"E 43.07 feet; thence S9°58'30"E 53.91 feet; thence S6°37'28"W 103.89 feet; thence S9°27'03"W 107.43 feet; thence S8°32'21"W 53.31 feet; thence S6°29'17"W 48.17 feet; thence N89°58'51"W 1118.84 feet to the Northwest Corner of Plat "W", Harvest Hills Subdivision; thence S26°33'37"W along the westerly line of Plats "W & R/S", Harvest Hills Subdivisions 1040.70 feet; thence S89°36'29"W along Plats "Z, AA & CC" Harvest Hills Subdivisions 1346.34 feet; thence N9°35'01"E 216.50 feet; thence West 315.47 feet; thence S3°19'17"E 215.67 feet to the point of beginning.

Contains: ±168.69 Acres

Note: Acreage in legal description varies from Community Plan. See exhibit on page S1-2.

- Civil Engineering
- Structural Engineering
- Surveying
- Land Planning
- Landscape Architecture

www.lei-eng.com

Corporate Office: 3302 N. Main Street • Spanish Fork, UT 84660 801.798.0555 801.798.9393
Salt Lake Office: 14441 South 980 West • Bluffdale, UT 84065 801.495.2844 801.495.2847
Boise Office: 2040 S. Eagle Road • Meridian, ID 83642 208.846.9600

Note: Acreage in legal description varies from Community Plan.



RESIDENTIAL LEGEND

LAND USE	AREA*	ERUs*
RESIDENTIAL VILLAGE 1	±148 ACRES	571
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS VILLAGE 1	±15 ACRES	--
MASTER PLANNED ROADS (NO NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS)	±5 ACRES	--
TOTAL	±168 ACRES	571

*ALL AREAS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE, FINAL AREAS TO BE DETERMINED BASED ON FINAL ALIGNMENT AND BOUNDARY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR.

Uses within a Planned Community District shall be guided but not limited to the following section of the Land Development Code (19.04.13):

R-3 Permitted Uses: Apiary; Chickens; Church; Dwelling, Single Family; Production of Fruit and Crops; Public Parks, Playgrounds, Recreation Areas, or Other Park Improvements; Residential Facilities for Persons with a Disability; School, Charter; School, Public; and Temporary Sales Trailer.

R-3 Conditional Uses: Bed & Breakfast; Cemetery; Child Care Center; Educational Center; Golf Course; Preschool; Public & Private Utility Building or Facility; Public Building or Facilities (City-Owned); Residential Facilities for Elderly Persons.

Buffering: Proposed land uses are compatible with neighboring land uses, including uses within and outside of Village Plan Area 1. Fencing will be used to buffer between residential areas, open space, and the church site (see the Fencing Plan in Section 5.)


VILLAGE PLAN AREA 1 BOUNDARY
PROPOSED LAND USES
SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
OPEN SPACE
OPEN SPACE FUTURE VILLAGE PLAN PHASE
CHURCH
FUTURE VILLAGE PLAN PHASE
MOUNTAIN VIEW TRAIL
UDOT DETENTION AREA
Mountain View Corridor
0
500'
1000'
SCALE IN FEET
NORTH

The following information details the allocation of all acreage within Village Plan Area 1 (Refer to Phasing and Maintenance Plan in Section 7).

Area	Land Use	Acres	ERUs Assigned in the Community Plan	ERUs in Village Plan Area I	Percent Change	ERUs/Gross Acre
Neighborhood 1	Single Family Residential Open Space ROW	19.33 5.03 5.85	79	80	+1.0%	2.64
Neighborhood 2	Single Family Residential Open Space ROW	13.24 0.68 4.03	51	51	0%	2.84
Neighborhood 3	Single Family Residential Open Space ROW	19.93 1.67 6.56	128	125	-2.4%	4.44
Neighborhood 4	Single Family Residential Open Space Church ROW	17.55 6.39 3.76 7.39	109	94 (2 of these for the church)	-12.8%	2.71
Neighborhood 5	Single Family Residential Open Space ROW	10.58 0.15 9.92	55	47	-14.6%	2.32
Neighborhood 6	Single Family Residential ROW	22.43 7.16	128	138	+7.8%	4.66
Neighborhood 7	Single Family Residential Open Space ROW	5.71 1.82 2.01	30	36	+1.2%	3.77
Village Plan Area 1	Master Planned Roads	4.57	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Total ERUs Village Plan Area 1	580	571	-2.1%	

Note: See Lotting Plan for Neighborhood Breakdown in Section 8.

Future Population Projections

According to the City's Parks, Recreation, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan (2011), the average household size in Saratoga Springs is 4.05 persons. The total number of new housing units in Village Plan Area 1 is 571. Multiplying the number of new housing units by the average household size of 4.05 persons provides a future population projection of 2,316.6 for Village Plan Area 1.

Employment Levels

The land uses within Village Plan Area 1 are single family residential, open space, church, and right-of-way; therefore no employment will be provided in Village Plan Area 1.

SECTION 4: Development Standards

Building Form — Single Family Residential

Disclaimer: If any requirements in the Development Standards conflict with City or State Codes, the City or State codes take precedence over the Development Standards.

BUILDING CONFIGURATION	
Number of Bldgs. per Lot	1 + outbuilding
Height — Principal Building	35' maximum height measured at vertical distance from established finished grade surface at the building wall to the mean highest level between eaves and ridge for gable, hip, or gambrel roofs.
Height — Outbuilding	Equal to or less than 20 feet
Lot Coverage	50% maximum
Lot Frontage	45' minimum measured at front setback
Lot Size	Varies by neighborhood (see S8-1). Minimum lot size on corner lots shall be increased by 10%
SETBACKS — SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS	
Front Yard*	15' minimum
Front Access Garage	20' minimum (to garage)
Side Access Garage	24' minimum (subject to standard driveway approach widths)
Rear Yard	10' minimum
Side Yard*	Varies by lot size measured at front setback (see Section 8-1)
Corner Front Yard	15' minimum
Corner Front & Side Access Garages	20' minimum
Corner Side Yard Facing Street	15' minimum
SETBACKS — ACCESSORY STRUCTURES REQUIRING A BUILDING PERMIT	
Front Yard	Same as principal building
Side Yard	5' minimum
Rear Yard	5' minimum

*Any plats using 15' front setbacks will require the proper buffering per Questar Gas Standards.

SECTION 4: Development Standards (cont'd)

Building Form — Single Family Residential

Neighborhood 1 - Primrose

Building Setback Detail



Building Form — Single Family Residential

Neighborhood 2 - Primrose

Building Setback Detail



SECTION 4: Development Standards (cont'd)

Building Form — Single Family Residential

Neighborhood 3 - Sego Lily

Building Setback Detail



Building Form — Single Family Residential

Neighborhood 4 - Sego Lily



Building Setback Detail



Building Form — Single Family Residential

Neighborhood 5 - Daisy



Note: The landscaped island and parking area associated with it are subject to change or deletion.

Building Setback Detail



Building Form — Single Family Residential

Neighborhood 6 - Daisy



Building Setback Detail



Building Form — Single Family Residential

Neighborhood 7 - Wild Rose

Building Setback Detail



Private Open Space — Single Family Residential



PRIVATE YARD*	
Permitted Elements	Front Yard: Fences, hedges, & masonry walls (4' max. height/3' max. height inside clear-view triangle); outdoor furniture to stay within porch. Rear & Side Yard: 6' fences.
Surface Treatments	Groundcover, lawn, trees, flower gardens, vegetable gardens, & small shrubs. Stone mulch limited use with approval of WDRC. Landscape boulders are allowed. Artificial turf not allowed in front yard.
Special Requirements	Fences, hedges, & walls must be parallel with facade of principal building or placed along the front lot line.
Decks	Decks may not extend into setback. Deck must stay within the setbacks as described above.
Schedule	Front yard landscaping to be installed by certificate of occupancy. Back yard landscaping to be installed within 1 year of certificate of occupancy.

* Lawn, patio, and garden areas are subject to approval by the Wildflower Design Review Committee (WDRC).

** If certificate of occupancy is issued between November and March, landscaping to be installed by end of June.

Parking — Single Family Residential

Two off-street parking spaces are required per single family residential unit. Driveways for single family residential units meet this requirement.

Please reference City Code "Section 19.12.06 General Subdivision Improvement Requirements" for standards on garages and covered parking.

SECTION 5: Design Guidelines

Architecture Materials

The architectural standards presented in this Village Plan document are meant to govern the selection of building material and color scheme. The matrix below contains the potential building materials and how they can be used on the included home elevations. Materials are not limited to the details below. Additional materials may be introduced once approved by the WDRC. New materials to be introduced must maintain a high level of quality similar to the products listed below, and must be shown to be appropriate to a specified architectural style.

EXTERIOR MATERIALS	ARCHITECTURAL STYLES				
	Prairie	Craftsman	Farmhouse	Utah Traditional	European
Composite Siding	✸	✸	✸	✸	✸
Stone / Brick	✸	✸	✸	✸	✸
Stone / Brick Not Required*	✸	✸	✸		
Stucco	✸	✸	✸	✸	✸
Architectural Asphalt Shingles	✸	✸	✸	✸	✸
Gable Returns				✸	✸
Metal Roofing	✸	✸	✸		
Main Body Low Pitched Roofs (Under 6/12—18" Minimum Overhang)	✸	✸	✸		
Exposed Rafter Tails	✸	✸	✸		✸
Shutters	✸		✸	✸	✸
Arched Windows				✸	✸

Craftsman Elevation

The Craftsman Style originated in Southern California and quickly became the dominant style for smaller homes built throughout the country in the early 1900s. Though bungalows are the most common form of the Craftsman elevation, "high-style" interpretations can be found in various locations and are sometimes called "stick houses." The following features identify a Craftsman style home:

- Lap siding, board and batten, and shake and shingle exteriors with limited use of stucco
- Low-pitched gable roofs (4/12 and 6/12 roof pitches are most common)
- Exposed rafter tails under eaves
- Decorative corbels and braces
- Front porches with possible extensions to the side and rear of the home
- Porch supports (columns/pillars) that are typically rectangular or tapered (not round) with masonry bases. All columns/pillars to be a minimum of 12 inches square.
- Large roof overhangs (typically 18 to 24 inches wide)
- Window grids
- Heavy, thick fascia
- Single-hung and double casement windows
- Exposed, decorative beams
- Garage windows



Window and Door Casing and Trim

2304

Farmhouse Elevation

The design of the American Farmhouse was initially influenced strictly by function and geography. The farmhouse was always unpretentious, straightforward, and functional. It was shaped by the needs of the farmers, the local climate, and the materials available. The original farmhouse represented simple shelter structures, yet provided a place of pride to entertain important relatives and live their lives in some comfort. Today, there is a growing interest in a simple, back-to-basics lifestyle. The American Farmhouse symbolizes that ideal, and it gives today's homeowners a tangible and sentimental connection to the nation's history. The following features identify a Farmhouse style home:

- Simple, single or double column porch supports (columns/pillars)
- Simple, rectangular floor plan
- Dormers
- Large, and often wrap-around, porches
- Window grids
- Large flat surfaces of board and batten on front elevation (typically 1.5 to 2 stories tall)
- Low roof pitches above porches (typically 3/12 to 5/12)
- Steeper roof pitches recommended on all other roofs, often as steep as 10/12 to 12/12
- Gable-style roofs (not hipped)
- Dormers (gabled and shed dormers are appropriate)
- Taller, more narrow windows
- White or light-colored exterior colors (strongly recommended)
- Dark or colored windows are common

Farmhouse Examples

European Elevation

The Wildflower European style combines an old world and romantic charm with modern elements. This style of home showcases many European influences such as Italian influence, Tudor style design cues, Mediterranean floor plans and Spanish home designs; the European style can easily range in size to fit each individual family's needs. These homes are characterized by medium to steep roof pitches, detailed entrances, hip roof forms, arched openings and shutters. Unique elements such as multi-paneled windows of varying sizes, spacious living areas and high ceilings create the unique blend of comfort and refinement. The following features identify a European style home:

- Moderate to high roof pitches
- Hip roof forms
- Arched or square openings
- Decorative front porches
- Shutters



Prairie Elevation

The Prairie elevation is a recent style created by incorporating modern elements into the style of a traditional prairie home. This design emphasizes the simplicity and integrity that combines comfort, utility, and beauty, without imitating past styles. Prairie home plans have broad, gently sloping, shelter roofs with prominent, low chimneys. Balconies and terraces extend in several directions beyond the basic house, creating a protected outdoor space and a rhythm of vertical and horizontal planes. The following features identify a Prairie style home:

- Low roof pitches (4/12-6/12)
- Large modern-style windows (typically without grids)
- Overhanging eaves, 18" to 24"recommended (Note: Eaves must be fire rated if less than 5 feet from property line)
- Horizontal, clean lines in the detailing
- Lap siding or stucco with masonry details
- Open floor plans
- Wide, rectangular columns/pillars
- Prominent low chimneys
- Brick as needed for masonry elements

The following features are often incorporated into traditional Prairie style homes in order to add a contemporary feel:

- Large, tall windows
- Modern, glass panel front door and garage
- Wide front door (42 inches wide or larger)

Utah Traditional Elevation

Traditional Utah architecture is very similar to domestic architecture elsewhere in the United States. This style is based on existing cultural traditions and/or current trends in architecture, rather than being original. It does, however, represent the early pioneer heritage and the eventual merging of Utah with mainstream American society. The result provides a certain sameness from community to community. The following features identify a Utah Traditional home:

- Roof pitches (6/12 and greater)
- Hipped and gabled roofs are common
- Shutters
- Masonry (brick or stone)
- Body materials of siding or stucco
- Gable returns
- Arched windows, front doors, and garages
- Use of copper or other metal on small roof elements
- Bay or boxed windows
- Wide front door (42 inches wide or larger)

12041

Exterior Color Schemes

All exterior colors will be compatible with the architectural style of each dwelling. Bright artificial colors such as pastels, neons, fluorescents, etc will not be allowed.

Color is a critical element for creating the ambiance of the overall community. A well-designed color palette should be based on natural elements. Appropriate use of color will bring unity to each neighborhood and help establish a sense of community. Additional colors may be added upon approval by the WDRC.

EXAMPLE COLORS - 01

Front Door
Manufacturer:
Kwal
Color:
Racoon CL3176N

Soffit, Fascia, Trim
Manufacturer:
Hardie Color Plus
Color:
Arctic White

Hardie - Color 1
Manufacturer:
Hardie Color Plus
Color:
Boothbay Blue

Hardie - Color 2
Manufacturer:
Hardie Color Plus
Color:
Sandstone Beige

EXAMPLE COLORS - 02



Front Door
Manufacturer:
Kwal
Color:
Jumpsuit CL2986A

Soffit, Fascia, Trim
Manufacturer:
Hardie Color Plus
Color:
Arctic White

Hardie - Color 1
Manufacturer:
Hardie Color Plus
Color:
Heathered Moss

Hardie - Color 2
Manufacturer:
Hardie Color Plus
Color:
Sandstone Beige

EXAMPLE COLORS - 03

Front Door
Manufacturer:
Sherwin Williams
Color:
Fireweed SW6328

Soffit, Fascia, Trim
Manufacturer:
Hardie Color Plus
Color:
Arctic White

Hardie - Color 1
Manufacturer:
Hardie Color Plus
Color:
Timber Bark

Hardie - Color 2
Manufacturer:
Hardie Color Plus
Color:
Sandstone Beige

Native Regional Suitability

The color palette established for Wildflower has been based on the native flowers found at Wildflower and the surrounding area as well as a variety of hues found in the landscape. Approved colors include native and natural tones found in the Utah landscape, including earth tones and colors indicative of mountainous and prairie settlements.

Stylistic Appropriateness

The colors used at Wildflower should reflect the architectural styles being offered at Wildflower. Fewer colors are typically more appropriate than incorporating a large variety of colors on individual buildings. This keeps homes from distracting from the overall ambiance of the community.

Community Cohesiveness

The relationship of colors between neighboring homes is critical when selecting the palette for each building facade. A sense of flow is created by balancing building elements, which have similar tones across many buildings, yet incorporate a variety of color elements, making each home unique.

Main Body and Trim

Color schemes for Wildflower may have a softer contrast between the main body and trim colors for a more subtle appearance. Alternatively, some homes may have a stronger contrast between the main body and trim colors.

Roofing Colors and Materials

It is especially important to consider color variation with roofing materials in order to encourage diversity and architectural interest in each neighborhood and throughout the community.



REQUIRED: 6' VINYL SEMI-PRIVACY FENCE

REQUIRED: 6' VINYL PRIVACY FENCE

REQUIRED: 6' SIMTEK PRIVACY FENCE

OPTIONAL: 6' VINYL FENCE

* Required fences adjacent to lots are a requirement of the builder, not developer, and shall be installed prior to receiving certificate of occupancy.
** If certificate of occupancy is issued between November and March, fencing to be installed by end of June.

0 300' 600'
SCALE IN FEET
NORTH

Fence Type Examples

6' Vinyl Semi-Privacy Fence*

6' Vinyl Privacy Fence

6' SimTek Privacy Fence

*Openings in semi-privacy fence to match the City standard of 1-inch.

SECTION 6: Associations

Home Owners Associations

In accordance with section 19.26.03,2,d of the Planned Community Zone ordinance, a Master Home Owners Association (HOA) will be established to review, approve, and enforce architectural requirements and restrictions, and to address common area maintenance obligations for the entire Wildflower Community. Where required, typically in multi-family areas in later phases, sub-HOAs will be established to address area-specific costs.

Wildflower Design Review Committee (WDRC)

In order to create, maintain and improve the Project as a pleasant, desirable and sustainable community, and to establish and implement a consistent and harmonious design concept and to protect and promote the present and future values of Wildflower Development, all exterior, architectural building elevations and building materials, colors and usage design, site plan and landscape treatments, wall and fencing, and signage within Village Plan Area 1 shall be subject to a Design Review Process and approval by the established Wildflower Development Review Committee (WDRC).

The WDRC shall review and approve all residential site plans and building permits prior to beginning the City of Saratoga Springs submittal and review processes. The WDRC shall consist of representatives from the following: the Master Developer and a selected team of design professionals, i.e. planners, engineers, architects, contractors, etc. The Master Developer shall retain the right to retain or replace members of the WDRC at its discretion.

SECTION 7: Phasing & Maintenance Plan

Phasing

As indicated on page 15 in the Wildflower Community Plan, Wildflower Village Plan Area 1 is the first phase for the Wildflower at Saratoga Springs development. Preliminary phasing for Village Plan Area 1 is shown on the Phase Plan on the following page, including open space. Phasing for open space in future village plan areas shown in the Detailed Use Plan in Section 3 will be determined at the corresponding Village Plan stage.

Maintenance

Maintenance for all common open space areas within Wildflower Village Plan Area 1, including park strips, private parks, and developed and natural open space, will be provided by the Master Homeowners Association (HOA) described in Section 6 of this Village Plan. Any open space where ownership is transferred to the City for use as a City Park will be maintained by the City of Saratoga Springs.

The balance of the open space approved in the plan is owned and controlled by UDOT, so improvement and use will correlate with their timeline.

Phases that depend on future improvements are not allowed.

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 200'

200 100 0 200

WILDFLOWER
AT SARATOGA SPRINGS

NOTES:
1. AREAS MAY BE MODIFIED OR BUILT OUT OF ORDER BASED ON AVAILABILITY AND EFFICIENCY OF UTILITIES AND MARKET CONDITIONS.
2. PHASES THAT DEPEND ON FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT ALLOWED.



RESIDENTIAL LEGEND

AREA #	NEIGHBORHOOD	AREA	# OF LOTS	LOT AREA	RIGHT-OF-WAY AREA	CIVIC	OPEN SPACE AREA	RUNNING TOTAL AREA	RUNNING TOTAL OPEN SPACE	RUNNING TOTAL REQ. OPEN SPACE (23.92%)*
AREA #1	NEIGHBORHOOD #4	5.13 AC	--	--	1.37 AC	3.76 AC	--	5.13 AC	00 AC (0%)	1.23 AC
AREA #2	NEIGHBORHOOD #1	4.56 AC	--	--	--	--	4.56 AC	9.69 AC	4.56 AC (47.06%)	2.32 AC
AREA #3	MASTER PLANNED ROAD	0.93 AC	--	--	0.93 AC	--	--	10.62 AC	4.56 AC (42.94%)	2.54 AC
AREA #4	NEIGHBORHOOD #7	9.54 AC	36 LOTS	5.71 AC	2.01 AC	--	1.82 AC	20.16 AC	6.38 AC (31.65%)	4.82 AC
AREA #5	NEIGHBORHOOD #6	5.69 AC	26 LOTS	4.12 AC	1.57 AC	--	--	25.85 AC	6.38 AC (24.68%)	6.18 AC
AREA #6	NEIGHBORHOOD #1	13.19 AC	45 LOTS	9.64 AC	3.55 AC	--	--	39.03 AC	6.38 AC (16.35%)	9.34 AC
AREA #7	MASTER PLANNED ROAD	3.32 AC	--	--	3.32 AC	--	--	42.35 AC	6.38 AC (15.07%)	10.13 AC
AREA #8	NEIGHBORHOOD #3	7.86 AC	29 LOTS	5.25 AC	2.12 AC	--	0.49 AC	50.21 AC	6.87 AC (13.68%)	12.01 AC
AREA #9	NEIGHBORHOOD #2	17.95 AC	51 LOTS	13.24 AC	4.03 AC	--	0.68 AC	68.16 AC	7.55 AC (11.08%)	16.30 AC
AREA #10	NEIGHBORHOOD #4	11.78 AC	45 LOTS	8.89 AC	2.74 AC	--	0.15 AC	79.94 AC	7.70 AC (9.63%)	19.12 AC
AREA #11	NEIGHBORHOOD #3	11.42 AC	46 LOTS	7.76 AC	2.48 AC	--	1.18 AC	91.36 AC	8.88 AC (9.72%)	21.85 AC
AREA #12	NEIGHBORHOOD #4	7.25 AC	--	--	1.01 AC	--	6.24 AC	98.61 AC	15.12 AC (15.33%)	23.59 AC
AREA #13a	NEIGHBORHOOD #5	8.68 AC	30 LOTS	6.02 AC	2.66 AC	--	--	107.29 AC	15.12 AC (14.09%)	25.66 AC
AREA #13b	NEIGHBORHOOD #6	7.26 AC	34 LOTS	5.69 AC	1.57 AC	--	--	114.55 AC	15.12 AC (13.20%)	27.40 AC
AREA #14	NEIGHBORHOOD #3	8.88 AC	50 LOTS	6.92 AC	1.96 AC	--	--	123.43 AC	15.12 AC (12.25%)	29.52 AC
AREA #15	NEIGHBORHOOD #1	11.98 AC	35 LOTS	9.23 AC	2.28 AC	--	0.47 AC	135.43 AC	15.59 AC (11.51%)	32.40 AC
AREA #16	NEIGHBORHOOD #6	5.69 AC	24 LOTS	4.43 AC	1.26 AC	--	--	141.12 AC	15.59 AC (11.05%)	33.76 AC
AREA #17	NEIGHBORHOOD #4	10.93 AC	47 LOTS	8.66 AC	2.27 AC	--	--	152.05 AC	15.59 AC (10.25%)	36.37 AC
AREA #18a	NEIGHBORHOOD #5	1.80 AC	6 LOTS	1.54 AC	0.26 AC	--	--	153.85 AC	15.59 AC (10.13%)	36.80 AC
AREA #18b	NEIGHBORHOOD #6	10.97 AC	54 LOTS	8.22 AC	2.75 AC	--	--	164.82 AC	15.59 AC (9.46%)	39.42 AC
AREA #19	NEIGHBORHOOD #5	3.87 AC	11 LOTS	3.02 AC	0.70 AC	--	0.15 AC	168.69 AC	15.74 AC (9.33%)	40.35 AC
TOTAL		168.69 AC	569 LOTS	108.77 AC	40.84 AC	3.76 AC	15.74 AC	168.69 AC	15.74 AC (9.33%)	40.35 AC

* PERCENTAGE BASED ON 23.92% OPEN SPACE REQUIRED ON DEVELOPER CONTROLLED PROPERTY, SEE OPEN SPACE PLAN.

1099 W. SOUTH JORDAN PARKWAY
SOUTH JORDAN, UT 84095
(801) 495-3414

SECTION 8: Lotting Map



AREA	NEIGHBORHOOD LOT SIZE PERCENTAGE EXCEPTIONS	MIN. LOT SIZE WIDTH AT FRONT SETBACK	TYPICAL RANGE OF LOT SIZES	SIDE YARD SETBACKS
Neighborhood 1: Primrose*	N/A	60'	8,000 - 14,000	6'/12'
Neighborhood 2: Primrose	Max. 10% of lots 8,000 - 9,000 s.f.	70'	9,000 - 14,000	8'/16'
Neighborhood 3: Sego Lily	N/A	45'	4,500 - 7,000	5'/10'
Neighborhood 4: Sego Lily	Max. 25% of lots 4,500 - 5,000 s.f.	45'	4,500 - 8,000	5'/10'
Neighborhood 5: Daisy	Max. 10% of lots 7,000 - 8,000 s.f.	60'	8,000 - 11,000	6'/12'
Neighborhood 6: Daisy	N/A	50'	4,500 - 7,000	5'/10'
Neighborhood 7: Wild Rose	N/A	45'	5,000 - 7,500	5'/10'

*In Neighborhood 1: Primrose, lots immediately adjacent to the Pumpkin Patch Neighborhood of Harvest Hills shall be equal to or greater than 10,000 s.f.

** Summary of setbacks. Full setback details can be found on page 26 of Community Plan and in the Development Standards in Section 4 of this Village Plan.



VILLAGE PLAN AREA 1 -- CONCEPT PLANT SCHEDULE

Quantities shown on this sheet are for entire Village Plan Area 1.

LARGE TREE (2" CALIPER) 390	
Acer platanoides `Emerald Queen`	Emerald Queen Maple
Pinus nigra	Austrian Black Pine
Platanus x acerifolia `Bloodgood`	London Plane Tree
Quercus macrocarpa	Burr Oak
Quercus robur `Fastigiata`	Pyramidal English Oak
Tilia tomentosa	Silver Linden

MEDIUM TREE (2" CALIPER) 853	
Acer negundo `Sensation`	Sensation Box Elder Maple
Celtis occidentalis	Common Hackberry
Gleditsia triacanthos inermis	Thornless Common Honeylocust
Tilia cordata	Littleleaf Linden

SMALL TREE (2" CALIPER) 228	
Acer tataricum	Tatarian Maple
Crataegus x lavallei	Hawthorn
Malus x `Indian Magic`	Indian Magic Crab Apple
Malus x `Prairifire`	Prairifire Crab Apple
Malus x `Spring Snow`	Spring Snow Crab Apple
Prunus virginiana `Canada Red`	Canada Red Chokecherry

Landscape Concept Plan
Neighborhoods 1 and 2



VILLAGE PLAN AREA 1 -- CONCEPT PLANT SCHEDULE

LARGE TREE (2" CALIPER)	
Acer platanoides `Emerald Queen`	Emerald Queen Maple
Pinus nigra	Austrian Black Pine
Platanus x acerifolia `Bloodgood`	London Plane Tree
Quercus macrocarpa	Burr Oak
Quercus robur `Fastigiata`	Pyramidal English Oak
Tilia tomentosa	Silver Linden
MEDIUM TREE (2" CALIPER)	
Acer negundo `Sensation`	Sensation Box Elder Maple
Celtis occidentalis	Common Hackberry
Gleditsia triacanthos inermis	Thornless Common Honeylocust
Tilia cordata	Littleleaf Linden
SMALL TREE (2" CALIPER)	
Acer tataricum	Tatarian Maple
Crataegus x lavallei	Hawthorn
Malus x `Indian Magic`	Indian Magic Crab Apple
Malus x `Prairifire`	Prairifire Crab Apple
Malus x `Spring Snow`	Spring Snow Crab Apple
Prunus virginiana `Canada Red`	Canada Red Chokecherry

Landscape Concept Plan
Neighborhoods 3 and 4

VILLAGE PLAN AREA 1 -- CONCEPT PLANT SCHEDULE

LARGE TREE (2" CALIPER)	
Acer platanoides `Emerald Queen`	Emerald Queen Maple
Pinus nigra	Austrian Black Pine
Platanus x acerifolia `Bloodgood`	London Plane Tree
Quercus macrocarpa	Burr Oak
Quercus robur `Fastigiata`	Pyramidal English Oak
Tilia tomentosa	Silver Linden
MEDIUM TREE (2" CALIPER)	
Acer negundo `Sensation`	Sensation Box Elder Maple
Celtis occidentalis	Common Hackberry
Gleditsia triacanthos inermis	Thornless Common Honeylocust
Tilia cordata	Littleleaf Linden
SMALL TREE (2" CALIPER)	
Acer tataricum	Tatarian Maple
Crataegus x lavallei	Hawthorn
Malus x `Indian Magic`	Indian Magic Crab Apple
Malus x `Prairifire`	Prairifire Crab Apple
Malus x `Spring Snow`	Spring Snow Crab Apple
Prunus virginiana `Canada Red`	Canada Red Chokecherry

Landscape Concept Plan
Neighborhoods 5, 6, and 7



Planting Mix
(size - 1 gallon minimum, grouped in clusters of 3, 5, or 7 per species)

Perennial Grasses
(*Miscanthus sp., Calamagrostis sp., Helictrotrichon sp.,* or *Deschampsia sp.*)

Perennial Flowers
(*Leucanthemum sp., Coreopsis sp., Gaura sp., Geranium sp., Hemerocallis sp., Lavandula sp., Linum sp., Penstemon sp., Rudbeckia sp.,* or *Sedum sp.*)

LANDSCAPE CONCEPT: PRIMARY ENTRANCE SIGN



Planting Mix
(size - 1 gallon minimum, grouped in clusters of 3, 5, or 7 per species)

Perennial Grasses
(*Helictrotrichon sp.* or *Deschampsia sp.*)

Perennial Flowers
(*Leucanthemum sp., Coreopsis sp., Gaura sp., Geranium sp., Hemerocallis sp., Lavandula sp., Linum sp., Penstemon sp., Rudbeckia sp.,* or *Sedum sp.*)

LANDSCAPE CONCEPT: SECONDARY ENTRANCE SIGN (TYPICAL)



Planting Mix
(size - 1 gallon minimum, grouped in clusters of 3, 5, or 7 per species)

Perennial Grasses
(*Helictrotrichon sp.* or *Deschampsia sp.*)

Annual Flowers
(As determined by WDRC)

LANDSCAPE CONCEPT: BUILDER DIRECTIONAL SIGN (TYPICAL)

Landscape Concept Plans
for Typical Signage

SECTION 10: Utility Plans

The following maps provide greater detail on the utilities for Wildflower Village Plan Area 1.

Section 10a: Culinary Water Plan

Section 10b: Secondary Water Plan

Section 10c: Sewer Plan

Section 10d: Stormwater Drainage Plan

Section 10e: Master CFP Plan



LEGEND

MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR	
ZONE 2 - PROPOSED 8" CULINARY	
ZONE 2 - EXISTING 8" CULINARY	
ZONE 2 - EXISTING 12" CULINARY	
ZONE 3 - PROPOSED 8" CULINARY	
ZONE 3 - EXISTING 8" CULINARY	
ZONE 3 - PROPOSED 12" CULINARY	
ZONE 3 - PROPOSED 16" CULINARY	
ZONE 3 - EXISTING 16" CULINARY	
SARATOGA SPRINGS MASTER PLAN	SSMP
PRESSURE ZONE 2	
PRESSURE ZONE 3	

WILDFLOWER
AT SARATOGA SPRINGS

NOTES

1. FINAL PIPE LOCATION & SIZE TO BE BASED ON SUBDIVISION DESIGN & USES
2. THESE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS ARE CONCEPTUAL IN NATURE AND SUBJECT TO SECTION 22 OF THE MASTER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT.
4. CULINARY LINES UNDER MVC LAND TO BE INSTALLED BASED ON CURRENT NATURAL GROUND. IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT UDOT WILL LOWER THESE LINES, IF NECESSARY.

Final design & sizing to be coordinated & approved with final plats.

DAI
1099 W. SOUTH JORDAN PARKWAY
SOUTH JORDAN, UT 84095
(801) 495-3414



Final design & sizing to be coordinated & approved with final plats.

1099 W. SOUTH JORDAN PARKWAY
SOUTH JORDAN, UT 84095
(801) 495-3414

Final design & sizing to be coordinated & approved with final plats.

Secondary Water Pond



Final design & sizing to be coordinated & approved with final plats.

SECTION 10d: Storm Water Drainage Plan

NOTES

1. FINAL STORM DRAIN LINE SIZING TO BE DETERMINED WITH FINAL ROADWAY DESIGN.

2. THESE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS ARE PRELIMINARY IN NATURE AND SUBJECT TO SECTION 22 OF THE MASTER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT.

3. UDOT HAS ALLOWED THE DEVELOPER TO CO-LOCATE STORAGE WATER AREAS TO SERVE BOTH THE PROJECT AND MVC UPON THE REQUEST AND APPROVAL OF THE CITY.

4. STORM DRAIN LINES UNDER MVC LAND TO BE INSTALLED BASED ON CURRENT NATURAL GROUND. IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT UDOT WILL LOWER THESE LINES, IF NECESSARY.

LEGEND

- MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR
- PROPOSED STORM DRAIN
- STORM DRAIN BASIN CONTRIBUTING AREA



WILDFLOWER
AT SARATOGA SPRINGS

Final design & sizing to be coordinated & approved with final plats.

An executed agreement between Saratoga Springs & Canal Company allowing for drainage shall be required prior to final plat approval.

If discharge is not allowed into the existing canal to manage the 100-year event, downstream storm facilities will be required according to the City's Capital Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan.

DAI
1099 W. SOUTH JORDAN PARKWAY
SOUTH JORDAN, UT 84095
(801) 495-3414



NOTES

1. THE IMPROVEMENTS SHOWN ARE IDENTIFIED AS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS THROUGH THE SARATOGA SPRINGS CITY IMPACT FEE FACILITY PLANS AND ARE ELIGIBLE FOR IMPACT FEE REIMBURSEMENT AS OUTLINED WITHIN EACH FACILITY / IFFP. OR WILL BE INCLUDED IN A FUTURE IFFP MASTER PLAN.

1099 W. SOUTH JORDAN PARKWAY
SOUTH JORDAN, UT 84095
(801) 495-3414

This document is for reference only. The City's Capital Facilities Plans and Impact Fee Facilities Plans stand alone.

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 500'

500 250 0 500

TRANSPORTATION LEGEND

- 77' COLLECTOR
- 66' LOCAL WITH RESTRICTED ACCESS (MATCHING EX PROVIDENCE & HARVEST MOON DR)
- 56' LOCAL
- FRONTAGE ROAD
- MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR / SR - 73

NOTES

1. TRAFFIC CALMING IS REQUIRED ALONG ALL STREET SEGMENTS LONGER THAN 1000 FEET.
2. THE INTERSECTION OF HARVEST HILLS BLVD WITH SR68 SHALL BE RECONSTRUCTED TO ADD A DUAL-LEFT-TURN (NORTHBOUND) MOVEMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH UDOT REQUIREMENTS.

WILDFLOWER
AT SARATOGA SPRINGS



Traffic calming is required along all street segments longer than 1000 feet without at least a 45°degree bend.

The intersection of Harvest Hills Blvd with SR-68 shall be reconstructed to add a dual-left-turn (northbound) movement in accordance with UDOT requirements if capacity noted in traffic study exceeds phase one and the MVC frontage road has not yet been built. If the frontage road has been constructed, then this requirement is removed.

DAI
1099 W. SOUTH JORDAN PARKWAY
SOUTH JORDAN, UT 84095
(801) 495-3414



5' SIDEWALK

10' PAVED MULTI-PURPOSE TRAIL

WALKING AND BICYCLE TRAIL

6' WIDE GREENWAY

Walking and bicycle trail along MVC shall be designed and constructed by UDOT to their standards.

SECTION 13: Density Transfers

Exhibit Two: Land Use Master Plan (page14), Equivalent Residential Unit Transfers (page 21), and Density (page 22) of the "Wildflower Community Plan" establish the number of Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs) and density for Wildflower.

An Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) is defined by the Saratoga Springs Municipal Code as a unit of measurement to evaluate development impacts on public infrastructure including water, sewer, storm drainage, parks, roads and public safety of proposed residential and commercial land uses. Every residential and commercial unit is a minimum of one ERU. Since build-out of the Wildflower development will occur over many years, flexibility is necessary to respond to market conditions, site conditions, and other factors. Therefore, residential density ERUs may be transferred within the project as necessary to improve design, accessibility, and marketability. The City acknowledges that the master developer shall have the ability in its reasonable business judgment to transfer ERUs between residential areas within the project upon written notice to the City and delivery to the City of written consent of the property owners of the neighborhoods which are sending and receiving such densities (if different from the master developer), so long as any such transfer adheres to the following standards:

- Any transfer of ERUs into or out of any neighborhood type established in the Community Plan shall not exceed fifteen percent (15%) without approval of the City Council. In no case shall the transfer of ERUs into or out of any land use designation or district exceed twenty-five (25%) of that established in the Community Plan. ERU transfers shall comply with the neighborhood breakdown on page 27 of the Community Plan.
- ERUs may not be transferred from a more intensive neighborhood into a less intensive neighborhood designated in this Community Plan located east of the identified Mountain View Corridor and bordering any portion of the Harvest Hills subdivision if such transfer would result in single family lots smaller than 4,500 square feet.
- ERUs may not be transferred into any open space or park unless said use and acreage is replaced elsewhere within the same neighborhood.

Village Plan Area 1 is approximately 169 acres in size, and contains 571 units. See Detailed Buildout Allocation in Section 3 for density transfers within Village Plan Area 1.

SECTION 14: Additional Detailed Plans

The following elements have been included to detail plans and direction contained in the Community Plan for Village Plan Area 1:

Section 14a: Neighborhood Names

Section 14b: Signage Plan

Section 14c: Grading Plan

Section 14d: Open Space Management

Section 14e: Natural Resource Inventory Plan

Section 14f: Wildlife Mitigation

Section 14g: Sensitive Lands Protection

Section 14h: Fire Protection Plan

Section 14i: Traffic Study


#1: Primrose
#2: Primrose
#3: Sego Lily
#4: Sego Lily
#5: Daisy
#6: Daisy
#7: Wild Rose
Mountain View Corridor
0
300'
600'
SCALE IN FEET
NORTH


Primary Entrance Sign (Development)
WILDFLOWER
Secondary Entrance Sign (Development)
Secondary Entrance Sign (Neighborhood)
Builder Directional Sign
0
300'
600'
SCALE IN FEET
NORTH

PRIMARY ENTRANCE SIGN

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN AND COLOR SCHEME



METAL PROFILE 5 A101
1" = 1'-0"



TYPICAL ELEVATION 6 A101
3/8" = 1'-0"



FOOTINGS AND FOUNDATION 1 A101
1/4" = 1'-0"



TOP OF MONUMENT BASE 2 A101
1/4" = 1'-0"



TOP OF BOX 3 A101
1/4" = 1'-0"



ROOF PLAN 4 A101
1/4" = 1'-0"

NOTE: Drawings show design intent. Contractor to provide shop drawings for owner/architect to review prior to construction. Contractor to coordinate with owner for finish selections, provide shop drawings for metal panels, and signage lettering. Coordinate with owner for additional information.

SECONDARY ENTRANCE SIGN

(Development and Neighborhood)



CONCEPTUAL DESIGN AND COLOR SCHEME

Secondary entrance signs have two functions:

1. The "development" version of this sign is used when a smaller sign is needed at secondary access points into the community.
2. The "neighborhood" version of this sign is used as a neighborhood entry feature announcing the name of the specific neighborhood.



SOUTH ELEVATION 5 A102

1/2" = 1'-0"



METAL FLASHING PROFILE 6 A102

3/4" = 1'-0"



EAST ELEVATION 4 A102

1/2" = 1'-0"

NOTE: Drawings show design intent. Contractor to provide shop drawings for owner/architect to review prior to construction. Contractor to coordinate with owner for finish selections, provide shop drawings for metal panels, and signage lettering. Coordinate with owner for additional information.



FOOTINGS AND FOUNDATION 1 A102

1/2" = 1'-0"



FLOOR PLAN 2 A102

1/2" = 1'-0"



ROOF PLAN 3 A102

1/2" = 1'-0"

BUILDER DIRECTIONAL SIGN

Maximum Height 12 Feet

There will be approximately 14 temporary, fixed way-finding signs in place at any given time. The height may vary depending on the number of builders in a given area.

Additional small temporary directional signage may be needed to efficiently direct traffic to individual builders.

All directional signage will be removed when construction is complete and model homes are closed in each neighborhood.



WILDFLOWER
AT SARATOGA SPRINGS



SECTION 14d: Open Space Management Plan

Wildflower meets the City's requirements for a minimum of 30-percent improved and native, public and private open space within the Planned Community District area, as shown on the following table and maps, and as described below:

UDOT has a total of 26 acres of open space in Village Plan Area 1 (see the tables on page S 14-9 and Open Space Plan on page S 14-10). This accounts for 5.85% of the open space. Developer-controlled land accounts for the remaining 24.15% of the open space. Wildflower is required to meet the 24.15% requirement on a phase-by-phase basis to stay compliant. The remaining 5.85% will be improved by UDOT in conjunction with MVC.

The amount of open space provided within Village Plan Area 1 is 11.8% of the required total. On the west side of the corridor, an additional 19.95 acres of open space will be dedicated or bonded as part of platting, so that as a cumulative, the plats are always balanced at a minimum of 24.15% open space. Additionally, the developer is committed to spend $2000/unit on improvements, which is also required to stay balanced on a cumulative basis.

Village Plan Area 1

	Units	Acres	Park Construction Value	Total Value Phase	Required/Phase	Discrepancy
Neighborhoods 1-7	571	15.74	$2,071,804	$2,071,804	$1,142,000	$929,804
Additional Open Space Ground Contributed from West of Corridor Towards Village Plan Area 1 Requirement	0	19.95	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Village 1	571	35.69	$0	$2,071,804	$1,142,000	$929,804
Carryover to Village 2	0	0	- $929,804	$0	$0	- $929,804

Future Village Plan Requirements

	Units	Acres	Park Construction Value	Total Value Phase	Required/Phase	Discrepancy
Future Village Plans	897	71.31	$864,196	$864,196	$1,794,000	-$929,804
Carryover from Village Plan Area 1	0	0	$929,804	$929,804	$0	$929,804
Total Future Village Plans	897	71.31	$1,794,000	$1,794,000	$1,794,000	$0

UDOT Open Space in MVC Trails & Detention

	Units	Acres	Park Construction Value	Total Value Phase	Required/Phase	Discrepancy
UDOT MVC Trails & Detention	0	26.0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total UDOT	0	26.0	$0	$0	$0	$0

Total Open Space Required Per Community Plan

	Units	Acres	Park Construction Value	Total Value Phase	Required/Phase	Discrepancy
Village Plan Area 1	571	35.7	$2,071,804	$2,071,804	$1,142,000	$929,804
Future Village Plans	897	71.3	$864,196	$864,196	$1,794,000	-$929,804
UDOT	0	26.0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Village Plan Area 1	1,468	133	$2,936,000	$2,936,000	$2,936,000	$0

Total Open Space Required Per Community Plan

	Units	Acres of Open Space	% of Total Ground
Wildflower Owned (Village Plan Are 1 plus Future Village Plans)	1,468	107	24.15%
UDOT	0	26	5.85%
Total Village Plan Area 1	1,468	133	30%

The open space outside of this Village Plan shall be dedicated at the time any plat does not have the sufficient 23.92% Open Space and sufficient Open Space is not available to dedicate from within this Village Plan.

Estimates for each park and amenity to be prepared and submitted by a licensed landscape architect at time of platting toward the required values of this village plan. Construction values to count all park/open space improvements and equipment costs.



Open Space Plan

WILDFLOWER
AT SARATOGA SPRINGS

LEGEND	
LAND USE	
	RESIDENTIAL
	NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS
	MOUNTAIN VIEW STORM POND
	MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR
	TRAILS
	UDOT TRAILS
	TRAILS BY OTHERS (TO SHOW CONNECTIVITY)

OPEN SPACE TABULATIONS:

TOTAL AREA VILLAGE 1: ..... 168.69 ACRES
REQUIRED OPEN SPACE VILLAGE 1 (23.92% SEE OPEN SPACE MASTER PLAN) : ..... 40.35 ACRES
PROVIDED OPEN SPACE VILLAGE 1: ..... 15.73 ACRES
(ADDITIONAL 24.62 ACRES TO BE DEDICATED ON WEST SIDE OF MVC AT FINAL)

**AREA NOT CONTROLLED BY DEVELOPER OPEN SPACE PROVIDED BY UDOT & INCLUDED WITH 6.08% OF OVERALL OPEN SPACE SEE BREAKDOWN:
OVERALL OPEN SPACE REQUIRED ALL VILLAGE AREAS (NOT SHOWN): ..... 132.57 ACRES (30.00%)
6.08% OPEN SPACE PROVIDED BY UDOT IN MOUNTAIN VIEW CORRIDOR TRAIL & STORM WATER POND: ..... ±26.88 ACRES
23.92% OPEN SPACE REQUIRED IN DEVELOPER CONTROLLED GROUND: ..... ±105.69 ACRES

Typical Trail Sections





NOTES

1. IN UPLAND AREAS PROVIDE 8'–12' ASPHALT TRAIL.
2. FOR WILDERNESS TRAILS IN DEVELOPED AREAS PROVIDE 12' WIDE ASPHALT TRAILS.
3. ALL TRAILS BUST BE ADA ACCESSIBLE AND PROVIDE MAINTENANCE ACCESS.
4. CENTERLINE RADIUS OF MEANDERING TRAILS SHALL BE 100' MIN.

Open Space A:	Private Neighborhood Park
Open Space B:	Private Neighborhood Park
Open Space C:	Private Greenway
Open Space D:	Public Community Park
Open Space E:	Private Neighborhood Park
Open Space F:	Private Neighborhood Park

Open Space Locator Map



Open Space A Illustrative

Open Space B Illustrative

WILDFLOWER - OPTION 1
SARATOGA SPRINGS, UTAH
OVER ALL SITE PLAN

The mega tower play system with the adjoining arch and climber and spinner will accommodate approximately 112 children.

AREA: 3318 SQUARE FEET
PERIMETER: 205'
The information provided is for estimation purposes only.



Play Area Capacity: 75-85

To promote safe and proper equipment use by children, Miracle recommends the installation of either a Miracle safety sign or other appropriate safety signage near each playsystem's main entry point(s) to inform parents and supervisors of the age appropiateness of the playsystem and general rules for safe play.	CD216781	✓	COMPLIES TO CPSC	DESIGNED FOR AGES 5-12		DATE: 1/18/2016
AN ENERGY ABSORBING PROTECTIVE SURFACE IS REQUIRED UNDER & AROUND ALL PLAY SYSTEMS.	GROUND SPACE: 42' X 46' PROTECTIVE AREA: 65' DIA.	✓	COMPLIES TO ASTM	ADDITIONAL GROUND LEVEL ACCESSIBLE ITEMS NEEDED FOR ADA COMPLIANCE		SCALE: 1"=10'-0"
		✓	COMPLIES TO ADA	TYPE: 0	QUANTITY: 0	CINDI / SHEET 1 of 2

Open Space B Playground Concept

LEVEL 1



LEVEL 2



THE PLAY COMPONENTS IDENTIFIED IN THIS PLAN ARE IPEMA CERTIFIED. THE USE AND LAYOUT OF THESE COMPONENTS CONFORM TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASTM F1487.

CD216781	
1/18/2016	SHEET 2 of 2

Open Space B Playground Concept

Open Space B Playground Concept

Open Space B Playground Concept



Open Space C Illustrative



Open Space C Illustrative

Open Space D Illustrative





The total capacity for all play equipment shown is approximately 93 children.

Open Space D Playground Concept

Open Space D Playground Concept

Open Space D Playground Concept



Open Space E Illustrative



Open Space F Illustrative

Slopes

Slope greater than 30% = 7.78 Acres. (for purpose of determining sensitive lands area, incidental & isolated area over 30% have not been included.)

Soils

A Geotechnical Investigation has been conducted for the eastern portion of the Wildflower development by Infinity Consultants, dated January 17, 2014. It is anticipated that the additional parcels within the Wildflower development will have similar soil characteristics. Excerpts from the investigation include:

- The subsurface soils encountered at the site consist of primarily of sandy clays (CL) and silty clays (CL-ML). Silty sands (SM) and clayey sands (SC) were found interspersed with clayey soils on the ridge and in its near vicinity. Cobbles and boulders are frequently found in the near surface soils and topsoil, layers of gravel are frequently found in the subsurface soils.
- No subsurface water was encountered to the maximum depth investigated, approximately 16 feet in the test pits and 50 feet in the borings along the northern ridge lines.
- It is our opinion that the site is suitable for the proposed construction. The buildings supported on shallow spread footings bearing on the undisturbed natural silt or clay soils should be designed for a net allowable pressure of 1,250 pounds per square foot. Shallow footings bearing on natural undisturbed well graded sands, gravels or at least 1 foot of compacted structural fill may be designed for a net allowable bearing pressure of 1,500 psf. Basement footings that are embedded a minimum of 6 feet deep from the native ground surface and are bearing on the undisturbed natural silt or clays may be designed for a net allowable pressure of 1,500 psf. Basement footings embedded more than 6 feet and bearing on undisturbed natural well graded sands or gravels may be designed for a net allowable pressure of 1,800 psf.
- At the time of the site investigation was conducted, vegetation at the site consisted primarily of sage brush, with farmed and fallow fields, native grasses and weeds were present around the perimeter of the fields.
- Based on the information collected during our field investigation and subsequent laboratory testing, we anticipate that collapse-susceptible soils will not be encountered during construction.
- No active faults are mapped to extend through or near the property. The closest mapped fault to the site lies beneath Utah Lake, located approximately 4.5 miles to the south. (Machette, 1992).

The full Geotechnical Investigation is to be submitted separately and available for further detail.

Wetlands

No wetlands exist on this site.

Special Protection Areas

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment has been conducted for the Wildflower development by Infinity Consultants, dated December 12, 2013. The conclusion of this assessment states:
"The Subject Property consists of open, unused land with no structures. There has not been any historic use of the property that is inconsistent with its current use. There is no evidence of current or past use, storage, or production of hazardous chemicals or petroleum products at environmentally significant levels on the Subject Property.

In the opinion of Infinity Consultants, this assessment has provided no evidence of "recognized environmental conditions," as defined by the ASTM standard, in connection with the Subject Property. Therefore, it can be concluded that no further action is required."

The full Phase I Environment Site Assessment is to be submitted separately and available for further detail.

Dams and Canals

No dams exist above this site. The Provo Reservoir Canal clips the far northeast and southeast corners of the property.

Shrubs, Trees and Wildlife

Shrub and tree stands are outlined per recent aerial photos. Wildlife is typical of the foothill areas of the Wasatch Front. No known endangered, threatened or rare flora or fauna are known to exist on the site. Any trees greater than 2 ½" caliper removed during grading operations will be replaced within the development with like kind c

Flood Plain Data

All project area is within flood zone "X" as shown on FIRM maps 4955170105B (July 17, 2002) and 4955170115B (July 17, 2002)

Mitigation Requirement

If areas of proposed development are determined unsuitable due to any of the above conditions, acceptable mitigation must be completed prior to development, i.e. soil stabilization, environmental hazards, etc.





Natural Resources Inventory Plan

Legend

- Stands of Trees
- Existing Gravel Road
- Existing Drainage Channel
- Existing Canal

Existing Sensitive Land Calculations	
Sensitive area calculation: (for purpose of determining sensitive lands area, incidental & isolated area over 30% have not been included.)	7.78 Acres

Village Area 1 Boundary (added to this map for reference purposes)

This Natural Resources Inventory Plan was approved as part of the Wildflower Community Plan, and is used for reference in several of the following sections.

SECTION 14f: Wildlife Mitigation Plan

As indicated in the Natural Resources Inventory Plan in Section 14e of this document, Wildlife is typical of the foothill areas of the Wasatch Front, and no known endangered, threatened, or rare flora or fauna are known to exist on the site. Therefore, no wildlife mitigation is required for Village Plan Area 1.

SECTION 14g: Sensitive Lands Protection

Sensitive lands cannot be included within lots. However, as per the Community Plan, areas that are graded out of sensitive lands are allowed to be included within lots. As indicated in the Natural Resources Inventory Plan in Section 14e of this document, there are several areas of sensitive lands (shown in red) within the Village Plan Area 1 boundary. These areas represent land with slopes greater than 30%, and are primarily found in neighborhoods #1 and #2 Primrose, with a small amount found in the open space south of neighborhood #7 Wild Rose. The lots of neighborhoods #1 and #2 Primrose have been laid out to ensure that the sensitive lands in these areas remain in the undeveloped rear yards. These sensitive lands will be protected from disturbance during the development of Village Plan Area 1 through the establishment of construction limit lines.

SECTION 14h: Fire Protection Plan

As described in the Wildflower Community Plan, "The project lies entirely within the City defined Wildland/Urban Interface. At the time a preliminary plat is submitted, a Fire Protection Plan in accordance with the Wildland-Urban Interface Code shall be prepared to assess site specific wildfire risk. This assessment includes consideration of location, topography, aspect, flammable vegetation, climatic conditions and fire history. The plan shall address water supply, access, building ignition and fire-resistance factors, fire protection systems and equipment, defensible space and vegetation management. Feasibility of the Fire Protection Plan will be reviewed at time of preliminary plat and full details finalized before a final plat is approved."



SECTION 14i: Traffic Study

The revised traffic study addresses the entire Wildflower community. However, it is broken into two segments. The first is the number of units that can be developed and have an adequate capacity on current collectors. The second segment is the number of units that can be developed and have an adequate capacity on the MVC frontage roads are built.

HALES ENGINEERING
innovative transportation solutions

Wildflower
Traffic Impact Study

LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
No. 295899
RYAN R. HALES
2-4-16
STATE OF UTAH

WILDFLOWER
AT SARATOGA SPRINGS

Saratoga Springs, Utah
February 2016

UT16-841

1220 North 500 West, Ste. 202 Lehi, UT 84043 p 801.766.4343
www.halesengineering.com

HALES ENGINEERING
innovative transportation solutions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study addresses the traffic impacts associated with proposed Wildflower residential development in Saratoga Springs, Utah. The proposed development is located on the west side of Redwood Road (SR-68) and the existing Harvest Hills residential development.

Included within the analyses for this study are the traffic operations and recommended mitigation measures for existing conditions and plus project conditions (conditions after development of the proposed project) at key intersections and roadways in the vicinity of the site. Future 2020 and 2040 conditions are also analyzed.

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

The following is an outline of the traffic analysis performed by Hales Engineering for the traffic conditions of this project.

Existing (2016) Background Conditions Analysis

Hales Engineering performed weekday morning (7:00 – 9:00 a.m.) and afternoon (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) peak period traffic counts at the following intersections:

- Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85)
- Redwood Road (SR-68) / Spring Hills Drive
- Redwood Road (SR-68) / Harvest Hills Boulevard
- Providence Drive / Harvest Hills Boulevard
- Harvest Moon Drive / Spring Hills Drive
- Providence Drive / Harvest Moon Drive

These counts were performed on Wednesday, January 27, 2016. The a.m. peak hour was determined to be between the hours of 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. and the p.m. peak between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m. The afternoon volumes were approximately 17 percent higher than the morning volumes and were used for this analysis. Detailed count data are included in Appendix A.

As shown in Table ES-1, the Redwood Road (SR-68) / Spring Hills Drive intersection is currently operating at LOS F. All other study intersections are currently operating at acceptable levels of service during the p.m. peak hour. The 95th percentile queues at the Redwood Road (SR-68) / Harvest Hills Boulevard extend for several hundred feet on the north- and southbound approaches. The southbound queue, at times, blocks an upstream intersection. The queues on the eastbound approach to the Redwood Road (SR-68) / Spring Hills Drive intersection also extend for several hundred feet. No other significant queueing was observed during the p.m. peak hour.

HALES ENGINEERING
innovative transportation solutions

Project Conditions Analysis

The proposed land use for the development has been identified as follows:

- Single-Family Detached Housing: 1,069 Dwelling Units
- Residential Condominium/Townhouse 246 Dwelling Units

The total trip generation for Phase I of the development is as follows:

- Daily Trips: 5,184
- a.m. Peak Hour Trips: 408
- p.m. Peak Hour Trips: 502

The total trip generation for both Phase I and Phase II of the development is as follows:

- Daily Trips: 6,042
- a.m. Peak Hour Trips: 471
- p.m. Peak Hour Trips: 577

Existing (2015) Plus Project Conditions Analysis

As shown in Table ES-1, all three study intersections on Redwood Road (SR-68) are anticipated to operate at LOS F with project traffic added during the p.m. peak hour. All other study intersections are anticipated to operate at LOS A. The 95th percentile queues on all three approaches to the Redwood Road (SR-68) / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection are anticipated to extend for several hundred feet.

Future (2020) Background Conditions Analysis

As shown in Table ES-1, the Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85) and Redwood Road (SR-68) / Spring Hills Drive intersection are anticipated to operate at LOS F with future 2020 traffic conditions. All other study intersections are anticipated operate at acceptable levels of service during the p.m. peak hour. The 95th percentile queues at the Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85) intersection are anticipated to be excessive on all three approaches during the p.m. peak hour. The 95th percentile queues on the southbound approach to the Redwood Road (SR-68) / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection are anticipated to extend several hundred feet. The queues on the eastbound approach to the Redwood Road (SR-68) / Spring Hills Drive intersection are anticipated to be excessive due to the difficulty of executing left-turn movements at this location.

Future (2020) Plus Project Conditions Analysis

As shown in Table ES-1, the Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85) intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS F with project traffic added. All other study intersections are

HALES ENGINEERING
innovative transportation solutions

anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service during the p.m. peak hours. Significant queuing is anticipated at the Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85) intersection on all approaches. No other significant queuing is anticipated.

Future (2040) Plus Project Conditions Analysis

As shown in Table ES-1, the Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85) intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS F, and the Southbound Mountain View Corridor Frontage Road / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS E during the p.m. peak hour. All other study intersections are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service. Significant queuing is anticipated at the Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85) on the southbound approach, and at the Southbound Mountain View Corridor Frontage Road / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection on the south- and eastbound approaches.

HALES ENGINEERING
innovative transportation solutions

TABLE ES-1
P.M. Peak Hour
Saratoga Springs - Wildflower TIS

Intersection	Existing 2016 Background	Existing 2016 Plus Project	Future 2020 Background	Future 2020 Plus Project	Future 2040 Plus Project
Description	LOS (Sec/Veh[1])	LOS (Sec/Veh[1])	LOS (Sec/Veh[1])	LOS (Sec/Veh[1])	LOS (Sec/Veh[1])
Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85)	-	-	F (>80)	F (>80)	F (>80)
Redwood Road (SR-68) / New Access Road	-	F (>50) / EB	-	C (18.6) / EB	C (18.8) / EB
Redwood Road (SR-68) / Spring Hills Drive	F (>50) / EB	F (>50) / EB	F (>50) / EB	D (26.0) / EB	C (22.2) / EB
Redwood Road (SR-68) / Harvest Hills Boulevard	D (51.7)	F (>80)	C (25.5)	B (14.3)	C (30.0)
Providence Drive / Harvest Hills Boulevard	A (2.4)	A (3.4)	A (3.0)	A (3.4)	A (6.1)
Harvest Moon Drive / Spring Hills Drive	A (7.5) / WB	A (5.6) / NB	C (15.7) / SB	A (3.4) / WB	A (3.8) / WB
Providence Drive / Harvest Moon Drive	A (2.0)	A (2.4)	A (2.1)	A (2.1)	A (2.3)
SB MVC / 2100 North (SR-85)	-	-	-	B (14.7)	-
NB MVC / 2100 North (SR-85)	-	-	-	C (23.3)	-
SB MVC / 1500 North	-	-	-	C (23.5)	C (20.9)
NB MVC / 1500 North	-	-	-	B (13.3)	A (9.8)
SB MVC / Harvest Moon Drive	-	-	-	C (21.0)	B (15.7)
NB MVC / Harvest Moon Drive	-	-	-	B (18.4)	B (13.1)
SB MVC / Harvest Hills Boulevard	-	-	-	D (49.6)	E (77.1)
NB MVC / Harvest Hills Boulevard	-	-	-	C (30.2)	C (34.7)

1. Intersection LOS and delay (seconds/vehicle) values represent the overall intersection average for roundabout, signalized, all-way stop controlled intersections and the worst approach for all other unsignalized intersections.
2. This intersection is a project access and was only analyzed in "plus project" scenarios.
3. This intersection was eliminated as part of the proposed project and was only analyzed in "background" scenarios.

Source: Hales Engineering, February 2016

HALES ENGINEERING
innovative transportation solutions

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following mitigation measures are recommended:

Existing (2016) Background Conditions Analysis

The Redwood Road (SR-68) / Spring Hills Drive intersection is a stop-controlled access onto a major highway. It is generally expected that there will be delays at these types of intersections, especially during peak traffic periods. The Redwood Road (SR-68) / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection is currently meeting UDOT criteria for dual left-turn lanes on the northbound approach. Although this intersection is currently operating at an acceptable LOS, it is recommended that dual left-turn lanes be constructed at this location.

Existing (2016) Plus Project Conditions Analysis

As previously discussed, the Redwood Road (SR-68) / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection is currently meeting UDOT criteria for dual left-turn lanes on the northbound approach. It is recommended that dual left-turn lanes be constructed at this location.

Future (2020) Background Conditions Analysis

Additional capacity will be required to accommodate the projected traffic on Redwood Road (SR-68). It is recommended that Redwood Road (SR-68) be expanded to a seven-lane cross section. It is recommended that the Redwood Road (SR-68) / Spring Hills Drive intersection be converted to a right-in right-out (RIRO) configuration, as it is anticipated that executing left-turn movements will continue to be difficult. It is likely that drivers will elect to utilize Harvest Hills Boulevard as an alternate access.

Future (2020) Plus Project Conditions Analysis

The Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85) intersection is a junction of two major roadways. Future plans are for 2100 North (SR-85) to become a freeway connecting I-15 to the Mountain View Corridor, and for the Mountain View Corridor to take the place of Redwood Road (SR-68) as primary north/south route through the western part of the county. When these projects are completed, east/west traffic will be grade separated and the amount of north/south traffic will be diverted to the Mountain View Corridor. Until these projects are completed, it is recommended that an innovative intersection design be implemented to accommodate the large amounts of traffic at this intersection. No other mitigation measures are recommended.

HALES ENGINEERING
innovative transportation solutions

Future (2040) Plus Project Conditions Analysis

It is anticipated that there will be a high number of right-turning vehicles on the southbound approach to the Mountain View Corridor Frontage Road / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection. It is recommended that right-turning capacity be increased at this location with the addition of a free right-turn lane onto westbound Harvest Hills Boulevard. No other mitigation measures are recommended.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a summary of key findings and recommendations:

- It was assumed that the proposed project would be built in two phases: the first phase on the east side of the Mountain View Corridor right-of-way, and second on the west side. Trips generated by Phase I of the project were included in the existing (2015) background and plus project analyses. Trips from both Phase I and Phase II were included in all future (2020 and 2040) analyses.
- It was assumed for these analyses that the Mountain View Corridor frontage roads would be constructed through the project area for the future (2020 and 2040) plus project scenarios, and that the Mountain View Corridor and 2100 North freeways would be constructed for the future (2040) plus project scenario.
- The Redwood Road (SR-68) / 2100 North (SR-85) intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS F in 2020 and 2040. It is recommended that an innovative intersection design be implemented at this location.
- The Redwood Road (SR-68) / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection currently meets UDOT criteria for dual left-turn lanes on the northbound approach. It is recommended that these turn lanes be constructed.
- It is anticipated that the Redwood Road (SR-68) / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection will operate at LOS E with Phase I project traffic added. With only 90% of the planned 567 single-family homes completed, the intersection will operate at LOS D.
- The Redwood Road (SR-68) / Spring Hills Drive intersection is anticipated to continue to operate at LOS F through 2020. This is generally expected at stop-controlled intersections on busy roadways.
- It is anticipated that a large portion of traffic on Redwood Road (SR-68) will reroute to the new Mountain View Corridor system, alleviating some of the congestion along the corridor.
- All intersections along the Mountain View Corridor frontage roads are anticipated to operate at acceptable levels of service, with the exception of the Southbound Mountain View Corridor Frontage Road / Harvest Hills Boulevard intersection in 2040. There are a high number of right-turning vehicles anticipated on the southbound approach to this intersection. It is recommended that a free right-turn lane be constructed on this approach.

HALES ENGINEERING
innovative transportation solutions

- All existing intersections within the existing Harvest Hills residential development currently operate at acceptable levels of service, and are anticipated to continue as such through 2040 with traffic from the proposed project added.

SECTION 15: Site Characteristics

General site characteristics for Wildflower were provided in the Community Plan, page 92, first paragraph in the geotechnical investigation (text is provided below).

Wildflower is a proposed 800-acre development "located west of Redwood Road approximately 1.5 miles north of highway 73 (Lehi Main Street/Cedar Fort Road) in Saratoga Springs Utah. The project area is located on the northern and western borders of the Harvest Hills subdivision and consists of a northern region and a southern region that are joined by a narrow neck of property. The northern regional slopes generally to the east and has some steep slopes. The southern region of the property predominantly slopes to the southeast with mild slopes. Approximately 70 percent of the property was previously farmed. The remaining 30 percent of the property is undisturbed rangeland with wild grasses and sagebrush."

General site characteristics were also provided in the Community Plan on page 89, under the summary of the Environmental Site Assessment conducted by Infinity Consultants.

- "Surficial soils were visually inspected and appear to be sandy silts with gravel and boulders at higher elevations. The property is covered by native grasses, weeds, and plowed fields,.
- The property slopes gradually and changes several hundred feet from its high point in the northwest to the lowest points in the northeast and south. The slope is much steeper in the northwest, in the vicinity to the western most City water tank.
- An irrigation canal runs through the Subject Property at two locations, First in the southern part of the property just north of and then crossing Cedar Fort Road, then second in the northeast portion of the property.
- All drainages crossing the property seem to end at the irrigation canal.
- There are high power electrical transmission lines bordering the west boundary of the Subject Property.
- There are no constructed structures on the entire property or evidence of past structures."

SECTION 16: Findings

Village Plan Area 1 is the 169-acre first phase within the 800-acre Wildflower Community Plan located in Saratoga Spring, Utah. The Wildflower Village Plan Area 1 is compliant with all PC Zone Requirements for Village Plans as defined in section 19.26.09 of the Saratoga Springs Municipal Code. We find that Village Plan Area 1:

a. is consistent with the adopted Wildflower Community Plan;

» Village Plan Area 1 adheres to the development standards, thoroughfare types, and open spaces types and requirements established in the Wildflower Community Plan.

b. does not exceed the total number of Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs) dictated in the adopted Community Plan;

» The number of potential ERUs established in the Community Plan for Village Plan Area 1 is 580. Village Plan Area 1 establishes a maximum of 571 within the seven neighborhoods that comprise Village Plan Area 1.

c. for an individual neighborhood, does not exceed the total number of ERUs established in the adopted Wildflower Community Plan;

» The ERUs were reduced from 109 to 95 to increase the size of the neighborhood park located in Neighborhood 4.

d. is consistent with the utility, infrastructure, and circulation plans of the Wildflower Community Plan; includes adequately sized utilities, services, and roadway networks to meet demands; and mitigates the fair-share of off-site impacts;

» Village Plan Area 1 implements the utility, infrastructure, and circulation plans as specified in the Wildflower Community Plan.

e. properly integrates utility, infrastructure, open spaces, pedestrian and bicycle systems, and amenities with adjacent properties;

» Wildflower has been designed to accommodate significant infrastructure elements that are important to the City within the structure of the property. Wildflower was designed to maximize pedestrian, bike, and other mobility options. Open space is highly integrated to provide direct and easy access to residents.

f. contains the required elements as required in section 19.26.10 of the Saratoga Springs Municipal Code.

SECTION 17: Mitigation Plans

According to the Natural Resources Inventory Plan in Section 14e:

- Slopes greater than 30% total 7.78 acres for the entire Wildflower property;
- No wetlands exist on this site;
- No subsurface water was encountered to the maximum depth investigated;
- The site is suitable for the proposed construction;
- No active faults are mapped to extend near or through the property;
- There is no evidence of current or past use, storage, or production of hazardous chemicals or petroleum products at environmentally significant levels on the Subject Property;
- No dams exist above this site;
- The Provo Reservoir Canal clips the far northeast and southeast corners of the property;
- No known endangered, threatened or rare flora or fauna are known to exist on the site; and
- All project area is within the flood zone "X."

Section 14e states that "if areas of proposed development are determined unsuitable due to any of the above conditions, acceptable mitigation must be completed prior to development, i.e. soil stabilization, environmental hazards, etc."

As described in Section 14g: Sensitive Lands Protection, that are several small areas of sensitive lands with slopes over 30%. The lots in Village Plan Area 1 have been laid out to ensure that the sensitive lands in these areas remain in the undeveloped rear yards. These sensitive lands will be protected from disturbance during the development process through the establishment of construction limit lines. As described in Section 14e: Natural Resources Inventory Plan, "any trees greater than 2 1/2" caliper removed during grading operations will be replaced within the development with like kind or better, 2 1/2" caliper minimum."

Wildflower Village 1 Offsite Estimates

Saratoga Springs, UT

Engineer's Construction Cost Estimate Per Master Development Plan Exhibits

Project Costs						Notes
Item	Est. Quantity	Unit		Unit Price	Total Amount	
Sanitary Sewer - Offsite						
12" PVC Main	3,365	lf	$	40.00	$ 134,600	
18" PVC Main	488	lf	$	50.00	$ 24,400	
48" Manholes	13	ea	$	2,500.00	$ 32,500	
T-Patch Repair in Ex. Asphalt	50	lf	$	16.00	$ 800	
Bore Under Canal & Redwood Road	200	lf.	$	350.00	$ 70,000	
Traffic Control on Redwood Road	1,064	lf	$	20.00	$ 21,280	
Canal Crossing Repair	1	ls	$	25,000.00	$ 25,000	
Imported Pipe Bedding	1,002	tons	$	12.00	$ 12,021	
Imported Trench Backfill	5,009	tons	$	8.00	$ 40,071	
Subtotal Sanitary Sewer - Offsite					**$ 360,673**	
Culinary Water - Offsite						
12" PVC	2,739	lf	$	40.00	$ 109,560	
8" PVC	1,072	lf	$	28.00	$ 30,016	
Imported Pipe Bedding	579	tons	$	12.00	$ 6,946	
Imported Trench Backfill	991	tons	$	8.00	$ 7,927	
Subtotal Culinary Water - Offsite					**$ 154,448**	
SUBTOTAL					**$ 515,121**	
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST					**$ 515,121**	

NOTES:

1. Estimates are only for OFFSITE utility improvements relative to Village 1 of the Wildflower Development.
2. Refer to the Master Development Plan Exhibits for the location of all offsite improvements.

DISCLAIMER

THE DATA AND INFORMATION PRESENTED HEREIN HAVE BEEN PRODUCED CONSISTENT WITH INDUSTRY STANDARDS BY OPERATORS EXERCISING REASONABLE SKILL AND CARE. THIS DATA AND INFORMATION IS PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. NO GUARANTEE OR WARRANTY EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED IS MADE WITH RESPECT TO THE ACCURACY OF THIS DATA OR INFORMATION. IN NO EVENT WILL LEI CONSULTING ENGINEERS AND SURVEYORS INC. BE LIABLE FOR ANY LOSS OF PROFIT OR ANY OTHER COMMERCIAL DAMAGE INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, OR OTHER DAMAGES RESULTING FROM THE USE OF THIS INFORMATION OR DATA.

SECTION 19: Master Development Agreement

A Master Development Agreement has been approved by the City and was recorded with the County on February 24, 2015.

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Council
Staff Report

Rezone, General Plan Amendment, Community Plan, Master Development Agreement
Mt. Saratoga
Tuesday, August 16, 2016
Public Hearing

Report Date:	Tuesday, August 9, 2016
Applicant:	Edge Homes, LLC
Owners:	DCP Saratoga LLC, Capital Security Mortgage, Jan Wilkins, Mt Saratoga LLC
Location:	~1200-1900 West, between Pony Express Parkway and SR 73
Major Street Access:	State Road 73, Pony Express Parkway
Parcel Number(s) & Size:	Size: ~688 acres 580330243, 580330329, 580330208, 580330328, 580330288, 580340442, 580340289, 580340347, 580340312, 580340313, 580340360, 580340441, 580340359, 580340355, 580340372, 580340333, 580340357, 580340323, 580340324, 580340340, 580340341, 580340230
Parcel Zoning:	R-3
Adjacent Zoning:	R-3, RR, RA-5
Current Use of Parcel:	Vacant
Adjacent Uses:	Residential, Agricultural, undeveloped
Previous Meetings:	PC Work Session 1/14/16 CC Work Session 2/2/16 PC Public Hearing 7/2/16
Previous Approvals:	None
Land Use Authority:	City Council
Type of Action:	Legislative
Future Routing:	None
Author:	Sarah Carroll, Senior Planner

A. Executive Summary:

The applicant is requesting approval of a General Plan Amendment and Rezone to change the designations of the property from Low Density Residential (R-3) to Planned Community (PC). They are also requesting approval of a Community Plan (CP) and Master Development Agreement (MDA) to master plan approximately 688 acres of property for residential and commercial uses. The CP lays out general densities and configurations, however future approvals must be obtained prior to construction, including Village Plans and subdivision plats. These future approvals will involve additional Planning Commission public hearings and City Council

Sarah Carroll, Senior Planner
scarroll@saratogaspringscity.com
1307 North Commerce Drive, Suite 200 • Saratoga Springs, Utah 84045
801-766-9793 x106 • 801-766-9794 fax

meetings, and will give the neighbors additional opportunities to see more specific plans prior to finalization.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the City Council conduct a public hearing on the applications, take public comment, review and discuss the proposal, and choose from the options in Section I of this report. Options include approval with conditions, continuing the item for additional information, or denial.

B. **Background:** The property is currently zoned R-3, Low Density Residential and was previously approved to be developed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The previous Master Development Agreement was approved in 2004 and was valid for 8 years, expiring on January 28, 2012. In 2008, an application was received to revise the approved MDA, but did not progress due to market conditions at that time. In 2013, changes were made to the Land Development Code to prevent the PUD from being used for future development.

The subject property is a hillside area with sensitive lands and slopes greater than 30 percent. The applicant would like to cluster housing types and preserve sensitive lands and that type of flexibility is now offered in the Planned Community District Zoning. The proposed MDA is intended to reinstate and amend the MDA that expired in 2012.

The Planning Commission held a work session on January 14, 2016 and the City Council held a work session on February 2, 2016. Minutes from those meetings are attached.

Based on the feedback received at these work sessions the applicant has reduced the proposed number of units from 2,649 to 2,553 and added two-family and three-family units to reduce the number of multi-family units. Two-family and three-family units were not included in the referendum.

C. **Specific Request:**
The application covers approximately 688 acres and proposes residential and commercial development and large amounts of open space as shown in the Community Plan and summarized below:

Total acres: 687.93
Community Commercial acreage: 7.50
Residential/Civic acreage: 445.45
Open space acreage: 234.98 (34.2% of overall acreage)
Residential units: 2,553

Density is based on the overall project area minus the commercial acreage which results in 2,553 units within 680.43 acres and equates to 3.75 units per acre. Product type is broken down as follows:

Single family units: 988 (39%)

Single family units in flex neighborhoods: 285 minimum (11%)
Two and three family units in flex neighborhoods: 284 maximum (11%)
Multi-family units: 996 (39%)

The applicant is requesting approval of a rezone from R-3 to PC and a general plan amendment from Low Density Residential to Planned Community. They are also requesting approval of the proposed Community Plan and Master Development Agreement.

A brief outline of items in the CP that the City Council may wish to discuss further include, but are not limited to the following:

- The Community Plan includes some street designs for hillside areas that have been reviewed by the Development Review Committee (DRC) and the Fire Chief. These include a 2000' block length and a 750' cul-de-sac in hillside areas as identified in the CP. Staff has reviewed these and finds them acceptable in limited hillside locations as identified in the CP in order to avoid vast cuts in the hillside.
- A 63' cross section is proposed for a portion of Talus Ridge Blvd that is adjacent to an area with 30% slopes. This results in a sidewalk adjacent to the homes, but not adjacent to the steep slopes. The DRC has reviewed this request and finds it acceptable, a sidewalk that is not abutting homes would not see any snow removal or the City would be responsible.
- The Design Guidelines outline proposed lot sizes, setbacks, architectural styles, etc.
- The Design Guidelines specify two categories for multi-family, but it is not clear in which situations these would be applied. It is most likely for attached versus stacked units.
- Hillside standards are included in the CP; staff would like to propose these standards city-wide for hillside developments and a Code Amendment is anticipated to do so.
- There are some 30% slopes shown in the CP that are proposed to be graded subject to further review under future applications. These areas included manmade areas, a portion of a drainage channel and areas one-half acre or smaller.
- The applicant is requesting a waiver to the 20' buffer strip in some locations as outlined later in this report.
- Phasing of open space and amenities is proposed and outlined in the CP.
- Open space proposals are included and match the pending open space ordinance; the proposed points exceed the requirements of the pending open space ordinance.
- The applicant is proposing that the City own and maintain 205 acres of open space, including a trail and park network that will be installed by the developer
- The applicant is asking that the City maintain the park strips along the arterial and collector in locations where no lots front the street.
- The applicant is asking for impact fee credits for the 205 acre community park.

D. Process:

General Plan Amendment and Rezone
Section 19.17.03 of the City Code outlines the requirements for a rezone and General Plan amendment; first is a formal review of the request by the Planning Commission in a public

hearing, with a recommendation forwarded to the City Council. The City Council then holds a public hearing and is the land use authority.

Community Plan
Section 19.26 of the Code describes development in the PC zone:

(a) For a large-scale planned community district, an overall governing document is first approved, known as the District Area Plan (Section 19.26.13).
    - *The property does not exceed 2000 acres, therefore no DAP is required.*

(b) A Community Plan is then proposed and approved (Sections 19.26.03-19.26.08). The Community Plan lays out the more specific guidelines for a sub-district within the DAP.
    - *The applicant has proposed a Community Plan for the entire property, which plan contains proposed guidelines for the property.*

(c) Following and / or concurrently with the Community Plan, a Village Plan is proposed and approved (Sections 19.26.09 – 19.26.10). The Village Plan is the final stage in the Planned Community process before preliminary and final plats, addressing such details specific to the sub-phase as open space, road networks, and lots for a sub-phase of the Community Plan.
    - *The applicants are not yet proposing their first Village Plan(s); such plan(s) will come at a later date and be reviewed according to 19.26 of the Code and also according to the standards in any approved Community Plan.*

The approval process for the Community Plan includes:
1. A public hearing and recommendation by the Planning Commission *(held July 28, 2016).*
2. A public hearing and final decision by the City Council (19.26 states that the process is per Section 19.17, which addresses Code amendments / rezones and requires hearings with the Council.)

The Community Plan and MDA will vest the property in terms of density and general configuration and overarching themes and standards, however future approvals of Village Plans and subdivision plats will be required prior to beginning construction. Both of these approvals require Planning Commission and City Council review, and will provide the public additional opportunities to review the plans and provide input as specific subdivision layouts and phasing plans are proposed and finalized.

E. **Community Review:** This item has been noticed as a public hearing in the *Daily Herald*; and mailed notices sent to all property owners within 300 feet. During the public hearing for ABC Great Beginnings Rezone, one member of the public commented on the proposed density as it relates to Proposition 6. At the July 28, 2016 public hearing with the Planning Commission members of the public commented and voiced concerns; minutes from that meeting are attached.

G. General Plan: The applicant is requesting a general plan amendment from Low Density Residential to Planned Community.

Land Use Designation

The applicant is requesting approval of a rezone and General Plan Amendment to designate the property as Planned Community. The Planned Community Land Use Designation is described in the General Plan below:

> Planned Community. The Planned Community designation includes large-scale properties within the City which exceed 500 acres in size. This area is characterized by a mixture of land uses and housing types. It is subject to an overall Community Plan that contains a set of regulations and guidelines that apply to a defined geographic area. Required Village Plans contain regulations that apply to blocks of land and provide specific development standards, design guidelines, infrastructure plans and other elements as appropriate. Development in these areas shall contain landscaping and recreational features as per the City's Parks, Recreation, Trails, and Open Space Element of the General Plan.

The property exceeds 500 acres in size, and thus qualifies for consideration under the PC zone and designation. The proposal includes a Community Plan that contains regulations for the development of the property.

Staff analysis: if the rezone and GP amendment are approved the CP and MDA will be consistent with the Planned Community Land Use Designation.

Density

The proposed density is 3.75 units per acre. The Planned Community Zone does not identify a specific density; densities are approved and managed by the governing Community Plan.

Proposition 6

Per Proposition 6, which was approved in November 2013, the General Plan has been amended to limit the percentage of multi-family dwelling units in the City. Multi-family is limited to a maximum of 27%; the specific language is as follows:

(a) require 73% of the dwelling units to be single family, detached housing;
(b) limit single family units with a common wall and single story to no more than 11% of the dwelling units in the City;
(c) limit multi-family, single story units to no more than 7% of the total dwelling units;
(d) limit multi-family units with two stories to no more than 11 % of the dwelling units; and
(e) limit multi-family units with more than two stories to no more than 2% of the dwelling units.

On July 21, 2016, staff updated the review of housing types. Based on the recorded developments, ~79.91% of the recorded lots/units are single family detached units; ~9.58% are multi-family two stories; ~8.93% are multi-family more than two stories. While (d) and (e) above have been exceeded, the overall count for multi-family does not exceed 27%.

The proposed community plan specifies that 39% of the units are intended to be multi-family, with the remainder in single family and flex neighborhoods (single, two, and three-family units). The specific layout of these units has not yet been provided, and will be reviewed at a later date following the finalization of the Community Plan, however townhomes and stacked units are expected and would fall under (d) and (e) above. While the limit in the General Plan for these unit types has been exceeded, the Planning Commission and City Council may consider permitting them, in this case, for several reasons:

- The General Plan is advisory, and with a finding of good cause, the Land Use Authority may choose to approve a development that is not fully consistent with the General Plan. Such good cause would be the preservation of hillside areas and sensitive lands, large-scale infrastructure, and vast amounts of open space and an amenities schedule that exceeds the expectations of the pending open space ordinance.
- The items outlined below result in a unique project that does not exceed an overall density of 3.75 units per acre.
- The proposed CP includes major infrastructure including, but not limited to, a collector road connecting SR73 and Pony Express Parkway, improvements on arterial roadways, a water tank, a secondary water pond, storm drain and sewer infrastructure as outlined in the CP.
- The proposed CP includes 234.98 acres of open space (34.2% of overall acreage) and over 11 miles of trails; of which ~205 acres is proposed to be public open space and includes ~30 acres of improved open space.
- An amenities schedule to accommodate the needs of the projected population.
- The MDA is intended to modify and extend the MDA that was approved in 2004. The 2004 MDA included 524 Multi-family units.
- An application to amend the 2004 MDA was submitted in 2008, prior to Proposition 6, which was not fully processed and remained open and active. That application included a request for 574 multi-family units.
- The previous applications were PUD's which are no longer allowed by Code.
- The CP and MDA codify an application that was submitted prior to Proposition 6 (in 2008), which application also included multi-family units.
- Within the project ~70 acres out of ~688 acres is indicated for multi-family units; this is ~10% of the land area within the project.
- The majority of the project acreage will be open space, single-family, two- family, and three-family units consistent with the intent of the Proposition.

Staff analysis: consistent. The Land Use Authority may consider a proposal that exceeds the limits of the general plan if good cause is found. The CP contains proposals that will be a public benefit including preservation of hillside areas and sensitive lands, large-scale infrastructure, ~32% open space, and an amenities schedule that exceeds the expectations of the pending open space ordinance. ~205 acres are proposed to be public open space; including ~11 miles of trails and ~30 acres of open space to be improved by the developer. The majority of the project acreage is proposed for open space, single-family, two-family, and three-family development and is

consistent with the intent of Proposition 6. Therefore, if the General Plan is amended then the MDA and CP will be generally consistent with the General Plan.

H. Code Criteria:

<u>Rezone and General Plan Amendments</u>

Rezones and General Plan amendments are legislative decisions; therefore the Council has significant discretion when making a decision on such requests. Therefore, the Code criteria below are provided as guidelines, and are not binding requirements.

Section 19.17.04 outlines the requirements for both a Rezone and a General Plan Amendment, and states:

> The City Council shall consider, but not be bound by, the following criteria when deciding whether to recommend or grant a general plan, ordinance, or zoning map amendments:
>
> 1. the proposed change will conform to the Land Use Element and other provisions of the General Plan;
>
> ***Consistent.*** *The application conforms to the Planned Community category identified in the General Plan.*
>
> 2. the proposed change will not decrease nor otherwise adversely affect the health, safety, convenience, morals, or general welfare of the public;
>
> ***Consistent.*** *The CP outlines that multi-family neighborhoods are located near the major roadways as to limit the impacts on single-family and flex neighborhoods. The project includes arterial roadways, the extension of Talus Ridge Blvd, per the City's Transportation Master Plan, major infrastructure and ~32% open space including ~11 miles of trails and ~30 acres of developed park space. Guidelines are included for ridgeline development to minimize the visual impact from other locations in the City and design standards are included. Village Plans have not yet been submitted and will allow for a more detailed review of each neighborhood.*
>
> 3. the proposed change will more fully carry out the general purposes and intent of this Title and any other ordinance of the City; and
>
> ***Consistent.*** *The application is consistent with the expired approval in that the R-3 PUD designation allowed for a maximum of 4 units per acre; the CP proposes 3.75 units per acre. The Planned Community zone is intended for projects over 500 acres and allows flexibility and clustering that is not currently described in any other zone. The Planned Community designation is characterized by a mixture of land uses and housing types.*
>
> 4. in balancing the interest of the petitioner with the interest of the public, community interests will be better served by making the proposed change.

Consistent. *The applicant is keeping an overall density of 3.75 units per acre, only placing higher densities on a small portion of the property (~10%); this density is the result of preserving ~32% of the project area as open space. The CP also includes an amenities package that exceeds the requirements of the pending open space ordinance and includes ridgeline development guidelines, design guidelines, theming, and large scale infrastructure and roadway improvements.*

<u>Community Plan</u>

Section 19.26.06 – Guiding Standards of Community Plans
The standards for a Community Plan are below:

1. Development Type and Intensity. The allowed uses and the conceptual intensity of development in a Planned Community District shall be as established by the Community Plan.

   Staff finding: complies. *The Community Plan contains general densities and locations, capped at an overall maximum density.*

2. Equivalent Residential Unit Transfers.

   Staff finding: complies. *The Community Plan contains a maximum of 2,553 units, and a provision for density to be transferred between Village Plans within the development area. The proposed transfers include a 20% limitations as allowed by Title 19.26.*

3. Development Standards. Guiding development standards shall be established in the Community Plan.

   Staff finding: complies. *The Community Plan contains standards and regulations to govern the development within future Village Plans and then subdivision plats and site plans. The majority of the project will be subject to the standards in the Development Code, with some items such as density, lot size, setbacks, and architecture governed more specifically in the Community Plan.*

4. Open Space Requirements.

   Staff finding: complies. *The Code requires 30% of the project to be placed in protected open space. The applicant is proposing a plan that meets this requirement, per the proposed Community Plan definitions of allowable open space and in accordance with the limitations in Section 19.26 of the Code.*

5. No structure (excluding signs and entry features) may be closer than twenty feet to the peripheral property line of the Planned Community District boundaries.
   a. The area within this twenty foot area is to be used as a buffer strip and may be counted toward open space requirements, but shall not include required back yards or building set back areas.

b. The City Council may grant a waiver to the requirement set forth in this Subsection upon a finding that the buffer requirement will result in the creation of non-functional or non-useable open space area and will be detrimental to the provision of useful and functional open space within the Project.

Staff finding: up for discussion. *Much of the plan complies, and in portions the applicants have requested a waiver to this requirement (see page 20, Exhibit 2). The waiver is requested where single family lots are proposed adjacent to the periphery.*

19.26.07 – Contents of Community Plans

The items summarized below are required to be part of a Community Plan:

1. Legal Description. ***Provided***
2. Use Map. ***Provided***
3. Buildout Allocation. ***Provided***
4. Open Space Plan. ***Provided***
5. Guiding Principles. ***Provided***
5. Utility Capacities. ***Provided – see Engineering staff report***
6. Conceptual Plans. Other elements as appropriate - conceptual grading, wildlife mitigation, open space management, hazardous materials remediation, fire protection. ***Provided.***
8. Additional Elements.
    a. responses to existing physical characteristics of the site ***Provided***
    b. findings statement ***Provided***
    c. environmental issues ***Basic information provided***
    d. means to ensure compliance with standards in Community Plan ***Provided***
9. Application and Fees. ***Provided***

19.26.05 – Adoption and Amendment of Community Plans

The criteria for adoption of a Community Plan are below:

a. is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, with particular emphasis placed upon those policies related to community identity, distinctive qualities in communities and neighborhoods, diversity of housing, integration of uses, pedestrian and transit design, and environmental protection;

Staff finding: consistent. *See Section G of this report.*

b. does not exceed the number of equivalent residential units and square footage of nonresidential uses of the General Plan;

Staff finding: complies. *The General Plan does not identify ERUs or square footage for the Planned Community designation, and the overall density proposed carries forward the allowable range under the existing Low Density Residential PUD land use. Square footages of commercial development will be guided by the pending Community Commercial zone.*

c. contains sufficient standards to guide the creation of innovative design that responds to unique conditions;

Staff finding: up for discussion. *The proposed standards will guide the development and will permit the proposed densities and maintain quality of design (see Design Guidelines, pg. 51-53 of CP). During the work sessions the PC and CC had concerns with the proposed minimum lot size of 2,500 square feet and suggested more variety. The minimum lot sizes now range from 3,500 to 5,000 square feet with an indication that "more appropriate site specific standards will be established at the Village Plan level".*

d. is compatible with surrounding development and properly integrates land uses and infrastructure with adjacent properties;

Staff finding: up for discussion. *Village 5 Neighborhood 3 is proposed for multi-family development and is adjacent to an existing Rural Residential development. However, there is a 100' wide powerline corridor between these developments and the CP includes standards for ridgeline development. The other two multi-family developments are not adjacent to existing development and are located with direct access to an arterial roadway.*

e. includes adequate provisions for utilities, services, roadway networks, and emergency vehicle access; and public safety service demands will not exceed the capacity of existing and planned systems without adequate mitigation;

Staff finding: pending. *The applicants are working with engineering to ensure that adequate infrastructure can be provided, and identifying appropriate mitigation as necessary. The impacts of City-wide growth on public safety are evaluated by the City Council on an annual basis to determine staffing needs.*

f. is consistent with the guiding standards listed in Section 19.26.06; and

Staff finding: up for discussion. *The application complies with standards 1-4, however the project is requesting a partial exemption from standard 5 as outlined on page 8 of this report (this is regarding the 20' periphery setback).*

g. contains the required elements as dictated in Section 19.26.07.

Staff finding: complies. *The application contains the required items.*

<u>Master Development Agreement</u>

Section 19.26.11 requires a Master Development Agreement, subject to the legislative discretion of the City Council. Approval shall generally conform to and include by reference, if appropriate, the requirements found in Section 19.13.06 (now 19.13.07), except for the plat, site plan, and CCR's or elevations are not required until later.

19.13.07(2) outlines the requirements for the contents of an MDA. The proposed MDA includes the required contents listed in this section; except that bond documents are not practical at this

particular stage of development and will be required with each preliminary plat. If the City Council adds requirements, the MDA will be updated to include those requirements.

I. Recommendation and Alternatives:

Staff recommends that the City Council discuss the applications and choose from the options below.

OPTION 1: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS
(Separate motions are provided for the Rezone and GPA and for the CP and MDA)

Motion for Rezone and General Plan Amendment:
"Based upon the information and discussion tonight, I move to approve the Rezone and General Plan Amendment, from Low Density Residential (R-3) to Planned Community (PC) for the Mt. Saratoga project, as identified in the Community Plan, with the Findings and Conditions in the staff report:"

Findings

1. The Rezone and General Plan Amendment will not result in a decrease in public health, safety, and welfare as outlined in Section G of the staff report, which section is hereby incorporated by reference.
2. The Rezone and General Plan Amendment are consistent with Section 19.17.04 of the Code, as articulated in Section H of the staff report, which section is hereby incorporated by reference.

Conditions:

1. The rezone shall not be recorded until accompanied by a finalized Community Plan and MDA. The Community Plan shall in all respects be consistent with the MDA.
2. Any other conditions added by the City Council: _____
   _____

Motion for Community Plan and Master Development Agreement:
"Based upon the information and discussion tonight, I move to approve the Community Plan and Master Development Agreement for the Mt. Saratoga project, as identified in the Community Plan, with the Findings and Conditions in the staff report:"

Findings

1. The Community Plan and Master Development Agreement are consistent with the General Plan, as articulated in Section G of the staff report, which section is hereby incorporated by reference.
2. The Community Plan and Master Development Agreement are consistent with the Land Development Code, as articulated in Section H of the staff report, which section is hereby incorporated by reference.

Conditions:

1. All requirements of the City Engineer shall be met.
2. All other Code requirements shall be met.
3. The rezone shall not be recorded until accompanied by a finalized Community Plan and MDA. The Community Plan shall in all respects be consistent with the MDA.
4. Any other conditions articulated by the City Council: _____
   _____

OPTION 2: CONTINUANCE

The City Council may choose to continue the application. "I move to **continue** the [Rezone, General Plan Amendment, Community Plan, MDA] for Mt. Saratoga to the [DATE], with direction to the applicant and Staff on information and / or changes needed to render a decision, as follows:

1. _____.
2. _____.
3. _____.
4. _____.
5. _____.

OPTION 3: NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

The City Council may choose to forward a negative recommendation:

"Based upon the information and discussion tonight, I move to **deny** the Rezone, General Plan Amendment, Community Plan, and Master Development Agreement for the Mt. Saratoga project, based on the Findings below:

1. The applications are not consistent with the General Plan, as articulated by the City Council: _____, and/or
2. The applications do not comply with Section 19.17.04 of the Development Code, as articulated by the City Council: _____, and/or
3. The applications do not further the general welfare of the residents of the City, as articulated by the City Council: _____.

"I also move to deny the Mt. Saratoga Community Plan and MDA based on the Findings below:

1. The applications are not consistent with the General Plan, as the current designation is Low Density Residential and not Planned Community.
2. The applications do not comply with Section 19.04 of the Development Code, regarding Land Use Zones, specifically:
   a. the request exceeds the allowed density in the R-3 zone.
   b. there are proposed uses that are not allowed in the R-3 zone; and
   c. setbacks, lot widths, lot sizes, and other development standards are not consistent with the R-3 zone; and
   d. Community Plans are not permitted in the R-3 zone.

3. The MT Saratoga Community Plan and MDA do not further the general welfare of the residents of the City, as articulated by the City Council: _____

J. Exhibits:

1. City Engineer's Report
2. Location & Zone Map
3. General Plan Map
4. PC Work Session Minutes 1/14/16
5. CC Work Session Minutes 2/2/16
6. PC Minutes 7/28/16
7. Proposed Community Plan
8. Master Development Agreement

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

Memo

To: Mayor, City Council and/or Planning Commission
From: Planning Department
Date: August 9, 2016
Meeting Date: August 16, 2016
Re: New Applications & Resubmittals

New Projects:

- 7.15.16 Ruston Concept Plan (Approx. Near The Benches)
- 7.15.16 Papa's Car Wash Conditional Use Permit (1347 NW Commerce Dr. Lot 1 Plat A)
- 7.18.16 Smokin Star BBQ Food Trailer (Mobile- Food Truck)
- 7.18.16 Madison Meadows Preliminary Plat (700 W. 400 N.)
- 7.18.16 Madision Meadows Final Plat (700 W. 400 N.)
- 7.21.16 400 N. ULD Pump Station Site Plan (Approx. 700 W. 400 N.)
- 7.21.16 400 N. ULD Pump Station Conditional Use Permit (Approx. 700 W. 400 N.)
- 7.21.16 Civic Events Food Truck Monday Temporary Use (Neptune Park)
- 7.21.16 Civic Events Food Truck Neptune Events Temporary Use (Neptune Park)
- 7.21.16 Civic Events Food Truck Pumpkin Festival Temporary Use (Shay Park)
- 7.26.16 Harvest Village MDA Major Amendment (164 W. 2000 N.)
- 7.26.16 Harvest Village Preliminary Plat (164 W. 2000 N.)
- 7.26.16 Harvest Village Site Plan (164 W. 2000 N.)
- 7.28.16 Saratoga Springs 2 Church Site Plan (School House Rd in Legacy Farms)
- 7.29.16 Saratoga Animal Hospital Concept Plan (154 West Commerce Dr.)
- 08.2.16 Construction Consulting Management LLC Home Occupation (2254 Western Dr.)
- 08.05.16 Legacy Farms VP Amendment 1 to 5 (400 S. Redwood Rd.)
- 08.05.16 Legacy Farms Community Plan Amendment (400 S. Redwood Rd.)

Resubmittals & Supplemental Submittals:

- 7.11.16 Mt. Saratoga Community Plan (400 N. 1500 W.)
- 7.20.16 Heron Hills Plat C Final Plat (200 E. 3300 S.)
- 7.20.16 Sierra Estates Plat F Final Plat (Bono Blvd & Kern Ave.)
- 7.22.16 Mt. Saratoga Community Plan (400 N. 1500 W.)
- 7.22.16 Enterprise Rent a Car Permanent Sign Permit (2178 N. Stagecoach Dr.)
- 7.26.16 Papa's Express Car Wash Site Plan Amendment (1347 NW Commerce Dr Lot 1 Plat A)
- 7.27.16 Denny's Minor Site Plan Amendment (1516 N. Redwood Dr.)
- 7.29.16 Saratoga Animal Hospital Concept Plan (154 West Commerce Dr.)
- 8.01.16 Fox Hollow N.6 Village Parkway Irrigation Plan (Approx. 3200 S. Village Parkway)
- 8.03.16 Legacy Farms VP3 A-E Preliminary Plats (400 S. Redwood Rd.)
- 8.04.16 The Crossing Lot 8 & 9 Site Plan Amendment (NW Corner Pioneer & Redwood Rd)
- 8.8.16 Catalina Bay Phase 1 Final (McGregor Lane & Harbor Bay Dr.)

Staff Approvals:
Smokin' Star BBQ Temporary Use Permit
Saratoga Animal Hospital Concept
Enterprise Sign Permit
Denny's Minor Site Plan
Sierra Estates F Final Plat