

**City of Saratoga Springs
Planning Commission Meeting
November 13, 2014**

Regular Session held at the City of Saratoga Springs City Offices
1307 North Commerce Drive, Suite 200, Saratoga Springs, Utah 84045

Planning Commission Minutes

Present:

Commission Members: Jeff Cochran, Jarred Henline, Kirk Wilkins, Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Kara North

Staff: Kimber Gabryszak, Sarah Carroll, Nicolette Fike, Jeremy Lapin, Kevin Thurman

Others: Nate Shipp, Nola & Mel Bunkall, Juni Moore, Joan Black, Diana Bradey, Jeramy Cochran, Brett Hardcastle, Troy Herold, Sean Trinnaman, Mindy Danve, Jamie Danforth, Alan Johnson, Steve Larsen, Milt Shiff, Aric Jensen, J. & Q. Klingonsmith, Brian Ricks, Kalli & Austin Bee, Ryan Marle, Paul Linford, Bryan Flamm, Joe Hitzeman, Ken Betch, Wende Tate, Jason Broll, Rick Van Valkenburgh

Excused: Eric Reese

Call to Order - 6:30 p.m. by Jeff Cochran

Pledge of Allegiance - led by Sean Trinnaman

Roll Call - Quorum was present

4. Continued Public Hearing and Possible Recommendation: Preliminary Plat for Heron Hills located at approximately 3250 South Redwood Road, Steve Larson, applicant.

Sarah Carroll reviewed this plat which was tabled from a prior meeting. There were two concerns of the access to El Nautica boat club and a property overlap. It was actually a gap between the properties. Part of the fence is still on the Heron Hills property. The applicant will Quit Claim the gap parcel and up to the existing fence to the El Nautica owners. Applicant has met with UDOT and they agreed to have the future public road align with Wildlife Blvd. The shape of the park has been revised and some of the lots have been revised as well. They will submit the new phasing plan with the final plat.

Ken Berg for applicant stated that staff has addressed all concerns and he is happy to answer any questions that need to be answered.

Public Hearing Opened by Jeff Cochran

Brett Hardcastle asked if Redwood road would be expanded to include a turning lane.

Jeremy Lapin said that there are no plans to modify or change the historical access. It is not a public access.

Sarah Carroll noted they would have the option of using the public road but the residents can't use the private road.

Julie Moore asked if the developer and the members of the El Nautica could meet and create a written agreement between the two.

Steve Larsen agreed to meeting with the El Nautica Club.

Public Hearing Closed by Jeff Cochran

Sandra Steele asked Ken Berg on lot 413 how much of the fence line would be quit claimed.

Ken Berg stated it was about 10 sq. ft. that was adjusted on the lot which equaled just inches that would be deeded.

Hayden Williamson was glad that the developer was able to work out the details requested.

Kirk Wilkins asked who owned the property to be quit claimed and who would it be deeded to.

Sarah Carroll stated that it was the previous owners, Cedarstrom, that had the remainder parcel and would be deeding it to the adjacent owners.

Kirk Wilkins asked if there are provisions for parking at the lake access park.

Sarah Carroll stated that this item would be discussed further in the process, when the landscape plan comes.

Kirk Wilkins echoed it was great that they were able to come together and resolve the problems between UDOT and developer.

Kara North was also glad that items were resolved.

Jarred Henline thought it looks good.

Jeff Cochran noted his questions have been answered.

Motion by Hayden Williamson that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the Preliminary Plat for Heron Hills located at approximately 3250 South Redwood Road the based on the finding listed below in the staff report. Seconded by Kirk Wilkins. Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Jeffrey Cochran, Kirk Wilkins, Kara North, Jarred Henline. Motion passed unanimously.

Public Input Open by Jeff Cochran

No input at this time.

Public Input Closed by Jeff Cochran

5. Public Hearing and Possible Recommendation: Preliminary Plat, Site Plan and Master Development Agreement Amendment for Riverbend Townhomes located at approximately 900 North Redwood Road, Knowlton General/Aric Jensen.

Kimber Gabryszak reviewed the Phasing Plan; the applicant has requested an increase of units, which would require a Master Development Agreement. The trail will need to be realigned since it is located in the wetland flood plains, There are several Engineering requirements that must be met as well. Public input had been received and forwarded to the Commissioners.

Aric Jensen for applicant appreciates the staff work on this project. He would hope to have this approved as recommended.

Public Hearing Open by Jeff Cochran

Alan Johnson would like to request more parking on the north side, it is insufficient now. He would like to see that the HOA be reimbursed early on from the developer for the building of the park.

Joe Hitzeman wanted to request parking on the north side, there are often around 10 cars parked in the dirt area. Reimbursement of the park would be advised and funding to fix the existing park. He would like to push the amenities to be completed at the beginning rather than towards the end.

Public Hearing Closed by Jeff Cochran

Aric Jensen, has agreed to reimburse the HOA for the park improvements up front, additional parking has been added which includes 3-4 additional stalls but that was all that could be fitted. He said it's too hard to construct the landscaping at the beginning while construction is occurring.

Jarred Henline one concern is the parking, 3 stalls added is not enough for the north side, with the additional units added more parking will be needed and that needs to be addressed.

Kimber Gabryszak commented that there is no possibility of parking on the collector.

Jarred Henline maintains the position that more parking is needed and is a concern. The HOA and developer need to work out the reimbursement, and language would need to be added to address the parking issue.

Kara North asked if the parking requirement is being meet.

Kimber Gabryszak indicated that they do meet the requirements according to the current parking code. Guest parking is ¼ spaces per unit.

Kara North noted she was a resident of Riverbend. She expressed that the parking is a big concern and would like to distribute parking more to the north side. She thought a reconfiguration of the building would be able to fix that.

Aric Jensen responded that the unit couldn't be flipped because of a large sewer line that ran through the parcel on a diagonal.

Kara North feels that there could be a way to resolve the issue. The plan looks great and is glad to have this development completed.

Kirk Wilkins asked about the road next to the river. Would it take away future access to the river for the adjacent property owner?

Aric Jensen stated that the property is owned by someone else. It is there to show future connectivity required by the city.

Kimber stated that the road is shown on the City's future Master Transportation Plan they are following that general alignment, but doesn't require the property owner to do anything at this time. It could be reconfigured; it doesn't require a property owner to stick to that alignment.

Kirk Wilkins asked about the open space requirements.

Kimber Gabryszak noted that things were shifted but it comes out to about the same amount.

Kirk Wilkins echoed the need for additional parking and to make the neighbors happy, if there is anything that could be done that would be great. He asked about the trail access.

Aric Jensen said that on the east side the access was from their patios. There is a significant drop as to result of that the construction was to be raised.

Kirk Wilkins supported a condition to require trail connectivity. He asked about the realignment of the units.

Aric Jensen addressed why they requested the additional units and the cost of the units because of increased costs to fill and build walls.

Hayden Williamson expressed that parking is a concern of his as well and he would agree to commissioner's counsel to find additional parking. The additional units he is fine with, he asked if the landscaping for the detention basin has been determined.

Aric Jensen stated that the detention was designed to be flat bottom to be used for a play area and maintained by the HOA, it is redesigned slightly but will be a large play area.

Hayden Williamson asked if the parking would be enforced by the HOA.

Aric Jensen responded that yes the parking would be enforced by the HOA.

Hayden Williamson asked if the Fire Marshall would be able to enforce as well.

Kimber Gabryszak stated that they should put it on the plat very clear where they were allowed to park and if the Fire chief felt that there was concern then he could enforce any issues regarding the parking.

Kevin Thurman stated that Code Enforcement could also enforce any issues as well.

Sandra Steele asked what the lengths of the driveways were on the new units.

Aric Jensen said he thinks that they are 18 feet.

Sandra Steele feels some concern with the units on the east side and the lack of parking and asked if it was possible to add additional parking to the ends of the units.

Aric Jensen indicated that they could widen the drives on the ends.

Sandra Steele is not sure that the old parking issue could be fixed with the newer section and it should stand on its own. She asked if a traffic study had been completed.

Aric Jensen said that no study was completed.

Jeremy Lapin stated they could look at the need and see if one was warranted.

Sandra Steele clarified that chain link fencing is not permitted. She asked about the garage doors and do they meet the architectural design.

Kimber Gabryszak said that what was promised was provided.

Sandra Steele would feel more comfortable to add a condition that a connection to Riverside drive to the north be provided prior to the first Certificate of Occupancy.

Jeff Cochran asked if we could request additional parking for the additional units being requested.

Kimber Gabryszak reviewed the options that the Planning Commission could recommend for the project. They meet the current code requirements.

Kevin Thurman stated that the developer has an entitlement to the current R14 zoning.

Jeff Cochran asked if 8 additional stalls could be considered.

Aric Jensen stated that there is nowhere to locate any additional parking stalls, if they could they would.

Jeff Cochran strongly recommends he consider trying to reconfigure the plan to add the additional parking. He asked if the road extension was in the flood plain. (no) He asked if the slope and trail area was constructible and if it required a retaining wall to build.

Jeremy Lapin responded that it may, trail was flat. The northern units already had a wall proposed.

Motion by Kara North to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the amendment to the Riverbend MDA, increasing the maximum density from 58 units to 62 units, with the findings and conditions in the Staff Report. Seconded by Hayden Williamson. Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Jeffrey Cochran, Kirk Wilkins, Kara North, Jarred Henline. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Kara North to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the Riverbend Preliminary Plat and Site Plan with the Findings and Conditions contained within the Report, with the modifications that the number of units shall be 62, that the trail meet any staff concerns with respect to connectivity or the flood plain, that there be no on street parking on riverside drive per the request of the Fire Marshall, that per the agreement with the developer the driveways on the east end be widened as agreed, that if necessary based on staff's concerns or recommendations that a traffic study be conducted, that connectivity to Riverside drive be completed before the first Certificate of Occupancy is issued. Seconded by Kirk Wilkins.

Hayden Williamson had a question that no parking on Riverside drive was already Code. **The driveways to the units on the east side, that they not be allowed to park on the road but in private drives.**

Kara North **accepted that correction.**

Kimber Gabryszak clarified that they were accepting the other conditions that were in the staff report.

Kara North said yes.

Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Jeffrey Cochran, Kirk Wilkins, Kara North, Jarred Henline. Motion passed unanimously.

A 5 min. break was taken at this time.

6. Public Hearing and Possible Recommendation: Rezone, General Plan Amendment and Community Plan for Wildflower located approximately 1 mile west of Redwood Road on SR 73 and West of Harvest Hills, AI/Nathan Shipp, applicant.

Kimber Gabryszak presented the plan. The applicant is requesting approval of a General Plan Amendment and Rezone to change the property to the Planned Community zone, and also a Community Plan to a Master plan, about 1765 residential units and 200 acres of commercial. There are plans for Mountain View Corridor which passes through the center of the Plan. The applicants are asking to transfer the residential density from these acres to the rest of the project, based upon a maximum of 3 units per acre overall. The highest density is furthest away from the existing neighborhood. There was a neighborhood meeting held and she reviewed feedback from that. They recommended to applicant that homes built next to existing homes be the same size and transition to smaller. She noted that each phase will have to be brought forward with a Village plan that will have more details. And then come to Council again in individual subdivision plats. She reviewed the current impact that planned MVC would be to the development. She reviewed recommended conditions.

Nathan Shipp, applicant, noted they had spent a lot of time with staff on how to comply with code and neighborhood feedback and UDOT. They did try to get UDOT to move MVC further to the west so their development wasn't split in the middle, but that is not an option. They are proceeding in good faith that the corridor will be done. Their plan allows for overall low density. They are leaving the commercial area alone at this time with plans to come back later with the best way to lay that out. They are working with staff and the major transportation plan. They are matching the size of roads stubbing into their plans. They are open to exploring the traffic patterns further to make sure they are done in a manner that is safe and addresses concerns of all residents.

Public Hearing open by Jeff Cochran

Jennifer KlingonSmith was concerned that granting the Planning Community zone gives the developers more flexibility in how things are laid out. She mentioned what has happened with the Legacy Farms project. If the City Council approves this than densities would be vested and she urges the Planning

Commission to use discretion. She feels that to shift the density really makes it less than 3 units per acre. She thinks that the developer would make a decent amount of money from UDOT with the sale of the area for MVC and he could keep the density lower and maintain the 3 units per acre on the rest of the area. She appreciates that he didn't put in a lot of multi-family units. The R18 pocket she wants to point out that while it doesn't seem big; it makes a big impact on their schools and wards. She feels that since this was only submitted and not approved before Prop. 6 that this should not be grandfathered in. Granting this density and seeing how it is playing out with Legacy Farms project she thinks they need to protect those and define those densities more.

Jeremy Cochran seconds a lot of comments Mrs. Klingon-Smith made. He thinks that if they get the credit for the units that might have been in the corridor than increasing density in the other area it is an unfair advantage. He notes that if they add the road on the north (connecting to Providence) it eventually runs right in front of the school that it would be too congested for that road and unsafe. On exhibit 15 in the packet he wanted some clarification. He is questioning how much material would be extracted and where it would go and that it would be putting heavy equipment on the Harvest Hills roads which would ruin the roads and put a burden on the residents. He likes the trails but questions if there could be trails on the east of MVC. He wonders about the traffic flow onto MVC. He recommends a frontage road on the east of MVC.

Rick Van Valkenburgh is concerned about the proposed road to the north (Providence) that would increase traffic on that road. He mentioned the traffic impact during peak hours is on the Harvest Hills Blvd. He thinks that would also dump more traffic onto the proposed road. He would like to see the proposed road moved.

Brian Ricks feels that the argument is that they are trying to shift what MVC has taken away and he doesn't think it would put the developer in dire straits. He has spoken with the administrators at local schools and they are concerned with being able to pass a bond for a new high school to take some load off the high numbers at local schools. This development would bring a lot more students to our schools. He is concerned also about the proposed road connecting through Harvest Hills. The road goes by a major park and school. By design in the neighborhood the roads slow traffic down and this would put more traffic on those roads.

Jamie Danforth likes the comments that have been made already. We care about our community and the city. She echoes that when the project was proposed that MVC was not in that plan. The change in density would change the feel a ton. This would add about 3400 kids that need schools and there isn't space in the plan for schools. It looks nice but the majority is on 4500-6000 sq.ft. lots. She likes the idea of matching what exists. She is concerned on the shift of demographics. She is concerned with the comparison of high density vs. lower on the north end of the city. The north end is carrying a huge weight for the city with all the high density in this area.

Sean Trinniman is wondering what type of stores/commercial is planned on the south end of the plan. He is concerned with parking at those also and that it not be crammed. He thinks that what is around the high density is a better forecast for crime. He would suggest a crime forecast for the area and what it would mean to our Police force. The increased housing pod next to Saratoga Chase community will be high density also. He is concerned with the view to the west being blocked and concerned with extra light pollution. He is suggesting another study for how previous developments from DAI were designed and what their current problems are and what we can do to avoid those. He notices that other areas of MVC have a large buffer zone. He is wondering what the plan is for the mixed use area and thinks it could be expanded.

Public Hearing Closed by Jeff Cochran

Kimber Gabryszak answered some of the public's questions. With the requested density transfer, she said staff had the same questions. Staff did recommend a condition that they add an amendment process to predictably shift density if the Mountain View Corridor is not built, or if the density in the Corridor is purchased by UDOT. Initial communication is that UDOT will not purchase the density. They don't think double dipping is really happening. The Commercial area is not really a change in the general plan, if they changed it for a big box use they would have to go through a review process. Right now they are only working on the residential areas. In terms of Prop 6, this development is not necessarily grandfathered in,

but as it's an advisory document it will be looked at. It will be a legislative decision by City Council and it gives them things to weigh. There are items to discuss if the benefits to the city outweigh the risks. MVC is an important connection because Redwood road and I-15 are projected as failing. They can request additional information for extraction and designated routes to minimize impact to the neighborhood. Density is based off of R3 but there is not min or max with planned community zone. They took the R3 and dispersed it through the plan. The height of the high density housing; there is a current plan that it will be determined in the village plan submissions. They requested that the maximum height be added to the Mountain View neighborhood. Kimber addressed the language in the state code that prohibits us from addressing school impacts.

Kevin will need to look further into it; he thinks it was changed recently. This area is going to need land that will facilitate schools and churches.

Jeff Cochran said that with the buffer on MVC in the north, it is intended in its ultimate build out to be a freeway like I-15, which is why it is spread out now to allow for that growth.

Jeremy Lapin addressed the impact to existing roadways and changes; it was always planned that they would have its own entrance from S.R. 73 and Redwood Road. It doesn't talk about who would build it UDOT of the developer. They do want interconnectivity; those roads are not meant for main trips but for community travel to schools and churches etc.

Nathan Shipp addressed some of the questions. Why the Planning Community zone is being requested. They are being asked to restrict 25 % of their ground right off (for MVC). They don't have much flexibility as far as that is concerned. They don't know how they are going to build out exactly. He had a map which compared the densities of Harvest Hills with Wildflower. They felt this was their only alternative to ebb and flow with the market and give them what they need to build what they said they would. Staff has added in the recommendations that they are comfortable with. They will obligate themselves to match what is recommended tonight. They have taken 144 acres and only changed that to 20 acres of change to higher density. If they were to take the MVC out and be able to use it, what is on the East of it would not change. They have only proposed a change to 14% of the property the rest stays the same. As for grading there are some pretty hefty graded areas they need to move around. They have requested to move that so that it is developable. They are committed to keep that traffic out of Harvest Hills. They think they will have plenty of access around that area. As for the schools, they get that it will have an impact and they have worked with other districts and charter organizations to help build schools in the area. They are committed to do the same thing in this community. Plans for areas for parks, churches and schools will come with the various village plans.

Kevin Thurman looked up the code, we can't state as conditions that we would approve based on their getting approval from school districts but we can require that they have identified sites for future schools.

Jarred Henline asked what his timeline was.

Nathan Shipp said they hoped to start this spring their build out would be 15-20 years.

Jarred Henline asked on the timeline of the highway, wasn't it 20 years, what he would do if the road wasn't built.

Jeremy Lapin could not comment on that timeline.

Nathan Shipp said it would need to be a big park or something, but their density would already be set. Their preference would be that the road would be built now but that isn't possible. They don't have any options right now. They would hope that they would close with UDOT in the next few years.

Jeremy Lapin noted they would probably not have them hold out on that land if it wasn't closed in a few years. The belief is it would close fairly soon after this approval.

Jeff Cochran noted that MVC was critical in UDOT's planning so his guess is it's coming.

Jarred Henline wouldn't mind postponing this until they get it right; to make sure all the questions get taken care of. He understands their predicament with 25% of their land taken away. He wants to make sure promises would be met.

Nathan Shipp thinks he hasn't promised anything, he is asking that they vote on a specific project plan that has specific commitments that they would be contracted to work with.

Jarred Henline noted points about matching density, he is not against this project, and he thinks that they can work through it. He asked how the prison would fit into this if it were to come into this area.

Kimber Gabryszak noted that in EM close to this area with industrial planned that it made more sense to increase density nearer to similar uses. This project proposes to place quite a few residences close to where the prison is proposed.

Kevin Thurman said we know a decision will be made soon and one criterion would be that it be compatible to surrounding area.

Kimber Gabryszak noted that the Prison is looking at population centers within a certain radius.

Jarred Henline noted it's hard to be confident when we don't have more specific village plans. That is not to say he is against the developer or his plans.

Nathan Shipp said the plan make sure certain things are vested. They are obligated to a certain number of units and a certain number of acres. He can't change the neighborhood pods from the way they are specified in the current plan. These units will be distributed in these areas only. They have been in contact with the district. The district thinks it premature at this point; it will wait until the project is approved. They also contacted the Church and at this point in time they are no longer purchasing new sites but at this time they are finishing projects first and redistributing.

Jarred Henline said it sounds like they may want to move this project along for other reasons.

Jared Henline was excused for the remainder of the meeting.

Sandra Steele added language in conditions about side yard fencing between homes. She asked about him making things more dense.

Nathan Shipp noted that he could not make things more dense, they are limited on the units given tonight.

Jeremy Lapin thinks the language could be changed to say Equivalent Residential Units, not just residential units. So churches and schools don't increase density.

Kimber Gabryszak said we would need a very clear definition of what an ERU is. If it's determined that a church or school would impact density than they could limit it.

Sandra Steele is concerned that there have been no minimum frontages given. Establishing minimum frontages may result in a loss of units if you stick to city standards. She would like to see a condition that he established some minimum frontages.

Nathan Shipp asked if they could establish that at the time of village plans.

Kimber Gabryszak and Sandra were fine with that.

Sandra Steele said he needs 24 ft. for maneuvering in side access garages. She wanted the parking to be a condition. She asked if the city had signed off on the parks.

Jeremy Lapin said that it is not in the plan on who takes over the parks; City Council would be discussing that. Also City Council would need to agree on impact fees and credits.

Sandra Steele asked does city reimburse developer for costs of improvements.

Jeremy Lapin if the city is collecting fees they can't collect he fees twice. It depends if the facility is required by the city plans.

Kevin Thurman said with impact fee law you can't add a facility that serves one community, they would need to tweak the language. They would wait until City Council to address.

Sandra Steele noted open space code and that he has defined parkways as open space

Nathan Shipp said they designed it as part of the community but they are not counting it as part of their 30%

Sandra Steele thinks the signs are beautiful but she thinks they are too tall.

Nathan Shipp he wants people to know that when they pass those gates they have entered that community.

Kimber Gabryszak said if they approve the plan tonight are they approving the sign height. If they create a standard in their plan that is different than our code and it is approved than they are not held to our code.

Kevin Thurman noted that they are not approving this tonight they are making a recommendation, it could be made as a condition.

Sandra Steele feels it is too high, when other signs in the city are held to 20ft. She thinks that a builder's sign should be limited to being up for only 90 days after building is done. She noted a mistake in the traffic report. She asked about sensitive lands and disturbance.

Nathan Shipp noted that with MVC and the natural drainage there was no way to access the other area without disturbing a portion of it.

Jeremy Lapin said he would work more with it and there was really no other way or option other than to have some equipment on site to deal with that material. It is only one spot not continuous slopes.

Sandra Steele had more errors she suggested get fixed. She thinks notes need to be placed on the plats to note the high noise and vibrations area in proximity to Camp Williams.

Nathan Shipp said they have met with the Colonel at Camp Williams and they are aware of the impacts and will continue to work with him.

Sandra Steele had some suggested conditions. Minimum lot frontages shall be established prior to approval of village plans, side access garages shall provide 24 ft. for maneuvering. Parkways as defined by the community plan shall not be included in required open space. The way finding signs for different home builders shall be removed within 90 days of the last home of a particular plat being sold. That way finding signs shall not be higher than 20 ft. and shall comply with 19.18.09 development information signs. And plats within ½ mile of camp Williams shall have a noted that states that it is a high noise and vibration area due to training at Camp Williams. Monument signs shall not be higher than 20 ft.

Kimber Gabryszak noted that on residential monuments entry signs there is not maximum height in our code, it shall just match surrounding features.

Hayden Williamson echoed Commissioner Henline's concerns about things that we are being asked to make a decision on that will make a big impact on the community and it's only a draft plan, there are a lot of detail that impacts the community that won't be coming until later. But he understands that they need to be able to start making some plans. He wondered if it would be possible to say we are ok with this but it doesn't take place until approval of village plans

Kimber Gabryszak said they can submit a village plan concurrently with a community plans. A conditional approval is possible so developer has some reliance but it's not finalized signed document. It would be up to Council to make it a conditional rezone.

Nathan Shipp said to do that it would prohibit them from moving forward. They are going to bring plans forward based on market plans at the time they move forward. They will be looking at about 5 village plans coming forward in the course of the project.

Hayden Williamson thinks that they could put forward a condition and move it to ERU's.

Kevin Thurman you are making a decision based on conditions, they are all tied to the rezone, and if they are not complied with than it goes away. It needs to be a legitimate concern furthering the general welfare.

Kirk Wilkins asked what the current right the applicant had, and what Commission had the ability to choose with regard to high density, if it is rejected how it affects the prison proposal.

Kimber Gabryszak said they have the right to develop under the R3 zone. They had the ability to choose about the density and it may impact the prison decision.

Kevin Thurman said one of the factors of the prison decision was if it was compatible with surrounding area. Making a decision about the density impacts the MVC and the city wants it preserved at this point.

Kimber Gabryszak This is the type of decision that staff has been working on to preserve the MVC.

Kirk Wilkins asked if there was another alternative in a way that would maintain the r3 that does not have the high density.

Kevin Thurman said the developers are asking these things to preserve the MVC and they could maybe do a few changes but it's based on market conditions.

Kirk Wilkins is there a way to remove the high density to comply with the wants of the people and still preserve the corridor

Nathan Shipp replied that it gets complicated, they are holding themselves to the 30% open space standard. If they reduced density through consolidating and making some true R3 zones it would reduce open space. They have tried to make up some of the impact that MVC has had on them. He doesn't think that against EM asphalt plant and industrial things to put the larger lots doesn't make sense. He is trying to consolidate the large density in that one spot. He doesn't think to get rid of it will make a better project.

Kirk Wilkins asked about water plans for this project.

Jeremy Lapin replied they are responsible to making sure their needs are met at the time it's recorded. They don't reserve the capacity. This doesn't commit us or them right now.

Kara North noted that had village plans been here it might have eased some concerns. They would look at the village plans close to make sure they were meeting the needs and concerns and thinks many conditions brought up would be better served then. She urged them to continue to work with the School District. She likes the big monument signs but doesn't know if they will get approval from everyone. What she

understood from Kimber Gabryszak was that it could have its own special signage when approved as part of the community plan.

Jeff Cochran did not have a lot of additional questions, most have been answered. He did ask about the density being preserved with the MVC.

Nathan Shipp said he couldn't preserve the corridor without the smaller density. At this time they are not being compensated for the loss of the density, they have worked on it with the city and UDOT and if the density goes away than they cannot say they can preserve the corridor.

Jeff Cochran thanked him for his community plan. He doesn't know if the prison is coming or not and does not think that this has to be approved tonight. The prison can see it's ready and developer wants to move forward. He doesn't know enough about the Monument signs to make that decision. He knows the residents are concerned with higher densities, he thinks some higher density is needed in the city. But he is aware that this doubles the amount of high density in the north area of the city. He acknowledges that it is a legislative decision of City Council. He thinks the high density should be distributed more throughout the city. He thinks it's the developer's job to work with UDOT to get the fair market valued he thinks condition C should be removed. He thinks the MVC is a great opportunity for the development with being able to bring traffic to the neighborhoods. Take advantage of a frontage road. He thinks the road to the north should not take the traffic through Harvest Hills it goes past two churches and a main park and a school and it's not the right fit. He appreciates the work done and the Planned Community. He doesn't think what is presented tonight is consistent to their general plan. He is not opposed to high density but doesn't think this is the right area clustered together.

Sandra Steele noted that there were plans for more high density coming to the south area of the city.

Kara North had a question, were we already over the percentages given in Prop. 6?

Kimber Gabryszak said they hadn't updated it lately so she wasn't aware what the exact status was. If that housing isn't built for 10 years than there is unknown, they only know the situation of things being built to date. It's a difficult discussion because it will be different in a few years.

Kevin Thurman thinks a good approach would be to look at those percentages and see if they are being exceeded in this project. Also keeping in mind there are bigger interests here and is it worth preserving MVC at this time for the tradeoff.

Kara North wanted a quick run of thoughts on monument height.

Sandra Steele wanted to cap it.

Hayden Williamson would be in favor or letting developer do it.

Jeff Cochran was closer to Sandra Steele's thoughts.

Kirk Wilkins wanted to see more conformity with city standards.

Nathan Shipp wanted the opportunity to come back with village plans and more of a plan for the monuments. So they can see more of the details.

Kimber said they could remove that page and put a condition that entry signage standards shall be reviewed as part of the village plan containing the entrance to the development.

Hayden Williamson wanted to add a condition that we limit units to ERU's and not just residential units.

Suggested verbiage: shall be defined as based on ERU's as per city water utility ordinance, and not residential unit's.

Kimber Gabryszak asked that we add those requirements that were added in the presentation: 7. Second access requirements shall be met and addressed through phasing so that no more than 50 lots may be constructed on any road until a second access is provided. 8. Where side setbacks of five feet or less are utilized no side yard fencing between homes shall be permitted.

Kevin Thurman reminded Commissioners that City Council would need to weigh if it was worth the change in zoning for the benefits it may bring.

Motion by Kara North Based upon the information and discussion tonight I move to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the amendment to the Riverbend MDA, increasing the maximum density from 58 units to 62 units, with the following findings and conditions contained in the staff report. Seconded by Sandra Steele. Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, , Kirk Wilkins, Kara North. Nay: Jeffrey Cochran. Motion passed 4 - 1.

Motion by Kara North to forward a positive recommendation to City Council for the Wildflower Community Plan with the findings and conditions contained within the report as well as the following conditions: that the minimum lot frontages shall be established prior to approval of the village plan; that no side yard fencing between homes with 5' setbacks or less shall be allowed; side access garages shall provide 24' for maneuvering; parkways as defined by the community plan shall not be included in required open space; the way findings signs for different home builders shall be removed within 90 days of the last home in that particular plat being sold; the way finding signs shall be no higher than 20 feet and shall comply with 19.18.09 including off premise directional sign and on premise directional signs; also plats within ½ mile of Camp Williams shall have recorded on their plats information alerting to the purchaser that this area has high noise and high vibrations due to periodic training at Camp Williams; and that density shall be defined based on ERU's as per the City Water and Utility ordinance, not residential units; and that entry and monuments signage standards shall be reviewed as part of the village plans with respect to the entrance of that development; 7. Second access requirements shall be met and addressed through phasing so that no more than 50 lots may be constructed on any road until a second access is provided. (8. Where side setbacks of five feet or less are utilized no side yard fencing between homes shall be permitted.) With the request that applicant and city staff work to provide densities percentages according to the Community plan to the City Council. Seconded by Sandra Steele.

Kimber Gabryszak noted a condition missed - **Off street guest parking shall be provided for the multifamily products and any products with less than 20' driveway at the rate of .25 spaces per unit.**

Kara North accepted that condition.

Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Kirk Wilkins, Kara North. Nay: Jeffrey Cochran . Motion passed 4-1.

7. Approval of Reports of Action.

Kimber Gabryszak had a Report for Riverbend, she reviewed with Planning Commission.

Motion by Hayden Williamson to approve the Report of Action for Riverbend Townhomes. Seconded by Kirk Wilkins. Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Jeffrey Cochran, Kirk Wilkins, Kara North, Jarred Henline. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Hayden Williamson to approve the Report of Action for Wildflower. Second by Sadra Steele. Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Jeffrey Cochran, Kirk Wilkins, Kara North, Jarred Henline. Motion passed unanimously.

8. Approval of Minutes:

1. October 23, 2014.

Motion by Kara North to approve the Minutes of October 23rd, 2014 with the changes sent to the Recorder by Sandra Steele to be made. Seconded by Sandra Steele. Aye: Sandra Steele, Hayden Williamson, Jeffrey Cochran, Kirk Wilkins, Kara North, Jarred Henline. Motion passed unanimously.

9. Commission Comments. – None at this time.

10. Director's Report.

Kimber Gabryszak - had a quick update of items upcoming for meetings. Eric Reese has resigned from Planning Commission as he is moving.

Meeting adjourned without objection by Jeff Cochran

Adjourn 11:03 p.m.

December 11, 2014
Date of Approval

Lori Yates
Lori Yates, City Recorder

