



EAGLE MOUNTAIN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

May 11, 2021, 5:30 p.m.
Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers
1650 East Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, Utah 84005

5:30 P.M. – Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Work Session

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeremy Bergener, Matthew Everett, Christopher Pengra, and Brett Wright. Commissioner Erin Wells was excused.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Steve Mumford, Assistant City Administrator/Community Development Director; Tayler Jensen, Senior Planner; Jessa Porter, Planner; and Elizabeth Fewkes, Recording Secretary.

Commissioner Wright called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. Discussion Items

1.A. DISCUSSION – Residential Zone Livestock Requirements

Senior Planner Tayler Jensen presented the item. The City Council requested staff review the residential zone livestock requirements regarding the allowance on the number of horses. Staff has reviewed the livestock quantity restrictions in other Utah County communities and proposed a potential amendment based upon the research. The current standards prohibit horses on less than an acre lot, unless the Equine Overlay zone has been approved, which allows two horses on a half-acre lot. Four horses are permitted on a one-to-three-acre lot and 12 horses on lots above three acres. A fenced area of 22,000 square feet is required per animal for one to four horses and a setback of 50 feet from the residence or other periodically inhabited buildings. Mr. Jensen reviewed horse requirements for other cities in Utah County. The proposed amendment allows 2 horses per half-acre on lots above one acre. A footnote would be added to state “two horses are allowed if zoned with the Equine Overlay zone in accordance with EMMC 17.52.” Staff also recommends that language be added to clarify how combinations of animal types impact the total allowance. Similar to Bluffdale’s “Combinations of animals are permitted such that the ratio of animals kept does not surpass the total permitted. For example, one horse and one cow would be permitted, but one pig and five sheep would not be permitted.” The number referenced would be revised to reflect the City’s correct count.

Mr. Jensen stated that when the current standards were reviewed, a total limit of animals was discussed but excluded. However, the fencing area per animal requirement limits the total number of animals. Commissioner Everett requested further research regarding the cumulative impacts of the proposed standards.

Commissioner Bergener encouraged residents with concerns regarding the standards to continue to share their feedback with the City. Although the fencing square footage per animal area regulates

animal limits, he concurred it would be wise to consider a cumulative impact to set additional limitations accordingly.

Commissioner Wright advocated for protecting animal rights; however, residents have shared concerns that need to be addressed. He expressed concern regarding the total number of animals allowed under the standards. He cited a footnote to Table 6.10.090, "Exceptions to these standards must be presented by the property owner through an alternative animal management plan to be heard by the planning commission. Approval of the plan by the commission shall be considered a conditional use and shall be subject to all required conditions. If an approved plan is violated or causes situations that become a nuisance to adjoining property owners, the conditional use shall be subject to revocation by the code enforcement or animal control officer." The current exemption option allows the standards to be applied with equity and fairness as residents with lot sizes slightly below the standards or greater than the lot sizes contemplated in the table may request additional animals while permitting increased regulations and oversight of exceptions to the standards through conditional use permits. Due to the ability for residents to apply for a conditional use permit, he feels the current standards are sufficient and an amendment is unnecessary.

Commissioner Everett said he was willing to consider amending the standards to be based upon horses per half-acre rather than acreage ranges with the addition of consideration of the total number of permitted animals. Commissioner Wright countered that should the standards be adjusted to regulate the number of horses per half-acre, similar standards should be applied for other large animals such as buffalo, cattle, and donkeys. Mr. Jensen stated that some cities use a point system, assigning each animal type a point value and set limitations on the total number of points per acre.

Mr. Jensen explained his research indicated that a horse requires two to ten acres to graze per animal; however if the animal is provided food, the recommendation is 4,500 square feet per animal. The current standards exceed those recommendations.

Commissioner Wright inquired regarding the number of residents requesting a change to the standards to determine if it would be appropriate to address the cases with conditional use permits or if the desire and need were sufficient to justify a change to Municipal Code.

Commissioner Bergener supported the point system explained by Mr. Jensen as a mechanism to self-regulate concerns regarding the maximum number of animals permitted per acre. He concurred with Commissioner Wright's assessment that as a mechanism for an exemption exists; only the cumulative issues in the existing standards need to be resolved.

Commissioner Everett stated that he is not opposed to the amendment as contemplated but agrees the maximum number of animals should be considered. If a point system were to be implemented, he would prefer it to be based upon animal size rather than animal species to avoid being overly prescriptive or overlooking a type of animal.

Discussion ensued considering the standard to use to designate animals as small, medium, and large category including potentially using veterinarian definitions.

Legislative Update

The Planning Commission discussed the recent Legislative session.

Mr. Jensen presented State legislative changes that impact the Planning Commission. HB 409 requires Planning Commissioners to complete four hours of annual training including one hour on general powers and duties of the Land Use and Development Management Act (LUDMA), one hour from attending 12 Planning Commission meetings, and two additional hours focused on land use through conferences, seminars, or in-house training. New Commissioners must complete the LUDMA training prior to participating in any meeting.

HB 98 was vetoed; however, it is expected to pass during the upcoming special session. HB 98 Local Building Regulations prohibits building design regulations for single-family, duplex, and townhome units with the following exceptions:

- Historical districts that were established before January 1, 2021. Eagle Mountain City does not have any established historical districts.
- Floodplains set by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. No floodplains have been identified in the City.
- State Wildland Urban Interface requirement.
- Development agreements that were entered into that contain design standards.
- Residential areas developed before 1950. The City does not have any qualifying areas.
- Standards regulating water-efficient landscaping in rear yards.
- Standards regulating defective cladding materials.
- Planned Unit Developments or Overlay Zone granted for increased density or other benefits not available under the zone.
- Standards requiring rear entry garages for townhomes.
- Removing design elements is no longer a menu option that can be used to meet moderate-income housing plan strategies found in SB 34.

HB 82 permits internal accessory dwelling units in all residential zones and prohibits homeowner's associations from restricting internal accessory dwelling units. The City already allows internal accessory dwelling units.

The former Tier Based system would have allowed the City to regulate duplexes, townhomes, and other multifamily developments. Staff has been working on multifamily design standards updates that can still be presented as recommended design standards and can focus the update on condo/apartment design standards.

Mr. Jensen explained the City can enforce standards in existing master development agreements (MDAs). Design standards in future MDAs will likely be a result of benefits granted to the developer in exchange for agreeing to the design standards. Design regulation options include granting additional density in exchange for complying with design standards, reducing park and/or parking requirements for complying with design standards, accelerating the approval process for following design standards, or drafting design guidelines as encouraged recommendations for development. Potential changes to Municipal Code standards include regulating stories, building locations, varied roof planes, horizontal and vertical articulation, road layout/hierarchy, parking

location distribution through developments, pedestrian and auto connections to neighboring developments, garage locations and styles, and shared driveways.

Discussion ensued regarding potential amendments to implement the State requirements.

Commissioner Wright adjourned the work session at 6:33 p.m.

6:30 P.M. – Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Policy Session

Commissioner Wright called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Assistant City Administrator/Community Development Director Steve Mumford led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes

4.A. April 13, 2021, Planning Commission Minutes

MOTION: *Commissioner Bergener moved to approve the April 13, 2021 minutes. Commissioner Everett seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Jeremy Bergener, Matthew Everett, and Brett Wright. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

5. Status Report

Mr. Mumford reviewed the planning items discussed and voted upon at the May 4, 2021 City Council meeting.

6. Action and Advisory Items

6.A. PUBLIC HEARING – A to Z Building Blocks (Site Plan)

This item was removed from the agenda at the request of the applicant.

6.B. PUBLIC HEARING – Hidden Hollow Phase C (Preliminary Plat & Site Plan)

Mr. Mumford presented the item. The Planning Commission discussed and held a public hearing on January 12, 2021 and voted 4 to 0 to table the item to a future meeting with direction to the applicant to work with staff to bring the application into compliance with Municipal Code. The applicant met with the Planning Commission on February 9, 2021 and the City Council in March

to obtain feedback mainly related to density vesting. After receiving feedback from the Planning Commission and Council, the applicant agreed to return to the Planning Commission with a site plan and preliminary plat responding to the provided feedback.

The updated proposal includes the same number of units with 86 townhomes and 48 single-family units for a total of 134 units. The townhome area has been redesigned and minor adjustments were made to the lots. The large gravel trailhead parking lot was added within the utility corridor as an amenity. The City is working with an appraiser to receive an updated appraisal of the 1.5-acre, City-owned property being considered as a part of the project.

The property was zoned Village Core as a part of The Ranches Master Development Plan and Agreement (MDA/MDP) and designated with 20-acres of commercial and 1,002 residential units. The Village Core allowed for multifamily uses but did not provide for a specific density associated with those uses, because the density was established through the Ranches MDA which expired in March 2018. The preliminary plat for Hidden Valley North was approved on May 9, 2006. Preliminary plats and site plans were approved that replaced portions of the 2006 plat including Hidden Hollow Elementary School which opened in 2006, Hidden Hollow Phase A Preliminary Plat for 34 single-family lots approved November 18, 2014, Hidden Hollow Phase B Preliminary Plat and Site Plan for 17 single-family lots and 54 townhomes approved September 4, 2018, and Juniper Springs Preliminary Plat for 84 townhomes approved September 18, 2018, resulting in a total of 51 single-family lots, 138 townhomes, and one elementary school.

Phase C of Hidden Valley North included 300 condominiums and 60 townhomes. The applicant has chosen to reduce the density by over 60% and is proposing a total of 134 lots consisting of 48 single-family lots and 86 townhomes. Conceptual discussions were held concerning amenities in Phase C at the Phase B meetings. The amenity worksheet and concept portion of Phase C was included in the meeting documents. No approval was given to Phase C at the time because it was not a part of the site plan or preliminary plat for Phase B.

Commissioner Pengra joined the meeting at 6:53 p.m.

Due to topography, the applicant has worked with staff to redirect a future extension of a 94-foot-wide collector road to avoid steep terrain resulting in a 1.5-acre property between the road, hillside, and Phase C development. The applicant has requested to buy the property and add it to the plat for Phase C. The City Council will need to approve an agreement to sell the property in addition to the project's approval. Road considerations include improving a portion of Hidden Valley Parkway and grading the remainder of the right-of-way for the future expansion, ensuring drainage flow is directed to the existing drainage channel leading to the detention area, and reducing the future cost to the City of grading for the expansion.

The project is required to have 3.07 acres of improved open space and 307 amenity points. The proposal includes approximately 3.1 acres of improved open space: 2.75 acres within the utility corridor that will be dedicated to the City and improved with a large gravel trailhead parking lot, and an additional 35 plus acres of hillside open space to be dedicated to the City that includes trails to the north, northwest, and south of this project. Upon completion of this last phase, the developer will have provided a 20-stall, paved parking area, a 60-stall gravel parking area with a restroom

and trailhead signs, and a 2.5-acre gravel parking area that provides approximately 66 parking stalls and 13 larger trailer stalls. For amenities, the Phase C proposal includes a lighted pickleball court, a playground, a pavilion, trees, benches, and trails. The pickleball court, playground, and park amenities will be available for the townhomes and the homes in both Phase B and Phase C. EMMC 17.25.050(L) requires all multifamily developments to include a clubhouse and swimming pool. Following the City Council's feedback, the applicant is now proposing a clubhouse and pool that comply with the requirements. This amenity will be available to all 140 townhome residents in both Phase B and Phase C. EMMC 17.55.120(C) requires two stalls per townhome unit not in a tandem configuration, plus one guest parking space per three dwelling units. The project is required to have 29 stalls and the applicant has provided 34 stalls.

A slope analysis map was provided with the previous submittal showing that the steepest lots averaged 17.5% slope. The developer will be constructing a section of mountain bike trail behind the single-family lots, to replace the trail that will be removed by the lots, and will be installing a cutoff ditch along the trail directing the water to the west where the existing drainage is located. The applicant designed these townhome units in 2018 for the Phase B project, desiring to and relying on being able to construct the same units in Phase C as were approved in Phase B. The applicant proposes a gray, faux wood-grain composite fence similar to fencing used in other areas of the City.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Hidden Hollow Phase C preliminary plat and site plan with the following conditions:

1. This project is contingent upon the sale/purchase of the 1.5-acres of City property at fair market value, based upon a new appraisal. The applicant shall be reimbursed the cost of the large gravel parking lot, once completed;
2. The garage sizes shall comply with EMMC 17.25.050 (C);
3. No blasting shall be permitted within Phase C development;
4. The cluster mailboxes shall be located adjacent to the park, near the parking stalls;
5. The 30 plus acres of open space near the project shall be dedicated to the City with the first recorded plat for this project;
6. Retaining walls shall be stepped to not exceed five feet high and shall include at least five horizontal feet between walls;
7. The developer shall grade and prepare the entire Hidden Valley Parkway right-of-way for future expansion, including providing a method to direct the stormwater to the existing retention basin;
8. Additional architectural detailing shall be provided on the townhomes in order to comply with EMMC 17.72.040 (E)(2); and
9. The applicant shall obtain approval from Kern River Gas, and provide it to the City, and coordinate with them during construction of the gravel parking lot within the utility corridor.

Mr. Mumford clarified that Municipal Code standards exclude a specific height for retaining walls; however, staff has worked with developers at the direction of the City Council to limit retaining walls to five feet high. Also obtaining approval from Rocky Mountain Power for the gravel parking lot located within the utility corridor was inadvertently excluded from the staff recommendations and should also be included as a condition of approval.

Commissioner Wright expressed concern regarding the frontage width of several of the lots, side elevations not meeting the mixed materials requirements, the prominence of the front-loaded garages, and the 40-foot-wide private roads.

Mr. Mumford stated lots 94 and 109 through 116 have frontages below the 58-foot requirement; however, the RC zone standards permit a 20-foot frontage for homes in a cul-de-sac or circle.

Applicant representative Ryan Bybee confirmed that he understood and had no concerns with the staff recommendations. During the approval of Phase B, they added an additional material to the side elevations. The project engineer designed the private roads and determined the widths.

Commissioner Wright opened the public hearing at 7:16 p.m.

Evan Lund submitted the following public comment, "Why are we building so many town homes? Do we want a transient community? Last question Can we build more single family homes? Last of all if there are town homes behind my home can the builder please install a fence between the single family homes. I oppose all the town home and condo building that is to many people in the location."

Commissioner Wright closed the public hearing at 7:17 p.m.

Mr. Bybee explained the townhomes in this development only abut single-family homes in the development that are not yet built. He said they are required to install fencing along the arterial roadways, and he is willing to consider but not commit to installing fencing between the single-family and townhomes in Phase C.

Commissioner Pengra said in his opinion the lots with shorter frontage widths qualify for meeting the circle frontage width reduction.

Commissioner Wright feels the lot frontages are a gray area. He is concerned with the road widths creating parking issues in the densest portion of the development and would prefer for the streets to be 53-foot public roads.

Commissioner Everett thanked the applicant for providing wider garages as required in current standards. He said he was disturbed with the line from the staff report in the packet materials "the feedback from the City Council, however, was that they prefer front-loaded garages." He believes the City should either enforce Municipal Code or amend the standards. He cited EMMC 17.72.030(C) "Multifamily Parking/Garages. Garages and parking areas should be placed to the rear of buildings, accessed by a service drive. Service drives must meet all fire access requirements found in the fire code, or as required by the fire marshal. Units accessed via rear service drive shall have a man door on the garage side of the unit, and be addressed off the service drive. If garages are placed on the front facade, they *shall* be staggered and set back so as to minimize their appearance from the street. Garages shall *never* dominate the street-facing facade of a building." (*Emphasis added.*) In his opinion, the elevations presented do not meet the garage standard requirements. Individual opinion regarding Municipal Code is irrelevant. The purview of the

Planning Commission is to apply the standards as written. For those reasons, he will vote against the proposal and beseeched the other Commissioners to likewise vote against the item.

Commissioner Wright cited EMMC 17.72.040(H) "Multifamily Garage Doors. Garage doors shall not be the most prominent or visible feature on a building. They shall be accessed from the side or rear, or set back from the front facade. If garages are visible from the street, white doors are discouraged. Decorative doors are encouraged." Based upon his interpretation of this section of Municipal Code, front-loaded garages are permitted on townhomes, if they adhere to these specifications.

Commissioner Everett concurred that the standards allow a front-loaded product in some circumstances. He noted that EMMC 17.72.030 "garages and parking areas should be placed to the rear of buildings" and "if garages are placed on the front facade, they shall be staggered and set back." The "staggered" and "set back" requirements are similar to the requirements in EMMC 17.72.040(H). Although the garage doors proposed are not white, the front doors are set back farther than the garages and thus in his assessment are not compliant with the standards to permit front-loaded garages.

Discussion ensued regarding concerns with the existing Municipal Code standards regarding rear-loaded garages for multifamily units. The Commission determined the standards should be reviewed and addressed.

Mr. Mumford clarified that EMMC Table 17.60.170(b) requires a 20-foot landscaped area with trees and a wall between multifamily and single-family areas. Some areas in the City back up to common open space areas that exclude the wall. This project is unique because the townhomes and single-family areas are combined into one neighborhood. The only area that would be an issue would be lots 129 through 134.

Commissioner Wright recommended requiring an alternative street standard for the proposed 40-foot private streets.

MOTION: *Commissioner Pengra moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the preliminary plat and site plan for Hidden Hollow Phase C with the following conditions:*

- 1. This project is contingent upon the sale/purchase of the 1.5-acres of City property at fair market value, based upon a new appraisal. The applicant shall be reimbursed the cost of the large gravel parking lot, once completed;*
- 2. The garage sizes shall comply with EMMC 17.25.050 (C);*
- 3. No blasting shall be permitted within the Phase C development;*
- 4. The cluster mailboxes shall be located adjacent to the park, near the parking stalls;*
- 5. The 35 plus acres of open space near the project shall be dedicated to the City with the first recorded plat in this project;*
- 6. Retaining walls shall be stepped to not exceed 5-feet high and shall include at least five horizontal feet between walls*

7. *The developer shall grade and prepare the entire Hidden Valley Parkway right-of-way for future expansion, including providing a method to direct the stormwater to the existing retention basin;*
8. *Additional architectural detailing shall be provided on the townhomes in order to comply with EMMC 17.72.040 (E)(2);*
9. *The applicant shall obtain approval from Kern River Gas and Rocky Mountain Power, and provide it to the City, and coordinate with them during construction of the gravel parking lot within the utility corridor; and*
10. *The applicant shall install a six-foot privacy fence between the townhome products and lots 129 through 134.*

Commissioner Wright stated that he is unable to support the proposed motion due to 40-foot private streets not being contemplated in Municipal Code standards. He feels it would be appropriate to recommend 53-foot public streets. Private streets in other areas of the City have caused traffic flow concerns, especially if the road is used for through-traffic connections to other roadways.

Commissioner Pengra expressed concern that the suggestion would have unforeseen consequences and would likely result in a reduction of the garage sizes. He is less concerned with the layout of this project due to the lack of street parking.

Mr. Mumford verified the Fire Marshal has reviewed the proposal and did not have concerns with the private roadways' 40-foot width. All the approved townhome projects within the City contain private streets and this is common in other cities as well; however, Municipal Code standards have not been created to govern private street widths.

Commissioner Bergener seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Jeremy Bergener and Christopher Pengra. Those voting nay: Matthew Everett and Brett Wright. The motion failed with a vote of 2:2.

MOTION: *Commissioner Everett moved to recommend denial to the City Council of the preliminary plat and site plan for Hidden Hollow Phase C as it does not comply with EMMC 17.72.030 and 17.72.040. Motion failed for lack of a second.*

MOTION: *Commissioner Wright moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the preliminary plat and site plan for Hidden Hollow Phase C with the following conditions:*

1. *This project is contingent upon the sale/purchase of the 1.5-acres of City property at fair market value, based upon a new appraisal. The applicant shall be reimbursed the cost of the large gravel parking lot, once completed;*
2. *The garage sizes shall comply with EMMC 17.25.050 (C);*
3. *No blasting shall be permitted within this Phase C development;*

- 4. The cluster mailboxes shall be located adjacent to the park, near the parking stalls;**
 - 5. The 35 plus acres of open space near the project shall be dedicated to the City with the first recorded plat in this project;**
 - 6. Retaining walls shall be stepped to not exceed 5-feet high and shall include at least five horizontal feet between walls**
 - 7. The developer shall grade and prepare the entire Hidden Valley Parkway right-of-way for future expansion, including providing a method to direct the stormwater to the existing retention basin;**
 - 8. Additional architectural detailing shall be provided on the townhomes in order to comply with EMMC 17.72.040 (E)(2);**
 - 9. The applicant shall obtain approval from Kern River Gas and Rocky Mountain Power, and provide it to the City, and coordinate with them during construction of the gravel parking lot within the utility corridor;**
 - 10. The applicant shall install a six-foot privacy fence between the townhome products and lots 129 through 134; and**
 - 11. The private roads shall be converted to 53-foot public rights-of-way.**
- Commissioner Pengra seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Jeremy Bergener, Christopher Pengra, and Brett Wright. Those voting nay: Matthew Everett. The motion carried with a vote of 3:1.**

Commissioner Everett clarified that his dissent was due to the application not complying with his interpretation of EMMC 17.72.030 and 17.72.040.

Commissioner Pengra stated that he respects and agrees with Commissioner Everett's opinion. He stated that in the future, he would also vote against applications not compliant with the multifamily garage standards and requested for staff to address the sections of Municipal Code with issues. He stated that he is in favor of allowing a front-loaded product.

Commissioner Wright concurred with Commissioners Everett and Pengra. He requested for staff to prepare an amendment and supported permitting a front-loaded product.

6.C. White Hills Country Estates Lot Split (Concept Plan)

Planner Jessa Porter presented the item. This concept plan is for a potential lot split of about 5.5 acres located west of Wride Memorial Highway on Stagecoach Drive. The lot split will create one lot of about 2.3 acres and a second lot of about 3.16 acres. The property was annexed into the City as a part of the Pole Canyon Development area in 2010. While the parcel is located in the Pole Canyon area, the parcel is not a part nor subject to the Pole Canyon MDA.

In the General Plan, the area is identified as Agricultural Rural Density Two, which has a range of half to 2.5 acre lots. Per EMMC 17.25.20 and 17.60.160, possible zoning districts include RD1 with a minimum lot size of one acre and RD2 with a minimum lot size of a half-acre. Staff recommends the applicant consider applying to rezone to RD1 or RD2 based on the General Plan land use designation. The applicant is advised to follow the process and application for a recorded

plat amendment and rezone request. Both lots would have direct frontage and access onto the existing Stagecoach Drive. The concept plan was reviewed at the April 13, 2021 Development Review Committee meeting with feedback regarding utility stubs, particularly water, that will need to be provided to the new lot.

The Commission and staff recommended for the applicant to apply for a General Plan and zone amendment simultaneously.

Commissioners Wright, Bergener, and Everett stated they are likely to support a rezone to allow the division of the property.

6.D. PUBLIC HEARING – Pole Canyon NPA-17 (Master Development Plan, Rezone, General Plan Amendment, Preliminary Plat)

This item was removed from the agenda at the request of the applicant.

6.E. PUBLIC HEARING – Community Mailboxes (Development Code Amendment)

Mr. Jensen presented the item. The United States Postal Service (USPS) requires community mailboxes for all new residential developments. Municipal Code only requires locations to be approved by the USPS resulting in residents impeding traffic with their vehicles due to stopping at the mailbox location. The purpose of the amendment is to guide community mailbox placement to meet USPS requirements, provide mailboxes within close walking distance of all units, and prevent the blocking of travel lanes.

Proposed changes to Municipal Code adding 16.35.150 Community Mailboxes:

- A. General Requirements. Community mailboxes are typically required for all new residential developments. Community mailboxes may be located along special mailbox pullouts or in community open spaces. Any new Community Mailbox must be in compliance with the standards in this chapter. Community mailbox locations shall be approved by the Eagle Mountain Community Development Director, his or her designee, and the US Postal Service.
- B. Community Mailbox Spacing Standards. All homes shall be located within one-quarter of a mile (¼ mile) (1,320 Feet), measured along normal walking paths/routes. (Sidewalks, Pedestrian Paths, and trails)
- C. Community Mailbox Locations. Community mailboxes shall be located:
 - a. Adjacent to a local street modified with a mailbox pullout in accordance with this title.
 - b. Adjacent to a private street with special mailbox pullout in compliance with this title; or
 - c. In a community open space
 - i. Community open space mailboxes shall provide at least 4 off-street parking stalls adjacent to the mailbox.
 - ii. Community Open Space mailboxes shall be located adjacent to a public or private ROW.
- D. Mailbox pullout design standards

- a. Local ROW pullouts.
 - i. Community mailboxes are to be placed adjacent to a local street, the street shall utilize the modified local street with mailbox pullout, as defined in this title, for either seventy-eight feet (78') or one hundred and four feet (104') (3 or 4 Parallel parking spots). Mailbox shall be located near the center point of the pullout adjacent to the right of way, if located on private property a public access easement shall be granted over the mailbox location.
 - ii. Modified mailbox pullout streets shall replace the 4' emergency lane and 5' parkstrip with additional pavement to serve as a pullout/parallel parking location.
 - iii. Modified "mountable" curb and gutter shall be continued in line with curb and gutter on either side of the modified ROW, with parking lane being above the street level.
- b. Private road mailbox pullouts.
 - i. Shall include an additional nine feet (9') of pavement adjacent to the drive aisle for a minimum of seventy-eight feet (78') to serve as a Mailbox pullout.
- c. All mailbox pullout parking spots shall be striped.
- d. All Mailbox parking spots shall be signed as 5-minute parking zones, unless located inside a community open space.

Staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend approval of the proposed amendments to EMMC 16.35 to the City Council as presented or with changes as agreed upon at the meeting.

Commissioner Pengra inquired regarding mailbox design standards. Mr. Jensen explained that amendments to the design standards are on hold until the State legislative changes are implemented and will be addressed in the future.

Commissioner Wright requested to amend the proposed verbiage to reflect the enumeration style found in current Municipal Code standards and for coloration to be added to the right-of-way diagram. He inquired if the mailboxes should be allowed to be located on private streets.

Mr. Jensen said that as most multifamily developments include private roads, requiring the community mailbox to be located on a public street could result in the mailboxes being located a significant distance from the homes.

Commissioner Wright opened the public hearing at 8:16 p.m. No comments were submitted to the City Recorder's Office and no public was in attendance to make comment. As there were no comments, Commissioner Wright closed the hearing.

MOTION: *Commissioner Bergener moved to recommend approval to the City Council of an amendment to Eagle Mountain Municipal Code Chapter 16.35 Community Mailboxes with the following conditions:*

- 1. The enumeration of the proposed chapter shall be amended to match the lettering and numbering style of other Municipal Code chapters; and*

2. Coloration shall be added to the right-of-way diagram included in the chapter.

Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Jeremy Bergener, Matthew Everett, Christopher Pengra, and Brett Wright. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

7. Discussion Items

Commissioner Wright requested for rear-loaded garages and mailbox design standards to be reviewed by staff and included on the agenda of a future meeting.

Commissioner Pengra suggested discussing prohibiting private roads due to on-street parking and traffic flow concerns. Commissioner Wright concurred and stated that other cities have prohibited private streets in multifamily developments.

Mr. Mumford explained that staff had delayed an amendment regarding rear-loading garages to ensure the standards are compliant with State requirements under review. Staff will research private roads in multifamily developments. He noted that in developments with front-loaded garages few opportunities exist to accommodate street parking and should be a consideration in the amendment.

8. Next scheduled meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for May 25, 2021.

9. Adjournment

MOTION: Commissioner Everett moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 p.m. Commissioner Pengra seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Jeremy Bergener, Matthew Everett, Christopher Pengra, and Brett Wright. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Approved by the Planning Commission on May 25, 2021.


Steve Mumford (May 27, 2021 13:12 MDT)

Steve Mumford, AICP
Assistant City Administrator/Community Development Director

3214_001

Final Audit Report

2021-05-27

Created:	2021-05-27
By:	Shawna Ellis (sellis@emcity.org)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAYFocRn_QL3SD8svZImJyoz6XEMYvhJxX

"3214_001" History

-  Document created by Shawna Ellis (sellis@emcity.org)
2021-05-27 - 4:51:40 PM GMT- IP address: 206.251.45.149
-  Document emailed to Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org) for signature
2021-05-27 - 4:51:59 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org)
2021-05-27 - 7:12:22 PM GMT- IP address: 206.251.45.149
-  Document e-signed by Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org)
Signature Date: 2021-05-27 - 7:12:39 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 206.251.45.149
-  Agreement completed.
2021-05-27 - 7:12:39 PM GMT