



EAGLE MOUNTAIN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

March 26, 2019, 5:30 PM
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: Matthew Everett, DeLin Anderson, Rich Wood, Brett Wright, and Jared Gray.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT: Councilmember Melissa Clark.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Steve Mumford, Community Development Director; Michael Hadley, Planning Manager; Tayler Jensen, Planner; Aaron Sanborn, Economic Development Director; and Lianne Pengra, Recording Secretary.

Commissioner Everett called the meeting to order at 5:36 p.m.

1. Discussion Items

1.A. Discussion - Code Amendments: Residential & Residential Bonus Density Entitlements

Community Development Director Steve Mumford said staff has been drafting new zoning standards for residential development in the City. The new residential zones will match the General Plan's Future Land Use Map designations. The new zoning will maintain the bonus density concept, but will require rezones to increase allowed density. The draft includes a new land use table that shows which uses are permitted, conditional, special, and non-permitted within the new residential zones; staff is considering including commercial uses in the new land use table. The draft also contains new generally applicable provisions.

Mr. Mumford presented the new residential zoning and explained what each zone encompasses.

Rural Residential 1 (RR1) has a minimum lot size of 2.5 acres. Front and rear setbacks are 25 feet, and side setbacks must be a minimum of 12 feet with a combined minimum side setback of 30 feet. Lot frontages must be 150 feet, or 60 feet on a circle. There are no open space requirements. The City Council may exempt curb, gutter, sidewalk, or streetlights. A paved trail is required on one side of every road, and equestrian trails along each lot may be required.

Rural Residential 2 (RR2) has a minimum lot size of 0.5 acre. Front and rear setbacks are 25 feet, and side setbacks must be a minimum of 12 feet with a combined minimum side setback of 30 feet. Lot frontages must be 100 feet, or 40 feet on a circle. The open

space requirement in this zone is 1,000 square feet per lot; a fee-in-lieu may be required. Equestrian trails may be required along each lot, as well.

Foothill Residential (FR) has a minimum lot size of 0.25 acre and developments must have an average lot size of 0.5 acre. The setbacks are as follows: 15 feet in the front, 20 feet in the rear, 5 feet on the sides with 10 feet required on the garage side. Retaining walls shall be 10 feet away from the primary structure. Lot frontages must be 75 feet, or 40 feet on a circle; minor reductions may be approved if the frontage is 75 feet at the front setback. Lots and roads shall be arranged to best protect contiguous open space areas, ridgelines, hillsides, drainages, wildlife habitat, and useable open space or trail access to useable open space. The open space requirement is 1,000 square feet per lot; the City Council may consider alternative plans to be evaluated based upon benefit to the neighborhood or community and the unique nature of the site, and may include additional trails, preservation or dedication of additional open space areas, and unique improvements or amenities. This zone requires a minimum of three elevation schemes; houses on adjacent lots and across the street shall have different floor plans or elevations and different color schemes. Street trees are required in park strips along with front yard landscaping. Entry monument signs are required at major entrances and may include water features, sculptures, or monument signage with the name of the project; alternative amenities may be required.

Neighborhood Residential 1 (NR1) has a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet, and developments must have an average lot size of 8,000 square feet. This zone requires 25% of the lots to be greater than 0.25 acre, unless otherwise approved. A variety of lot sizes is required. The front setback is 15 feet with 22 feet at the garage or driveway. The rear setback is 20 feet, and the side setback is 5 feet with 10 feet required on the garage side. Lot frontages must be 55 feet, or 20 feet on a circle; a quarter of the lots must have lot frontages of at least 62 feet. The open space requirement is 1,000 square feet per lot; the City Council may require a fee-in-lieu. Developments in this zone must have a minimum of three elevation schemes; houses on adjacent lots and across the street shall have different floor plans or elevations and different color schemes. Street trees are required in park strips along with front yard landscaping. Entry monument signs are required at major entrances and may include water features, sculptures, or monument signage with the name of the project; alternative amenities may be required.

Neighborhood Residential 2 (NR2) allows densities up to eight dwelling units per acre. Applicants are not automatically entitled to that density and must provide sufficient evidence that their proposed development is compatible with surrounding developments and provides an appropriate mix of housing (including lot sizes or housing types) and buffering or transitioning for the location. The City Council may approve slightly reduced density if supported by findings of fact. This zone does not contain minimum lot sizes or frontage requirements. The front setback is 15 feet with 22 feet at the garage or driveway. The rear setback is 20 feet, and the side setback is 5 feet with 10 feet required on the garage side. Developments must have 15 feet between multifamily buildings. The open space requirement is 1,000 square feet per lot; the City Council may require a fee-in-lieu. A clubhouse is required for all single-family attached projects and must be a minimum of 1,500 square feet. A swimming pool is required for 150 dwelling units or

more; no more than 250 units may utilize the pool unless it is sized to accommodate four square feet of pool space per dwelling unit. Site plans are required for all single-family attached and small-lot single-family home projects. Developments in this zone must have a minimum of three elevation schemes; houses on adjacent lots and across the street shall have different floor plans or elevations and different color schemes. Townhomes must comply with the City's multifamily design standards. Street trees are required in park strips along with front yard landscaping. Entry monument signs are required at major entrances and may include water features, sculptures, or monument signage with the name of the project; alternative amenities may be required. Projects in this zone must comply with visitor parking requirements as per Municipal Code.

Neighborhood Residential 3 (NR3) allows densities up to 22 dwelling units per acre. Applicants are not automatically entitled to this density and must provide sufficient evidence that their proposed development is compatible with surrounding developments and provides an appropriate mix of housing (including lot sizes or housing types) and buffering and transitioning for the location. The City Council may approve slightly reduced density if supported by findings of fact. This zone does not contain minimum lot sizes or frontage requirements. The front setback is 15 feet with 22 feet at the garage or driveway. The rear setback is 20 feet, and the side setback is 5 feet with 10 feet required on the garage side. Developments must have 15 feet between multifamily buildings. The open space requirement for this zone is determined by types of units; 1,000 square feet is required per 3-bedroom unit, 750 square feet per 2-bedroom unit, and 500 square feet per 1-bedroom unit. A clubhouse is required for all single-family attached projects and must be a minimum of 1,500 square feet. A swimming pool is required for 150 dwelling units or more; no more than 250 units may utilize the pool, unless it is sized to accommodate four square feet of pool space per dwelling unit. Site plans are required. Projects in this zone must comply with the City's multifamily design standards. Street trees are required in park strips along with front yard landscaping. Entry monument signs are required at major entrances and may include water features, sculptures, or monument signage with the name of the project; alternative amenities may be required. Projects in this zone must comply with visitor parking requirements as per Municipal Code. Covered parking, garage parking, and storage units are optional.

Mr. Mumford explained the updated generally applicable provisions within the new zones. The newly added provisions are as follows: buffers and transitions require compliance with the transitioning code, front and side yards must be improved prior to occupancy in accordance with approved typical yard landscaping plans, projects must comply with hillside and ridgeline ordinances, and projects must comply with dark-sky lighting standards.

The Commissioners requested larger minimum lot size requirements in the NR1 zone, larger side setbacks in the FR and RR1 zones, for plans to include building envelopes, and for set criteria regarding elevation and streetscape standards. They also requested a minimum of five elevation schemes for developments.

Discussion ensued regarding potentially requiring master development agreements for projects in the NR3 zone, and requiring central locations for improved open space.

Commissioner Wood asked if the Planning Commission can table rezone applications until the new zones are approved. Mr. Mumford said his understanding is new rezone applications will need to comply with the General Plan and with the updated residential zones. He explained staff is drafting a hillside ordinance as well. He asked the Planning Commission to send any recommendations and concerns to him; he hopes to present the new zones to the Planning Commission and City Council in the near future.

1.B. Scott's Subdivision

Planner Tayler Jensen said a project will be presented to the Planning Commission in the next month to split one 5-acre lot into two 2.5-acre lots. The lot is currently zoned Agriculture, so the project will require a rezone. The potential rezone complies with the Future Land Use Plan; the lot is designated as Agriculture Rural Density One which allows 2.5- to 5-acre lots.

6:00 P.M. - Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Policy Session

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Matthew Everett, DeLin Anderson, Rich Wood, Brett Wright, and Jared Gray.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT: Councilmember Melissa Clark.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Steve Mumford, Community Development Director; Michael Hadley, Planning Manager; Tayler Jensen, Planner; Aaron Sanborn, Economic Development Director; and Lianne Pengra, Recording Secretary.

Commissioner Everett called the policy session to order at 6:19 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Everett led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes

4.A. March 12, 2019 Minutes

MOTION: *Commissioner Wood moved to approve the March 12, 2019 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Commissioner Gray seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, DeLin Anderson, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, and Jared Gray. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

5. Action and Advisory Items

5.A. Amendment to the Future Land Use & Transportation Corridors Map of the Eagle Mountain City 2018 General Plan

Mr. Mumford said the General Plan was adopted in July 2018. While drafting the map, the consultants used high-level terrain and slope maps along the East bench to differentiate between Parks and Open Space and Foothill Residential. The City was recently presented more detailed terrain information for this area showing more land is buildable than previously thought. Additionally, areas around City Hall were always envisioned as Community Commercial but were mistakenly designated Residential 3 and Civic Uses/Schools. The proposed map changes those areas to Community Commercial.

Commissioner Wood asked if the addition of the Foothill Residential area would encroach on hillsides. Mr. Mumford said if lots do not comply with the hillside ordinance, structures will not be permitted.

Commissioner Wright asked if City staff will independently verify the newly presented slope information. Mr. Mumford explained the information will be confirmed when preliminary plats are presented.

Discussion ensued regarding BLM exchanging land with SITLA, and if SITLA could potentially develop land that is currently designated Parks and Open Space.

Commissioner Wood asked about the Community Commercial land that now has the Regional Technology and Industry Overlay applied to it. Planning Manager Michael Hadley clarified that the overlay has been applied, but the original zone is still in place. Mr. Mumford stated the land owner may choose to develop commercial business on that site and explained the General Plan still shows that area as Community Commercial. Discussion ensued regarding maintaining levels of each zone designation within the Future Land Use Map throughout the City.

Commissioner Everett opened the public hearing at 6:32 p.m. As there were no comments, he closed the hearing.

MOTION: *Commissioner Gray moved to approve an amendment to the Future Land Use and Transportation Corridors Map of the Eagle Mountain City 2018 General Plan. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, DeLin Anderson, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, and Jared Gray. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

6. Discussion Items

6.A. Gateway Park Phase 4 (Affordable Housing) Concept Plan

Mr. Jensen introduced applicants Isaac Patterson, Dan Ford and Scot Hazard to present an affordable housing concept plan. He said Gateway Park Phase 4 is east of Spring Run Plat D.

Mr. Patterson explained affordable housing should be placed with consideration of large transportation infrastructure, close proximity to commercial development, available open space, and cooperative land owners. He said in Utah, a home worth \$125,000 in 1991 now averages a value of \$347,000, as opposed to the national average of \$183,000. Utah housing costs are 20% higher than in Boise, Las Vegas, and Phoenix; those locations are top competitors in attracting new jobs and businesses.

Mr. Ford explained workforce housing is a key component for site selection when businesses evaluate Eagle Mountain as a potential location. Economic Development Director Aaron Sanborn agreed that workforce housing is an important aspect and said affordable housing is a component of those discussions.

Mr. Ford stated many types of people live in affordable housing communities. He said common myths include the ideas that affordable housing increases crime, that it is only for the poor, and that it is run down and unattractive.

Mr. Hazard said the City needs to plan for generational differences from Baby Boomers to Millennials in housing preferences. He explained the State's affordable housing approval process requires centrally managed projects to ensure a higher quality product. Centrally managed properties differ greatly from HOA-managed properties. He said this system creates a consistent, fair filtering process as well as maintains high levels of service to the tenants. He stated some of the most attractive new projects in Salt Lake and Utah County are affordable housing projects.

Mr. Hazard explained the proposed project in Gateway Park includes four-story buildings on top of covered parking structures. He said the buildings' height would be above the allowed 35-foot height limit currently stated in Municipal Code. They propose an alternate plan to transition from Spring Run to Gateway Park, as adding townhomes as required in Municipal Code does not fit into their plan of affordable housing. He said the building elevation sinks as the buildings go farther away from the Spring Run subdivision, which mitigates the height issue. If all units are included within three buildings, the plan would include ten acres of improved open space. The improved open space, along with the distance from Spring Run, provides for better transition than townhomes would. The site is 19.5 acres and meets the density limit of 22.7 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Hazard said the intent is to include one parking stall under each unit, plus an additional uncovered parking stall assigned to every unit. The parking requirement in the City's Municipal Code is 2.33 parking stalls per unit; they are requesting an amended parking plan allowance of 1.5 parking stalls per unit, as 35% of the units will be 1-bedroom, 50% will be 2-bedroom units, and 15% will be 3-bedroom units. He explained families are not necessarily the target audience for this plan, which is why they are building so few 3-bedroom units.

Mr. Hazard said the proposed plan is next to the Wride Memorial Highway expansion area. Residents in this project would not travel through the surrounding residential development. He said if commuter rail is built in Eagle Mountain, it will likely be along Wride Memorial Highway.

Commissioner Gray said he loves the project, but the best location would be in a downtown area. He stated this location is not in proximity to the large construction projects in the City, and since it is in an industrial area, is not close enough to commercial services to allow residents to walk to businesses. He explained similar projects in Chicago were unsafe and eventually demolished; traditionally, government-funded projects like this do not work.

Mr. Hazard agreed that the industrial component is not synergistic; however, the commercial component is. He stated they will not rent to those who do not have jobs, and all renters will go through a screening process. He manages Section 8 housing throughout the state and the renters are good people who simply cannot afford homes in the area. He said he did not want to paint those who need affordable housing as bad people or as criminals.

Commissioner Wood stated affordable housing will be needed in the City in the future, but the City does not have the services needed to support affordable housing at this time. He said it is uncertain if the adjacent commercial area will contain the needed services to support this project. Additionally, light rail will not be installed along the highway; it will likely go along Pony Express Parkway. His opinion is that the City needs to discuss regular apartments, not affordable housing. Mr. Hazard asked if he would approve of the project if it was presented as regular apartments and not affordable housing. Commissioner Wood said he would if the buildings were only three stories.

Discussion ensued regarding buffering for industrial development adjacent to Spring Run, versus buffering for high-density housing.

Commissioner Wood confirmed with staff that the homes adjacent to this project in Spring Run are on less than 0.20-acre lots. He said he is not willing to give up industrial space for residential development, and stated the intent of affordable housing is to place residents near their work locations.

Commissioner Gray said better location options are adjacent to Rock Creek or near the new high school, as more services will develop in those locations. Mr. Hazard explained that rooftops drive retail development. The commercial area adjacent to the proposed location will likely develop due to this project and it allows room for the necessary services while maintaining close proximity to Wride Memorial Highway. He said this housing project adds to the City's economic development plan. Mr. Ford stated the Rock Creek and new high school locations will not allow development of the commercial services under discussion.

Commissioner Wood stated ample rental homes exist in the area and the City does not need additional rental options. Commissioner Gray said the City has many starter homes but there is a need for larger lots. He expressed concern that the City is overbuilt with townhomes and cluster homes but limited on estate housing.

Commissioner Everett stated he preferred the apartment model versus rental homes. He said this project is not intended for contractors working at the Facebook construction site; this is for all types of people. Mr. Hazard confirmed their market is not construction workers, rather the employees of surrounding companies.

Commissioner Wright agreed that this plan may be early, and it is better to be early than late; however, he isn't certain this is the correct timing.

Mr. Ford said affordable housing is not cheap housing. Affordable housing projects require State designation; this project may take years to come to fruition. He explained it is a complex process and there are many requirements to obtain the designation.

Commissioner Gray asked what would happen if the project did not have the funds necessary to continue for fifty years, as required by the State. Mr. Ford said the answer is very complex, but the State heavily vets each project and maintains funds to assist them. He explained affordable housing is needed and stated only one affordable housing apartment building exists in Utah County that has any availability.

Commissioner Everett stated he likes the project and acknowledged that Midvale City has been revitalized with their newer apartment buildings. He expressed concern that the Municipal Code requires 1,030 parking stalls but the proposal only includes approximately 600 stalls. Since the City does not have mass transit, he explained he would have a difficult time limiting the parking as proposed. He expressed appreciation for the proposed improved open space plan, and stated he prefers that to including townhomes for transitioning, and said he is willing to consider four-story structures along major transportation corridors.

Commissioner Wright asked the applicants to consider connectivity to the south of the plan.

Mr. Hazard said even with the City's approval, it may take years to obtain approval from the State for the project.

6.B. Sage Park Storage - Concept Plan

Applicant Isaac Patterson explained the residential aspect of Sage Park is currently under development. He said the proposed storage facility is noted as Employment Center/Campus on the General Plan. The facility would employ two to three people, and may offer moving trailers, as well. This is an opportunity to accommodate City Center residents, as well as jump start Employment Center/Campus development in the area. They have included a second access point at the request of the Fire Department, and may

add another on Eagle Mountain Boulevard, if needed. The lots adjacent to the proposed plan are approximately 8,000 to 12,000 square feet.

Applicant Wayne Patterson explained they are willing to adjust the plans according to the Planning Commission's recommendations. Mr. Mumford noted the plan has been adjusted to comply with the City's General Plan and according to the Design Review Committee's feedback.

Commissioner Wright asked what the required zone is for storage facilities. Mr. Jensen said this parcel would be rezoned to either Industrial or Commercial Storage.

Commissioner Wood expressed concerns that the storage facility will be adjacent to large lots. Commissioner Wright said that while he does not want storage facilities spread throughout the City, there is a need for RV parking and storage space. Isaac Patterson explained their current facility on Wride Memorial Highway is at 70% capacity after one year in business. They are working on the second phase of development for that location.

Commissioner Everett noted the other storage facilities are near larger lots and do not appear to pose problems with the adjacent residents.

Discussion ensued regarding potential business types that may develop within the Employment Center/Campus area.

Commissioner Wood stated the facility is needed and would approve of the project in its proposed location. Commissioner Gray said he likes the project, but expressed the desire that development stay consistent with the General Plan.

Discussion ensued regarding noticing requirements for this project.

Wayne Patterson explained that the applicants own the residential development adjacent to the proposed storage facility; if they did not believe the business was compatible with their undeveloped residential lots, they would not build at this location.

Commissioner Wood recommended the applicant provide adequate screening between the storage facility and the residential lots to the south. Commissioner Everett recommended moving the second entrance to the northeast side of the project.

Wayne Patterson said office warehouse units are needed in the City and they may consider adding those to a future plan.

7. Next scheduled meeting: April 9, 2019

8. Adjournment

MOTION: *Commissioner Gray moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m.*
 Commissioner Wood seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew

Everett, DeLin Anderson, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, and Jared Gray. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Approved by the Planning Commission on April 9, 2019.


Steve Mumford
Community Development Director