

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

**AMERICAN FORK CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION**

February 21st, 2024

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on February 21st, 2024 at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Christine Anderson, Chris Christiansen, Jenny Peay, Rodney Martin, Bruce Frandsen, David Bird

Commissioners Absent: Harold Dudley

Staff Present:

Cody Opperman	Planner
Travis Van Ekelburg	Senior Planner
Ben Hunter	City Engineer
Angie McKee	Administrative Assistant I

Others Present: Ken Berg, Ben Wheat

REGULAR SESSION

Chairwomen Anderson led the “Pledge of Allegiance”

COMMON CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Minutes of the February 7th, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Session.**

Bruce Frandsen motioned to approve the Common Consent agenda.

Jenny Peay seconded the motion.

Voting was as follows:

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

Chris Christiansen	ABSTAIN
Jenny Peay	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE

The motion passed

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a. Public hearing, review, and recommendation on a proposed amendment to the American Fork General Plan, amending the Transportation Master Plan to incorporate updated road classifications, new signals and roundabouts into the plan.**

Travis Van Ekelburg reviewed the background information for Public Hearing Item letter a: The staff has initiated a Code Text Amendment to the American Fork General Plan, amending the Transportation Master Plan to incorporate new signals and roundabouts into the plan.

Chairwomen Anderson: Engineering, do you have an overview that you'd like to share with us?

Ben Hunter: Yeah, so mostly if you pull up the map there. A lot of it you know, as time goes on, and things get updated, we update our master transportation plan based on modeling and demands and so forth. So, a lot of the changes and modifications were just related to various intersection applications or cleanup of certain alignments of roads and things like that, to be able to better identify where, based on modeling and information that we have, where signals may be more applicable versus roundabouts or things of that nature. So, just kind of some overall cleanup of those intersection applications, updates to some road alignments, updates to potential at grade intersections instead of bridges for the future Pony Express. We had a couple of local streets that we're just making sure we preserve the corridors for those local streets that we'll need to make sure are in place so, happy to entertain any questions.

Chairwomen Anderson: Questions?

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

Bruce Frandsen: I have a couple of thoughts, comments, whatever. What is the determining factor between a roundabout versus a semaphore? Is there some kind of magic number, or is it kind of based on experience and knowledge? And I have no problem with that. I do remember the one roundabout we had in town that got torn out down on Auto Mall Drive. They put it in, it didn't function, and after a few years it got removed and now we just have the big, huge intersection, a big wide spot in the road down there. Some of the mapping programs still show it, you know. I don't know, I personally like roundabouts. There are a lot of places that I think they work good. The last couple of days I've driven around to all of them on the South side of town. You know, to kind of look at those intersections south of the freeway. I wonder about the one on the boat harbor road. I think the reason the one in Auto Mall got removed was we found out, somebody did, that the large trucks going in and out of there with the pumps on them, the trailers were just running over that thing, and I wonder if the one on boat harbor road and 1st West, between the freeway and the boat harbor. That's really the only one I saw. I mean, the roads aren't in yet. But I wonder how those got determined?

Ben Hunter: Yeah, so there's a lot of different things that can play into what and when an appropriate application is made for a particular intersection. And in some instances, it is something that we also identified 'Well, we anticipate something will need to be here in the future', but we may not know which will function more appropriately. And so, generally speaking, some of the components that play into that are in some instances, well in all instances, we will install a traffic signal where a traffic signal is warranted. There's several warranting factors. It could be total volume, it could be pedestrians and car crashes, safety, there's lots of different warrants that could end up identifying that a traffic signal is warranted. So, when a traffic signal is warranted, we can compare it. You can sometimes have a traffic signal and it will function at a certain level of service. And the roundabout may function at a different level of service. In some instances, it may be better, usually a lot of that is like the queue length or the amount of time, the delay, that vehicles have going through an intersection. So sometimes where it is an application that a traffic signal functions better than that's when we put in a traffic signal versus a roundabout. There's also sometimes other constraints, for example, one of the areas that that ended up in this particular case, right now we've got it identified as an intersection application, and that's at 200 south and 570 West. The reason it's an intersection application is our modeling has identified that the level of service that that intersection will function is a poor level of service. You'll have quite a bit of a delay for cars coming northbound on 570 West, up to 200 south and because of the significantly larger volume of vehicles going on 200 south. That's part of why it just makes it really hard for someone to turn left to head westbound on 200 south. But based on the modeling information that we have, it doesn't meet any of those warrant thresholds for being able to install a traffic signal. So that may be a potential appropriate application where a roundabout may be more feasible than a traffic signal. So various things based on modeling, based on how the intersection functions, based on other potential constraints.

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

All of that plays into the determining factor of whether we do a roundabout or whether we do a traffic signal.

Bruce Frandsen: One more question, and this is just that I need some education on this. A three-lane road, a five-lane road, a seven lane, and a four lane. Okay, a three-lane road, that means one going in each direction with a turn center.

Ben Hunter: Correct.

Bruce Frandsen: Four Lane means two lanes each direction with no turn center, is that what that means?

Ben Hunter: Yes, and in some instances a lot of times when those are applicable. Some of it also depends on cross section, you know the right of way widths and stuff like that. In some of those instances it may be such that there aren't enough turn lanes throughout the stretch, but at certain intersections, you may have to widen it out to accommodate a right turn lane or a left turn lane. Generally, those intersections are on a case-by-case basis, based on some sort of traffic study and the information at the time that we'd be looking at that. Does it need a traffic signal or a roundabout? And depending on what the answer is to that question, and what the traffic studies show that we need here. If we have enough cue lengths that we need to do designated right turn lanes and left turn lanes versus a left turn lane and a shared through right turn lane or things like that, that would play into that. But generally, it would just be a little bit different cross section throughout the rest of it, but the intersections we'd look at on a case-by-case basis.

Bruce Frandsen: Okay, thank you.

Chairwomen Anderson: Thank you. Any other comments or questions?

David Bird: So, just so I'm clear on this proposal. What it is proposing is that we approve not specific intersections or changes, but just general as you see fit.

Ben Hunter: Correct. And from time to time as we evaluate, you know, the traffic volumes as development comes in, and how it plays out, and things of that nature. That all plays into it. The other thing that this particular map is an important component of, is it is part of the larger general master plan. Where we have some of these larger upsize roads, that also plays into impact fees and impact fee analysis and things like that. So yes, it is a general based on modeling based on the overall big picture, we see that these roads need the three lanes or the five lanes or whatever it might be. So, it's an update to the overall plan for the entire city,

David Bird: Which is really what we're voting on. It's the updated version of this is what we are approving.

Ben Hunter: Correct.

Bruce Frandsen: So, this becomes now the new road master plan.

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

Ben Hunter: Correct.

Bruce Frandsen: I have one question. I'm on the south part of town, and if Mr. Bunker was here he would remember, or Patrick. They went to the the neighborhood crazy party that they had over that. It seemed to me like the road at that time was designed to follow the power lines through that development. I forget what they're calling that down on the Fenn property?

Ben Hunter: AF Crossings.

Bruce Frandsen: Yeah, they were gonna follow through there and this doesn't seem to show that. It seems to show that it's dropped down south on 1500 south?

Ben Hunter: It does actually show it. So, the purple line there you can see on the south end. I know that it doesn't have street labels and things like that. That may actually be something that would be helpful to better identify, but the purple line that is drawing through and crossing through, you have kind of a gap there just north of that AF Crossings area, that's going through there where you don't have any roads on the south side of the purple line right where Cody's pointing to right there. So, the power line corridor is to the south of that purple arterial that's identified. So, the parks plan identifies a linear park that goes along the powerline corridor, and then that arterial runs parallel with that power line corridor, and that's right through that area with the AF Crossings that you're talking about.

Bruce Frandsen: Okay, and the green line, and the solid green line to the north of that?

Ben Hunter: That is 620 South that's headed directly East West. And then the very south one, that's the minor collector identified on this plan as the Lakeshore drive that's all the way down to the lake. And so combined between those are kind of the major thoroughfares with major roadways through that area.

Bruce Frandsen: Okay, hey thank you for that. I appreciate it.

Ben Hunter: Yep.

Chairwomen Anderson: We'll do a public hearing, but I just have, I guess my only comment; When we look at things like this, especially in the south area where we are kind of paving a lot of new infrastructure, is that we reiterate how important, I feel it is, to have a lot of connectivity between major connectors and even arterioles, so that we have, you know, the the best access through spaces without having a lot of cul-de-sacs, and a lot of walls and a lot of subdivisions that are walled in, but that we really connect like, almost like a grid as much as we can.

Public Hearing Opened

No Comments

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

Public Hearing Closed

Chairwomen Anderson: We're open to any other comments or discussion or a motion.

David Bird moved to recommend approval for the proposed amendment to the American Fork General Plan, amending the Transportation Master Plan to incorporate new signals and roundabouts into the plan and providing an effective date for the ordinance.

Chris Christiansen seconded the motion.

Voting was as follows:

Chris Christiansen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE

The motion passed

- b. Public hearing, review, and recommendation on a proposed Code Text Amendment, known as RBD Investments, of the American Fork City Municipal Code. Amending Section 17.4.403, the Code Text Amendment plans to provide personal service establishments, including reception centers, as permitted uses within the CC-2 zone.**

Cody Opperman reviewed the background information for Public Hearing Item letter b:

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

The applicant has applied for a Code Text Amendment to amend Section 17.4.403 CC-2 Central Commercial Zone of the American Fork City Municipal Code. The proposed amendment looks to provide personal service establishments within the designated zoning district. The applicant is looking to provide a reception area within their property in the CC-2 zone, which has prompted them to apply for a code text amendment due to reception areas not being a permitted use within the CC-2 zone.

Cody Opperman: So as staff, we do have a little bit of concern about having reception centers in this CC-2 zone. Because it doesn't provide a whole kind of services such as retail or maybe personal service establishments within a downtown area, or kind of a main street type of environment. We think that we want to have a little bit more type of activity for maybe other retail uses to be provided in that area. But this will be more of a discussion for you guys. To see if you would like to see the reception areas in that CC-2 zone.

Jenny Peay: Do you have a map of where that is located?

Cody Opperman: Yeah, he will pull up the zone map for you.

Chairwomen Anderson: I think we can look at a lot just as an example of what possibly could be considered in the future. But I think it would make it simpler for tonight, if we focus just on whether or not we want reception centers in the CC-2 zone. Because that'll apply to whatever areas come in with this kind of application. So you know, we could probably debate this specific lot and whether it worked with fire and everything but we can save that for when they come in with a specific plan for that. I'm not opposed to pulling it up.

Jenny Peay: I guess my concern is that some of these lots are going to allow and be able to accommodate that you know. So, do we do it as say a case-by-case basis? Or you lead this with a gunshot and say 'Yeah, we are going to allow this to happen'. That's why I say some areas are not going to be able to have these types of facilities, but some probably will. That's why we'd like to see what they're at least proposing.

Chris Christiansen: So, one of the issues with this being a code text amendment as proposed here, like we either move it forward or we don't. If we move it forward, it becomes applicable to the whole zone, right? So maybe while that is good information to know, maybe there is another alternative, like say it's conditional upon certain things. As it's proposed here, it's sort of all or nothing, right?

Jenny Peay: So is this portion a conditional use? That is what I'm assuming this is.

Chairwomen Anderson: Not how it is worded today, right?

Cody Opperman: No, it's just an outright permitted use.

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

Jenny Peay: Can you bring up the possible code text? I'm sorry to go back and forth.

Cody Opperman: So, in the red it will talk about personal service establishments such as Beauty and Barber shops, photographic studios, shoe repair, laundries, commercial and self-service reception centers and similar establishments. So, this particular wording is actually kind of a direct copy from the CC-1 zone, just to the CC-2 zone, just to give you a little bit of background on that.

Jenny Peay: What I'm looking at, and you will have to kind of explain how this works. I'm looking at number 2. So, number 1, and number 2, then the subsection is 14. But number 2 says 'permitted and conditional uses'. What I'm trying to get at is, does that give us variance to have the staff look at that as a conditional use?

Cody Opperman: So currently, I would say no right now. The way that it's worded, I would say that the 'and conditional uses' are going to be the ones that are subject to additional sections of code. So, for instance, like home occupations when conducted as an incidental part of a resident or residents permitted, pursuant to paragraph one above and subject to the provisions of Section 17.5.123. That would be more of a conditional use located within that section. But since there's not any additional section of code here, it'd be more outright permitted here.

Chairwomen Anderson: So, our code has permitted and conditional uses all in the same list?

Cody Opperman: Yeah.

Chairwomen Anderson: Does it seem easier if we divide those so that it's a little more clear?

Cody Opperman: Yeah, I think that would be a little better for that CC-2 zone.

Chairwomen Anderson: So, I have a lot of thoughts on this one. Going back to that map, in our CC-1 zone, reception centers are allowed. And to me in the CC-1 zone we're especially concerned with making it walkable and making it you know, usable during the day during all hours. So, it seems to me that the CC-2 zone wouldn't require anything more than that. A CC-2 zone is a step back from a CC-1 zone. So, if the CC-1 zone allows it, then I would think it would be fine in a CC-2 zone. From what I've looked at in other cities, personal service establishments are allowed in both CC zones. And my question, I guess for you for staff is if it were allowed, not as a conditional use, but just as a permitted use? During the site plan submittal, staff would still have the ability to check all the things and make sure that it makes sense to make sure that it works. Right. So, it seems like that would cover the use, I mean, that would provide the protection that we're looking for from conditional use.

Cody Opperman: Yes. So, with a commercial site plan, they're still going to be required to follow all other sections of code throughout the municipal code for the city. So, that would include driveways, parking standards, landscaping, and stuff like that. So, we would still be able to check it out. But again, the staff's concern is going to be more of that activity use section for more of a

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

main street environment. But yeah, we'd still be able to look at it for all the sections of code within the city.

Chairwomen Anderson: Could we pull up that code again? I'm looking at the intent of the CC-2 zone, because I had to kind of refresh my memory. And it says, And I'm open to your opinion, I just want to kind of make sure we understand the CC-2. The intent of this zone is to facilitate the orderly development of property within and adjacent to the built-up central business area of the city for commercial purposes, but to do so in a manner to minimize the adverse impacts of such commercial activity on existing residents and residential uses in the zone. So, it's kind of like that middle ground between more build up and residential and encourage and facilitate the preservation and restoration of homes that are historic. And so, some of the things that are listed are like movie theaters, bowling alleys, recreation centers, athletic clubs, it seems that, in my opinion, reception center kind of falls into that kind of usage with the understanding that it wouldn't just be a blanket "you can build anything you want" it would still go through all the processes and still have all the checks and balances. So, I don't think it's a big problem.

Rodney Martin: I don't think so either. Where we're at here on Main Street on both sides here over on the west end of Main Street. If a reception center can make it work down there. I find that there's no activity in the evenings down on Main Street, which you know, some people were concerned about disrupting residents and stuff. But that's where West Main Street is going. The houses are being purchased and demolished, stuff like that. We want more activity, more walkability, more businesses on Main Street, which I strongly feel we need. We need places people can come in the evenings and in North Utah County we are severely lacking in large meeting spaces for things, other than somebody's cultural hall that you need to be in a ward for that.

Chris Christiansen: So, some of my concerns when it comes to this is one, the parking situation because of reception demand. Receptions could be small, and they can be really large, right? So having that ability and again, that would be during that review process where that could be addressed a little bit because they still have to meet that, but that presents a little bit of a challenge to me. We read the purpose of the CC-2 Zone and it kind of contradicts itself a little bit, because it's supposed to be preserving these homes and things like that. I don't know how you turn a home into a bowling alley or a movie theater, you know, so it sort of contradicts that purpose. So, again, my perspective it contradicts itself a little bit. Overall, I also looked up the definition of personal service establishment. And there is a definition here that I found where it says barbershops, beauty parlors, massage providers, dry cleaning shops, things that we use for personal services, and things like that. And then I looked up the event centers, and that's where you find these bowling alleys and things like that. So, if we were to do this, I would probably make the suggestion that the text be personal services there. We can further define that. I think it's number three there. Number three where it addresses general retail and services. Providing goods and services there. So, it further clarifies that, but I just felt like this is a small

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

detail. I don't like reading that reception centers are a personal service establishment. I think it belongs more in five, right, it's more of an event center. So just some thoughts there for everyone.

Chairwomen Anderson: I know the applicant's here, you're welcome to step forward if you'd like to kind of talk about this and explain your goals.

Ken Berg: Ken Berg, Berg Civil Engineering. The proposed amendment was to just add the line that is in your CC-1 code that lists all of those as personal services to allow them to CC-2. So, in your mind's eye, if you drive up and down that section of West Main Street, where's Durfey's Drycleaning? CC-2. Where is four beauty salons and barbers? CC-2. No fault of anyone, but the character of that section, to maintain the old houses, you have a better chance for those to become personal service entities for businesses than a retail establishment like a bowling alley or all the things that are listed there. And that's part of the proposal. We would like to come forward with the event center and they would like to build the Event Center in the rear of their property and keep the existing home as you know, the Bridal room or whatever. It's like the office that's attached to the to proposed event space, you know. So, this is what we would like to do. It's trying to find a fit within the existing city code, but then also acknowledge what else is going on in that area, to have it meet the the current situation. As I read the CC-2, it was mainly 'oh, we're going to create these two areas to protect the existing homes', to have them try to keep the existing homes and transform them into something else. In some areas, it's worked great. As the codes written now, it's for doctors' offices. My wife has spent a lot of money at The Glass Slipper, the dance place. I know, it's shocking, looking at me that I had a dancer for a daughter, I did. So there's things that the code helped establish to keep those existing homes, but then the portion that is the easiest picking of personal services got stripped down. I don't know when it got stripped out, but there was a purpose to it when the code was written. I think that that was a mistake. That's why we put it back in, just the way that was in the CC-1 zone. If it needs to be reshuffled, that's fine. We came to the city saying we want to build an event center, a reception center. And so looking at the codes, we found a part that said reception center, that's where we came up with it, was seeing what you already had, and saying is it appropriate in the CC-2 zone.

Chairwomen Anderson: Looking at that area of town, I feel like it's doing what it's supposed to do, converting these historic homes into these kinds of businesses. And it almost seems like the omission of this part was on accident. And I think that it was just unintentionally left out because the natural way to convert all homes is to do salons and personal service things, so I almost feel like it was intended to be there, because it makes sense.

Ken Berg: I agree. That's why I wrote it the way I did. It was not to reorganize the whole zone. It was oh, we feel like this one was omitted. And we're just moving it from a permitted or conditional use in the CC-1, to just allow it.

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

Chairwomen Anderson: I do agree with Chris. However, that same personal service and reception centers seems a little confusing and that it might make more sense being organized a different way in the code.

Public Hearing Opened

No Comments

Public Hearing Closed

Chairwomen Anderson: Is there any more questions for staff or discussion?

Cody Opperman: If you're looking to change around some of the items, and this is just based off of your conversation, you're able to make those suggestions in their at this time for this code text amendment. If you want to keep the personal service establishment language that the applicants provided and keep it there but move the reception center down into more kind of the recreational center section of code. You can make that suggestion today too.

Chris Christiansen: What if we just made that number 14, leave that in our proposals, and then just create a 15 to be reception centers and similar establishments.

Cody Opperman: Yeah.

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

Rodney Martin: Or add it to number 5. It makes more sense to add it to number 5. Move reception centers over with movie theaters, bowling alleys, athletic clubs, etc.

Chairwomen Anderson: I think our current process still gives us plenty of provisions to make sure that it works in the space, and the applicant has the burden of making the parking work and all the things that I think could be a concern. I would love to give applicants' businesses a chance in this area to grow. If there are no more comments, we can move on a motion.

Chris Christiansen moved to recommend approval for the proposed Code Text Amendment, amending Section 17.4.403, titled RBD Investments, relating to personal service establishments, including reception centers, being permitted within the CC-2 zone and providing an effective date for the ordinance. With the change that we remove reception centers and like-minded businesses, from number 14, and add it to the end of number 5 of said section.

Rodney Martin seconded the motion.

Voting was as follows:

Chris Christiansen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE

The motion passed

Other Business

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

Cody Opperman informed the commissioners that there is still work being done on the code re-write, and the American Fork Stationary Plan should be on the agenda by the end of the year.

Chairwomen Anderson: When we are getting closer to that code rewrite will we have like several work sessions where we get to kind of work through it with you?

Cody Opperman: I am not really sure what Patrick has in store, but I can relay the message that you guys would like to be a part of those work sessions.

Chairwomen Anderson: Two other things I'd like to just have on the record to be relayed. I know we normally do a winter and a summer kind of event for the planning commission and stuff. So if we can maybe try to get that on the calendar. Come up with some suggested dates and then see if that works for the commission. We can even do like, April and September or something like that kind of open-ish times in people's schedules.

Jenny Peay: If I can Just make one other suggestion, when we review the code text, if we can have some extra time to review that too. When you send the packet instead of just a week or a few days before, can we have some extra time to review that?

Cody Opperman: Sure, no problem.

Jenny Peay: That would be great.

Bruce Frandsen: Yeah, I think those work sessions would be great. I mean I spent way too much time on a couple of intersections, I realize we can get into the weeds pretty quick, and sometimes we end up finding some things we need to address.

Chairwomen Anderson: Well just like today, right? This needs to be worded differently, or this has been omitted.

Bruce Frandsen: Another question, are we talking calendar year or fiscal year for the station area plan?

Cody Opperman: I would say calendar year. Probably more towards October, November, December.

Adjournment

APPROVED MINUTES

02.21.2024

Rodney Martin motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Jenny Peay seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 6:40 PM

Angie McKee

Administrative Assistant I

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Angie', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the commissioners, public and staff.