

**AMERICAN FORK CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION**

April 15th, 2026

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a work session on April 15th, 2026, in the American Fork City Administration Office conference room, located at, 51 East Main Street, commencing at 6:30 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Christine Anderson, Claire Oldham, David Bird, Harold Dudley, Rod Martin, Geoff Dupaix

Commissioners Absent: Chris Christiansen,

Staff Present:

Patrick O'Brien	Development Services Director
Cody Opperman	Planner II
Annalisa Reed	Planner I

Others Present:

WORK SESSION

- a. Roll Call**
- b. Discussion on proposed amendments to the City's Municipal Code, General Plan, and Zoning.**

Patrick O'Brien reminded the commissioners of the meeting back in February where there was a very in-depth analysis and input from the community, based on what was originally proposed for the amendments to the city's Municipal Code, General Plan, and Zoning. He informed the commissioners that after that meeting, there was a big discussion with administration and the City Council, and they decided to rewind quite a bit on some of the things that were proposed. He noted that they are going to be working on updating the draft based on input from the

APPROVED MINUTES

04.15.2026

Council, and this presentation that he is doing tonight was given to the Council two weeks ago. He shared the hope that on May 20th, they would like to have a public open house to walk the public through the new proposal based on community feedback. While they acknowledge that it is nearly impossible to propose something that everyone will be fully happy with, what's being proposed in the general plan is where they would like to see American Fork City in 10 to 15 years' time, and is not going to be an impact that people are going to notice right away.

Patrick informed the commissioners that the Cherylyn Egner sent him her presentation for the code rewrite because she could not attend this meeting, so some of the dates will be wrong due to this being the presentation she gave to the City Council a few weeks ago. He explained that the majority of the code rewrite is pulling out a lot of the outdated sections of code. They had 34 pages of completely irrelevant and outdated building related stuff for sections of electrical code that no longer exist because the city follows IBC and IRC requirements for construction. They are also bringing a lot of sections of code into compliance with what the state is requiring and mandating. One of the changes will be with the detached ADU's, as the state requirement just changed, and mandated that ADU's will now be allowed on lots over 11,000 square feet, as long as there is not already an attached ADU, as parking issues would come into play if both were to be allowed on the same property. He mentioned that one of the other areas of concern based on feedback from people is setback requirements, so there will be some updates on that as well.

Christine Anderson asked for clarification on what the set-back change looks like. Cody Opperman explained that right now with internal lots of any kind in a residential zone, there is currently a minimum of 10 feet on one side, and a minimum of 8 feet on the other side for a combined total of 18 feet. With the new proposal they are looking at 10 feet on one side and 12 feet on the other side for interior lots, for a total of 22 feet, and 8 feet minimum on one side, and 20 feet on the other for corner lots in any residential zone.

Patrick O'Brien told the commissioners that he would like to get their opinions on this as the Council feels like they may want to keep the setbacks as they are currently in the code. He added that they came up with the proposal due to people complaining that they are not able to access their back yards to build a shed or a pool, or to utilize a side yard for other purposes.

Harold Dudley shared his concerns with the change as it would cause problems for people with a larger rear set-back who would like to do an addition. Patrick O'Brien told him that one of the Council members has the same concern, so they discussed this change possibly being for new builds only, and they would have to come up with a way to handle existing structures.

Planning commission members asked if they could maybe consider a continuance of a non-conforming use, and Patrick O'Brien noted the main thing is ensuring there is adequate language in the code so that future staff and Commissioners don't come up with a completely different

APPROVED MINUTES

04.15.2026

perspective. Several Commissioners agreed that “legal non-conforming” verbiage should be included in this section.

Christine Anderson asked if it wouldn't be better to decrease a setback in order to address affordability issues. Patrick O'Brien explained that if you decrease them too much, you run into Building Code issues. Christine added that she is not proposing to decrease them; She was just wondering if increasing them is maybe going in the wrong direction to make housing more affordable. Patrick O'Brien explained that having larger buildable envelopes doesn't solve affordability issues. Affordability is related to lot size and prices, and construction costs, not setbacks. Rodney Martin asked about which zones would be affected, and Cody Opperman informed the change would be to all residential zones. Harold Dudley noted that if you have a small house on a large lot, requiring larger set-backs adds to the amount of landscaping while the state is currently having water issues.

Patrick O'Brien explained that a smaller house equates to less expense, and having a larger setback means you have a smaller footprint for the home. Geoff Dupaix pointed out that these are minimum not maximum setbacks. Annalisa Reed added that a setback doesn't affect the lot size; it just affects how big the home can be within your lot. Christine Anderson agreed that she would like to see smaller lots available, and while she doesn't want our code to be like Traverse Mountain, she likes the current setbacks. Patrick O'Brien noted that another issue they are trying to address is the amount of people coming to the planning commission getting their setback reduced to 5 feet, which is the very minimum. Claire Oldham agreed that she would rather the standard be bigger, so they would need to request the setback to be less.

Christine Anderson mentioned that she does not even use her side yard, and Patrick O'Brien explained that part of the reason this became a discussion in the code change, is due to people not having side yards, so many of them are parking trailers and extra vehicles on the street which is public right of way, and the city has to send code enforcement out to ticket people. Christine Anderson mentioned maybe making the requirement be that one side must be large enough to park a trailer. Rodney Martin noted that he built a 17-foot-wide carport on the side of his shop, and he can park 2 trucks there, but they are only inches away from each other, so the current 12-foot requirement is not as big as it seems. David Bird noted that he is okay with the way the code is now, but he does think they need to consider people having enough space to park their trailers, as it is a hazard and a nuisance to have them parked on the street.

Patrick O'Brien reminded the commissioners that the recently mandated ADU requirement also brings a parking element into play as there needs to be enough parking for multiple dwelling units. He added that unless people are going to concrete their front lawns, the feedback from people is they would like to see a little more space, so it would be beneficial to have a big enough side yard, at least on one side, to accommodate a parking space.

After much discussion about implementing a new setback requirement in the city code update for all of the residential zones throughout the city, the commissioners suggested that Mr. O'Brien

APPROVED MINUTES

04.15.2026

ask the City Council how they would feel about an 8-foot requirement on one side, and a 12-foot requirement on the other side.

Patrick O'Brien moved on to discuss the commercial zone requirements. He explained that the proposal is to bring development to the frontage of streets, rather than pushing it way back off of the street and having a big parking island in the front. They would like to make it more attractive out on the street frontage and put the parking at the back of the development. Christine Anderson asked if they are leaving room for things such as dining out in front of the developments. Patrick O'Brien informed her that they are thinking it should be a maximum of 10 feet in the CC-1 areas, and while UDOT would have a right of way in most of those areas, her question is something they would definitely like to explore in the future.

Geoff Dupaix agreed that there is a challenge, especially with Main Street being a US route that comes with additional restrictions including the proximity to the freeway. Patrick O'Brien added that when the freeway is backed up due to an accident, American Fork streets become the priority funnel. Christine Anderson asked if there was a way to make room for outdoor dining style businesses if they were to do it on Main Street. Patrick O'Brien explained that those issues are not something they are looking to address with this project, but the polycentric plan will be reviewing matters like this.

Patrick O'Brien continued the presentation explaining that after discussions with the City Council, the plan is to square off a specific area of the PO-1 zone, and the permitted uses will not be changing in those areas. Geoff Dupaix asked if they would be cleaning up the areas that are currently islands, and Patrick O'Brien confirmed that the area along 300 North will be squared off and the properties that are not yet annexed in will be incorporated into the PO-1 zone upon annexation. Christine Anderson mentioned that one of those property owners has spoken to her and is not happy with that change, so she wonders what the harm would be if they left that property as it is. Patrick O'Brien explained that while they will be grandfathered in with the residential use, but they can't start doing things based off of what every individual property owner wants, they are looking at what benefits the City as a whole. He feels it would be a very bad planning decision to carve out one person's property but noted that the change won't impact that parcel until they decide to redevelop it.

Moving to the PI-1, Patrick O'Brien explained that zone will stay the same other than one area of warehouse space along Auto Mall Drive. The Council has contemplated a potential conditional use in the PI one for box gyms, cross fit, cheerleading studios, indoor soccer type uses, and Patrick asked the planning commissioners' opinions on that. Rodney Martin mentioned that businesses of that type that may have competitions will be having those on the weekends, so it shouldn't be a problem for traffic. Patrick O'Brien noted that most of these buildings have loading docks, and larger trucks would be part of the traffic in these areas, but as a whole they are adaptable spaces. He mentioned an area in Orem that is a great example having a greenhouse area, go-carting and laser tag spaces, but also office warehouse. Rodney Martin mentioned this has been a challenge in Utah County for a long time, trying to find square footage available to do

APPROVED MINUTES

04.15.2026

those types of things. David Bird noted that the only negative thing is possible parking problems if there were an event. Geoff Dupaix likes the idea of requiring a conditional use permit, so there is some management over volumes of people and parking plans.

Patrick O'Brien informed that there are no changes to the I-1 zone; the boundaries and uses will stay the same. He added that the city is working with a property owner down in the south of that area who's looking to purchase some adjacent parcels of land and actually build out and make their existing facility even more beneficial to not only American Fork solely, but Utah County, they're a major player for development in the community. He added that the S-1 zone may just roll into the PF zone, which would include the Developmental Center. Patrick and David Bunker recently met with their management team, and they are exploring some concepts of redevelopment and potential expansion of that space.

Patrick O'Brien moved on to the SP zone and informed the commissioners that they are planning to have a manicured open space and proposing some redevelopment opportunities down in that area. There is a trail boardwalk type of use that aligns with the shoreline trail, and the Marina is not going to change. Patrick encouraged the commissioners to go down to the boat harbor if they have not been this year, as the city managed a large investment from multiple groups and were able to redevelop that space.

Patrick O'Brien told the planning commissioners that concluded the city attorney's presentation slides, but as the city does updates with the polycentric plan and general plan, there are implementation strategies in place to come back in the future and start taking sections of code to update them as needed in more manageable chunks, instead of taking on three of the largest long range projects that you can do at the exact same time. He reminded them that this is the first major update in over 15 years, and during that time the city has experienced significant growth, so they are hopeful these changes will help correct the course to where the city wants to be.

Geoff Dupaix commented that sometimes cities are lucky to update these general plans every 25 years, so he is wondering if as part of this discussion should include a more regular check on the plan to keep it more consistent. Patrick O'Brien agreed that incremental change is a lot easier than a full overhaul, and he thinks it is a good idea to do a performance evaluation more often. Geoff Dupaix noted that MAG does an update to the RTP every 4 years, and to him that seems more appropriate. Patrick O'Brien agreed that the city should look at any RTP changes and see if they impact things in a positive or negative way and decide if the city should make changes based on that data.

Geoff Dupaix spoke of a meeting he recently attended where they had a panel discussion of changes needed in resort towns and also spoke about a zip line company that is starting to deliver medical supplies. Patrick O'Brien mentioned that being something that may need to have a section of code requirements in the near future. Geoff Dupaix mentioned a possible 4-8 year time frame as there is a plan to have air taxis for the Olympics. Christine Anderson asked when the Olympics would be here, and Cody Opperman informed that they are in Utah in 2034. The commissioners discussed possible parking issues during that time, as well as being hopeful that public transportation will be available 7 days a week by the time the Olympics are in the state.

APPROVED MINUTES

04.15.2026

Patrick O'Brien explained that the city will also be changing the land use designations in the plan. He noted that currently there is residential low density, very low density, medium density, and they are hoping to clean that up a bit. He added that while the commercial uses would stay the same, they are looking at the single family detached and single family attached land uses as there does not need to be 4 different designations for something they can cover with 2.

Christine Anderson mentioned that while her neighborhood is mostly single-family detached homes, there are some beautiful duplexes just a couple of streets over, and she thinks they belong in the area. Patrick O'Brien explained that those things can be handled with zoning requirements like in the PR 3.0 where you can have mixed type options. He continued that he and the planners were talking recently about the housing authority of Utah County having two great affordable housing projects for seniors, and if you drive past them you cannot tell they are quadplexes because they have single level homes, but 4 units in each building with a front door on each side of the building. This doesn't detract from streetscape, or impact property values as much because it is not obvious or scary when you drive past. He noted that community management is key in these types of developments. Christine Anderson wanted to make sure the door is still open for projects like that.

Patrick O'Brien continued to explain some of the small changes being proposed to the land use map, that includes areas with parcels that have yet to be annexed being incorporated into the entire community, as well as cleaning up boundaries around the TOD. He explained the changes would be helpful while trying to be consistent with what is in the city code, as well as the overlay which allows some areas in a commercial zone to have residential development on the upper floors.

David Bird asked if some specific properties belonging to the Bromley's and the Devereaux's were staying the same, and Patrick O'Brien confirmed that those were staying the same. He added that while a lot of stuff is staying the same, they are mostly changing land use to match what is already developed on the ground in both residential and commercial areas. David Bird asked about another specific area, and Patrick informed him that will be the linear park where the Vineyard Connector/Pony Express has environmentally cleared alignments, and because it is underneath the power corridor, no development would be allowed to run underneath it. David Bird asked about the area of to the left, and Patrick O'Brien explained that they are preserving that space until the alignment happens with Lehi City and it is decided if the Vineyard Connector is going to shoot up through the TOD, or if it's going to dip underneath Spring Creek subdivision in Lehi, at which time the city will figure out where the parks will be.

Christine Anderson mentioned that the new proposal seems more squared and boxed off. Patrick O'Brien explained that they are trying to show land use more along actual property lines rather than just cutting across the middle of properties, as well as applying the realities of what is actually happening on the ground.

Geoff Dupaix asked about a specific area to the West regarding attached and detached where there are a lot of apartments in the area. Patrick O'Brien explained that the area is all PC zoned, and staff is trying to figure out what land use is going to be there because the area falls more in

APPROVED MINUTES

04.15.2026

line with the TOD requirements, so they may need to put a specific planned community land use there. He reiterated that they are just proposing to take a realistic look at what's on the ground and making the land use match that, and where there's areas for future development, they'll look at being a little bit more flexible with what the land use can or can't be to guide growth patterns, but to also just square out areas.

Patrick O'Brien moved on to discussing areas around Main Street where some places are still considered residential but most of the buildings are actually commercial structures, so they are continuing to take a look at the actual current uses of the majority of structures in these areas and updating the land uses with that in mind. He also mentioned that while specific streets can still be used as arbitrary lines, or buffers, he would like to be using more block style boundaries based on the type of buildings and businesses on the ground in specific areas already. Geoff Dupaix mentioned that it would make sense to wait and see what UTA is doing with tracks and other routes before they take a more serious look at major changes to Main Street and the downtown area, and Christine Anderson agreed the city should wait and make changes based on how the tracks can be used. Christine asked if the residential homes off of 500 East have gone to commercial, and Patrick O'Brien informed her that some of the homes on the south side have gone commercial, and one of the questions the city council asked was how long before the other side starts going that route as well. Geoff Dupaix feels like that conversation should take place when the change of use happens, and Patrick O'Brien reminded the commissioners that the zone and land use have to comply, so the question is does the city help facilitate that by having it done in advance, and Geoff Dupaix noted that in looking at the different properties, things do seem to be trending in that direction. Christine Anderson noted that she likes how it is, and while it is nice to have straight lines, it is okay to have little jagged areas included when it makes sense.

Patrick O'Brien told the commissioners that staff and administration would be working hard for the next little while to get all of the maps updated based on the feedback from them and the council, and will continue to make further tweaks as more information comes in. He noted that they are waiting on more feedback about the water element of the general plan because that is a big component of the update, as well as transportation maps and historic preservation.

Christine Anderson wanted to discuss a code section that talks about planning commission and expiration timelines. Patrick O'Brien informed her that the City Council will make the ultimate decision but he doesn't have a definitive answer on that. Christine Anderson noted that right now it says 3 terms maximum of 3 years each, and Chair would be for one year. Harold Dudley mentioned that means he is in violation of those terms; Geoff Dupaix added they he is as well, but Mr. Dudley's terms have been consecutive. Patrick O'Brien informed them that the City Council will be having a work session on May 5th, and that should be something that is addressed, and invited the planning commissioners to attend.

Adjournment

APPROVED MINUTES

04.15.2026

Geoff Dupaix motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Rodney Martin seconded the motion.

Voting was as follows:

Christine Anderson	AYE
Claire Oldham	AYE
David Bird	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rod Martin	AYE
Geoff Dupaix	AYE

The motion passed

Meeting adjourned at 7:53 PM

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