

EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2015 AT 6:00 P.M.

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers; 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, UT 84005

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

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes
  - A. June 9, 2015
4. Development Items
  - A. Eagle Mountain Health Center– Site Plan Public Hearing, Action Items  
A proposed 1.18-acre, site plan for a health center which will have different health related services. It is located in the southwest corner of the Porters Crossing Town Center along Pony Express Parkway and Smith Ranch Road.
5. Other Items/Business
  - A. Updates
6. Adjournment

EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2015 AT 6:00 P.M.  
Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers; 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, UT 84005

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

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Wendy Komoroski, Daniel Boles, Miriam Allred, John Linton, and Matthew Everett.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Steve Mumford, Planning Director; Mike Hadley, Senior Planner; and Johna Rose, Deputy Recorder.

ELECTED OFFICIAL PRESENT: Tom Westmoreland

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Linton led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

A. May 26, 2015

**MOTION:** *Wendy Komoroski moved to approve the May 26, 2015 meeting minutes. Matthew Everett seconded the motion. Those voting aye: John Linton, Daniel Boles, Miriam Allred, Wendy Komoroski, and Matthew Everett. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

4. Advisory Items (Recommendations to the City Council)

A. Glenmar – Rezone; Public Hearing, Advisory Action

Mike Hadley explained that this is an applicant-proposed rezone of 16.17 acres from Agriculture to Residential. The property is located on the west side of Lake Mountain Road approximately ½ mile southeast of Pony Express Parkway. The General Plan land use designation for this area is Rural Residential, which requires lots of a ½-acre minimum. All of the lots in this proposed concept plan are 1 acre or larger.

Rezone proposals are evaluated using the following criteria:

A. Compliance with Future Land Use Plan. The City’s Future Land Use Plan designates this area as Rural Residential. Based on the overall density, this proposal complies with that plan.

B. Compatibility Determination. This property is surrounded by agricultural land and land that zoned for residential, but with a transition of 2 acre and 1 acre lots. By

1 rezoing the land to residential the rezone is compatible with the future proposed uses  
2 of the land and compatible with the adjacent residentially zoned land.

- 3  
4 C. Buffering of Incompatible Uses. The City Code requires that a transition of lot sizes  
5 (starting with 1 acre lots) be placed adjacent to agricultural lots that have been  
6 subdivided for the purpose of building. Although the adjacent properties have not  
7 been subdivided for this purpose, this proposed plan consists of 1 acre lots.

8  
9 *Commissioner Linton opened the public hearing at 6:08 p.m.*

10 Elise Erler, SITLA, said that SITLA supports the rezone.

11  
12  
13 Karen Scott, resident, felt that the development was a great idea.

14  
15 Marianne Smith, applicant, felt that the 1 acre lots could be a buffer between the 5 acre lots  
16 and the town core.

17  
18 *Commissioner Linton closed the public hearing at 6:10 p.m.*

19  
20 **MOTION:** *Wendy Komoroski moved to recommend approval to the City Council of*  
21 *the Glenmar rezone application with the following condition:*

22 *1. The lot size minimum for this property is 1 acre.*

23 *Matthew Everett seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Wendy*  
24 *Komoroksi, John Linton, Daniel Boles, Miriam Allred, and Matthew*  
25 *Everett. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

- 26  
27 B. Eagle Mountain Benches / Eagle Mountain Ranches – Rezone; Public Hearing, Advisory  
28 Action

29 This is an applicant-proposed rezone of approximately 85 acres from Agriculture to  
30 Residential and 11.11 acres from Agriculture to Commercial Storage. A majority of the  
31 property is located near 5504 N Lake Mountain Road, and 5.5 acres are located  
32 immediately south of 5121 N Lake Mountain Road. Parcel Numbers: 59-006-0028, 59-  
33 006-0046, 59-006-0055, 59-006-0042, 59-006-0054.

34  
35 Mr. Hadley explained that the applicant is proposing rezoning approximately 101.62 acres of  
36 land currently zoned agricultural to residential. There is also a small portion that is being  
37 proposed as a Commercial Storage zone (lots 134 to 139 on concept Plan). Included in this  
38 application is a concept plan for a proposed residential development. The residential portion  
39 of the rezone complies with the City's Future Land Use General Plan. The General Plan land  
40 use designation for this area is Rural Residential which requires lots of a ½-acre minimum.  
41 All of the lots in this proposed concept plan are 1 acre or larger. The Commercial Storage  
42 portion for rezone does not comply with the General Plan.

43  
44 The proposed concept plan for Eagle Mountain Benches currently includes the following:

- 45
  - 56 total lots
  - Average lot size is 1.6 ac
  - The density is .55 units/acre

1 The proposed concept plan for Eagle Mountain Ranches (not shown in an exhibit) currently  
2 includes the following:

- 3 • 3 total lots
- 4 • Average lot size is 1.8 ac in size

5  
6 Items to Consider

- 7 1. Regional Trail. A regional trail is planned within the power line corridor, which  
8 crosses portions of this property.  
9
- 10 2. Power Line and Gas Line Corridor. This property is considered unbuildable, and  
11 will restrict the uses and layout of lots in this project. Certain restrictions are also  
12 placed on the property by PacifiCorp, Kern River Gas, and the City.  
13
- 14 3. Commercial Storage Zone. Once the property is rezoned, the permitted and  
15 conditional uses within that zone must be considered by the Planning Commission  
16 and City Council, and must be approved if all development code standards are  
17 met. Permitted and Conditional Uses for this zone include:
  - 18 a. Public and private utility structures or facilities;
  - 19 b. Public and private utility equipment and inventory storage, fenced or  
20 enclosed;
  - 21 c. Fully enclosed commercial storage of equipment and inventory;
  - 22 d. Fenced or unfenced outdoor storage of commercial equipment and  
23 inventory;
  - 24 e. Outdoor storage/parking of recreational vehicles, trailers, boats, and similar  
25 vehicles;
  - 26 f. Self-storage or mini-storage units;
  - 27 g. Small office uses associated with storage.

28  
29 Commissioner Linton was concerned that most of the lots are unbuildable due to the  
30 power and gas corridor.

31  
32 *Commissioner Linton opened the public hearing at 6:21 p.m.*

33  
34 *Public comment emails are attached to the minutes.*

35  
36 Marci Taylor, resident, said she felt that the development would bring a different look  
37 and feel to the area. She was also concerned about the traffic it would bring to the area.

38  
39 Jodi Hooley, resident, *see attached letter.*

40  
41 Jeff Scott, applicant, explained that he wanted to give residents a place to expand and  
42 store RVs. He said the gas company was fine with building commercial storage in the gas  
43 corridor. He said that the City requested that the top road be put in. He also explained  
44 that John Walden is approved to develop beside his development. He said John Walden  
45 development consists of about 780 new homes. He felt that his development would help  
46 create a buffer between the existing and new developments.  
47

1 Karen Scott, applicant, explained that she had about 14 letters from home buyers wanting  
2 to buy their lots. She also explained that they are not there to harm or be a burden to the  
3 neighbors.  
4

5 Doug Sutton, superintendent of the project, he explained the need for a storage facility for  
6 recreational vehicles in Eagle Mountain. The storage facility would not be an eyesore,  
7 because the only one to see the RV storage would be the ones that drive by the facility.  
8 He felt that it would benefit the City more than the developer. He also explained that  
9 Lake Mountain Road is a public road, and how paving the road would benefit the  
10 residents on Lake Mountain Road. He felt that septic tank for the development is not an  
11 issue.  
12

13 Kim O'Donnell, resident and operator of the Friends in Need Animal Rescue. He said  
14 that the commercial property is not compatible with the residents. He explained that he  
15 was under the impression that the property in the development would be 5 acres plus and  
16 no commercial building. He was upset about all the development coming to the area, and  
17 said that it was too big of an increase for an agriculture residential development. He was  
18 concerned about his property taxes going up because of the new development and the  
19 safety of his animals.  
20

21 Karen Crofered, resident, said she wanted to know how you could approve development  
22 at each end of the road and not the middle of Lake Mountain Road. Her first thought of  
23 Eagle Mountain was a ghetto in the making with its postage stamp lots. She was also for  
24 the RV storage facility.  
25

26 Craig Jepson, resident, said he wanted it on recorded that he opposes the rezone of the  
27 development. He was concerned if the City allowed this development that soon after the  
28 land behind their lots will also be rezoned to make small lots. He said that it will push out  
29 the agriculture lots. He felt that the development should be left at the 5 acre plus lots. He  
30 was also concerned that there would be too many septic tanks, wood burning stove and  
31 propane tank in one area. He felt that with acre or less lot size that there would not be  
32 enough room if the septic tanks needed to be replaced. He felt that Eagle Mountain was  
33 selling their self short with developer and risking the health of the residents. He felt that  
34 the developer should wait until the necessary utilities are available for the development  
35 before the development is approved.  
36

37 Ilene Wetzel, agriculture land owner in the area, said she is for the rezoning of the  
38 property and the RV storage facility. She explained that she can't get to her property and  
39 can't wait for the road to be paved. She knows that John Jacob, who sold them the land,  
40 made promises to the property owners in their development about the 5 acres plus. But  
41 she said that times are changing and the property owners need to go with the change.  
42

43 Kristy Barnson, resident, felt that an RV storage facility in the area was a wonderful idea.  
44 She explained that she would love an RV but her lot is not big enough to store one.  
45

46 Ryan Rawlings, resident, was concerned about a lack of trail system in the proposed  
47 development.  
48

1 Ray Belgian, resident, felt that there was a great need for an RV storage facility in the  
2 City.

3  
4 *Commissioner Linton closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.*

5  
6 Commissioner Boles asked what kinds of improvement are required for Lake Mountain  
7 Road. Mr. Hadley explained that with a rural cross section, the road would need to be  
8 paved with asphalt, typical swells and a trail on one side.

9  
10 Commissioner Komoroski said she does not understand how the City could build lots on  
11 the unbuildable land, because of the gas and power line corridors. Mr. Hadley explained  
12 that the plan that was presented is only a concept plan and the developer would have to  
13 meet all the City standards.

14  
15 Mr. Hadley explained that any development on Lake Mountain Road would require the  
16 improvement of Lake Mountain Road.

17  
18 Commissioner Komoroski felt that there is a need in the City for RV storage, but this  
19 property is not the right spot for that kind of commercial facility. Commissioners Allred  
20 and Everett also agreed.

21  
22 Commissioner Boles said that he would recommend to the City Council the rezoning of  
23 the rural residential property but not the commercial rezoning.

24  
25 Commissioner Allred would recommend 1 acre plus lots for the area.

26  
27 **MOTION:**

***Wendy Komoroski moved to recommend approval of the residential  
portion of the Eagle Mountain Benches / Eagle Mountain Ranches  
rezone application with the following conditions:***

- 28 ***1. The lot size minimum for this property is 1 acre.***
- 29 ***2. No residential lots on the land restricted by the power and gas  
30 corridor.***
- 31 ***3. Denial of the commercial storage rezone.***

32  
33 ***Miriam Allred seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Wendy  
34 Komoroksi, John Linton, Daniel Boles, Miriam Allred, and Matthew  
35 Everett. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.***

36  
37  
38 C. Spring Run – Master Development Plan Amendment; Public Hearing, Advisory Action  
39 Parcel Numbers: 58-033-0281, 58-033-0282.

40  
41 D. Spring Run Phase B – Preliminary Plat; Public Hearing, Advisory Action  
42 Parcel Numbers: 58-033-0281, 58-033-0282.

43  
44 Mr. Hadley presented items C. and D. located east of the Meadow Ranch neighborhood  
45 and northwest of the new Ranches Parkway northern extension. He explained that there  
46 are two proposals:

- 47 1. The amendment to the Spring Run Master Development Plan to change “Pod 3” from  
48 Town Center (Commercial), allowing 237 residential units, to Residential zoning,  
49 allowing 156 residential units, decreasing the density of the proposal.

- 1 2. The proposal of the Preliminary Plat for a subdivision containing 150 single-family  
2 lots on 25.43 acres in “Pod 3” of the Spring Run Master Development Plan.  
3

4 **Fencing**

5 The City Code requires 6-foot privacy fencing or a decorative wall along collector and  
6 arterial roads. This project is completely surrounded by collector roads, so the perimeter  
7 fence will need to be improved by the developer along with each final plat’s  
8 infrastructure, prior to building permits being issued. This fencing must be included in  
9 the bond as well. The developer should provide a fence detail for the City Council to  
10 review for approval along with this plat.  
11

12 **Parks**

13 This preliminary plat includes a park which is being proposed to be deeded to the City.  
14 The MDA states that it will be maintained by the Home Owners’ Association, so the City  
15 will need to decide. The park is 1.08 acres in size and conforms to the required open  
16 space in the Master Development Agreement (required a park of 1.07 acres). 108 total  
17 amenity points are required for this park (1.08 x 100). The following table represents  
18 what the applicant has proposed. This park must be fully improved, or developer shall  
19 place into escrow with the City sufficient funds to improve the park space prior to the  
20 issuance of 40% of the building permits within this project, and a bond must be posted  
21 for the park along with the subdivision improvements. The funds shall be escrowed with  
22 the City with each final plat recording.  
23

24 *Commissioner Linton opened the public hearing at 7:33 p.m.*  
25

26 Christy Gordon, resident, strongly opposed the development, and was concerned with not  
27 getting the proper notification. She also felt that the City has already sold out Meadow  
28 Ranch development by allowing smaller lot to come in west of the development.  
29

30 Dean Thornton, resident, opposed the development, and felt that the City keeps taking  
31 away from their development.  
32

33 Teresa Heart, resident, explained that since new development has come to their area that  
34 their water pressure has gone way down. The water run-off from the new developments  
35 are also affecting their homes in Meadow Ranch. She felt that 1 acre plus lots should only  
36 be approved around their subdivision. She also felt that her neighbors have given up  
37 fighting for their subdivision.  
38

39 Anna Allen, resident, said that she is against having lots smaller than an acre in the area.  
40

41 Jim Allred, applicant, explained that the master plan for Spring Run has been in place for  
42 4 years which gives development of the town center a density of 10 units per acre. When  
43 the development was approved the developer put in a 100 foot buffer so there would be  
44 no negative impact on the surrounding neighbors. The developer wants to be a good  
45 neighbor. The developer had the option of putting in townhomes. He explained that the  
46 developer has decreased the density of the proposed development.  
47

48 Lisa Barton, resident, is opposed to the size of the lots for this development.  
49

1 Ralph Johnson, applicant, explained that all the developer is doing is proposing less  
2 density then what was permitted in the master development plan for Spring Run.

3  
4 *Commissioner Linton closed the public hearing at 7:48 p.m.*

5  
6 Commissioner Allred asked the applicant about the master development plan that  
7 contains the elements and uses that are no longer consistent with the City's future plans  
8 and which are no longer viable. Mr. Johnson explained that the developer is in the  
9 process of changing those elements to meet City staff's recommendations.

10  
11 **MOTION:** *Miriam Allred moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the*  
12 *Spring Run Master Development Plan Amendment with the following*  
13 *conditions:*

14 *1. No additional plats may be approved before an overall amendment*  
15 *of the MDP is approved that addresses the freeway, commercial*  
16 *property, fire station, and community park.*

17  
18 *She also moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of*  
19 *the Spring Run Phase B Preliminary Plat to the City Council with the*  
20 *following conditions:*

21 *1. This approval is contingent on the amendment to the Spring Run*  
22 *MDP allowing 150 single-family residential lots in the town center*  
23 *area.*

24 *2. All lot frontages within the project must meet City standards (55*  
25 *feet minimum except for the patio homes adjacent to the park).*

26 *3. Any traffic flow issues brought up by the traffic engineer must be*  
27 *resolved to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. If the resolution*  
28 *causes major redesigns, then this plan must return to the Planning*  
29 *Commission and City Council for reconsideration.*

30 *4. A six-foot privacy fence or decorative wall must be installed along*  
31 *the perimeter of the project with the infrastructure for each final*  
32 *plat. A detail of the fence/wall design and color shall be reviewed*  
33 *for approval by the City Council.*

34 *Matthew Everett seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Wendy*  
35 *Komoroksi, John Linton, Daniel Boles, Miriam Allred, and Matthew*  
36 *Everett. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

37  
38 5. Adjournment

39  
40 The meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

41  
42 APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON JUNE 23, 2015

43  
44 \_\_\_\_\_  
45 Steve Mumford, Planning Director

## Michael Hadley

---

**From:** Mike Kieffer <mkieff@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2015 8:34 PM  
**To:** Mayor; Fionnuala Kofoed; Adam Bradley; Donna Burnham; Ryan Ireland; Richard Steinkopf; Tom Westmoreland; Steve Mumford; Michael Hadley; Jeff Thompson  
**Subject:** Eagle Mountain Ranches Re-Zoning

(I am unable to attend the planning commission meeting on the 9th, please print this and give it to the members of the committee or have it read during public input.)

I would like to be put down on the record for my opposition for the re-zoning of agricultural to commercial in the Eagle Mountain Ranches proposed-subdivision.

I would like to encourage the City Council and Planning Commission to not approve the commercial zone. I am not in opposition to the proposal for residential 1+ acre lots, but do not feel that a commercial zone in the middle of residential and agricultural zones fits into the over all feel of Eagle Mountain. Please make sure you read the Planning Commission Staff Report, in the report is specifically states, "The Commercial Storage portion of the rezone does not comply with the General Plan." I believe that is true, and I feel that anything but the already planned rural residential and mixed residential in that area would lessen the appeal to that area. Lets keep it so that when you look at the mountains, you see mountains.

I have voice my opinion on this before, and just want to make sure that you know where I stand. We have plenty of other areas in Eagle Mountain for commercial zoning. There are a lot of acres already zoned for commercial development. The city does not need to have one plopped down in the middle of an out of the way sub-division.

I also ask that as you make plans for development, that you keep in mind that there are families on Lake Mountain road, with small children. We need to make sure that the roads are safe for kids as well as cars. The more development that happens on Lake Mountain, the more traffic the road will see. I would suggest that as part of the development plans that you put in place traffic control measures. Lets slow the traffic so that it is still safe for those of us that have houses facing Lake Mountain. When the road becomes paved, the traffic will increase to the east end of City Center via Lake Mountain Road. We need to take this into consideration as well.

Thanks,  
Mike Kieffer  
Aimee Kieffer  
Kallie Kieffer  
Katie Kieffer  
Sarah Kieffer  
Emma Kieffer  
Thomas Kieffer  
Lydia Kieffer  
Abbie Kieffer  
Jack Kieffer

The Kieffers  
5121 Lake Mountain Road

## Michael Hadley

---

**From:** bjeppson3@netzero.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 03, 2015 3:37 PM  
**To:** Michael Hadley; Mayor  
**Subject:** Lake mountain Road

Discussion about paving, fire Marshall opinion and "making exceptions" here and there.... and then they discuss changing city code because the 5 acre lots stay and the entire road needs to be paved prior to developing....

The "Master Plan" is mentioned several times and the importance of it. My question is; WHY do we pay so much attention to the MASTER PLAN, when WE make it so easy to "REZONE"?? Wouldn't rezoning change the Master Plan? It seems to me that allowing Agricultural to be rezoned to Residential; would make the Planning Commission unnecessary, as well as any "Master Plans." {What is the point??}

Millions of Agricultural Acres have disappeared over the past few decades and to allow the constant rezoning; millions more will disappear. We do not necessarily need to be concerned about ourselves... but what about our children and their children??

Where will they grow food? Where will the cattle graze? Where will the wild animals live? {How often do you see dead deer on Pony Express? {I saw 3 dead deer within 1 week, last month.}}

**WE NEED TO STOP REZONING AND STOP THESE GREEDY DEVELOPERS. WE NEED TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FUTURE, WE NEED TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY NOW!!**

Our new concern about the Utah County Health Department's statements regarding septic tanks and ground water, would also impact our environment up here.

This workshop discussed 5 acre lots and now we are meeting to discuss changing codes?? WHY??? {Just so you are aware; There is NOT one resident in Eagle Mountain that does not believe that the property owner/developer is getting "special favors".}

Please reconsider rezoning.... please stand up to these developers and show your concern for the future. Please lead by example.

Thank You

See this work shop: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iy2SCY8MTto>

---

Old School Yearbook Pics

View Class Yearbooks Online Free. Search by School & Year. Look Now!

<http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3231/556f7383ce36273830b9dst01vuc>

## Michael Hadley

---

**From:** Steve Mumford  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 09, 2015 5:05 PM  
**To:** Michael Hadley  
**Subject:** FW: NO to Rezoning Lake Mountain Road



**Steve Mumford, AICP**

*Planning Director*

[SMumford@Emcity.org](mailto:SMumford@Emcity.org)

801-789-6616

[www.eaglemountaincity.com](http://www.eaglemountaincity.com)



**From:** sue martin [<mailto:fisherq@netzero.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 03, 2015 12:50 AM  
**To:** Steve Mumford  
**Subject:** NO to Rezoning Lake Mountain Road

There is no reason for this area to be rezoned. The individual making this request should not receive special treatment due to the fact he is a city employee. Last month the Utah County Health Department expressed serious concerns about contamination to our groundwater Commissioner Everett wants to know how the City is going to identify the pollution.... The City should NOT ALLOW REZONING. This person does not satisfy the requirements to change the current zoning law; Utah State Code 17-27a-702. ZONING LAWS were implemented to serve a purpose; protect watersheds, provide habitat for important wildlife, maintain clean water and air. The specific purposes and intent of the County Commission in establishing the A-40 Agricultural Zone - implement the plans provided for in Section 17-27-301 of the said Code; preserve the county's agriculture land, preserve and protect agricultural activities from the conflicts and problems in residential areas by limiting residential areas by limiting residential developments. According to a 2008 Governor's Office of Planning and Budget report, in 1960, about 250,000 acres of land had been developed in Utah. By 2008, 750,000 acres in Utah had been developed for non-agricultural uses. It is predicted that by 2030, more than a million acres of land in Utah will be developed for urban uses. Unjustifiable discrimination would result against those who are not allowed to escape the requirements of the ordinance, i.e. to those without political influence. Many years ago, Bassett, a leading authority, pointed out that such dis-crimination would have gravely weakened the cause of zoning politically. If there was no mistake in the original zoning ordinance or no change of conditions in the area, and the change is not "in accordance with a comprehensive plan.... Zoning amendments, it is usually said, must be made for the general welfare; they must not be just a "special privilege" for the property owner.

My name is Jody Hooley, I live at 5008 N Lake Mtn. Rd. My husband and I bought our property here in 1993 and became residents in 1997. I sat where you are sitting several years ago and so I understand that this hearing is only for the rezoning of these properties, but I also know that you will ~~be~~ <sup>make</sup> recommendations to the city council based on the basic site plan and the input you receive from this hearing. I also want to say that getting a copy of the actual site plan was only possible because I am registered through a government site to receive all information regarding planning and council meetings. While I appreciate the 1 acre lots in this plan, I also have several concerns about how many and their situation as platted. These are my concerns: • First, the 5+ acre piece directly across from my house I don't believe has the required frontage to split in to 3 lots. ~~Even putting that~~ I believe putting that many lots next to the Kiefer's property to the north which is over 5 acres and across from ours creates a compatibility issue including the traffic of 3 driveways across from our home. I looked up lot split in the city code, but there was no clarification as to whether the property had to be owned by the owner of record in 1996 to be considered pertinent to this lot, which would not make it eligible as they are not to be less than 5 acres. As for the property to the north of me: • Although I know the code allows for 1 acre next to 5 acre I believe in certain areas as ours there should be better transitioning of lots and this plan shows 8+ acres, the Scott's home with 1 acre bordering 3 sides, and then to the north the lots go back up to 3 acre and larger because of the building restraints of the power and gas lines. • I am unable to tell from the paper work I was able to view as to whether the 32 lots around the existing house of Scotts's whether all the lots have the 150' required for 1 acre lots. • These 32 lots will require septic tanks which for all of us on wells, feel this is a very high concentration and are concerned about the possibility of eventual contamination. I know there are 2 washes toward the top of the property and I see no accommodations for them, they would be right on lots and send water down to others. There may also be alluvial discharge areas, but with the short amount of time I was able to view this plan and 2 jobs I was unable to research that possibility. Is there an open space plan or will the developer pay a fee in lieu? • I believe this is a base density residential development? One of the items in those requirements is "developments will be rural residential areas that are compatible with predominantly agricultural uses and natural open spaces that traditionally define the character of Cedar Valley and the associated foothills of Lake Mountain and Cedar Pass". One of the defining characters of Lake Mountain is the 100+ year old Juniper trees that create a huge grove in the area between the north cattle guard and the substation. Creating that high density of lots with streets would virtually destroy all the Junipers in that area. In the original city code there was very strong wording about mitigating the total destruction of those trees. • I know the code provides for the ability to have one road access for up to 30 lots, but feel as though that is not safe regarding the high risk of wild fires in this area. The only access to this property is one road off Lake Mountain Road. The drawing depicts another road going south from the top road, but there is no road there and I believe the developer may think there is a plan for one in the division created by John Jacob, but that is not safe regarding the high risk of wild fires in this area. The only access to this property is one road off Lake Mountain Road. The drawing depicts another road going south from the top road, but there is no road there and I believe the developer may think there is a plan for one in the division created by John Jacob, but it's access is also Lake Mountain and has no north outlet.

①  
I did not address the commercial ~~use~~ storage because I think it should be tabled as it was not in our notice, but it is not compatible with existing or future master plan.



# EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY

## Planning Commission Staff Report

JUNE 23, 2015

**Project:** Eagle Mountain Health Center Site Plan  
**Applicant:** Chas Johnson  
**Request:** Site Plan  
**Type of Action:** Action Item, Recommendation to City Council

**Preface**

This application is for a Site Plan located in the Porter's Crossing Town Center site Lot 8 approximately 1.18 ac in size. The Porter's Crossing development was approved by the City Council on May 3, 2011, along with a master site plan and preliminary plat (approved April 2011). This proposed project is for a health center facility. The center will have different health related services offered by different health professionals.

**Buildings & Commercial Design Standards**

The Eagle Mountain Health Center building is shown at 13,995 square feet. The building will contain four separate office spaces. These spaces are approximately 3,000 sq. ft. each. The project design does comply with the City's requirements for building & commercial design standards.

Building elevations and renderings have been submitted for the Eagle Mountain Health Center. Staff has no concerns with these elevations. Minor deviations from these elevations, still in compliance with the Design Standards, require approval by the Planning Director.



**Parking**

Required parking is 1 stall per 250 square feet of the building; the plan provides 54 total stalls with 3 handicapped stalls 2 stalls will need to be added for this project to meet the required number of parking stalls.

**Landscaping**

The applicants have designed the site according to our standards, including parking lot landscape islands with trees, pedestrian walkways, etc. 3 ½-foot high landscape berms are also required between sidewalks and parking areas, when adjacent to streets. These must be noted on the landscape plans. The applicants have provided entrance features similar to those found in other areas of The Ranches. There is a question regarding who is going to be responsible for the maintenance of the landscaping surrounding the site and extending out to Pony Express Pkwy. Is the applicant or the owner/developer of the Porter's Crossing Town Center going to be responsible?

**Tickville Wash**

The applicant is not planning on piping the wash but instead will install a retaining wall along the portions of the wash within the applicant's lot. The retaining wall specs will need to be submitted and approved by the City Engineer.

**Lighting**

All lights must be shielded downward and the light source may not be visible from surrounding properties. The lighting plan must comply with the City's dark sky ordinance requirements.

**Signs**

Proposed signage includes a monument sign facing Pony Express Parkway, a small directional sign at the main vehicular entrance and building signage. The monument sign will be designed with tenant names and logos, along with building name and address. A signage plan showing the planned locations of monument sign and directional sign has been submitted and reviewed. Staff has no concerns with this plan, as long as the signs meet the standards found in the City Code. Sign permits are required prior to any construction.

**Future reviews**

The applicant is proposing to redesign lots 7-9 within the existing Porter's Crossing Town Center plat. The applicant will be required to submit an amended plat to redefine the new lot lines. Currently the proposed site plan is on a smaller sized lot.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the Eagle Mountain Health Center site plan be approved with any proposed conditions.

**Recommended Motions**

The recommended motions are provided for the benefit of the Planning Commission and may be read or referenced when making a motion. The Planning Commission has the option to recommend approval, recommend approving with conditions, table, or deny the application, and should make one of the following motions:

*I move that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Eagle Mountain Health Center site plan to the City Council.*

**Attachments**

Overall Site Plan  
Landscape Plans  
Building Elevations & Renderings





