



**MINUTES OF THE VINEYARD TOWN
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Vineyard City Offices, 240 East Gammon Road, Vineyard, Utah
Wednesday, April 19, 2017 at 6:30 p.m.**

PRESENT	ABSENT
Commissioner Chair Chris Judd	(A) Commissioner Cristy Welsh
Commissioner Tim Blackburn	Commissioner Angela Kohl
Commissioner Daniel Pace	(A) Commissioner Nate Carter
(A) Commissioner Bryce Brady	
(A) Commissioner Anthony Jenkins	

STAFF PRESENT– Community Development Director Morgan Brim, Town Engineer Don Overson, Community Development Technician Elizabeth Hart

OTHERS PRESENT– Resident and Town Councilmember Tyce Flake, Councilmember Julie Fullmer, Homesteads representative Mike Olson and Resident Thora Searle.

The Vineyard Town Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, April 19, 2017, starting at 6:30 PM in the Vineyard Town hall.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Judd called the meeting to order at 6:31PM

INVOCATION

Commissioner Blackburn offered the invocation

OPEN SESSION

Chairman Judd asked for a motion to open the open session for public comment.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE OPEN SESSION. COMMISSIONER PACE SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE OPEN SESSION OPENED AT 6:33 PM.

Thora Searle, resident of the Gardens neighborhood, expressed her concern for changing the Homesteads development agreement.

Chairman Judd stated that the Homesteads development agreement is on the agenda and that Ms. Searle’s concerns will be addressed during that item. He asked for additional public comment. There was none. Chairman Judd asked for a motion to close the open session.

Motion: COMMISSIONER PACE MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE OPEN SESSION. COMMISSIONER BRADY SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE OPEN SESSION CLOSED AT 6:36 PM.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Chairman Judd asked for any comments or corrections for the minutes of the March 1, 2017 and April 5, 2017 Planning Commission meetings. There were no comments or corrections. Chairman Judd asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE MARCH 1, 2017 AND APRIL 5, 2017 THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES. COMMISSIONER JENKINS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED.

WORK SESSION

5.1 Homesteads Development Agreement

Chairman Judd turned the time over to Mr. Brim to discuss the Homesteads development agreement. Mr. Brim gave a brief background on the development agreement. He stated the agreement covers the entire Homesteads development, it is not specific to one neighborhood.

There was discussion on the background and the neighborhoods the agreement covers.

Mr. Brim introduced Mike Olson the representative for the Homesteads Development. Commissioner Jenkins asked for clarification that no changes have been made to the agreement since 2012. Mr. Brim confirmed that there have been no amendments since 2012.

Mr. Brim stated that the reason the development agreement is on the agenda is because staff met with Mike Olson to go over the comments from the planning commission and city council. He stated that there was concern over an interpretation given by Nathan Crane, the previous planner. He stated that this interpretation was in an email between Mr. Crane and the Homesteads broker and a copy has been given to everyone. He stated that there are two standards in questions, the requirement to have 40 percent brick or stone on the front elevation and the requirement to have a 2-5 foot wainscot return on the side elevation. Mr. Brim stated that the interpretation from the email states that the home does not have to have the 40 percent brick or stone on the front elevation as long as the builder has used fire cement or hardie board along with 3 feet of wainscoting on the front elevation, which includes the side of the garage that pops out. Mr. Brim stated that the intent of the 40 percent brick or stone requirement was that the front elevation have a visual break. But if they met the alternative requirement of fire cement or hardie board with the 3 feet of wainscoting, then the builder would not have to fulfill the 40 percent of brick or stone and the 2-5 foot side wrap of wainscot. Mr. Brim stated that he spoke with the City Attorney about this interpretation and that he said in a council meeting that this was discussed and was approved by the council in a verbal confirmation. Mr. Olson stated that he would like this interpretation be stated in the development agreement so that there is no confusion.

Chairman Judd stated that the email from Mr. Crane was confusing because he is not approving anything and asks for clarification on item number 7 from the broker. There was additional discussion on the items within the email. Chairman Judd asked for the rest of the email chain for clarification and for the city council meeting minutes of the verbal approval to be found. He also reiterated Mr. Olson's comment on documenting this approval is needed this time.

Mr. Brim asked if the commission is okay with the interpretation from Mr. Crane and stated that the intent is clear, it was to break up the front elevation. Chairman Judd expanded by stating that what is lost with this interpretation is the 2-5 feet of wainscot on the side elevation. He asked if the commission was willing to make a recommendation to the city council with this interpretation. Chairman Judd asked Mr. Olson if having the 2-5 feet of wainscot on the side would be a dramatic cost to the house, he also stated that the public comment at the previous planning commission meeting was that they do like the wainscot on the side of the house. Discussion ensued on this topic.

Commissioner Pace asked if a survey had been done on how many existing homes meet the requirements. Mr. Brim stated that the only survey that was done was for the white vinyl fences. Commissioner Pace asked Mr. Olson if he is stating that all the homes do meet the requirements being discussed. Mr. Olson stated that they meet what was laid out in the email. There was additional discussion on clarifying the 40 percent brick or stone on the front elevation and the 2-5 feet on wainscot on the side elevation. Commissioner Judd asked for additional comment on this section of the development agreement. Commissioner Jenkins asked if the 40% brick or stone was the biggest offender. Mr. Brim stated that the biggest offender was the 2-5 foot return on the side but with the interpretation discussed tonight, a lot more homes will comply but there were other things like the 3rd car garage setback.

Chairman Judd moved the discussion to defining agricultural heritage that is in the development agreement, he stated that the city council expressed that a definition is needed. Commissioner Blackburn stated that it needs to be defined somewhere whether it be the development agreement or the general plan, so that it is not forgotten. Mr. Brim stated that if we do it in the general plan we can create a chapter that is for historical preservation and we can talk about agricultural heritage. Chairman Judd suggested that this be talked about during business item 5.3 because it is about the general plan.

Commissioner Brady stated the Mr. Olson discussed a clubhouse at the city council meeting. Mr. Olson stated that the clubhouse will look like a farm. Commissioner Brady stated that along with the clubhouse there has been some farm equipment donated to the city which can all be used to add to the agricultural theme the community is aiming for. Discussion ensued on this topic.

Commissioner Judd commented about the 2-car garages for POD 1, he stated that at the last planning commission the commission was told that 8 units would have 1 car garages but that number now is roughly 28 units. Mr. Olson stated that it will be more likely around 20 units or less. Commissioner Brady stated that in response to this the developer has added more parking spaces. Mr. Olson stated that they have added 72 parking spaces, which is more than what was required. Chairman Judd asked for comments. Mr. Brim stated that the 1 car garages are paired with the 1 bedroom units, not like Edge Water where there is a 1 car garage for units with 3 bedrooms. Commissioner Jenkins stated that the intent is to eliminate any parking issues and that the extra spaces does this. Chairman Judd asked if the units will be sold individually or as one building. Mr. Olson said that they are sold individually. Mr. Brim added that they will be under one property Management Company. Mr. Olson stated that another difference between this development and Edge Water is that the roadways will 30 feet wide instead of 20 feet.

Chairman Judd asked Mr. Brim if there was any other items the city council that they wanted the planning commission to discuss further. Mr. Brim stated that the city council agreed with everything the planning commission discussed. Mr. Olson brought up the requirement for 12 to 18 inches of eaves. He stated that this requirement is met by all the homes. Mr. Overson commented that when you have a 5 foot side yard setback and you extend an eave two feet you are creating a fire hazard, the fire can jump easily, a fire marshal wouldn't want you to be any closer than you have to be. Chairman Judd asked Mr. Olson what the longest eave they

have done. Mr. Olson said 18 inches was the longest. Chairman Judd asked if it helped to keep a maximum in there for safety. Mr. Overson stated that he cannot speak for the fire marshal but that the fire marshal has said before you are creating a fire hazard the closer the house are together. Commissioner Pace asked if there was any architectural need for the eaves to be longer than 18 inches. Mr. Olson said no and asked for the wording to be changed to say the minimum is 12 inches. It was agreed that stating the minimum 12 inches was good.

Chairman Judd stated that city council was okay with the wrought iron fencing to be along the wetland trails but defining that as the wetland trails needs to be done. And taking out prohibiting white solid fences. Chairman Judd addressed the comments made by resident Thora Searle, stating that removing the restriction of white vinyl fencing was not because towards any one resident or home but the development as a whole. He also stated that the adjustment would only affect the interior fencing not the exterior boundary fencing. He stated that as a whole, the planning commission felt that from the survey staff did and the public comment received that removing this restriction was the right thing to do. He also stated that there is no enforcement process in place with the city and there is not enough staff to do so at this time. That these things helped the planning commission make their decision on removing the white vinyl fencing restriction. Ms. Searle stated that for the development agreement it made sense but the CC&Rs are very clear that white vinyl fencing is not allowed. Chairman Judd stated that the city does not get involved with CC&Rs and that it would be civil matter between property owners. He also stated that her concerns would be best heard by going to her neighbors or the developer about not changing the CC&Rs. Resident and Councilwoman Julie Fullmer also addressed Ms. Searle concerns. Chairman Judd thanked Ms. Searle for her concern and her comments.

Chairman Judd asked for additional comment on the development agreement. Mr. Olson brought up street trees in the front yard. He stated that there is a requirement for lots that are less than sixty (60) feet in width have to have a minimum of 2 trees. He stated that he would like to remove the sixty (60) feet and make that every lot has to have at least 2 trees. Chairman Judd asked Mr. Overson for comment. Mr. Overson stated that 60 foot lots are already so narrow that once you start adding the utilities to the lot you will invariably have a tree that is too close to those utilities and the question comes up of where should the tree be put. He stated that it should be eliminated and there should be a reference to the city standards that there must be two trees per lot not per foot and they do not need to be located in the park strips. Chairman Judd asked how this would be enforce. Mr. Overson stated that the landscaping is already bonded for and for the bond to released it will have to be verified by staff that the landscaping has been installed. Discussion ensued about the city's standards for trees.

Chairman Judd asked Mr. Brim to explain what Mr. Church said at the city council meeting. Mr. Brim said that Mr. Church found that the planned development ordinance had been already adopted by ordinance for the Homesteads development prior to the development agreement being approved by resolution, meaning that the development agreement should not go through a public hearing process. He stated that it won't come through the planning commission for a formal public hearing, it will go for an approval to the city council. Mr. Brim stated that once the development agreement has been drafted and worked out with the developer, the city will send it out to the planning commission for final comments and then send it to the city council

for final approval. For clarification Commissioner Jenkins stated that the planning commission is not directing the developer to change the CC&Rs and that there is no expectation that they will be changed to match the development agreement.

5.2 Zoning ordinance

Chairman Judd turned the time over to Mr. Brim. Mr. Brim stated that he has been getting calls from interested parties for self-storage. He stated that he feels it is time to tighten up the code for this and he developed a section that requires a mixed use self-storage type project. He stated that it will be inserted within the RMU and Industrial district. Mr. Brim said that he will send this out the commissioners for their comments. There was additional discussion on the timeline for getting this approved.

Chairman Judd asked if there are another standards within the RMU district that need to be tweaked now. Mr. Brim stated that there needs to be standards for drive-thrus. Discussion ensued about what standards are needed. Mr. Brim suggested that a work session can be done for the drive-thrus.

Mr. Brim also discussed a possible development happening in the industrial zone along Geneva Rd.

5.3 General plan trails and open space

Commissioner Judd thanked staff for sending out other city examples. There was discussion on the how an outline can be created for the trails and open space chapter of the general plan.

Mr. Brim stated that once the zoning ordinance update is finished that the process for the trails and open space chapter will begin. He stated that there are some good processes that can be done that involve the public, especially the youth. Commissioner Jenkins asked how the general plan works with other jurisdictions, specifically the Utah Lake Trail. Mr. Overson stated that it would be with the state. Mr. Brim stated that the general plan is for the ideas and then the implementation process is for making what is possible work. Discussion ensued on the implementation process.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMEBERS' REPORTS/DISCLOSURES

Commissioner Blackburn talked about the Vineyard Heritage Day Commemoration that is going to be help on Saturday May 13th at 10 AM.

STAFF REPORTS

- Morgan Brim, Community Development Director
 - Mr. Brim stated that an event for cleaning up the beach area is taking place on Saturday and they are expecting 400 volunteers.
 - Mr. Brim stated that Councilwoman Julie Fullmer has been working with UVU on a library concept and the group of students will be coming to present their concept to the Planning Commission at the next meeting.
- Don Overson, City Engineer

Commissioner Pace left the meeting at 8:14PM

- Mr. Overson discussed the plans for the overpass.
- Commissioner Jenkins asked what is happening with the huge dirt pile along Center St. Mr. Overson stated that the Homesteads development is getting ready for the construction of POD 1.
- Mr. Overson discussed the timeline for opening the 18 acre park and putting out bids for the reservoir at the 6 acre park.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Judd asked for a motion to adjourn the planning commission meeting.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOUR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AT 8:32 PM. COMMISSIONER JENKINS SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL IN ATTENDANCE WERE IN FAVOR. THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:32 PM.

MINTUES APPROVED ON: May 17, 2017

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Elizabeth Hart
Elizabeth Hart, Community Development Technician