

APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES JUNE 5, 2019

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on June 5, 2019 at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Present: John Woffinden
Christine Anderson
Eric Franson
Chris Christiansen
Geoff Dupaix

Absent: Harold Dudley
Rod Brocious
Rebecca Staten

Staff Present: Scott Sensanbaugher, Public Works Director
Wendelin Knobloch, Planner
Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant

Also Present: James Wadsworth, Duaine Rasmussen

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Woffinden welcomed everyone and those present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Hearing, review and action on a land use map amendment located in the area of 705 East 50 South from the Residential-High Density to the Design Industrial designation

Chairman Woffinden stated that items 2 and 3 will be discussed together and voted on separately.

Mr. Knobloch explained that American Biotech Labs operates a facility at the northeast corner of 700 East and 50 South. They are looking to expand on a residential property, directly east of the current facility. The property for expansion is zoned R1-9,000 and lies within the High Density Residential Land Use designation. The property housing American Biotech Labs lies within the PI-1 (Planned Industrial) zone; however, the underlying Land Use designation is also High Density Residential.

Staff supports a change to the underlying Land Use designation, to Design Industrial, in order to bring the facility in line with current zoning; and, for the area under consideration for expansion to be amended to both the Design Industrial designation and Planned Industrial zone. Higher

APPROVED MINUTES

density residential uses are present to the north and east of the facility, and proposed expansion area. Should the Land Use and Zone Map amendments be approved, the applicants will return with a site plan, illustrating expansion.

Public Hearing Opened on Land Use Amendment

Public Hearing Closed on Land Use Amendment

Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the land use map amendment, at 705 East 50 South, from the Residential High Density designation to the Design Industrial designation.

Mr. Franson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Eric Franson	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye

The motion carried.

3. Hearing, review and action on a zone map amendment located in the area of 705 East 50 South from the R-1-9,000 Residential to the PI-1 Planned Industrial zone

Public Hearing Opened on Zone Map amendment

Mr. Scott Muller told commissioners that he rents space from Gunthers but needs additional space. He wants to know if it is an option to buy the Phelps property to expand, but the zoning would need to be changed. His business makes dietary supplements and cosmetic products. The current building has a lot of warehouse and storage space, they have 45 employees.

Ms. Anderson asked what activities would be conducted in the extension.

Mr. Muller said that both warehouse and office activities would be going on in the new addition.

Public Hearing Closed on Zone Map amendment

Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of a zone map amendment at 705 East 50 South, from the R-1-9,000 Residential zone to the PI-1 (Planned Industrial) zone.

Mr. Franson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Eric Franson	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Rod Brocious	

The motion carried.

APPROVED MINUTES

4. Hearing, review and action on an amendment to Section 17.4.608-5.03 of the American Fork City Development Code regarding Transportation Network Standards in the TOD Transit Oriented Development zone

Mr. Knobloch said that the proposed amendment seeks to allow cul-de-sacs within a Block Type 5 of the TOD zone. The current code allows cul-de-sacs in Block Types 1-4. Block Types 5 and above do not allow cul-de-sacs or other types of close-ended streets. This is due to the nature of the intended block types. Block Types 5 and above are found within the core area of the TOD overlay; within the area that strives for maximum connectivity for both pedestrians and vehicles. By allowing cul-de-sacs in a Block Type 5, this connectivity is compromised.

The TOD Code was recently adopted, with cul-de-sacs deliberately left out of the higher block types within core areas, to promote maximum connectivity. Staff does not see a need to allow cul-de-sacs or other close-ended street types within a Block Type 5 (or above); and, as such, recommends denial of the proposed code text amendment.

Mr. Sensanbaugher indicated that the Engineering Division supports the code as written and recommends denial of the proposed code text amendment. The purpose of the TOD code is to form a whole community and not isolated islands, especially in the higher-density areas. Streets that continue from neighborhood to neighborhood allow for a more cohesive community.

Mr. Franson stated that he supports the code as written and recognizes the many hours spent on developing it.

Ms. Anderson added that the code will be modified as needed, but she supports the current code.

Chairman Woffinden recalled all the work and many hours spent to write the TOD plan, he doesn't want to make changes that would defeat the purpose with a lack of accessibility.

Public Hearing Opened

Mr. James Wadsworth represents the property owner. He said that this block is a unique situation because it borders the Brad Reynolds property and a fence runs along the whole boundary side. He added that the TOD code allows cul de sacs when there are barriers in place that prevent through streets. He would like the area to be more walkable, and more vehicle traffic means it will be less safe in his opinion. He believes the code is well thought out, but there is an anomaly with the Reynolds project that reduces their options. He believes that the highest and best use of the property is the plan that is before the commission.

Duaine Rasmussen with Castlewood Development added his comments. He agrees with the concept of connectivity, but this is a unique situation. The road to 75 South was to go south through the Reynolds property then continue north. However, that road dead-ends into the Reynolds property and can't go anywhere. He wishes that the commissioners could see the proposed site plan, he thinks that they would be in approval. Their site plan has high density, but also has green space with several pedestrian paths. The design they submitted had cul de sacs. Connectivity and vehicular access are both obvious and promoted in their site plan. Public safety vehicles are even able to turn around.

APPROVED MINUTES

- 1 Christine clarifies that the site plan is a plan for several apartment buildings, Mr. Rasmussen
2 agrees. He adds that their plan includes common areas, play areas, bar bq and clubhouse areas.
3 He states that the Reynolds property is fully developed and there won't be connectivity going
4 east into that property. He agrees with the code and has created walking paths that will promote
5 walkability.
- 6 Mr. Franson asked city staff a question: If a cul de sac isn't allowed on 275 South,, can they
7 turn the road and head north and south?
- 8 Mr. Knobloch replied that they are considered too close to access 200 South. Walkability is a
9 great solution to the barrier that is the Reynolds property. The culdesac would accomodate public
10 safety vehicles.
- 11 Chairman Woffinden said that a culdesac is against the current code. When this commission
12 votes on the issue, it will go to council next and they can make the decision.
- 13 Mr. Christiansen asked what the difference is, why the Reynolds property cannot have the
14 desired connectivity.
- 15 Mr. Knobloch said that the difference is density, the Reynolds project is not calibrated to be part
16 of a TOD. The development in the proposed project is twice the density of the Reynolds
17 development. He suggests distinguishing between district framework plan and code text
18 amendment.
- 19 Mr. Franson said that there is an exception in the code for natural or man-made barriers. Mr.
20 Knobloch replied that it doesn't apply to this block type. Chairman Woffinden added that access
21 to the Reynolds property could be changing, and that two exits are required. He feels that the
22 commissioners' hands are tied, they cannot approve the proposal if it goes against the code. City
23 council will have the final decision.
- 24 Mr. Wadsworth stated that he is just asking for a recommendation from the commission, but the
25 Chairman said that their hands are tied.
- 26 Ms. Anderson said that there is not agreement to change the code across the block. There might
27 be a consensus to make an allowance, but not by changing the code.
- 28 Mr. Dupaix stated that it looks like staff missed the boat with the Reynolds development and
29 with the way the blocks are set up. If the city council approves this, he feels that they will be
30 opening a can of worms. A lot of effort has gone into the grid network and the TOD. The
31 Reynolds project was approved before the current code, and it doesn't meet the requirements of
32 the TOD code.
- 33 Mr. Sensanbaugher said that the Reynolds property plan was approved before the TOD was even
34 planned.
- 35 Mr. Dupaix disagreed, he feels like they may have prematurely approved that project.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Sensanbaugher replied that the Reynolds plan complied with code at the time, and the
2 criteria for approval is whether a development meets code or not.

3 **Public Hearing Closed**

4 **Mr. Franson moved to recommend denial of the proposed amendment to Section 17.4.608-**
5 **5.03 of the American Fork City Development Code.**

6 **Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

7 **Chairman Woffinden Aye**

8 **Christine Anderson Aye**

9 **Eric Franson Aye**

10 **Chris Christiansen Aye**

11 **Geoff Dupaix Aye**

12 **The motion carried.**

13

14 Ms. Anderson indicated that she can see that an exception may be appropriate.

15

16 Chairman Woffinden asked when this will be in front of the city council. Mr. Knobloch replied that it
17 should be on June 25.

18

19 Mr. Christiansen said that the city council needs to address this problem, and they must consider
20 some kind of exception for this situation. He feels that the solution has to come from the city
21 council.

22 Mr. Rasmussen stated that he looks forward to making his case in front of the council, this issue
23 needs to be addressed.

24 Geoff asked if we need to be on record that code language needs to be changed to accommodate
25 these situations.

26

27 5. Hearing, review and action on a District Framework Plan for the Castlewood Project,
28 located at 900 West 200 South in the TOD Transit Oriented Development zone

29

30 Mr. Knobloch explained that the area comprising this District Framework Plan consists of
31 approximately 9.7 acres. It is located at 900 West 200 South, and runs north/south. The property
32 lies within the Transit Core District, and within the Mixed-Use Core sub-district. The highest
33 intensities of use and densities are envisioned in this area.

34 District Framework Plans are covered in Section 4 of the recently adopted TOD Code. A District
35 Framework Plan lays the overall groundwork, or backbone, of forthcoming development. District
36 Framework Plans proceed through Planning Commission and ultimately City Council. Following
37 approval of a District Framework Plan, subsequent development submittals are reviewed and either
38 approved or denied by staff; the exception being formal subdivision plats, which proceed through
39 Planning Commission and City Council. Per Section 4.01.3 of the Code, District Framework Plans

APPROVED MINUTES

expire 24 months after approval “if not acted upon further through the submittal of a block plan”. Extensions may be granted by the Council, if requested and deemed appropriate.

Because this District Framework Plan is dependent on the previous agenda item (Code Text Amendment), Staff recommends the Planning Commission TABLE the plan until resolution is made regarding the use of cul-de-sacs within the block type designated for this area. If the amendment is denied, redesign of the District Framework Plan will be required.

Mr. Sensanbaugher indicated that the Engineering Division recommends TABLING of the proposed development.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Christiansen moved to table action on the District Framework Plan until such time that resolution is made by Council regarding the accompanying Code Text Amendment.

Mr. Dupaix seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Eric Franson	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Franson said that they have the authority to make a finding that they believe there are extenuating circumstances for an extension, but Chairman Woffinden feels that the city council must make that decision. Mr. Franson stated that the commission has to first make a finding. He recommended discussing this question with the city attorney. Mr. Dupaix agreed that this discussion needs to happen with legal staff first.

6. Other Business

Chairman Woffinden reminded commissioners that the next meeting will be held on June 19, there will be no meeting on July 3. The second meeting in July will be held on the 20th.

7. Review and action on the minutes of the May 22, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Session

Ms. Anderson moved to approve the minutes of the May 22, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Session.

Mr. Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye

APPROVED MINUTES

Eric Franson Aye
Chris Christiansen Aye
Geoff Dupaix Abstain
The motion carried.

Mr. Dupaix moved to adjourn.

Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. All concurred.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.



Lisa Halversen,
Administrative Assistant