

**AMERICAN FORK CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION
NOVEMBER 20, 2019**

Notice is hereby given that the American Fork City Planning Commission will meet in regular session on November 20, 2019 at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 p.m. The agenda shall be as follows:

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Hearing, review and action on an ordinance relating to cannabis cultivation and processing.
3. Other Business
4. Site Plan Committee Report
5. Review and action on the minutes of the November 6, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Session
6. Adjournment

John H. Woffinden, P.G.
Planning Commission Chairman

The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the commission, city staff and the public

Hearing, review and action on an ordinance relating to cannabis cultivation and processing

Planning has been in coordination with the City Attorney's office in drafting an ordinance regulating cannabis cultivation and processing facilities. Recent changes to State Law permit the cultivation, processing, and location of such facilities. Unless jurisdictions further identify zones in which facilities may locate, State Law allows a more-broad interpretation on their location.

The draft ordinance proposes two zones for the cultivation and processing of cannabis; the RA-5 zone for cultivation, and the I-1 zone for processing. Pharmacies dispensing cannabis product are allowed in any zone other than residential, and a population cap is set; ensuring limited location(s).

Potential Motions:

APPROVAL

Mr. Chairman, I move that we recommend approval of the proposed ordinance.

DENIAL

Mr. Chairman, I move that we recommend denial of the proposed ordinance.

TABLE

Mr. Chairman, I move that we table action on the proposed ordinance.

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE OF AMERICAN FORK CITY, UTAH, GOVERNING CANNABIS PRODUCTION ESTABLISHMENTS AND CANNABIS PHARMACIES

WHEREAS, Title 4, Chapter 41a of the Utah Code allows for the establishment of Cannabis Production establishments and requires municipalities to permit Cannabis Production Establishments in at least one agricultural or industrial zone;

WHEREAS, Title 26, Chapter 61a of the Utah Code requires municipalities to permit Medical Cannabis Pharmacies in any zone not established primarily for residential use; and

WHEREAS, Title 4, Chapter 41a and Title 26, Chapter 61a of the Utah Code allow municipalities to enact regulations and conditions upon Cannabis Production Establishments and Medical Cannabis Pharmacies relating to cultivation, business operations and licensing and that such regulation do not conflict with the state code.

NOW THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of American Fork City, State of Utah, that:

Section _____.____.____ Title.

The provisions in this chapter shall be known and may be referred to as Cannabis Production Establishments and Medical Cannabis Pharmacies Ordinance.

Section _____.____.____ Conformance With Existing Laws and Regulations.

Nothing in this chapter shall be deemed to permit or allow cannabis production establishments in any manner which is contrary to applicable federal or state statutes regulating such business. Additionally, cannabis production establishments shall comply with all applicable city codes and ordinances.

Section _____.____.____ Definitions.

For purposes of this chapter, the definitions in Title 26, Chapter 61a, the Utah Medical Cannabis Act and Title 4, Chapter 41a, Cannabis Production Establishments, of the Utah Code, as may be amended, are hereby adopted and incorporated into this Chapter.

The following words shall have the following meanings:

Cannabis Production Establishment means a cannabis cultivation facility, a cannabis processing facility, or an independent testing laboratory.

Community location means:

- A. all public or private schools;

- B. licensed child-care facilities;
- C. licensed preschools;
- D. trade or technical schools;
- E. churches;
- F. public libraries;
- G. public parks and playgrounds;
- H. youth centers or other spaces used primarily for youth oriented activities;
- I. public recreational facilities; or
- J. public arcades.

Zones Established Primarily for Residential Use means, for purposes of this Chapter and any applicable state law, the following zoning districts in American Fork City:

- A. RA-1
- B. One and Two Family Residential Zones as established in 17.3.101
- C. Multi-family Residential Zones as established in 17.3.101

Section __.__.__ License Required.

It is unlawful for any person to operate a Cannabis Production Establishment or Medical Cannabis Pharmacy within American Fork City without first obtaining a Cannabis Production Establishment or Medical Cannabis Pharmacy license from the City. The Cannabis Production Establishment or Medical Cannabis Pharmacy business license shall specify the type of business for which it is obtained.

Section __.__.__ Premises Location.

- A. Operation of a Cannabis Processing Facility shall be a permitted only in the Industrial-1 (I-1) zone.
- B. Operation of a Cannabis Cultivation Facility shall be permitted only in the Residential Agriculture-5 (RA-5) zone.
- C. Operation of a Medical Cannabis Pharmacy shall be a permitted use in all zones except those Zones Established Primarily for Residential Use.
- D. No business license shall be provided to a Cannabis Production Establishment or Medical Cannabis Pharmacy if it is located within:
 - a. 1,000 feet of a community location;
 - b. 600 feet from Zones Established Primarily for Residential Use; or
 - c. 1,000 feet of any other Cannabis Production Establishment or Medical Cannabis Pharmacy.
- E. For purposes of this section, proximity requirements shall be measured in a straight line from the nearest entrance of the Cannabis Production Establishment or Medical Cannabis Pharmacy to the nearest property boundary of the community location or Zone

Established Primarily for Residential Use by following the shortest route or ordinary pedestrian travel, without regard to intervening structures or zoning districts.

Section _____.____.____ Land Use Permit.

- A. A Cannabis Production Establishment or Medical Cannabis Pharmacy must obtain a land use permit from American Fork City, which the City shall issue in writing upon a showing that the proposed Establishment or Pharmacy and the corresponding facilities and operations comply with the provisions of this Chapter and with Title 4, Chapter 41 or Title 26, Chapter 61a of the Utah Code, as may be applicable to the proposed use.
 - a. A Cannabis Production Establishment or Medical Cannabis Pharmacy seeking a land use permit shall provide to the American Fork Police Department a copy of its state approved security plan for securing the operations so as to prevent the theft, embezzlement or illegal use and/or distribution of cannabis from the Establishment or Pharmacy.

Section _____.____.____ Standards for Cannabis Production Establishment.

- A. There shall be no emission of dust, fumes, vapors, odors or waste into the environment from any facility where growing, processing and testing of cannabis occurs.
- B. No signage is allowed for Cannabis Production Establishments.

Section _____.____.____ Standards for Medical Cannabis Pharmacies.

- A. Drive through service shall not be allowed.
- B. Outdoor seating areas shall be prohibited.
- C. Outdoor vending machines shall be prohibited.
- D. Direct or home delivery service shall be prohibited.
- E. Permitted hours of operation are 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.
- F. The maximum size of a Medical Cannabis Pharmacy shall be 3,000 square feet.
- G. No more than one (1) Medical Cannabis Pharmacy shall be permitted in the City for every 135,000 residents.
- H. No cannabis products shall be visible from outside a Medical Cannabis Pharmacy building.
- I. Signs shall be limited to one wall sign on the front face of the building, not to exceed five percent (5%) of the first story building face of the front face of the building.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL, STATE OF UTAH, ON THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2019.

AMERICAN FORK CITY:

MAYOR BRADLEY J. FROST

ATTEST:

TERILYN LURKER, CITY RECORDER

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES NOVEMBER 6, 2019

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on November 6, 2019 at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Present: John Woffinden
Chris Christiansen
Christine Anderson
Rod Brocious
Harold Dudley

Absent: Rebecca Staten
Geoff Dupaix

Staff Present: Ben Hunter, Engineer
Adam Olsen, Senior Planner
Wendelin Knobloch, Planner
Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant

Also Present: Carolyn Lloyd, Corey Nielsen, Mindi Lovell, Jerimy and Jessica Vosika, Tiffany Ashton, Michael Beck, Chad Spencer, Vaha Souphom, Andrea McAllister, Gregg Lybbert, Stacie Carter, Ken Berg, Andy Spencer

1. Pledge of Allegiance

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

2. Hearing, review and action on the Fenn Farms Conservation PUD, consisting of 79 units, located in the area of 350 South 570 West in the PR-3.0 Planned Residential zone

Mr. Olsen stated that the Estates at Fenn Farms is proposed as a Conservation Subdivision PUD (Planned Unit Development). 79 lots are proposed; one lot with an existing home. Overall density for the project is 2.8 du/ac. Access is provided from 330 South and from 700 West. An extensive wetland area exists and will be incorporated into the development as open space, with a trail system meandering throughout. Additional smaller open space areas are proposed in the subdivision, at both the north and south.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 Section 17.7.503 of the Development Code provides guidelines for the approval of a Conservation
2 Subdivision PUD. The Estates at Fenn Farms proposes a combined preliminary/final plat and has
3 been processed as such.

4 The Development Code outlines provisions for calculation of density (17.7.503.F). Per the table,
5 provided in 17.7.503.F, density is calculated as the sum of the following: portion of the gross
6 project area without limitations, times the density factor; plus the portion of the gross project area
7 with limitations, times one-half the density factor; plus transfer of development rights (if
8 applicable). For the Estates at Fenn Farms, the calculation is as follows: 23.59 acres (gross area
9 without limitations) x 3 (derived from table in 17.7.503.E); plus 5.9 acres (gross area with
10 limitations) x 1.5 (derived from table in 17.7.503.E). This equals 80 units. The Estates at Fenn
11 Farms proposes 79.

12 Conservation subdivisions within the PR-3.0 zone require 25% open space. The subdivision
13 provides 38%. The Development Code requires that all areas “determined to be unsuited for
14 development” be included as open space (17.7.503.H.7(c)).

15 As with other development options in the PR-3.0 zone, the Code allows the Planning Commission
16 flexibility to require changes in the plan if it feels the intent of the ordinance is not met. Changes
17 may include, but are not limited to, “adjustments in the density or number of structures, relocation
18 of project elements, redesign of the road system, increase in the amount of open space and
19 provisions for the disposal of surface water drainage” (17.7.503.D).

20 Ms. Anderson asked how the open space will be developed, will it stay native?

21 Mr. Olsen indicated that wetland areas will be left native, with a trail around and to the west of the
22 subdivision. Code requires that any areas that are undevelopable be included in open space. The
23 wetlands would be passive open space.

24 Mr. Brocious added that he likes the layout and the plans for the open space.

25 Mr. Hunter indicated that the Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed
26 development. On the west side of the project, the 700 West segment will be completed with the
27 Willow Glen development. Necessary changes in alignments and utilities have been
28 incorporated.

29 Mr. Mike Beck, developer of property, along with Mark Greenwood, project engineer, stood to
30 answer questions. Mr. Beck said that he has owned this property for an extensive time, the goal
31 is to come in under the PR 3 zoning. The amount of open space is higher than required, density is
32 lower. He feels it is an economical design, asks for approval.

33 Ms. Anderson asks about parcels H, J, C and D, are they in grass? Who will maintain these?

34 Mr. Greenwood said they would be grass and trees and will be maintained by an HOA.

35 Chairman Woffinden asked about the high liquefaction potential indicated in the soils report.
36 How will this be mitigated?

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Greenwood replied that they've talked with their geotech engineer a lot about this, they will
2 probably bring more material in.

3 Mr. Beck indicated that there is a home in the area with a full basement that's never had water in
4 it, there is a large gravel bed in the south end of property that will help with drainage.

5 Ms. Anderson said that she would like to see a light at the front of parcel J. It will be a detention
6 basin.

7 **Public Hearing Opened**

8 Vaha Souphom, neighbor, has concerns about easements, he indicated that he is working with Mr.
9 Beck to resolve the issue. He would like more information about any HOA, and if the existing
10 residents will be forced into it. He expressed his appreciation for the city planners and engineers
11 that have listened to his concerns over the years. He doesn't like the proposal, but he guesses it
12 meets the requirements. His main concern is the geotech concern raised by the chairman. His
13 home has a full basement, with a sump pump that has never run. He also has concerns about the
14 trail system around the wetlands, and maintenance questions. He said that he wants it to be good
15 quality materials and well-maintained.

16 Mr. Greenwood said that it's typical for everyone in the area to be included in an HOA. The trail
17 may be boardwalk in some areas, some areas could be asphalt. It will likely be a mixture of
18 materials, and the trail will connect to a sidewalk on the east corner of the development.

19 Ms. Andrea McAllister is a homeowner in the top right corner of the development. She has been
20 to several planning commission meetings. Her main concern is traffic and safety, 200 South hasn't
21 been widened yet as previously promised. Each unit in this proposed development will have at
22 least one car, she is concerned that there will not be sufficient parking. The crowded streets make
23 it difficult to plow snow and give access for emergency vehicles. She is frustrated by the high
24 density of the proposal that adjoins the existing neighbors, instead of slowly changing the density
25 to adjust to the low density neighbors. She doesn't want to pay for an HOA, she has concerns
26 about accessibility and high density, she would prefer parks and larger lots and yards. She is
27 concerned about this new development impacting existing home values negatively.

28 Chairman Woffinden added that it is illegal to park on streets from November to March, but it isn't
29 enforced due to lack of personnel. He asked Mr. Hunter what the plans are for 200 South.

30 Mr. Hunter replied that 200 South is still in the design phase, plans have not been finalized. The
31 horizontal alignment is basically fixed. As each new development along 200 South comes in, road
32 improvements will be built into the plans. It is likely that the road improvements will happen
33 along with developments. The 200 South design is being pushed forward now because they are
34 aware of issues in the area, but he doesn't have a timeline for the project. There are a lot of different
35 moving parts. As to road construction, 700 and 900 West are being constructed to help with some
36 of the traffic needs. At full buildout 700 West will accommodate a lot of traffic, thicker pavement
37 is being used to provide for more traffic. Bike lane and trail components are both being planned
38 as well.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Brocious added that he doesn't think that construction on 200 South will be happening anytime
2 soon, Mr. Hunter said that it depends on which segment and if the city has funding and rights-of-
3 way.

4 Mr. Brocious asked at what point the traffic demand will require that 200 South be improved.

5 Mr. Hunter replied that it depends on their modeling, they don't have specific numbers yet, this
6 development doesn't put 200 South in jeopardy.

7 Ms. Stacie Carter lives on 200 South, the homes at the top west edge of the proposed development
8 will be her back neighbors. She asked if the trails will be lit, there are a lot of skunks in this area.
9 She is concerned about roads. Willow Glen and the Meadows Apartments are creating massive
10 traffic on 200 South, sometimes she has to wait 15 to 20 minutes just to get out of her driveway.
11 570 and 700 West both tee up to 200 South, along with 900 West. There is no way to get to this
12 development without using 200 South. It is also the main road for Meadows Apartments and
13 Willow Glen.

14 Chairman Woffinden acknowledged those traffic problems, and said that is why the road is going
15 to be widened.

16 Ms. Carter pointed out that it hasn't been improved yet. Big trucks are all going up and down 200
17 South and the road is crumbling on both shoulders. It is a big mess. The city has been good about
18 coming and fixing the potholes, but not at dealing with the long-term problem. She's been told
19 for years that 200 South is in the design process, but nothing has changed except adding much
20 more development and traffic. Will 570 and 330 West be widened as well? These roads are
21 narrow and 700 West is the only option. Bus stops are here, there is no room for sidewalks, and
22 buses will be going across tracks. Greenwood Elementary is expanding and bussing. This
23 development would have homes with kids within a year, they need safe crossing for school buses.
24 This development should be put on hold until 200 South can handle all the extra traffic. The new
25 neighbors have been great, but parking has not been sufficient for their needs.

26 Ms. Anderson indicated that 200 South is an extremely expensive road. She understands that the
27 current roads are not capable of handling these developments. Developers have to pitch in and
28 absorb some of the costs of the necessary improvements, they go along concurrently with
29 development plans. It might be helpful for the neighbors to meet with the developer and discuss
30 their needs and wants. Their role as planning commissioners isn't to make new requirements, they
31 just say if the proposal meets code or not.

32 Chairman Woffinden said that this proposal still has to go to city council, he suggested that
33 residents take up their concerns in that meeting on November 26.

34 Ms. Anderson reassured residents that this project is not typical of the density that will be coming
35 to this area. This project is more visually dense because of the wetland areas that have to be
36 calculated in. Still, these are larger lots than what the developer could have proposed.

37 Mr. Beck says they will be widening 330 and 570 West to make full-sized roads.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Gregg Lybbert, neighbor, shares the same concerns. He feels that the streets are already at
2 their limit, there is no additional capacity. There is a ton of traffic already. It is an unsafe situation
3 with deteriorating roads and speeding traffic, and the commission will be making things worse by
4 adding more development. When the trains come, everything is locked up, there is nowhere to go
5 or to get out. He wants to know who will rebuild 200 South and when this will happen. 200 South
6 is the choke point, it is a critical path and all you have is gridlock. The high density is concerning
7 to citizens in the area, they are surrounded by small lots and homes. The city seems to have no
8 long-term plan.

9 Chairman Woffinden pointed out that the city had a moratorium on TOD development, but if a
10 developer follows the rules, the commission can't stop them. He told neighbors to go to the city
11 council and tell them the same things they are telling commissioners. He feels that the
12 commissioners are handcuffed in regards to what they can do.

13 Mr. Lybbert indicated that there are numerous fields for sale, and new development will likely be
14 at the highest density. He asked who is helping to pay for 200 South repairs, he said that the city
15 is approving developments that impact 200 South and nobody is reconstructing it.

16 Mr. Dudley said the road will be fixed at some point.

17 Ms. Anderson told the neighbors that they want the funding for the roads, but that comes from
18 developments and impact fees. She agreed with the Chairman's suggestion that they go to the city
19 council, they are the ones that control the funding and they need to hear these concerns. This
20 proposal will be on the city council agenda on November 26 if commissioners approve it tonight.

21 Mr. Christiansen said that all development in that south area pays impact fees that will help to do
22 the road improvements.

23 Ms. McAllister said that there should be another moratorium until the road 200 South is improved.
24 She understands that Highland added road repair charges to people's utility bills, she thinks that
25 American Fork should consider the same thing.

26 Ms. Anderson indicated that these ideas should be raised by residents at the city council meeting.

27 Mr. Christiansen asked Mr. Beck what his timeline for development is.

28 Mr. Beck replied that the process is to first get the entitlements, then the builder may start around
29 the first of March.

30 Ms. Anderson asked when the road improvements are projected to be done.

31 Mr. Beck replied that 330 West will be as soon as they start construction, 700 West will have to
32 be near the beginning of the project as well.

33 Ms. Anderson expressed understanding that the property developer's rights have to be considered
34 as well, and neighbors should voice their concerns to the council, commission and developer.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

Chairman Woffinden suggested that residents come to the council meeting en masse, have a spokesman or two, and pick a couple of the most important topics for the council to hear.

Mr. Brocious told city staff that it is important for the city to get a timeline for the 200 South improvements and it would help neighbors to have this prepared for council.

Mr. Hunter replied that the city recognizes that improvements are needed, but the council has the funding ability to make them happen. Staff will reach out to council and express those concerns.

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Christiansen moved to recommend approval of the preliminary plan for the Estates at Fenn Farms, with the finding (#1) listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions, and modifications listed in the Engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Harold Dudley	Nay
Rod Brocious	Aye

The motion carried.

Ms. Anderson said that the city council has the role of saying “do I like this”. The Planning Commission just has to say if it meets code requirements or not.

Mr. Christiansen moved to recommend approval of the final plat for the Estates at Fenn Farms, with the findings listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications listed in the Engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Harold Dudley	Nay
Rod Brocious	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Dudley said that it is best to move this on to city council, but he voted nay to indicate to city council that the residents’ concerns have been heard and agreed with. Anything that can be done to accelerate and move forward the improvements to 200 South is a worthy goal.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

- 1 3. Review and action on a site plan for an addition to a church building located at 239 East 1100
2 South in the R-1-12,000 Residential zone
3

4 Mr. Olsen stated that in 2016, a meetinghouse was constructed at the site. The proposal is to convert
5 the structure into a stake center; thereby necessitating an increase in the footprint (expansion of
6 2,605 sq. ft.) for additional office and classroom space. The expansion is located at the rear (north
7 side) of the existing structure.

8 Parking and landscaping comply with City codes. Renderings of the expansion are included. The
9 expansion area will match the existing building.

10 Mr. Hunter indicated that the Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed
11 development. Utilities are existing and road improvements are already there.

12 Mr. Chad Spencer, the church's architect, answers questions. Plans include a font and stake offices.
13 They plan to expand out to the north side of the building, they won't have to reconfigure storm
14 drains.
15

16 **Public Hearing Opened**

17 **Public Hearing Closed**
18

19 **Ms. Anderson moved to recommend approval of the site plan for the church expansion, with**
20 **the finding listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications**
21 **found in the engineering report.**

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

23	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
24	Chris Christiansen	Aye
25	Christine Anderson	Aye
26	Harold Dudley	Aye
27	Rod Brocious	Aye

28 **The motion carried.**
29

- 30 4. Hearing, review and action on a commercial site plan for the Woodbury American Fork
31 Tower located at 860 East 1050 South in the GC-2 General Commercial zone
32

33 Mr. Olsen explained that Woodbury Corporation proposes the American Fork Tower project, a 5-
34 story office building located at approximately 1050 South 860 East. The site is adjacent to I-15,
35 north of 1100 South and west of 860 East. Access to the site is provided from 860 East, 1100

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

South (coordinated through UDOT), and through shared access easements with property to the north, in the Utah Valley Business Park. The office building will consist of approximately 155,500 sq.ft.

Parking is provided slightly above the City's parking requirements (727 spaces), at 739 spaces. Landscaping is also provided at slightly higher than the City's requirement (10%), at 13%. A detention/wetland area exists adjacent to 860 East. The City will gain additional right-of-way along 860 East, pending approval of the site plan. This additional right-of-way will be utilized for trail expansion along 860 East. Renderings of the office tower are included in the submittal materials.

Mr. Hunter said that the Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed development. The road and infrastructure are in place aside from the trail, access and easements are the only things outstanding. UDOT still owns some of the property.

Mr. Ken Berg, civil engineer, informed commissioners that they have a written agreement to landscape the UDOT land, he will provide that to staff. He is excited about this project. It will probably be the tallest building in the city.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Dudley moved to approve the commercial site plan for the Woodbury American Fork Tower, with the finding listed in the staff report, and subject to any findings, conditions, and modifications listed in the Engineering Report, conditional upon submittal of landscape plans and agreement for improvements along Sam White Lane and 1100 South.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Rod Brocious	Aye

The motion carried.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 5. Hearing, review and action on an overall concept plan for Lake City Row Planned
2 Community Development Project, located in the area of 860 East 620 South in the PC-
3 Planned Community zone
4

5 Mr. Olsen stated that the Lake City Row comprises properties that were annexed under the Vest
6 Annexation (2019). The property was zoned PC (Planned Community) in anticipation of mixed-
7 use development consisting of office space, retail space, and higher density residential uses. The
8 agreement stipulated build ratios and benchmarks for development of commercial and residential
9 units. These provisions are in place and reflected in the overall concept plan as the applicants are
10 utilizing a provision in the Code which allows an open range of residential densities; provided a
11 development provide primary commercial areas and mixed-use components. This plan reflects the
12 intent of the PC zone with a range of uses in proximity to one another (both vertical and horizontal).

13 An overall concept plan is the first step in the approval process; followed by preliminary and final
14 plans/plats for individual phases. Approval of an overall concept plan grants vesting to a project,
15 through approval of an ordinance adopted by City Council. Phases at the beginning and end will
16 be commercial, the mixed-use will be constructed in the middle. This proposal covers a large area,
17 it will be higher-density and mixed use.

18 Ms. Anderson asked about the timeline for the 620 South roadwork.

19 Mr. Olsen said that 860 East will be expanded at the beginning of the development, the 620
20 buildout will come later in increments.

21 Mr. Hunter said that the Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed development.
22 The main developer is responsible for 620 South, the city is receiving plans currently for work on
23 this, the developer is also working with Pleasant Grove for necessary access. Work on 620 South
24 should come sooner rather than later. Other road improvements will come in with different phases
25 of development, there will be different phases of densities, city staff are making sure there is
26 sufficient infrastructure in place for the different phases of development. This is a very preliminary
27 plan, but there are no major concerns or issues.

28 Mr. Brocious asked if the proposed round-about is conceptual.

29 Mr. Hunter replied that this is a proposal from the developer, staff has asked them to provide
30 information and modeling showing that it will function adequately. If it won't be adequate, there
31 will be a signal here.

32 Mr. Buck Swaney, with Millennial Development, said that this is a great opportunity to use the
33 Planned Commercial zone. Residential mixed with commercial development will enable better use
34 of commercial parking. With a new concept called "shared parking", daytime use of office parking
35 will change to nighttime use as residential parking. This is a 100 acre project, they listened to the
36 council's desire for mixed-use and changing density throughout.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

Ms. Anderson asks about the shared parking concept. What conflicts could arise at any time that is shared?

Mr. Swaney stated that the goal is adequate parking on-site, overflow parking can be the office parking because times of use don't overlap. Retail might have more conflict with hours of use, but office parking is what will be shared. The times that office parking empties are directly correlated with the times that residential parking fills up.

Chairman Woffinden complimented him on his geotech report, and pointed out a mistake in that the report specifies that this address is in Lehi instead of American Fork.

Mr. Swaney said that they overdesigned buildings for the geotech report so the developers would be well prepared.

Chairman Woffinden said the reports are about the best he's seen.

Mr. Brocious asked about the shared parking concept, is it a code change?

Mr. Olsen said that the code allows it, this is the first time it's really been pushed.

Mr. Swaney added that some on-street parking will become available as well.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Brocious moved to recommend approval of the Overall Concept Plan for Lake City Row.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
---------------------------	------------

Chris Christiansen	Aye
---------------------------	------------

Christine Anderson	Aye
---------------------------	------------

Harold Dudley	Aye
----------------------	------------

Rod Brocious	Aye
---------------------	------------

The motion carried.

6. Hearing, review and action on a Historic Building Conservation Project (Furry Tail Transformations) located at 55 East 400 North in the R-1-7,500 Residential zone

Mr. Olsen indicated that Furry Tail Transformations is a dog grooming business looking to locate in a historic structure/former church. The structure was originally used as a seminary building when the high school was located on the hill where the fitness center now stands. Due to the

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

underlying zone being residential, the applicants propose a commercial use through the City's Historic Building Conservation Project provisions. These provisions allow certain commercial uses to locate in structures deemed historic when the underlying zone is something other than commercial. An example of this use is the Northhampton House, a reception and events center housed in a former church, located within in a residential area.

The applicants originally came before the Planning Commission early summer of 2019 with a commercial zone change request. Rather than create a spot-zone of commercial, the Planning Commission recommended the applicants work with staff to utilize the Historic Building Conservation provisions found within the Development Code. The applicants have done so, and the project is ready to proceed back to the Planning Commission.

The building's appearance will remain largely the same. The applicants wish to clean up the property. A small parking lot is proposed along the east side of the structure, in order to provide parking for employees and patrons. Construction of this will likely wait until Spring 2020. In the interim, the applicants are working on an agreement with the City to temporarily utilize parking stalls in the existing parking lot to the west. Landscaping is proposed to remain as is, with some enhancement and clean-up.

Mr. Hunter stated that the Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed development. There were a couple of issues with existing improvements, current city standards are required to be met. There is some sidewalk that will need to be replaced. Some items have been excluded from requirements and some will be incorporated, such as new PI meters.

Ms. Jessica Vosika, applicant, owns Furry Tail Transformations. They are currently working out of their home, their goal is to have animals in and out in four hours with quick pickup and dropoff. They have a soundproofed interior, they need to move because of growth, they are hoping to expand their business.

Mr. Dudley said that he admires their entrepreneurship and appreciates them doing the improvements to make this work for the community. Government bureaucracy may be hard to understand but he thanks them for continuing to work with staff.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Ms. Stacie Carter said that this property has been an eyesore and it will be nice to have it taken better care of.

Ms. Carolyn Lloyd expressed her approval, she uses this service and they run a quiet and clean business.

Ms. Lisa Halversen agreed with Ms. Lloyd's comments.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 **Mr. Christiansen moved to recommend approval of the Furry Tail Transformations historic**
2 **building conservation project, with the finding listed in the staff report, and subject to any**
3 **findings, conditions, and modifications listed in the engineering report.**

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

5	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
6	Chris Christiansen	Aye
7	Christine Anderson	Aye
8	Harold Dudley	Aye
9	Rod Brocious	Aye

10 **The motion carried.**

11
12
13 7. Hearing, review and action on the amended final plat for the Walnut Court Innerblock
14 Cottage Development Project, located at 353 West 400 North in the R-2-7,500 Residential
15 zone

16
17 Mr. Olsen explained that the Walnut Court Plat A proposes to adjust lot lines between the two
18 existing duplex lots and one of the inner-block cottage lots. A previous plat illustrated a property
19 line through an existing shed between Lots 201 and 202. This plat eliminates the property line
20 through the shed, with both duplex lots meeting the minimum requirements per the Development
21 Code. The northern property line for Lot 203, the inner-block lot, has been slightly adjusted, and
22 still exceeds the minimum requirements for a lot within an inner block development. Duplex
23 structures on Lots 201 and 202 are under construction.

24 Mr. Hunter stated that the Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed
25 development. There are no concerns, this is basically a housekeeping measure.

26 Mr. Ken Berg said that lot 3 used to have an existing home, it makes more sense now for this to
27 match the rest of the innerblock cottage development.

28
29 **Public Hearing Opened**

30 **Public Hearing Closed**

31
32 **Mr. Brocious moved to approve the final plat of Walnut Court Plat A, with the finding listed**
33 **in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications listed in the**
34 **Engineering report.**

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

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

Chairman Woffinden Aye
Chris Christiansen Aye
Christine Anderson Aye
Harold Dudley Aye
Rod Brocious Aye

The motion carried.

8. Hearing, review and action on a commercial site plan for the Truck Ranch Project, located at 525 East 1000 South in the GC-2 Planned Commercial zone

Mr. Olsen stated that Truck Ranch, an auto dealership, proposes to locate at the site. The proposed building and associated sales and display area is located on Lot 3 of the Auto Mall Business Center Subdivision, Plat A; consisting of 2.43 acres. Points of access are proposed from an internal subdivision street (shared access for subdivision). The shared access drive has points of access along both 500 East and 1000 South (Auto Mall Dr.). The sales and office building will consist of 3,744 sq. ft.; with both a main floor and mezzanine level.

Parking is provided per the City's parking standards. Landscaping is also provided per City requirements. Renderings of the proposed structure are included in the submittal materials.

Mr. Hunter said that the Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed development. Most infrastructure is there minus some stormwater detention areas and sewer laterals. There are no major concerns or issues.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Dudley moved to approve a commercial site plan for the Truck Ranch, located at 525 East Auto Mall Drive, with the finding listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications found in the engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden Aye
Chris Christiansen Aye
Christine Anderson Aye
Harold Dudley Aye
Rod Brocious Aye

The motion carried.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

1 9. Hearing, review and action on the Cottages/Meadows at American Fork Phase 2 District
2 Framework Plan located in the area of 340 South 700 West in the TOD zone
3

4 Mr. Olsen explained that the area comprising this District Framework Plan consists of
5 approximately 3.6 acres. It is located at approximately 340 South 700 West and runs east/west.
6 The property lies within the Garden District, and within the General Mixed-Use sub-district. This
7 particular area/phase is unique in that a majority of the site was developed under the previous TOD
8 Code. As this area further develops, the new TOD Code takes effect. As such, a District
9 Framework Plan is the first step toward development. The applicant has taken steps to adhere to
10 the new Code, and this phase will conform to the requirements of the new TOD Code.

11 Mr. Hunter indicated that the Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed
12 development. This will be fairly simple, they will be constructing 350 South and tie in to 700
13 West, it meets staff's expectations.
14

15 Mr. Corey Nielsen, of Brad Reynolds Construction, will be building about 80 units in this
16 project. He said that the city is being smart by having developers dedicate land for roads at no
17 cost to the city. This saves the city a lot of money by not having to buy the land.
18

19 Ms. Stacie Carter is concerned with the 80-unit plan, she said that the residents of the new
20 apartments are now parking along 700 West and 350 South. With 80 more units in the area, she
21 is concerned that there will be a serious shortage of parking.
22

23 Mr. Olsen replied that the developer is providing more parking than they are required to, though
24 at times it is still insufficient. This should be a lesson about the necessity of holding to the code
25 requirements regarding parking.
26

27 Ms. Anderson asked if more parking is needed.
28

29 Mr. Olsen said that all city staff can do is go with what the code requires.
30

31 Mr. Dudley asked the developer why the code isn't sufficient for actual parking needs.
32

33 Mr. Gregg Lybbert gave his opinion that the inadequate parking situation is because of the Trax
34 station, there's not enough parking for those people who are riding Trax. He feels that
35 developments are being allowed in with no planning or preparation for traffic needs. The area is
36 being cluttered with people who don't live there, but park anywhere they can because they need
37 to get to the Trax station.
38

39 Mr. Hunter added that the traffic modeling is based on all development being completed, it may
40 not all come together until all the development is in. The Engineering Division will take a look at
41 the studies again. The master plan also shows 700 South connecting to Auto Mall Drive, but this

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

won't happen until sometime in the future. The engineering staff looks to see if the code is being met. As each development comes in, we will glean more information. If the development meets code but doesn't function well, the city council will have to make those decisions about changing the code requirements.

Ms. Carter thanks Red Pine Construction for being quiet and respectful, they've done well with their project.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Brocious moved to recommend approval of the District Framework Plan, with the finding as outlined in the staff report, and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications listed in the engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Rod Brocious	Aye

The motion carried.

10. Other Business

There was no other business to discuss.

11. Site Plan Committee Report

Mr. Knobloch reviewed the upcoming Planning Commission items, these include the developments moving through TRC. The next meeting will be held on November 20, 2019. One code text amendment is all we have thus far, it will likely be a short meeting.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

12. Review and action on the minutes of the October 16, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Session

Ms. Anderson moved to approve the minutes of the October 16, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Session.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Rod Brocious	Aye

The motion carried.

13. Adjournment

Ms. Anderson moved to adjourn.

Mr. Dudley seconded the motion. All concurred.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.

Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant