

APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES JUNE 17, 2020

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on June 17, 2020 in an electronic meeting on the Zoom platform, viewable on the City's YouTube link, commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Present: John Woffinden
Chris Christiansen
Geoff Dupaix
Ryan Hunter
Christine Anderson
Rod Brocious

Absent: Harold Dudley

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

Public Comments Received: Carolyn Lloyd, Tresa Chadwick, Norman Chadwick, Tyler Skidmore

1. Hearing, review and action on a zone map amendment from the R1-12,000 Residential zone to the PO-1 Professional Office zone located at 280 N. North County Boulevard

Chairman Woffinden stated that items 1 and 2 will be discussed together but voted on separately.

Mr. Olsen stated that the applicant proposes to amend the land use and zone map designations at 280 N. North County Boulevard, from a residential designation to the professional office designation. Due to proximity to the American Fork Hospital, the area is undergoing transition and development from residential to medical/professional office uses in support of the hospital area. If approved, the existing home will be removed, and the area redeveloped into medical/office use. Directly north, at the corner of 300 North and North County Boulevard, a medical facility is under construction. Additional professional office uses are being constructed in the vicinity. Staff supports the request to amend the land use and zone map designations.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Dupaix moved to approve the zone map amendment.

2 Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

3	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
4	Chris Christiansen	Aye
5	Christine Anderson	Aye
6	Geoff Dupaix	Aye
7	Ryan Hunter	Aye
8	Rod Brocious	Aye

9 The motion passed.

10

11

12 2. Hearing, review and action on a land use map amendment from the Residential Low
13 Density to the Professional Office designation in the area of 280 N. North County
14 Boulevard

15

16 Ms. Anderson asked about the plans for the surrounding properties, she would like to keep the
17 office designation from creeping into the residential area past the corner.

18 Mr. Olsen replied that as the surrounding land owners on that corner sell, they will likely go to the
19 office designation as well.

20

21 Public Hearing Opened

22

23 Public Hearing Closed

24

25 Mr. Brocious moved to approve the land use amendment.

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

27	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
28	Chris Christiansen	Aye
29	Christine Anderson	Aye
30	Geoff Dupaix	Aye
31	Ryan Hunter	Aye
32	Rod Brocious	Aye

33 The motion passed.

34

APPROVED MINUTES

3. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 17.5.133 of the American Fork City Development Code titled "Off-Street Parking Standards"

Mr. Olsen told commissioners that at the May 20th 2020 meeting, the Planning Commission discussed inconsistencies found in the parking ordinance; specifically, as it deals with multi-family requirements. Discussion centered on keeping the requirement of 2.25 spaces per unit (outside of the TOD area). While this standard is to remain in effect, the Planning Commission may consider adjustment requests, supported through parking studies by those who wish to propose the adjustment. The original background information for discussion is presented below.

A few years ago, the City's parking ordinance was updated by adding reference to a table from a widely accepted planning and urban design book. This was intended to clarify and provide parking standards for uses that the ordinance did not address, particularly commercial uses. Part of this table also addressed parking for multi-family uses, breaking down multi-family by number of bedrooms, from studio units to two-bedroom and above units.

An unintended consequence of this addition was that it provided an alternate standard from the existing multi-family requirement of 2.25 spaces per unit, regardless of the type or number of bedrooms. The question is raised, do we follow the 2.25 per unit standard; or, do we follow the table, which allows flexibility based on bedroom count? The development community prefers the table due to its flexibility.

Below are the two sections of the Code dealing with multi-family parking standards; the first section to remain, and the second (with strikethrough) proposed for deletion/clarification.

1. Residential uses.

- a. One-family dwelling: Two spaces per dwelling unit. All spaces shall be located on the same parcel as the dwelling. No portion of a front or side setback area adjacent to a street, including any portion thereof used as a driveway, shall be construed as part of the required off-street parking area.
- b. Multiple family dwelling: Two spaces per dwelling unit, plus 0.25 spaces per dwelling unit for visitor parking. Visitor parking shall be evenly distributed throughout the project.
- c. Long-term patient care facilities (assisted living centers, rest homes nursing homes): One space for each employee during the maximum care period, plus one space for each four patient rooms for visitors.

6. Uses not specifically listed. For uses not identified in the above schedule, the number of off-street parking spaces shall be determined by the planning commission. The determination shall be based upon the requirements for the most comparable use listed, and/or that certain table entitled recommended parking ratio requirements set forth under part 3 p. 246 of that certain book entitled Planning and Urban Design Standards, 2006 Edition, which is set out below, and/or

APPROVED MINUTES

1 upon an independent determination of parking demands for such uses in comparable locations,
2 all at the discretion of the planning commission.

3	~~Single-family dwelling unit~~ Multi-family dwelling unit	~~2~~ per dwelling unit
4	Studio	1.25 per dwelling unit
5	One bedroom	1.5 per dwelling unit
6	Two or more bedrooms	2 per dwelling unit
7	Accessory dwelling unit	1 per dwelling unit

8

9 **Public Hearing Opened**

10

11 **Public Hearing Closed**

12

13 Mr. Brocious missed this discussion at a previous meeting, he thinks that having a little flexibility
14 adds some value in the scenario where buildings have higher density and more parking could be
15 needed.

16 Mr. Olsen indicated that there is a different standard for the TOD area, this discussion doesn't
17 apply to the TOD. The developer can present a parking study if they feel they merit a lower ratio
18 for parking and the planning commission can consider that.

19 Mr. Ryan Hunter clarified that the parking requirement is based on the number of dwelling units,
20 this is the least developer-friendly option.

21 Ms. Anderson believes that developers like the table, with its options for less parking. She thinks
22 that studio and 1-bedroom apartments may need less parking, and suggests keeping a simplified
23 table where studio and 1-bedroom apartments would be allowed to have fewer spaces.

24 Mr. Olsen said that it can be amended, and that would be an easy change.

25 Mr. Ryan Hunter said that he's not aware of any studio apartments in the city outside the TOD
26 area, and that's why the TOD has its own requirements. He added that he feels that special
27 agreements with developers should be a rare thing.

28 Chairman Woffinden expressed support of the higher parking requirements, he is concerned that
29 sufficient parking be required in the city.

30

31

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Ryan Hunter moved to approve the code text amendment regarding multi-family
2 parking requirements.

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

4	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
5	Chris Christiansen	Aye
6	Christine Anderson	Aye
7	Geoff Dupaix	Aye
8	Ryan Hunter	Aye
9	Rod Brocious	Aye

10 The motion passed.

- 11
12 4. Hearing, review and action on the preliminary plan and final plat for Lakeshore Landing
13 Block 1 Plat A, located in the area of 900 West 350 South, in the Transit-Oriented
14 Development Overlay zone
15
16

17 Mr. Olsen stated that the area of Lakeshore Landing was annexed in 2018. It received approval of
18 a district framework plan in 2019 (ADG District Framework Plan), followed by block plan
19 approval (staff level review). As part of the lot plan submittal and review (staff level review),
20 subdivision plats were necessary. Further lot plan review will ensure placement of structures,
21 setbacks, height, landscaping, number of multi-family units, parking, etc. be compliant with the
22 TOD Code. The subdivision plats act as formal instruments in proceeding toward development of
23 the site.

24 The plats anticipate both townhome and multi-family development. Planning staff recommends
25 removal of the number of units currently labeled on lots intended for multi-family development.
26 These numbers will ultimately be determined through future reviews; largely dependent on
27 configuration of parking and open space elements as required by the TOD Code. Developer has
28 agreed to remove these notes from the plats before it goes to city council.

29 Chairman Woffinden asked how the current moratorium would affect projects in the TOD area.

30 Mr. Olsen replied that projects are allowed to go forward and get approval. If approved, they may
31 construct horizontal improvements such as roads and infrastructure, but no vertical improvements
32 will be allowed and building permits will not be issued.

33 Ms. Anderson asked where this development fits into the TOD.

34 A map is displayed, Mr. Olsen pointed out that this proposed development runs north and south
35 along 900 West, and into the Dixie Farms development to the south. This proposal is from the
36 same developer as Dixie Farms. All Lakeshore Landing plats are along 900 West from 350 South
37 all the way down to where 900 West makes the bend.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Ms. Anderson asked if the plans get lower in density as it moves away from the TOD area.

2 Mr. Olsen replied that the higher density is in the core area. This proposal's density is lower with
3 a range of lot types. Townhome development densities fall in line with what is allowed. Overall
4 density as proposed is just over 3.

5 Mr. Ryan Hunter asked if densities can be combined by having different densities in different areas
6 of the same project, Mr. Olsen affirmed. Mr. Hunter said that this is an important feature to protect
7 wetland areas with less density.

8 Mr. Ben Hunter has reviewed these plans, the project falls along 900 West so the infrastructure is
9 tied to the master plan requirements. Some storm drain requirements are specific to this
10 development, updated traffic studies will also be required for this project. These updates are being
11 finalized, we expect them to see them soon. Red-line comments have been made, and the city
12 council modified requirements for the roundabout. These modifications will have an impact on
13 this development. There is also a small portion of wetlands to be mitigated, developers are working
14 with the Army Corps of Engineers for a mitigation plan. This may take 6-12 months, and the
15 conclusions will be provided to the city. Right-of-way requirements have been met.

16 Chairman Woffinden feels that the Army Corp is slow but thorough.

17 Ms. Anderson asked if basements will be allowed.

18 Mr. Ben Hunter replied that the water table is too high, no basements will be allowed.

19 Mr. Brocious asked about the wetlands mitigation study and the risk that the outcome of that study
20 will change the proposed plans.

21 Mr. Ben Hunter said that the wetlands area is quite small, he doesn't anticipate any major concerns
22 or issues. It should just be a matter of determining what the ratios will be. Modifications could be
23 a possibility, but it would impact a very small area.

24 Mr. Brocious is concerned that wetland requirements may require more open space than the
25 developer is planning for.

26 Mr. Ben Hunter indicated that the developer has additional wetlands in nearby property and could
27 be flexible with other options.

28 Mr. Brocious asked Mr. Ben Hunter for a progress update on 200 South. Will the plans be ready
29 to go to bid in July as planned? Where are we at with water updates and improvements?

30 Mr. Ben Hunter replied that 200 South will have 90% of the plans submitted by the end of June,
31 with the final bid set for possibly August or September. The city council can make a decision when
32 we have a final bid number. As for water improvements, we've applied for various funding
33 sources, but don't have a timeline. We've been providing updated info as requested. Designs are
34 being completed for various phases. The overall picture is being looked at, we're not down to
35 details yet. He added that developers can still do horizontal improvements under the moratorium,

APPROVED MINUTES

but code requires that infrastructure be in place before permits will be issued anyway, so the moratorium hasn't been a huge deal. Developers can still move forward.

Public Hearing Opened

Carolyn Lloyd emailed a public comment.

"I have a few concerns regarding the Lakeshore Landing development.

1. The infrastructure for the roads and water still have not been resolved. Plus there still isn't the funding for all of these improvements.
2. It would be nice if there was somewhat of a transition from the TOD to those of us that have 1-5 acres. Just because it meets code doesn't mean that it is the right thing to do for the residents that have been there over 30 years.
3. The only way in and out of this area south of the freeway is 200 South which is in dire need of attention.

I appreciate the time and effort the planning commission takes to make sure these developments meet code and they coincide with the land use that is already there. Thanks for your time." Carolyn Lloyd

Tyler Skidmore emailed a public comment.

"How is the infrastructure going to handle this many more homes?"

"Should there be a better transition from high density to people who have acreage?"

Norman Chadwick emailed a public comment.

"I as a property owner for 30 years am highly opposed to the idea of condominiums or rentals being allowed this far south of the front runner station for reasons that follow

1. Infrastructure, ie. Roads have NOT been developed to handle the influx of traffic that will come with that many new households. 200 South has NOT been widened with only a wisp of talk. Front Runner has been in place and operational going on FIVE YEARS without so much as a shovel of dirt being turned over.
2. We landowners are of the understanding that a transition plan is in place to gradually increase the size of lots and move into single-family-dwellings with yards the further south you go. What happened to that? I would like to see stable families moving in instead of transient individuals coming and going. We have had a lot of experience with this.

APPROVED MINUTES

3. The value of my land and home will decrease substantially as this becomes the place NOT to live in American Fork.

4. Water – I understand that American Fork does not have the water to supply these dwellings or future increases. This needs to be addressed.

5. Groundwater. In the winter, the water table is one foot below the surface. Homesites need to be elevated with structural fill before footings can be started. This includes slab on grade.

I hope you see these as valid points and vote a denial to the proposal before you. Sincerely,
Norman Chadwick, 7195 North 6720 West, American Fork, UT

Tresa Chadwick emailed a public comment.

“My name is Tresa Chadwick. I am currently a home owner in the area of the proposed development. I have lived in this area for many years and have enjoyed living here. I realize that things change and development will happen, but I do not believe the proposed changes/development will benefit American Fork City in the long run. With the high condensed housing and no transitional areas, there is no balance in those who will just be living there short-term and more permanent homes with property. Looking down the road I believe, with the plan so heavy with high condensed, we will be looking at a “other side of the tracks” result. After years of people moving in and then quickly moving on I believe we will see a community that will not be a desirable place to live.

The apartments and condominiums that are newly built have tenants that come down to walk, ride bikes and just enjoy the open area that you will be designating as more condensed housing. When the open area is filled up with more condominiums, the balance will be gone. The future is in your hands. Tresa Chadwick

Mr. Ryan Hunter asked if there are any parks requirements for this project.

Mr. Olsen informed commissioners that there must be a certain percentage of open space in each block, this can be private or public. A linear park under the large power lines is planned to remain as open space and shoreline access. The Parks Committee is looking at this area to acquire property for a regional park in this quadrant of the city.

Chairman Woffinden said that most of his concerns were raised in the engineering report. He strongly disagrees with the liquefaction numbers in the geotechnical report. He thinks they are impossibly low.

Mr. Ryan Hunter suggested that maybe the city should investigate that rather than leaving it up to the developer to give us numbers. He thinks the company doing the reports is using a boiler plate template. He hasn't seen any information about mitigating liquefaction.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Ben Hunter told commissioners that a 3rd party peer review will be conducted in certain areas
2 to address these concerns. He did not remember what the 3rd party peer review said about this
3 proposal.

4 Chairman Woffinden feels that we ought to require them to go a lot further down than 30 feet for
5 the geotech testing.

6 Mr. Brocious asked if there should be an amendment to the geotech requirements.

7 Chairman Woffinden felt that this would be a good idea in this area south of the freeway. He
8 believes it is a high liquefaction area.

9 Mr. Ben Hunter replied that the ordinance only requires 30-40 feet testing depth. If we need to
10 look at this, he is open to changing it.

11 Mr. Dupaix added that those are valid concerns, and asked if any changes can be retroactive.

12 Chairman Woffinden believes that our requirements are lax, especially on multi-story buildings.

13 Ms. Anderson acknowledged the residents' comments, they have been heard. She focused first on
14 transition issues, she hopes they understand that the core is the highest density and that this section
15 is a transition from the higher density. This plan is a transition plan. For the period of time of the
16 moratorium, the focus will be on infrastructure requirements in order to be ready to support the
17 new projects and improvements. In regards to the concerns about this being a less desirable area,
18 she thinks it will be more desirable because it will be the nicer, newer part of town with high
19 standards for quality and design. She hopes the residents are pleasantly surprised.

20 Mr. Ben Hunter indicated that on the planning departments' website, there is a moratorium map.
21 Some vertical homes may be going in if they were approved before the moratorium. Most will not
22 be able to get building permits issued, but some will. He added that the council approved the
23 moratorium for 6 months, and this could be extended if the council wants to. It could also be
24 terminated early. The moratorium relates to water concerns and issues.

25 Ms. Anderson stated that she hopes 200 South will be improved in 6 months as well.

26 Mr. Ben Hunter replied that when a road begins to fail, it will be improved. Capacity will be
27 expanded on 200 South to handle increased volume. Though the road won't be finished in 6
28 months, at the same time the city is moving forward on road and infrastructure developers are
29 moving forward with buildings.

30 Ms. Anderson asked if the hope is that the timing will mesh, and Mr. Hunter affirmed.

31 Mr. Brocious said that the study shows that the road can handle traffic, but this is an area where
32 there will be increased bike and pedestrian use, we need to protect them as well.

33 Mr. Ben Hunter indicated that he has been aware of the discussions to provide safe passages for
34 pedestrians until 200 South is completed. The existing sidewalk is on the south side of the road,

APPROVED MINUTES

maybe we can acquire some rights-of-way, maybe fill in some of the gaps with trails connections and sidewalk, and perhaps pipe some irrigation ditches.

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Brocious moved to approve the preliminary plans and recommend approval of the final plats of Lakeshore Landing Plats A-J, with the findings and conditions listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions, and modifications listed in the engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Nay
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye
Rod Brocious	Aye

The motion passed.

5. Other Business

Mr. Olsen indicated that Planning Commission meetings will follow the lead of city council. When the city council holds meetings at city hall again, we will follow suit. The Planning Commission meetings for July will be held on the 8th and the 22nd.

6. Site Plan Committee Report

Mr. Knobloch reviewed the upcoming Planning Commission items. On the next agenda there will be two road dedication plats in the TOD area, a project on 500 East that is the 2nd phase of an existing project, and a code text amendment relating to utilities.

7. Review and action on the minutes of the June 3, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Session

Mr. Brocious moved to recommend approval of the minutes of the June 3, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Session.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Ryan Hunter seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

2	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
3	Chris Christiansen	Aye
4	Christine Anderson	Aye
5	Geoff Dupaix	Abstain
6	Ryan Hunter	Aye
7	Rod Brocious	Aye

8 The motion carried.

9
10
11 8. Adjournment

12
13 Mr. Ryan Hunter moved to adjourn, Mr. Dupaix seconded. All voted in favor.

14
15 Meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.

16
17
18
19 

20
21 Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant