



# EAGLE MOUNTAIN

## EAGLE MOUNTAIN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

August 25, 2020, 5:30 p.m.  
Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers  
1650 East Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, Utah 84005

### **5:30 P.M. – Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Work Session**

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Matthew Everett, Erin Wells, Rich Wood, and Brett Wright. Commissioner Christopher Pengra was excused.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Pete Kane, Long-Range Planning Manager; Michael Hadley, Planning Manager; Jessa Porter, Planner; Fionnuala Kofoed, City Recorder; and Elizabeth Fewkes, Recording Secretary.

Commissioner Wood called the meeting to order at 5:42 p.m.

#### 1. Discussion Items

##### 1.A. DISCUSSION ITEM – Proposed Code Amendments to EMMC 17.70 Accessory Apartments

*This item was discussed after item 1.D.*

Planner Jessa Porter explained staff recommends moving the Tiny Homes on Wheels standards within the Accessory Apartments section to the Detached Structures standards subsection as a more appropriate location.

Discussion ensued regarding the desirability of inclusion and the location of standards for tiny homes on wheels. Commissioner Everett advocated for the standards to be included and stated allowing tiny homes on wheels assists the City in meeting the affordable housing requirements.

Ms. Porter explained the exclusion of tiny homes on wheels from Municipal Code could cause confusion and enforcement difficulties.

Commissioner Wood recommended for tiny homes on wheels to include a requirement for the occupants to be family relations to the owners of the primary residential dwelling.

Commissioner Wright noted the family relation standards regarding accessory apartments also allows for the occupancy of two unrelated individuals.

Discussion ensued regarding the relationship requirements for tiny homes of wheels occupants, existing tiny homes on wheels currently within the City, and the desirability of permitting tiny homes on wheels.

1.B. DISCUSSION ITEM – Proposed Code Amendment to Add EMMC 17.23 Open Space Zone

*This item was removed from the work session agenda.*

1.C. DISCUSSION ITEM – Proposed Code Amendment to Add EMMC 17.31 Public Facilities Zone

*This item was removed from the work session agenda.*

1.D. DISCUSSION ITEM – Zoning Transition Table

*This item was discussed at the start of the work session.*

Commissioner Wood explained he had made some adjustments to the table and verbiage before the meeting to improve consistency.

Discussion ensued regarding the inclusion or removal of the residential transition up and residential transition down columns from the zone transition table, confusion regarding the transitioning up and down indications, the compatible buffer designations, and zone transition verbiage to be added to EMMC 17.60 Landscaping, Buffering, Fencing and Transitioning. The Planning Commission determined to remove the residential transition up and residential transition down columns from the zone transition table.

Commissioner Wood explained his recommended amendments to the lot size transitioning table in order to update the verbiage due to tier language being removed from Municipal Code and to be in accordance with current standards.

Long-range Planning Manager Pete Kane noted that Commissioner Wood's suggestion to designate lot size minimums may cause confusion as some lot sizes could be included in several categories and recommended retaining the acreage lot size ranges indicated in current zone standards.

Discussion ensued regarding the Lot Size Transitioning Tables lot size range indicator options, resulting interpretation concerns, and desired corrections to the adjacent lot requirements.

Commissioner Wells expressed concern regarding the impact of the range designations on existing property owners due to permitted acreages for adjacent properties. Commissioner Wood said that frontage requirements mitigate homeowner lot size transition concerns.

Commissioner Wood advocated retaining the lot size up and down transitioning for the lot size transitioning tables.

Commissioner Wright expressed concern regarding agricultural land that is designated as a different use on the General Plan Future Land Use Map and stated buffering requirements were not required along the Agricultural zone.

Discussion ensued regarding Agricultural land use buffering.

Commissioner Everett explained Agricultural standards require compatible transitioning from existing developers and require minimum lot size but not a maximum lot sizes for adjacent properties.

Commissioner Wells expressed concerns that owners of multifamily units may not desire to abut agricultural uses or large lots with animals. Commissioner Wood stated the zone transitioning table standards will mitigate transitioning concerns if approved and adopted by the City Council.

Commissioner Everett stated the Future Land Use Map's intention is to prevent transitioning concerns and incompatible adjacent land uses.

#### 1.E. DISCUSSION ITEM – Proposed Code Amendments to EMMC 16.10 Master Development Plans

*This item was discussed after item 1.D.*

Commissioner Wells suggested a phasing requirement to be added to the Application item for any proposed and phased parks in a development. Mr. Kane recommended also adding a phasing requirement to Criteria for Review of Master Development Agreement (MDA) and the benchmark section, not included in this section of the MDA standards.

Commissioner Wells expressed concern regarding the timing of the third-party legal counsel review after City Council approval of the MDA. Discussion ensued regarding changing the recommended amendment from “upon approval of the City Council” to “upon review by the City Council” prior to the legal review.

Commissioner Wells expressed concern that the six months from the approval of the site plan and preliminary plat timeframe requirement for the completion of all phase curb, gutter, and road may be insufficient due to winter and other weather construction constraints. Mr. Kane inquired if the Planning Commission desired a standard timeframe requirement for all projects or if the standards should indicate a timeframe will be required and set in accordance with each specific project.

Discussion ensued regarding phase infrastructure installation.

Commissioner Wood explained the suggested amendment changes the approval authority for MDA timeframe extensions from the City Council to the Planning Commission and should the amendments not be approved, the authority will be retained by the City Council.

#### 1.F. DISCUSSION ITEM – Proposed Code Amendments to EMMC 17.60.120 (R) and EMMC 16.35.090.

*This item was removed from the work session agenda.*

Commissioner Wood adjourned the work session at 6:40 p.m.

**6:30 P.M. – Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Policy Session**

Commissioner Wood called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

City Recorder Fionnuala Kofoed led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**

None.

**4. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

**4.A. August 11, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes**

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Wright moved to approve the August 11, 2020 minutes as discussed. Commissioner Wood seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, and Erin Wells. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

**5. Status Report**

Planning Manager Michael Hadley stated the Hoofbeats for Healing rezone and the Marketplace at Eagle Mountain Town Center master site plan and preliminary plat were approved at the City Council's meeting the previous week.

**6. Action and Advisory Items**

**6.A. B & H Property (Rezone and General Plan Amendment)**

Mr. Hadley presented the item. The item was tabled at the August 11, 2020 meeting. The property is located west of the Brylee Estates and north of Brandon Park on approximately 162 acres. The property is currently zoned Agriculture and the General Plan designation for the area is a combination of Employment Center/Campus (EEC) and Neighborhood Residential One (NR1). The application requests a General Plan Amendment to retain the NR1 designation with R2 zoning on 52.26 acres of the property and adding the General Plan Neighborhood Residential Three (NR3) designation with MF2 zoning on 27.90 acres of the property. The R2 zone allows the applicant to propose a variety of single-family lot sizes with a minimum lot size of 8,000 square feet and an average lot size of  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre. The MF2 zone allows a maximum density of 20 units per acre or 558 total units. The 80.17 acres on the northern portion of the property, proposed as Business, does not comply with the General Plan. The northern portion is not being developed at this time and is excluded from this rezone and General Plan amendment request.

The eastern and middle portion of the proposal complies with the General Plan NR1 designation. The west portion does not comply with the General Plan land uses: the proposal identifies the lower-right corner of this area for MF2 zoning although the General Plan land use designation is NR1, and the northwest corner which is designated as ECC but requested as MF2 zoning. The requested zones in this western portion conflict with the General Plan. The proposed uses and densities are compatible with adjacent and current land uses, can be accommodated with public services, and is not expected to have significant negative impacts on surrounding property values. Traffic generation is within the capabilities of the streets serving the property. A proposed future freeway intersects the northwest corner of the property and Aviator Avenue on the south of the property will most likely have an access onto the proposed freeway.

Commissioner Wood expressed concern regarding the increase in density.

Mr. Hadley stated the Brylee Estates development is to the east of the property with lots ranging from 6,000 to 9,000 square feet.

Applicant representative Andy Flamm clarified that Fieldstone has townhomes to the east of the project. He explained he requested the MF2 zone as he had understood from the feedback he had received in the previous meeting that the MF2 zone offered the product desired for that location. He placed smaller lots around the perimeters of the R2 area to buffer between the larger lots in the center of the project and the adjacent uses. Mr. Flamm displayed the original plan presented to the Planning Commission and City Council and stated the feedback he had received was to retain the commercial property and to offer a variety of home options. The original plan proposed 32.80 acres of commercial, 68.78 acres of MF2, 29.97 acres of RD2, and 29.77 acres of RC. He stated they had considered R1 for the southeastern portion of the property, but the homes would be adjacent to commercial and MF2 uses and determined the R2 zone to be more appropriate for the area.

Commissioner Wood advocated for creative, seamless lot size transitioning rather than grid development layouts and said the proposal included too much multifamily and recommended transitioning with single-family homes. He said the General Plan layout intended for the development to follow the curve of the future freeway and recommended commercial uses abutting the future freeway.

Mr. Flamm stated he had been informed the triangle shape/line for the land use designation in the southwest corner is arbitrary. He explained his intention is to develop a community. He is not attempting to maximize density and had understood the Planning Commission had desired multi-family uses in that area based upon feedback during the previous meeting. He explained as this was a concept plan, he only included a generic housing layout and can implement more creativity in the site plan design and that an increase in housing types will compartmentalize and create a grid layout.

Commissioner Wood suggested using road break and curvature transitions to prevent a grid layout.

Commissioner Everett said he concurred with Commissioner Wood's preference for curved roadways to reduce traffic speed and increase community aesthetics and he agreed the number of townhomes proposed is too high; however, he supports multi-family uses abutting the major

roadways. He stated he typically opposes General Plan amendments, but he supports an amendment as appropriate for this area and project.

Commissioner Wells agreed with the previous Commissioners' statements. She said she felt the level of detail provided for the project was appropriate for a rezone and General Plan amendment application. She suggested locating multifamily units along the north border of the residential area to buffer the ECC uses.

Commissioner Wright expressed appreciation to the applicant for his flexibility addressing varying and conflicting feedback. He stated support of granting a rezone for the residential area; however, he expressed concern recommending approval to the City Council as he believed the application required further amendments.

Mr. Hadley recommended moving the application forward with the conditions stipulating the Commission's desired amendments.

Mr. Flamm requested that the Planning Commission provide guidelines regarding their desired density ratios or acreage numbers for each residential zone.

Discussion ensued regarding the zone acreages and locations requested in the application and desired amendments to the project to address concerns.

Commissioner Wells expressed discomfort with drafting complicated conditions to the City Council during a meeting without adequate time to review and consider the recommendations.

Commissioner Wood concurred with Commissioner Wells' and expressed concern the application was not compliant with the zone transitioning table standards discussed during work session and stated the application must adhere to the unapproved, unadopted standards as the standards had been presented prior to the discussion of the application.

Discussion ensued regarding concerns recommending approval of the application, drafting conditions, and concerns regarding delaying the application.

Mr. Hadley stated the Planning Commission could recommend denial to the City Council to allow the application to move forward.

Commissioner Wells inquired if a recommendation for denial can include an explanation regarding the decision, the areas of concern, and suggestions to address their concerns.

Commissioner Wood stated a recommendation for denial requires findings of fact of the application. This application does not comply with the General Plan and the requested MF2 zone is not compatible with the General Plan.

Commissioner Everett expressed concern recommending denial to move the project forward if the Planning Commission has concerns regarding a project but does not desire for the project to be denied by the City Council. He said the Planning Commission's purpose is to resolve concerns

and prepare projects for the City Council. He desired to fulfill their roles as a Planning Commission before recommending the application to the City Council. He recommended tabling the item to allow more time for the applicant to amend the project if desired, and for the Planning Commission to determine their appropriate recommendations to address their concerns.

Commissioner Wood concurred with Commissioner Everett and stated recommending an application to the City Council without remedying concerns failed to meet the responsibility of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Wells clarified she desired to determine a creative solution to fulfill their responsibilities while allowing the project to move forward but stated a willingness to table the item if desired by the other Commissioners.

Commissioner Everett recommended for Mr. Flamm to add high-density units along the north and west boundaries of the residential portion of the property with appropriate lot size transitioning to the larger lots and suggested possibly adding commercial uses along the south border of the property.

Commissioner Wright suggested the addition of Commercial Neighborhood or Commercial Community along the south border of the property along Aviator Avenue and recommended R3 zoning along the north border of the property as an appropriate transition. He requested for the MF2 acreage to be reduced in half and incorporated into the existing residential area and advocated for retaining the existing ECC as a commercial use and withdrawing the General Plan amendment request.

Commissioner Wells concurred with the recommendation for commercial uses along Aviator Avenue.

Commissioner Wood recommended for Mr. Flamm to implement appropriate buffering between the NR1 and ECC areas. He concurred with Commissioner Wright's recommendation for the applicant to withdraw the General Plan amendment and retain the western portion of the property as the ECC General Plan designation and to add commercial uses along Aviator Avenue. He directed Mr. Flamm to use the lot transitioning table standards and recommended the R2 zoning as an appropriate buffer for the eastern edge of the development.

Mr. Flamm reviewed and clarified the Planning Commission recommendations. He expressed concern regarding the feedback as it conflicted with the direction he had received from the City Council.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Everett moved to table the B & H Property rezone and General Plan amendment. Commissioner Wood seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, and Erin Wells. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

#### 6.B. PUBLIC HEARING – SilverLake 28 (Site Plan)

Mr. Hadley presented the item and stated the SilverLake South development preliminary plat was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on September 20, 2019, and approved by the City Council on October 1, 2019. The SilverLake 28 site plan is part of the SilverLake South preliminary plat and includes 10 single-family lots and 64 townhome units for a total of 74 lots.

The overall general landscape plan for SilverLake South has been approved with the preliminary plat and the open space will be maintained by the homeowner's association. The exteriors of the multifamily dwellings shall contain masonry materials including stone, brick, and fiber cement siding such as Hardie board. The proposed site plan includes two-car garages for all units. Townhome standards require two stalls per dwelling unit; based on the parking requirements and number of units, Plat 28 requires 21 guest parking stalls and one ADA parking stall. The site plan includes seven stalls. The product is the same as from previous phases and the park will be improved by the developer and deeded to the City during a future phase of the project.

Staff recommends that a recommendation for approval to the City Council include the condition the applicant shall pay a landscape cash escrow to the City of \$2,810.40 per lot/unit.

Commissioner Wells inquired if the two-car garages reduced the parking stall requirement. Mr. Hadley stated he was not aware of any guest parking exemptions; however, a reduced parking requirement might be included in the master development agreement (MDA).

Commissioner Wood expressed concern regarding the proposed private road, Silver Spring Way, connecting two collector roads, Golden Eagle Road and Golden Meadow Crossing, and recommended widening Silver Spring Way and making it a public road.

Mr. Hadley verified the City Council had approved the fencing exemption for the reinforced vinyl fencing along Golden Eagle Road in the SilverLake South development.

Commissioner Everett expressed his opinion about the vinyl fencing along Golden Eagle Road stating "I think it looks like crap."

Commissioner Wright inquired regarding the landscaping plan for this portion of the project, the lighting plan, the MDA requirements for the pocket park, and required clarification regarding the park to the northwest of the project.

Mr. Hadley explained the pocket park was a private park and not required by the MDA or counted towards the open space requirement. The tot lot and northwest park were included in the original plan for the project and the applicant desired to postpone deeding the park to the City until the park was improved and contiguous with the development as it was excluded from the area within Plat 28.

Applicant representative Bronson Tatton explained the pocket park had been listed in the open space requirement calculation; however, the park was not necessary to meet the improved open space requirement and can be removed for clarity, if desired. The pocket park was added to improve the livability for the townhome residents. He stated Golden Eagle Road, SilverLake Parkway, and Woodhaven Boulevard are minor collector roads and as the development and

infrastructure expand, a connectivity network reduces the traffic flow to connecting roads and the majority of the traffic flow will be along Golden Eagle Road. The development design includes townhome units along private roads.

Commissioner Wood expressed concern that the private roads are being used by residents as local roads and increase potential safety concerns for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Tatton verified sidewalks will be installed along both sides of Silver Spring Way and expressed concern widening the road will alter the preliminary plat.

Discussion ensued regarding traffic concerns, road widths, and safety concerns.

Mr. Tatton explained the townhome units have full driveways that can accommodate four vehicles providing two garage stalls for residents and two driveway stalls for guest parking without obstructing the sidewalk and pedestrian traffic.

Commissioner Wood advocated for the future phases of the project to include public roads and sidewalks along both sides of the roads.

Commissioner Everett expressed concern the townhomes are not compliant with Municipal Code standard requirements for garages placed on the front façade to be staggered and set back to minimize their appearance from the street and that garages shall never dominate the street-facing façade of a building. He requested that Mr. Tatton address his fencing concerns and reiterated his disapproval of the vinyl fencing as a detriment to the development and the City, the expressed disfavor for allowing multiple fencing types along roadways.

Mr. Tatton recognized Commissioner Everett's right to his opinion and stated he had received the appropriate approval for the fencing from the City Council.

Commissioner Wood stated his surprise and expressed concern the City Council had approved three types of fencing along a major roadway.

*Commissioner Wood opened the public hearing at 8:06 p.m. No comments were submitted to the City Recorder's Office and no public was in attendance to make comment. As there were no comments, Commissioner Wood closed the hearing.*

Commissioner Wood stated his disappointment the MDA had not been included in the packet materials and desired for the City Engineer to determine if the proposed roadway configuration presented safety concerns. He noted the other issues discussed during the meeting had been previously approved with other plats for the project.

Commissioner Everett stated that even though the townhome elevations had been approved during previous phases of the project, the Planning Commission should recommend denial of the project to the City Council due to the failure of the townhome elevations to meet Municipal Code garage design and location standards. Commissioner Wood noted the MDA may permit an exemption regarding the townhouse elevations.

Commissioner Wright expressed concern regarding the inadequate number of guest parking stalls provided.

Discussion ensued regarding the MDA requirements and exemptions.

Commissioner Wells expressed her willingness to make a recommendation to the City Council with conditions; however, she concurred it would be beneficial to be able to review the MDA before making a decision.

Commissioner Wright recommended tabling the application to allow time to review the MDA requirements.

Mr. Hadley verified the lighting plan and landscaping plan had been submitted and approved by staff.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Wright moved to table the SilverLake 28 site plan until the Planning Commission is provided the master development agreement, the landscaping plan, and the lighting plan by staff and the applicant works with staff to provide the additional 14 required guest parking stalls. Commissioner Everett seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, and Rich Wood. Those voting nay: Erin Wells. The motion carried with a vote of 3:1.*

Commissioner Wells clarified her dissenting vote was due to being unsure if an additional 14 parking stalls were required as the townhomes had two-car garages.

#### 6.C. Ault Farms (Concept Plan)

Mr. Kane presented the item and stated the initial concept plan was reviewed by the Planning Commission on December 10, 2019, and the City Council on January 21, 2020. Feedback included concern with the proposed density, incompatible proposed land uses compared to the General Plan, reluctance with the request that commercial land in the plan may revert to residential if not developed within a set timeframe, concerns regarding the creation of new zoning districts not currently in standards, and questions regarding the need to utilize property designated as Business Park land use for residential purposes.

The property includes 2,995 lots on 750 acres with land uses including 983 single-family lots, 796 townhome lot/units, 296 four and six-pack lots, 460 apartment units, 460 condominium units, 12 acres of commercial property, and area reserved for open space.

The applicant has been working closely with the developers from the projects to the east of the subject property to ensure proper connections and traffic flow. The concept plan also includes several connections throughout the development including pedestrian crossings for the safe movement of residents and visitors. The majority of the subject property is identified in the General Plan Future Land Use Map as Neighborhood Residential One (NR1). The southwest corner of the

subject property has been designated as Business Park/Light Industry (BPLI). While most of the concept single-family areas comply with the General Plan land use designation, the townhomes, apartments, and condos do not comply with the land use designation. The concept plan proposes using half of the area designated for BPLI for apartments which is not a compatible land use based on the General Plan designation and would reduce the overall commercial/industrial potential of the subject property. Staff recommends additional commercial use would be appropriate on the north side of the proposed major arterial road across from where commercial use is currently noted as it would provide a commercial entryway to the development.

Applicant representative Pete Evans with Flagship Homes explained Flagship Homes is working in conjunction with other developers to create a master plan and install infrastructure in the area. He presented images to provide context for the area, the project, and adjacent developments. Changes to the concept plan include a reduction in the overall density unit count; an increase in the BPLI area; and additional detail including coordination with adjacent property owners, infrastructure and utility planning and design, a completed transportation impact study, an environmental report, an economic study, and a completed open space master plan. He explained the second concept plan integrates product types throughout the development and adds road curvature and connectivity to surrounding trails and open space, provides buffering to surrounding uses, and clusters density around transportation corridors.

Commissioner Everett thanked the applicant for addressing previous feedback and for considering the project in conjunction with adjacent developments. He said the location of the higher-density units near the transportation corridor as appropriate and expressed his approval of the road curvature.

Commissioner Wells stated her favor for the road design, connectivity, and pedestrian-friendly walkways. She disapproved of the amount of density requested for the project for an area with an NR1 General Plan designation; however, some high-density housing may be appropriate to transition from commercial uses. She concurred with the staff recommendation to add commercial uses on the north side of the proposed major arterial. She advocated to retain the full acreage of commercial development indicated in the General Plan and suggested the commercial uses could be relocated to other areas of the development.

Commissioner Wright concurred with Commissioners Everett and Wells and recommended for the development to adhere to the General Plan and the proposed zone transitioning guidelines discussed during the work session. He expressed concern the concept plan designations and acreages do not correspond with the updated zoning district regulations and recommended for the applicant to review the updated residential zone standards. He advocated for General Plan amendments in this area to accommodate commercial uses and lot size transitions. However, the majority of the development should correspond with the NR1 General Plan designation. He requested for Commissioners and the City Council to support the General Plan designations for the area. He stated that other updated and proposed Municipal Code standard amendments will impact this development.

Commissioner Wood thanked the applicant for providing curved roads for safety and aesthetical considerations. He requested for the applicant to review Municipal Code standards and amend the

plan to comply with minimum lot frontage standards and side setbacks. He recommended the development of rental apartments in the City to meet resident needs; however, he stated he was not in favor of the apartment development as presented. He advocated for commercial use development along major roadways and stated his disfavor for single-family residential units along major roadways. He concurred with Commissioner Wells that the concept plan proposed too high of density. He requested that the inclusion of the proposed acreage for each area in the concept plan in addition to the number of units.

Mr. Evans verified the concept plan excluded approximately 200 acres of the southern portion of the property with a BPLI General Plan designation and stated the concept plan includes approximately 550 acres of the 750-acre property.

Commissioner Wood stated the eastern portion of the concept plan does not comply with the Foothill Residential General Plan designation.

Mr. Evans explained the housing product proposed for the northern portion of that area is intended to buffer an approved twin home development.

Commissioner Wood indicated that the twin home project was not supported by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Evans clarified the commercial uses proposed for the southwest area north of the apartments would be commercial rather than a business park/light industrial use. He stated his intention in proposing unique zones was to increase product diversity and specificity to provide a better overall master development. He said he will work with staff to match their desired product types with City standards. He expressed his willingness to evaluate the appropriate product type for the major roadways. He explained the four and six pack lots are single-family units with a shared driveway such as a housing cluster or patio homes.

#### **6.D. Triumph (Concept Plan)**

Commissioner Wood recessed the meeting at 9:09 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Mr. Kane presented the item and stated the concept plan includes 252 single-family lots with 184 ½-acre lots and 68 1/3-acre lots and 3.53 acres of open space with three trail/pedestrian accesses. The development is centered around Lake Mountain Road and includes one additional north connection to Tiffany Lane, three connection points to the east, a southern connection via Lake Mountain Road, and no connections within the development to the west. The General Plan and Future Land Use Map designate the parcel as Rural Density Two. The 1/3-acre lots in the concept plan do not meet the zoning or land use designations but may be appropriate as a transition to the proposed single-family development directly to the north which currently is concepted as 8,000 to 10,000 square-foot, single-family lots.

Commissioner Wood expressed concern regarding the alignment of the concept plan with a proposed major arterial road on the Transportation Master Plan.

Commissioner Wright inquired if the development is located within the utility corridor.

Ms. Porter stated the Scarlet Ridge project to the east of the development has proposed 1/2-acre and one-acre lots for the project.

Applicant representative Scot Hazard explained he has proposed reducing the major arterial road to the west of the project to a more appropriate level of service indicated by recent traffic studies as the Transportation Master Plan was adopted before the zoning code amendments. He explained the intended road widths and connections for the project. He explained the powerline corridor is outside of the Triumph property and he proposed 1/3-acre lots to buffer along the powerline corridor and westbound connectivity is provided through the powerline corridor at the northern and southern edges of the project. He explained he is requesting zoning different than the General Plan due to offering a housing price point compatible with homes along a powerline corridor and in review with staff he recommended rezoning the area as Foothill Residential (FR) with the intent of keeping 1/3 acre lot as a minimum. The developers in the area are working in conjunction to provide utilities to the Lake Mountain foothill area. As the projects different developments will be selling homes at the same time, the developers of each project would like to offer slightly different products in order to not compete with each other.

Commissioner Wood expressed concern regarding the location of the park with a single access off a major roadway.

Discussion ensued regarding traffic concerns about the proposed widths and locations of roads in the concept plan in relation to the Transportation Master Plan.

Commissioner Everett stated his willingness to consider an FR rezone. However, he expressed concern about implementing civic uses within the concept plan. He concurred with Commissioner Wood's concerns regarding the location of the park on a major roadway.

Mr. Hazard stated he had not included civic uses as the likelihood of the identified site in the concept plan changing and expressed his willingness to relocate the park.

Commissioner Wright stated he is unlikely to support an FR rezone because the Scarlet Ridge development with an R2 zone would be surrounded by FR acreages. He noted although the FR allows for 1/4-acre lots, the zone requires an average lot size of 1/2 acre. He concurred with the concerns expressed regarding road alignment and the impact on the powerline corridor.

Mr. Hazard explained his purpose in proposing an FR rezone was not to reduce the average lot size. He stated he desires to offer a variety of product types, especially in relation to the surrounding developments to reduce competition with other developers.

Commissioner Wells concurred regarding the traffic concerns expressed by other Commissioners. She agreed with Commissioner Wright's concerns regarding an FR rezone. She stated her support for lot size buffering with the Ault Farms subdivision and the powerline corridor. She expressed concern the concept plan did not provide appropriate buffering along existing large lots to the south.

Commissioner Wright concurred with Commissioner Wells' concerns regarding respecting existing residents through the required lot size transitioning.

Commissioner Wood advocated for the retention of large lot areas designated on the General Plan to preserve rural areas within the City.

**6.E. PUBLIC HEARING – Development Code Amendment for Master Development Plans and Agreements**

Commissioner Wood explained the item will be tabled and moved to the next meeting.

*Commissioner Wood opened the public hearing at 9:53 p.m. No comments were submitted to the City Recorder's Office and no public was in attendance to make comment.*

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Wood moved to table a development code amendment for master development plans and agreements and continue the public hearing to the next meeting. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, and Erin Wells. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

7. Discussion Items

8. Next scheduled meeting

Commissioner Wells stated she will not be in attendance at the next meeting.

9. Adjournment

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Everett moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 pm. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, and Erin Wells. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

The meeting was adjourned at 9:54 p.m.

Approved by the Planning Commission on September 8, 2020.



Steve Mumford, AICP  
Assistant City Administrator/Community Development Director

# 1655\_001

## Final Audit Report

2020-09-09

Created:	2020-09-09
By:	Shawna Ellis (sellis@emcity.org)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAENNoA6lzKcz8lKse0MxtHTlbbBk6UWXO

## "1655\_001" History

-  Document created by Shawna Ellis (sellis@emcity.org)  
2020-09-09 - 2:38:59 PM GMT- IP address: 206.251.40.168
-  Document emailed to Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org) for signature  
2020-09-09 - 2:39:25 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org)  
2020-09-09 - 3:40:23 PM GMT- IP address: 71.195.219.107
-  Document e-signed by Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org)  
Signature Date: 2020-09-09 - 3:41:32 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 71.195.219.107
-  Signed document emailed to Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org) and Shawna Ellis (sellis@emcity.org)  
2020-09-09 - 3:41:32 PM GMT



Adobe Sign