

APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES APRIL 7, 2021

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on April 7, 2021 in an electronic meeting on the Zoom platform, viewable on the City's YouTube link, commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Chairman John Woffinden
Cristine Anderson
Geoff Dupaix
Harold Dudley
Ryan Hunter

Absent: Rod Brocious
Chris Christiansen

Staff Present: Adam Olsen, City Planner
Wendelin Knobloch, Planner
Rebecca Andrus, City Engineer
Tana Uyema, Engineering Division
Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant

Others Present: Ken Berg, Marissa Brown, Buck Swaney, Kirt Yingling

Public Comments Received: Emails from Timothy Holley, Royce Shelley, LaRee Finch, Carla Nielsen, Mark Nielsen, Debra Aston family, Kaden and Mardi Gubler, Heather Gray, Sarah Osmond, and Jennifer Harrison

Chairman Woffinden read the "Notice of Electronic Meeting." He also informed commissioners that Councilwoman Barbara Christiansen passed away last week and expressed that our thoughts and prayers are with her family.

1. Hearing, review and action on the final plat for King & McCleary Subdivision Plat A, located at 230 West Main Street in the CC-2 Central Commercial zone

Mr. Olsen stated that a site plan for a new structure on Lot 2 of the proposed subdivision was recently approved. The subdivision plat proposes an adjustment of the center line between the two properties (currently owned by King and McCleary). The new center property line will be at the middle of the shared access between the two structures/properties. While the site plan indicated a shared access, such an easement is absent on the plat. Staff recommends an easement for shared

APPROVED MINUTES

access and a plat note be added to formalize the shared access use. Each lot will be approximately .25 acres.

Mr. Dudley pointed out that the note regarding shared parking is already on the plat. It is note #8.

Mr. Uyema informed commissioners that the Engineering Division has no concerns and recommends approval.

Public Hearing Opened

No comments were received.

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Dudley moved to approve the final plat of King and McCleary Subdivision Plat A, with the finding and condition listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions, and modifications listed in the engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

2. Hearing, review and action on the preliminary and final plat for Mitchell Farms Plat D located in the vicinity of 730 North 860 West in the R1-12,000 Residential zone

Mr. Olsen stated that Mitchell Farms preliminary was approved in 2017. Plat D conforms with the original preliminary plan; however, the original preliminary plan has expired. Plat D is being processed as a new preliminary and final plat.

Plat D is located at the southwest corner of the overall subdivision and consists of 6 lots ranging from 12,002 sq. ft. to 17,424 sq. ft. creating a density of 2.7 du/ac. Access to Plat D is provided from the north, through 860 West. Former barns and commercial structures will be removed as part of this phase. All lots meet or exceed the requirements of the R1-12,000 zone.

Mr. Uyema stated that there are no concerns or issues and he recommends approval.

APPROVED MINUTES

Public Hearing Opened

No comments were received.

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Dupaix moved to approve the preliminary plan subject to any findings, conditions and modifications found in the engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

Mr. Dupaix moved to approve the final plat with the findings listed in the staff report, and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications found in the engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

3. Review and action on a final plat for Rockwell Ranch Block 5 Phase 2 located in the area of 620 South 1100 West in the TOD zone

Mr. Olsen stated that the final plat for Rockwell Ranch, Block 5, Phase 2, adds the common area to the overall development. While previous plats were approved, this area was inadvertently left out, but was always intended to be common area/open space. This plat formally incorporates the area into the overall development. The Common Area parcel is approximately 1.85 acres. It may

APPROVED MINUTES

be considered a “house-keeping” item as it was omitted in previous plats. No changes to the number of units are proposed.

Ms. Anderson asked if this common area would be used only for storm retention or if it will be used as a play area. If it will be used as a play area or for gatherings, she wondered if a crosswalk painted across 620 South would be suitable.

Mr. Dupaix supports that idea. Hunter Park is near his house and there were safety enhancements made to the street. People often cross the street to go to the park and drivers need to slow down.

Mr. Uyema stated that there is a crosswalk in the plans.

Mr. Dupaix suggested adding a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB).

Chairman Woffinden expressed support for the idea of a crosswalk with safety enhancements.

Mr. Dupaix wanted clarification regarding the Engineering Division’s position on adding an RRFB with the crosswalk.

Ms. Andrus said they would consider it, but usually they would focus that type of enhancement on high-use crossings such as near a school.

Mr. Dupaix strongly encourages putting one here. This is a busy street and it has the potential to become very heavily used.

Chairman Woffinden would support any safety measures.

Mr. Dupaix moved to approve the final plat of Rockwell Ranch Block 5 Phase 2, with the findings and conditions listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications listed in the engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

4. Hearing, review and action on a site plan for KT Dental, located at 332 South 500 East in the GC-2 Planned Commercial zone

APPROVED MINUTES

Mr. Olsen stated that KT Dental proposes to locate on Lot 3 of the Wyler Subdivision. The subdivision was approved in 2017 in anticipation of commercial uses. The site plan proposes a 2,330 sq ft dental office on approximately .25 acres. Parking is provided, exceeding the City's parking requirements by one stall. Landscaping is also provided. Renderings of the proposed structure are included in the submittal materials. Access is shared via an access easement as noted on the subdivision plat; it will ultimately approved by UDOT as 500 East is a UDOT facility.

Mr. Dupaix asked if the shared access is noted on the plat, Mr. Olsen confirmed that it is.

Mr. Uyema has no engineering concerns, he recommends approval.

Mr. Ken Berg, engineer, asked for a recommendation from the commission regarding using the existing right-of-way on 500 East, currently being used as an oversized planter, as part of their parking requirement.

Mr. Olsen has no issue with that, he doesn't believe it needs to be added.

Public Hearing Opened

No comments were received.

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Dudley moved to approve the site plan for KT Dental, with the finding listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions, and modifications found in the Engineering report.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

5. Hearing, review and action on a land use map amendment located at 717 West Main Street from the Major Transportation Facilities to the Design Commercial designation

Chairman Woffinden stated that items 5 and 6 will be discussed together but voted on separately.

APPROVED MINUTES

Mr. Olsen stated that the applicant proposes to amend the land use and zone map designations at approximately 717 W. Main from the Major Transportation Facilities designation (PF zone) to the design commercial designation (SC-1 zone). The property lies directly east of the I-15 Main Street interchange, south of Main Street and west of the Zupa's site. The area was zoned Public Facilities when UDOT acquired the property as part of the I-15 Core Project. The parcel under consideration for amendment is what remains in UDOT ownership, but not needed for the interchange. If approved, the applicants will submit a site plan application for a bank and for a re-routing of the drive through for In-N-Out. This would complete development in the area.

Mr. Uyema has no comments from engineering.

Public Hearing Opened

No comments were received.

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Hunter moved to approve the land use map amendment.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

6. Hearing, review and action on a zone map amendment located at 717 West Main Street from the PF Public Facilities to the SC-1 Planned Shopping Center zone

Public Hearing Opened

No comments were received.

Public Hearing Closed

APPROVED MINUTES

1 **Mr. Hunter moved to approve the zone map amendment.**

2
3 **Mr. Dupaix seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

4		
5	Chairman Woffinden	Aye
6	Christine Anderson	Aye
7	Geoff Dupaix	Aye
8	Harold Dudley	Aye
9	Ryan Hunter	Aye

10 **The motion passed.**

- 11
12
13
14 7. Hearing, review and action on an amendment to the Lake City Row Planned Community
15 Master Plan, located in the vicinity of 860 East Utah Valley Drive in the PC Planned
16 Community and the PI-1 Planned Industrial zones
17

18 Mr. Olsen informed commissioners that Lake City Row comprises properties that were
19 annexed under the Vest Annexation (2019). The property was zoned PC (Planned Community)
20 in anticipation of mixed-use development consisting of office space, retail space, and higher-
21 density residential. The Lake City Row master plan was approved in November 2019. The
22 master plan envisioned up to 2,500 residential units located both independently and within
23 mixed-use commercial areas. Additionally, areas of commercial office were approved as part
24 of the overall master plan. The applicants were also granted approval of a reduced parking ratio
25 of 1.8 stalls per unit; provided that a large area of shared parking would be present in-between
26 office commercial and high density residential, in order to provide overflow parking for the
27 adjacent residential; the peak demand for each use being offset. This area is called out as cross-
28 hatched on both the original (approved) plan and the proposed amended plan.

29 The applicants have proposed a change to the master plan, altering the “commercial” in Phase
30 1, by removing the “office” designation and “2-5” story from the anticipated product type. In
31 its place, they propose a “1-5” story “commercial” building product type, consisting of office-
32 warehouse.

33 Staff recommends against the proposed change. Following are reasons for such a
34 recommendation of denial:

35 The master plan approval granted a unit count of up to 2,500 units (corresponding overall
36 density of 25 du/ac) on the premise that this is a true mixed-use development. Office-
37 warehouse uses are typically found within largely industrial/light-industrial locations, not
38 within traditional high density mixed-use developments. Office and traditional commercial

APPROVED MINUTES

1 such as retail create the mixed-use environment conducive for high density, where residents
2 can conveniently access workspaces and other traditional commercial and retail uses.

3 Parking requirements for the residential portions of the project were reduced from the City
4 standard of 2.25 stalls per unit to 1.8 stalls per unit. This was based on a proposed count of
5 approximately 1,500 commercial parking spaces being provided from the commercial office
6 area in Phase 1. Office warehouse uses have a greatly reduced parking requirement;
7 warehouse portions requiring only 1 space per 1,000 sq. ft. While the applicants propose a
8 reduction in the number of units from 2,500 to 2,250, the reduction in units is proposed in the
9 northern area of Phase 3, well outside of the area designated for shared parking space. Phase
10 3, directly adjacent to Phase 1 and adjacent to the area proposed for shared parking has
11 already received site plan approval for over 500 units at the ratio of 1.8 stalls per unit.
12 Parking for the office use (Phase 1) adjacent to Phase 3 was intended to alleviate parking
13 pressure from this area. Office warehouse use, if approved, will reduce the number of shared
14 parking spaces available. In addition, the remaining, undeveloped Phase 3 is located north of
15 Quality Drive. While the applicants state that parking pressure will be minimized by a
16 decrease in units, there is still, in effect, approval to park at a reduced 1.8 stalls per unit.

17 Staff is concerned that if the master plan is amended to allow office-warehouse uses in Phase
18 1, not only will the shared parking be greatly reduced, but additional requests may be made
19 to convert the remaining commercial areas to office-warehouse, which will further reduce the
20 intended mixed-use community that was promised with the original approval.

21 Mr. Dupaix clarified that Phase 1 is currently considered as office/commercial designation.

22 Mr. Olsen stated that it was originally intended as office space, what they would like to do is
23 give it a general commercial designation. There is a zone change and site plan in the works
24 for an office/warehouse for that area. However, they are waiting on that until this master plan
25 amendment works its way through council.

26 Mr. Dupaix added that Built Bar, Thermal Works, etc. are somewhat industrial uses currently
27 in the area.

28 Mr. Olsen agreed, but said they were grandfathered in with the annexation. Phase 3 (Ritchie
29 project) was approved as high-density residential with mixed-use commercial designation.
30 The cross-hatched area of shared parking would be offset in peak times between the business
31 and the residential uses.

32 Chairman Woffinden agrees with staff that we shouldn't be changing the master plan, the
33 proposed amendment doesn't keep the vision of walkability. He also has concerns about
34 truck traffic and noise.

35 Ms. Anderson previously recommended mixed-use for this area, she feels it is important to
36 keep it the way it was originally approved with mixed-use and shared parking. Higher
37 density was allowed with the understanding that the extra parking that would be needed

APPROVED MINUTES

would be covered by shared parking in Phase 5. For a true mixed-use community to work it really needs the commercial uses as well. We would be allowing the higher density without the amenities if we approved this, not to mention the undesirable effects of noise and truck traffic.

Mr. Buck Swaney, developer with MDP Land, responded to concerns. He noted that they have been delivering lower residential density and this amendment would deliver less commercial intensity as well. Their company has a good record of delivery with Lake City Row. They have contributed \$3 million in right-of-way and \$6 million in roads and utilities. COVID has disrupted office economics around the country and the update that they are requesting comes from a desire to keep their commitments for all their partners. He responds to 3 core concerns:

1. Land use compatibility question – Staff is correct, we originally desired to build office buildings in this area. The office world has changed, new straight-office designation is not being developed right now. We are trying to adapt. Proposed flex-office use completely surrounds the property currently, is also all around Lake City Row. This concept adds the parking they promised. He displays a rendering of a 2-story office/warehouse building that is designed to not look overly industrial. Regarding the site plan, though it would have required 95 parking lots under a flex-industrial designation they are giving 50-60 overflow units so it would consist of 207 parking units.
2. Parking allocation – Parking allocations were reduced from 2.5 to 1.8, he agrees that staff is generally correct. Developers intend to put (zoom meeting audio cuts out) a lot of parking. In the master plan for Phase 3 it shows maximum density as 120 dwelling units per acre. In the Aspen Meadows property we had targeted a density up to 120, but the more likely outcome is 30-50 units per acre. Instead of 754 units, the site ended up with 512. There will be less demand for parking needed around the phase 5 area. They expect to continue making additional density reductions, it is feasible right now for developers to bring less density. Aspen Meadows delivered 100 more stalls than required by agreement. The final outcome of the first project in the area was less residential density and more parking than required. The Built Bar rear parking lot can also be used, adding 200 more stalls.
3. Limiting change to master plan – Staff is concerned that if this change is made, other changes will be requested as well. He acknowledged that this is a concern but said there is less intensity in an office/flex context, maybe the traffic density numbers are more comparable to a residential use. They are happy to make a commitment to ask for no other areas of flex-office. Phase 4 remains completely committed to mixed-use and higher-density. Their actual developments keep delivering reductions in density and they

APPROVED MINUTES

1 propose reductions in intensity as well. They want to be able to keep their commitments
2 with their partners.

3 Mr. Dupaix clarified that the developer's plan is to reduce the number of units in Phase 3,
4 which will lower the number of parking stalls required and also result in less intensity in
5 commercial use. There will still be overflow parking in those areas to use if needed.

6 Mr. Swaney agreed with that assessment, he added that they will follow through on their
7 commitment to city council that every time a site plan comes through they will orient
8 additional parking to the development.

9 Chairman Woffinden asked about the possibility of increased truck traffic in the area.

10 Mr. Swaney replied that the buildings will not be gigantic, there are ingress/egress areas
11 going to Utah Valley Drive and 860 East. Truck traffic could easily be routed away from
12 apartments. He displayed graphics that showed traffic routes for trucks, loading,
13 ingress/egress, etc. on the north, south, and west sides.

14 Mr. Dupaix asked if the intent would be to push truck traffic south to 930 and across to Utah
15 Valley Drive or possibly over to 500 East.

16 Mr. Swaney agreed and added that there is an access point from the Ritchie apartments to the
17 north. The Ritchie group is amenable to closing that driveway if the city desires so that the
18 two kinds of traffic don't mix. Shared parking in the business area would be visitor parking,
19 not overnight parking.

20 Ms. Anderson feels like this is a beautiful building and perhaps a good plan for an industrial
21 area, but she doesn't feel it fits in a residential mixed-use community. Commissioners are
22 trying to look at the whole area. This proposal has good parts, but she doesn't feel it would
23 all fit together in the desired way to promote walkability and less residential traffic.

24 Mr. Dupaix said that this area was originally slated to be office use. With that in mind, he
25 doesn't see that there would be a lot of shops, retail, etc, if it was slated for office use.

26 Mr. Swaney agreed that this area is not the mixed-use portion, it is the horizontal space
27 that was intended for office use.

28 Mr. Dupaix thinks they should take into consideration the office and light industrial uses to
29 the south and west. He has not seen a lot of retail businesses yet in the planned areas. The
30 city doesn't have a lot of shopping in this area to begin with. He believes that people will be
31 going up to State Street because that type of retail business isn't in this area.

32 Mr. Olsen explained that this was the purpose of granting the higher densities, more of those
33 traditional retail uses would locate here also. They would be pulled into the area by high
34 density residential, that is how it was sold to the council.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Dupaix understands, but it sounds like the Phase 1 was proposed to be office anyway,
2 which negates retail functionality.

3 Mr. Olsen added that the intent for Phase 1 was to supply an office use with shared parking,
4 not the light industrial use. The light industrial use exists already to the south and the west.

5 Mr. Swaney agreed that that was the intent and reiterated that the COVID situation has
6 forced them to reconsider their plans.

7 Mr. Olsen asked Mr. Swaney if they are planning to reduce the number of units in Phase 3.
8 This phase has already been approved. Approval was granted under a lower standard for
9 required parking based on the understanding that there would be shared parking available.

10 Mr. Swaney replied that there is an upper and lower section of Phase 3, the lower portion is
11 still in review. He explains that there is new context. They originally thought that section
12 would be 50 units per acre, now there is less demand and the development is smaller with an
13 associated smaller demand for shared parking.

14 Chairman Woffinden asked for input from other commissioners.

15 Mr. Hunter is trying to understand where Phase 3 is at and what has been approved. He
16 thought that the original approval was around 1350 parking stalls, now it looks like it will be
17 significantly fewer. He knows that the market has changed and nobody knows the long-term
18 ramifications. He asked where on the map the proposed office designation would go, and
19 what would be to the left (northwest) of it on the map.

20 Mr. Swaney replied that right now it will stay agricultural. The proposed office building will
21 be oriented to maximize the cross-hatched bank of shared parking.

22 Mr. Hunter asked if there will be a road through the parking area.

23 Mr. Swaney affirmed and said that there is a driveway access down the left side through
24 Phase 3 and into the cross-hatched portion. He feels that there are significant high-quality
25 accesses to the parking.

26 Mr. Hunter expressed that his position is somewhere in between Ms. Anderson and Mr.
27 Dupaix. If the proposal was slated to be a 5-story office tower then it wasn't going to
28 walkable anyway. Phase 1 wasn't intended to be like walking to Walmart, he thinks it fits in
29 with the other office/industrial uses as long as the parking needs are being met.

30 Mr. Olsen added that the importance of Phase 1 was that it was supposed to have been a
31 buffer between residential and more industrial use.

32 Mr. Hunter asked when the shared parking component was supposed to be put in.

APPROVED MINUTES

Mr. Olsen said it wasn't necessarily going to be at the beginning of the development, but in the annexation agreement an amount of residential was specified as required, then a certain amount of commercial before more residential was built.

Mr. Swaney added that as he heard it, Mr. Hunter was asking if there was a commitment for when the shared parking amenity was going to be built. It will be built along with each site plan to honor the commitment for the residential overflow parking.

Mr. Hunter wanted to know how many parking stalls will be netted, he wants to have the parking numbers confirmed. He also wants the environment with the shops for the high-density living but this Phase 1 project was not going to be that kind of environment anyway.

Mr. Olsen confirmed that Phase 1 was always intended to be office use.

Mr. Swaney indicated that they recently ran a market study, the economic consultant said the area would be perfect for village-type retail. Since then, investor discussions have been uniformly positive when the targeted residential is done in Phase 4.

Mr. Dupaix thanked him for the discussion, he added that these are hard decisions but it has been informative and well-stated by Mr. Swaney.

Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Swaney to clarify what Phase 5 will consist of.

Mr. Swaney indicated that it will be left as commercial for the time being. The upper part is boundaried by the house on the corner of 860 East in the northern quadrant of the master plan and the lower part is boundaried by Hadco. His group likely will not be involved in the planning unless they can acquire the corner house. If they have allowed density left-over in the project, they may put some residential on the upper Phase 5 parcel with some coffee-shop style retail on bottom.

Public Hearing Opened

No comments were received.

Public Hearing Closed

Ms. Anderson moved to deny the proposed Lake City Row master plan amendment, with a finding that conversion of office-commercial to office-warehouse does not follow the original intent to create a mixed-use community and the removal of "office" from Phase 1 will reduce availability of parking intended as shared parking (as identified in the original master plan).

There was no second for the motion.

Mr. Dupaix moved to table action on the proposed Lake City Row master plan amendment.

APPROVED MINUTES

Mr. Hunter would like more concrete numbers regarding parking and density before he makes a decision on the proposed amendment.

Ms. Anderson asked if the proposed office warehouse is oriented north and south, Mr. Swaney confirmed. He added that high-quality architectural finishes would be on the sides visible to residents. She expressed that she does not like the idea of truck traffic in the area and she is not thrilled about the proposal, but she indicates it may not be an insurmountable problem.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

Mr. Swaney agreed that he should clarify the effect on the parking and provide a more detailed master plan drawing showing landscaping details and architectural materials on the horizontal sides. He also can further address walkability concerns, truck traffic and noise, loading docks, etc. He will have necessary materials available for the next meeting.

8. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 17.4.401 entitled CC-1 Central Commercial zone of the American Fork Municipal Code regarding variability of road cross-sections.

Ms. Andrus indicated that the applicant will not pursue this amendment given the negative recommendation by city staff. She gave the Engineering response from American Fork City Code 17.4.401:

Intent. The intent in establishing the CC-1 central commercial zone is to provide a place where retail and service uses can be constructed and maintained which will serve the needs of the citizens of American Fork City and surrounding areas. It is the further intent in establishing this zone to maintain the central business district as the "heart of the city" allowing residential units to be located therein while maintaining street level commercial uses. The uses characteristic of this zone are retail stores, banks, office buildings,

APPROVED MINUTES

1 *theaters, hotels, a wide variety of specialty shops, restaurants, and higher density*
2 *residential uses. Conversely, uses which tend to create business dead spots, cause undue*
3 *scattering of business and generally tend to thwart the use of the land for its primary*
4 *purposes shall be excluded from the zone.*

5 The essence of the requested code text amendment change is to reduce the right-of-way on
6 Barratt Avenue by eliminating the park strip. City Staff has reviewed alternatives for reducing
7 the park strip. Staff has determined that it is reasonable to decrease the width of the park strip in
8 downtown areas, but only in conjunction with increasing the sidewalk to allow better pedestrian
9 access. It is not recommended to reduce the right-of-way.

10 In the cases of Church Street, Center Street, and Merchant Street the rights-of-way have not been
11 reduced. While eliminating the park strip, these roads have various combinations of angled
12 parking, bike lanes, and widened sidewalks to facilitate access to the businesses on those streets.
13 Future planning for the downtown area includes increased transit and trails to provide better
14 connectivity to and from the rest of the City and beyond.

15 As stated in the Rationale for Code Amendment, the existing cross-section of Barratt Avenue
16 does not meet the standards for a local street cross-section. On the south side, near Main Street,
17 there are no roadway improvements on the east side. The west side of the road does not have a
18 park strip, but it does have a setback behind the sidewalk that could be utilized later for widening
19 the road to meet the standard.

20 The property owner of the southeast side of Barratt Avenue has been in discussion with City
21 Staff, and has been informed that as he develops, they will be required to install full local street
22 improvements per City Code, and there is adequate room to allow for these improvements. The
23 proposed Lake City Flats development is 100+ studio apartment units on the northeast side of
24 Barratt Avenue directly south of 100 North/Pacific Drive. Currently, there are no improvements
25 on either side of the northern section of Barratt.

26 The developer's intent is to place the building frontage right at the property line. If the park strip
27 were to be eliminated, this would place the building only five feet (the sidewalk width) behind
28 the curb and gutter. The proposed project is a high intensity residential use, which requires
29 strong connectivity for all modes of transportation. An effective downtown streetscape should
30 include room for many things behind the curb and gutter. These items include a Curb Space,
31 Amenity Space/Utility Corridor, and Pedestrian Space defined below.

- 32 - Curb Space provides room for vehicles parked parallel to the curb to open their doors and
33 allow pedestrians to exit the passenger side of the vehicle. The clear space needed is
34 typically 2.5'.
- 35 - The Amenity Space/Utility Corridor provides room for street trees, streetlights, fire
36 hydrants, utility boxes and meters, bike racks and other features that provide an
37 aesthetically pleasing and necessary component of the streetscape. In Utah, this area and
38 the Curb Space is also used for snow storage when snow is removed from the street. The

APPROVED MINUTES

Heather Gray wrote:

We live in the cul-de-sac adjacent to the Northampton house on 351 N. 150 W. This proposal being submitted, if approved, will be a huge infringement on my property and our privacy. This is proposing large town-home like structures to be built on this very small space, allowing tenants/residents to peer directly into my yard and home as these structures would be much larger and taller than my actual house.

The resale value of our home and neighborhood would drop considerably with an establishment of this size right next to us in a space that is definitely not big enough. We are very concerned about our quiet neighborhood and property being ruined by this!

I also worry about the care and maintenance of these facilities. This parking lot that is adjacent to our culdesac has had noxious weeds and dirt mounds that have been unkept for quite some time. What will happen when there is more to maintain?

We are kindly asking that this proposal be rejected in regards to all of the surrounding neighbors and our privacy. We feel that this sort of proposal would be best suited for a commercial area, not an area that is surrounded by long time American Fork residents!

Thank you, Heather and Kurt Gray

Jennifer Harrison wrote:

Hello,

I see that you are once again discussing the hopes of Mr. Yingling to convert his Northampton house historic property into high density multi-family housing. I would like to share a few thoughts.

I quote from section A of Section 17.7.801 Historic Building Conservation Projects in American Fork City Municipal Code, which states the INTENT of the overlay code that applies to this building:

The intent of this section is to facilitate the preservation of structures of historic significance within the city. As a means of providing economic incentives for the preservation of the community's historic structures, the provisions of this section allow the placement and operation of certain commercial and residential activities within historic structures and the construction of appurtenant structures and facilities determined to be essential to the preservation of the historic structure, which may be at variance with the provisions of the underlying zone, but under controlled conditions which are not inimical to the quality of the residential environment in the territory surrounding the project area.

In reading this intent, I have a few comments based upon two specific items in this section:

APPROVED MINUTES

has constant traffic. I am concerned about adding to the congestion that is already there. Bringing in the additional high density residency will add to the congestion and threaten safety for the residents that have lived in the neighborhood. Many have lived here for 40 plus years. We do not have services nearby that are easily accessible for the new residents to access. This area has been zoned for residential living not high density living and it is my hope that we keep it as it is currently zoned. Thank you for your time and willingness to listen to the local neighbors in the area of the Northampton property.

Sincerely, LaRee Finch, American Fork resident

Kaden and Mardi Gubler wrote:

Dear Planning Commission Committee,

I am writing in opposition of the changes to the Northampton House property as currently proposed. Moreover, due to the overwhelming impact on the community surrounding the property, I ask that further discussions be postponed until all parties can be represented in-person.

Here are the primary reasons for my opposition:

1. **Current zoning for the area** – the current zone is an R-2-7500; a zone that is “established for the purpose of providing a place where one and two-family dwellings on individual lots can be constructed having attractively landscaped yards and a favorable environment for family life”. . . **“High-density apartment houses and commercial and industrial uses are not permitted in this zone.”** I ask that the committee **decline to entertain** any future proposals that do not fall within the currently established zoning requirements.
2. **Safety** – The proposed plan would increase auto and pedestrian traffic in an area with existing safety concerns. I ask that the committee require Mr. Yingling to provide a third party traffic study to help us understand the impact of his proposal.
3. **American Fork City Master Plan** – Allowing this development would be far outside the scope of the masterplan for the city of American Fork. This plan would create an island of development density not provided for in the masterplan. This proposal exceeds the masterplan for American Fork City that the planning commission is sworn to protect.

We are sympathetic to Mr. Yingling’s situation and his need to change the property and building to make it economically viable. However, we are not supportive of him asking us to pay for his changes in the form of decreased property values, higher traffic, higher density, and huge infrastructure changes.

Thanks, Kaden and Mardi Gubler, 383 N. 150 W.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 it would include residents' grown children or aging parents. She hopes that as residents we
2 remain open to options besides single-family housing, she doesn't necessarily believe that
3 allowing these uses into our neighborhoods will ruin their character. Multi-family homes don't
4 belong only in industrial areas, young families should be able to access the benefits of stable
5 residential neighborhoods as well. We as staff are committed to honoring the property rights
6 of everyone involved. She asked that neighbors stay open-minded and open-hearted to sharing
7 our communities.

8 Chairman Woffinden would like to see cost estimates, he thinks it will probably be more
9 expensive to do a seismic upgrade than Mr. Yingling expects.

10 Mr. Yingling thanked commissioners and stated that he will move forward with a formal
11 application.

12 13 **Public Comments Received**

14
15 Debra Aston wrote:

16 Dear Planning Commission:

17 Please consider our neighborhood before allowing high density housing to be approved on the
18 Northampton House property. There are many areas of the city where this is appropriate and has
19 become the norm, but please don't bring this to our neighborhood.

20 As you are aware, there is a lot of traffic on 300 North. School children cross at 200 West several
21 times daily. Adding more traffic to that intersection makes their crossing even more dangerous.
22 There are already too many accidents at that corner from unobservant drivers running the stop
23 sign.

24 I am truly sorry that the building owner has had financial difficulties, but that is not a good reason
25 to make my neighborhood unsafe.

26 Thank you for your consideration, Michael, Debra, Brandon and Camila Aston
27

28 LaRee Finch wrote:

29 Just would like to address my concern to the proposed plans for the Northampton property. I am a
30 resident that lives on 400 N. We live in a neighborhood where single family dwellings are the
31 majority. The area also has Shelley school just down the road 2 blocks. On the same block as the
32 Northampton house there is also the Jaycee Park which several months of the year is the Baseball
33 League playing field which has games going on during the weekend and on Saturdays. During that
34 time there is a severe parking and safety situation. 300 North is a main east west corridor which

APPROVED MINUTES

1 proposal. The costs to rehabilitate the old building are daunting, the only way to make it cost-
2 effective is to build new development around it. He needs the new development to be able to
3 keep the building cost-effective. He will be making a decision by the end of the year. Studies
4 from the University of Utah show that additional new housing raises property values, he
5 believes that this satisfies the concerns regarding the impact on the neighborhood. The
6 proposed density is between 14 and 15 units per acre. One phase consists of the old building
7 itself, and one phase is the new development of 15 or 18 units. Due to the high costs, he can't
8 afford to renovate the old building by itself. Mr. Yingling indicated that he wants to create a
9 beautiful master plan and not just put duplexes out in the back. The church is at the end of its
10 life cycle, it needs hundreds of thousands of dollars of work. The reception center is going
11 away and the community can help to decide what they would like it to be. He will keep the
12 density as low as possible, the current proposal is just shy of 40 units total. He wants the
13 apartments to be stately and show off architectural features. He wants to bring in the neo-gothic
14 and Victorian touches from the old building. The building has to move into a use that is a 100
15 year use, which is probably some kind of residential housing. He anticipates that it will be like
16 some of the higher end apartments in Salt Lake City that are managed well and highly sought
17 after. He hopes for increasing valuations for decades to come. He believes this is the only way
18 to keep the building and is committed to making a decision this year. He hopes the community
19 will want to keep it, he believes that this will increase property values and he doesn't believe
20 that traffic will be a huge concern because of reduced density. It will be a quiet development
21 and cater to a specific segment. It will not be low-income housing.

22 Mr. Dupaix expressed that meeting the code is the biggest challenge. He understands that
23 residents can be resistant to change, but from where he sits, any proposal should fit within the
24 code and not push the edges.

25 Mr. Hunter concurs, a proposal has to meet the code. Commissioners need an actual application
26 so they can really discuss it. The intent of the code is to preserve historic buildings, not create
27 a new development.

28 Chairman Woffinden pointed out that the code says a use cannot be detrimental to the
29 surrounding area.

30 Mr. Dudley expressed his view that this is an improvement over what they have seen before,
31 at this point he would like to see a formal application.

32 Ms. Anderson agreed, she is not necessarily against the look and appreciates the work that has
33 gone into it. She believes that he loves the building and feels that he is going in the right
34 direction by lowering the number of units. She feels that this look is better and it coordinates
35 well with the original building, but they need to see a formal submittal. She has read all the
36 comments and she appreciates the neighbors' willingness to speak up and engage in their
37 community. She wants to offer some of her perspectives about housing – who would the people
38 be who would move into a neighborhood if there were duplexes or apartments? She believes

APPROVED MINUTES

Public Hearing Opened

No comments were received.

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Hunter moved to approve the zone map amendment.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

10. Discussion on the Northampton House Historic Building Conservation Project located at 190 West 300 North in the R2-7,500 Residential/Historic Building Conservation Project zone

Mr. Olsen indicated that this is a discussion item only, no vote will be taken. This item has been before the commission previously, staff have received a number of public comments for tonight's meeting. As with previous discussions regarding this site, public comments are overwhelmingly in opposition. Because this is only a discussion item, the comments will be part of the written record but will not be read at the meeting.

The applicant is intending to change the use of the historical building, an old church that has also functioned as a reception center. He feels it is necessary to add additional buildings next to the church. A formal plan has never been submitted to the city. While the development code does allow uses to be expanded that may not be in compliance with the underlying zone, Mr. Olsen feels that what the applicant has been trying to do probably stretches the code beyond its intent. The applicant would like the opportunity to speak to you. When a formal plan is submitted, you will be provided a report with staff's thoughts and concerns.

Chairman Woffinden expressed that opposition is largely due to traffic, density, etc.

Mr. Kirt Yingling addressed commissioners. He explained that after the last time he gave a presentation to them, he went back to the drawing board and took their feedback into consideration. Since most concerns were about density, he has reduced the density in this

APPROVED MINUTES

Amenity Space is typically at least 5' wide and can overlap somewhat with the curb space if clear space requirements are met.

- Pedestrian Space provides for free flow of people to and through the site. In downtown areas, sidewalks are typically wider to allow for comfortable and free flow of people going both directions. An effective downtown sidewalk is often 8' or wider.

Reducing the required 13' wide area behind the curb will significantly reduce the safety and usability of the streetscape and will not set up the area for future success. Providing some flexibility within the required right of way as explained above, could enhance access and ensure that the CC-1 zone remains the "heart of the city."

Public Hearing Opened

No comments were received.

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Dupaix moved to deny the code text amendment.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

9. Hearing, review and action on a zone map amendment located at 1155 East 300 North from the RA-1 Residential Agricultural to the R1-9,000 Residential zone

Mr. Olsen stated that the applicant proposes a zone map amendment for property located at 1155 East 300 North to the R1-9,000 zone. The property is adjacent to a partially built street/cul-de-sac (1160 East). If approved, the applicant proposes to finish the west side of the street and subdivide the property. The property is approximately 1.26 acres. The request conforms with the underlying Land Use Plan designation of "Low Density Residential".

Mr. Uyema stated that additional right of way would be required on 300 North, the Engineering Division has been working with the applicant.

APPROVED MINUTES

1. The provisions of this overlay code are intended to provide options for what operations take place WITHIN historic structures, and additional construction is allowed for only when it is deemed to be “essential to the preservation of the historic structure.”
2. All these provisions are to be under controlled conditions “**which are not inimical to the quality of the residential environment in the territory surrounding the project area.**”

I think that the words “which are not inimical to the quality of the residential environment in the territory surrounding the project area” are the words that all the overlay incentives hinge upon. The definition of inimical is “tending to obstruct or harm; unfriendly; hostile.”

I believe that the proposal continues to be inimical to the residential environment surrounding the project area. Mr. Yingling stating that it is not inimical does not make it so. While these proposals come with new photographs and drawings each time, they are all slightly different representations of the same thing: high density housing in an area that is not zoned for it.

The residential area surrounding this historic building is one that merits special consideration from the city to ensure that the single family residential properties will be maintained and enhanced through updating and renovation, and thereby assist in guaranteeing the long-term livability of the neighborhood.

Currently you have a community of residents that are motivated to continue in this pattern of enhancing their single family properties. Dropping a high density multi-family housing project in the middle of it -even under the cloak of historic preservation - would in fact be inimical to the motivation and incentive of local residents to continue this pattern, as well as being incongruous with and inimical to the quality of the residential environment in the surrounding territory.

The phrase “essential to the preservation of the historic structure” is NOT, and should not be, interchangeable with something being deemed “essential to the business owner’s projected revenue.”

I believe that this proposal, quite obviously, sits OUTSIDE of the confines of the Historic Preservation overlay code, as it makes a historic building a mere appendage to a project that is clearly inimical to the area. The simple answer is that this location is NOT an appropriate location for a high density housing project of any kind.

Thank you, Jennifer Harrison

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Timothy Holley wrote:

2 Hi Adam,

3 I, along with many others, are concerned with the potential rezoning of the Northampton House to
4 allow high density housing. I know many of my neighbors have already contacted you, and you
5 have told them it is not a public hearing (merely a discussion item).

6 I still want to make my voice known that I am 100% against this proposal as a resident who lives
7 across the street. I also don't want this to become a trend that anyone with a little bit of extra land
8 to get it rezoned for townhomes or apartments.

9 Thank you for your continued service, Timothy Holley

10

11

12

13 Carla Nielsen wrote:

14 Hello!

15 Thank you for allowing this opportunity to express ideas and concerns regarding proposed
16 changes that will impact our neighborhood and community.

17 The architect's rendition of the proposed changes are beautiful and maintain the aesthetic of
18 the historic building. I appreciate the effort and financial cost required to produce these plans.

19 My concerns are primarily traffic and utility infrastructure.

20 TRAFFIC: In past meetings, it has been requested that a traffic study be completed. Have any
21 resources been dedicated to this study? The proposal material does not seem to indicate any
22 progress on that information. The information that would be provided by this type of study is
23 foundational to any decision regarding the zoning of this area. It is one of the major concerns
24 repeatedly voiced by the community but seems to be falling on deaf ears. This intersection is
25 already busy and difficult to cross. Adding additional dwellings will only make the problem
26 worse. The argument has been made that the reception center has brought in as much traffic as
27 this development would bring in. However, the reception center sees this traffic in the evening
28 and on 2 maybe 3 nights a week. Residences would create this traffic 24/7.

29 UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE: There is also concern about the existing infrastructure
30 limitations. 81 additional dwellings would significantly stretch the existing capacity for water,
31 both culinary and irrigation, as well as sewer and power. Would the current system need to be
32 upgraded to accommodate these dwellings? Who would be responsible for that cost? Would it
33 be the community or the developer? Even with the infrastructure updates, is there enough of

APPROVED MINUTES

1 the natural resource, i.e. water, to meet the demand? Would this deprive current users of
2 resources simply because they live further “downstream?”

3 I believe there are some basic considerations that need to be accounted for before we worry
4 about aesthetics and architectural plans. Regardless of what the buildings look like, can this
5 property sustain that many people?

6 Thanks, Carla Nielsen, 364 N. 300 W.

7
8
9
10 Mark Nielsen wrote:

11 Mr. Olsen:

12 As a member of the neighborhood near the Northampton House, I have some concerns about
13 the development plans being presented.

14 This is a lot of development. The plan is for 41 units in that space. That is almost as many
15 homes as we currently have in two blocks from 100-300 W between 300-400 N. I am not sure
16 what the average is for each block in American Fork, but I don’t know that this area is equipped
17 for that number of cars and amount of traffic.

18 Has there been a third party contracted to do a traffic study to project the impact of this many
19 cars? I felt like the last meeting I attended where this was a topic, someone talked about it, but
20 there was no real data. I don’t think someone’s rough guess is good enough (not even those
21 people living here in the neighborhood and especially someone who does not live and drive
22 here daily).

23 I think it may be a good idea for someone in the decision making group to visit with someone
24 who is currently living in a home owned by this developer/owner. I do not live in one of his
25 homes, but I would be interested in how he treats those tenants and how he maintains the
26 properties. Maybe he is a great landlord and that would be wonderful, but if he cannot manage
27 a couple properties/households, expecting him to maintain 20 times that many may be a
28 challenge that we might want to avoid.

29 This is a long term change that some of us will have to deal with every day for as long as we
30 live here. I hope that the decisions made will take into account the long term impact of such a
31 development.

32 Thank you, Mark Nielsen

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Sarah Osmond wrote:

2 As a 15 year resident of American Fork located across the street from the Northampton house,
3 I have enjoyed the beautiful view of this historic building. Occasionally during the spring and
4 summer months we see wedding ceremonies take place and the accompanying traffic.

5 As beautiful as this proposal is, I do not support adding this many residential units to the
6 property. That would create so much more traffic on an already busy street! This street is home
7 to a ballpark that sees so much traffic during spring baseball seasons as well as an elementary
8 school that already receives extra morning and afternoon traffic during the school year. I would
9 also like to suggest that this is a residential neighborhood and we are not looking to live
10 amongst high density living. It isn't zoned for that and it would do nothing to help add to our
11 property value or community. I understand the nostalgia behind the building itself, but I would
12 prefer to see the building torn down and single family residences built instead of high density
13 units. Thank you for your time and attention to my concerns.

14 Nathan and Sarah Osmond, 335 N. 200 W.

15
16
17
18 Royce Shelley wrote:

19 To All Concerned:

20 Finding nothing but pictures on the Agenda/Package I will address the concerns I have with the
21 pictures and previous submissions to the Planning Commission:

22 I am concerned since this is entirely out of character with the surrounding neighborhood.

23 This is definitely High Density Housing in an R2-7500 zone. This level of density is
24 inconsistent with the prevailing standards of the current residences in the area, and I do not
25 favor a zoning change to benefit a single property owner (even if that owner owns 3 properties).

26 If this is still being proposed as 55+ housing, my personal set of 55+ knees would never survive
27 ownership of a home in this development. If it is still being proposed as 55+ housing, the
28 project should be denied based solely on the basis of it being inappropriate for that market.

29 Royce S. Shelley, 165 W. 500 N., Resident of this neighborhood for 60+ years

APPROVED MINUTES

11. Other Business

Mr. Olsen told commissioners that he would keep them informed on the status of in-person meetings.

There will be a special city council meeting on April 29 to select a replacement for Barbara Christiansen. Her funeral will be held on Friday and there is a zoom link for those that would like to participate.

Mr. Dupaix remarked that he had had the opportunity over the span of his career to have several conversations with Barbara. He served in PR capacity for UDOT and she was a reporter. Though some discussions were difficult, she was always warm and kind in her interviews. She was a tremendous soul and left a good legacy in the community.

12. Site Plan Committee Report

Mr. Knobloch reviewed the items for the upcoming Planning Commission meeting to be held on Wednesday, April 21, 2021. The Lake City Row master plan will be repeated, as well as a final plat for Autumn Crest Plat E subdivision, an annexation agreement in the TOD area, and a code text amendment.

13. Review and action on the minutes of the March 17, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Session

Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the minutes of the March 17, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Session.

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

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion passed.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 14. Adjournment

2
3 **Mr. Hunter motioned to adjourn.**

4 **Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. All voted in favor.**

5
6 Meeting adjourned at 9 pm.

7
8
9 

10
11
12 Lisa Halversen

13 Administrative Assistant