



MINUTES

Planning Commission
Work Session
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioners Present: Genevieve Baker, Karen Ellingson, Michael Farrer, Rod Parker and Kay Heaps

Commissioners Excused: Brad Mertz, Frank Young

City Staff: Josh Yost, Community Development Director
John Penrod, City Attorney
Laura Thompson, City Planner
Heather Bakker, Executive Assistant

City Council: Matt Packard

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Baker called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m.

DISCUSSION OF AGENDA

Vice-Chair Baker asked if there were any corrections to the agenda. There were no corrections to the agenda.

DISCUSSION OF MINUTES

March 9, 2021

Vice-Chair Baker asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. There were no corrections to the minutes.

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Trevor Sharp seeking commercial site plan approval for Spring Pointe OW, an office/warehouse project located at 2188 and 2224 W 500 N in the HC-Highway Commercial Zone.*

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

1. *John York seeking to amend Section 11-4-405 of Springville City Code pertaining to setbacks for detached accessory structure rear yard setbacks. (Continued from March 9, 2021)*

ADMINISTRATIVE SESSION

1. *A presentation and discussion of the Lakeside Landing Special District Plan and Code.*

With nothing further to discuss, Commissioner Heaps moved to adjourn the briefing meeting. Commissioner Farrer seconded the motion. The vote to adjourn the briefing meeting was unanimous.

Vice-Chair Baker adjourned the briefing meeting at 7:09 p.m.

IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioners Present: Genevieve Baker, Karen Ellingson, Michael Farrer, Rod Parker and Kay Heaps

Commissioners Excused: Brad Mertz, Frank Young

City Staff: Josh Yost, Community Development Director
John Penrod, City Attorney
Laura Thompson, City Planner
Heather Bakker, Executive Assistant

City Council: Matt Packard

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Baker called the meeting to order at 7:09 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

March 9, 2021

Commissioner Farrer moved to approve the March 9, 2021 meeting minutes
Commissioner Ellingson seconded the motion. The vote to approve the meeting minutes was unanimous.

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Trevor Sharp seeking commercial site plan approval for Spring Pointe OW, an office/warehouse project located at 2188 and 2224 W 500 N in the HC-Highway Commercial Zone.*

Commissioner Farrer moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Parker seconded the motion. The vote to approve the Consent Agenda was unanimous.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION:

- 1. John York seeking to amend Section 11-4-405 of Springville City Code pertaining to setbacks for detached accessory structure rear yard setbacks.
(Continued from March 9, 2021)*

Mr. Penrod, City Attorney, presented. This item came to the Planning Commission two weeks ago. The applicants and their attorney were not present at that meeting. They are present here tonight. Director Yost and I were researching this today. It is a simple issue, but the ordinance makes it a little bit complex. We are talking about an accessory structure that is like a patio. This is not attached to the house. We are looking at the distance between a house and an accessory structure. This is important because it affects the accessory structure rear setbacks. There are two different areas of our ordinance that this applies to. Currently, if the distance between the house and the accessory structure is 6 feet, then the rear yard setback is 3 feet. One of the reasons the required 6-foot distance is there because of the building code. Not the current code, but the traditional building code, which was from 10-15 years ago. Historically, if two buildings were within 6 feet, based on fire reasons, the two structures were separated by six feet on the zoning side and the building limitations on the building code side would apply. Since that time, building code has reduced any improvements to the two structures down to 3 feet and even those improvements of 3 feet aren't that big of an improvement in today's building code.

Mr. Penrod said what we are talking about tonight is an unwallled patio structure. The current code is that if the distance between the structure is less than 6 feet, our current code requires a 15-foot setback. We are talking about the appropriate distance between an accessory structure and the house. The proposed ordinance shortens the gap between the house and the accessory structure to allow it, even if the structure was right up against the house, they would still get the 3-foot setback instead of having to the 15-foot setback.

Commissioner Heaps asked if they would have to be detached. Mr. Penrod said if it is attached, it has to have the 15-foot setback. But tonight, what is before the Commission, is allowing the applicant and everyone else in the City to shorten that gap, as long as it is a separate unit and still get the 3-foot setback instead of what is required for something that is attached.

Vice-Chair Baker expressed concern about the proximity of accessory structures to structures on neighboring properties. Especially those in the Historic District that has several non-complying grandfathered structures. Mr. Penrod said with that situation, we would have to see if the building code applied. Right now, we would still require the 6-foot separation between the house and the garage. The main issue tonight is the applicant wants to get rid of the 6-foot distance between an accessory building and a house. Mr. Penrod said that 40 percent of the lot still has to be open space and the structure cannot be more than 15 feet tall.

Vice-Chair Baker said this is unwallled, so if it was made into a sunroom, it wouldn't be allowed. Mr. Penrod said it would still be allowed. Tonight we are only talking about unwallled accessory structures being closer than 6 feet to the house.

Commissioner Ellingson asked if there are any fire concerns that we need to focus on. Mr. Penrod said that for an unwallled structure, he doesn't see any for the same reason that if there is a patio connected to your house, you still have the same issue of fire.

Commissioner Heaps said that if it were walled, you mentioned before the requirements from 6 feet to maybe 3 feet. Mr. Penrod said yes. Commissioner Heaps said that you

are now saying this applies to both the walled structures as well. Mr. Penrod said no, only the unwall structures. Commissioner Heaps pointed out that is what Vice-Chair Baker was asking earlier. She agreed. Commissioner Heaps confirmed that just the unwall structures would go all the way up to the primary structure. And walled would still be at the 6 feet. Mr. Penrod said yes. Vice-Chair Baker said to go into 3 feet. Mr. Penrod showed a portion of setbacks for accessory buildings on a property. He showed the distance between an accessory building and a principal building on the same lot. It is 6 feet. The proposed amendment is shown in red and the City may issue permits for rear yard unwall patio coverings that are closer than 6 feet from the principal structure. Where the rear yard is properly enclosed by a properly permitted privacy fence and the patio covering is professionally designed, constructed by a licensed contractor and will not intrude onto neighboring properties. That is the exception for the unwall structure to be within that 6 feet. It would still require that a walled accessory structure has to be 6 feet away, which our Building Official would agree that needs to be the case.

Commissioner Heaps asked if the fire department has looked at this and are they OK with them doing it unwall that close to a building. Mr. Penrod said we haven't talked to the fire department, but we have spoken with our Building Official who is at the beginning of all of these projects and he doesn't see the purpose of the 6-foot requirement, in the communications that we've had. Director Yost added that the difference is you could be constructing a patio roof or a deck connected to your house as long as it stays 15 feet off the property line. We can already have the structures attached to the house. Commissioner Heaps said or if we approve this, you could attach it to the house. Director Yost said you can do that right now, but you have to stay 15 feet away. Commissioner Heaps said that we are asking now to approve this so it would go down to 3 feet setback. Director Yost said that is correct. Mr. Penrod said if it is not connected to the house. Commissioner Heaps said that you could go an inch away from the house and then go 3 feet, or connect to the house and go 15 feet. Vice-Chair Baker said it is not that it is connected to the house and can go to 3 feet. Mr. Penrod said no, that is not what we are doing tonight. We are only dealing with one portion of our ordinance tonight because that is what the applicants brought. There are other portions of our ordinance that we could change to allow for someone to connect to their house and then take it to 3 feet from the back property line. But right now our ordinance does not allow for that.

Commissioner Ellingson asked why we add the part of the privacy fencing as a necessary element. Mr. Penrod said he didn't know why they added that. That is something that the applicant is asking for. Commissioner Parker said it is to allow properties around them to maintain their privacy as well. Commissioner Heaps said one of the purposes of the setback is to maintain some privacy. Maybe the applicant could address that. Mr. Penrod said right now, without having a fence, you could put a patio that was as big as the applicant has already installed as long as it is 6 feet back and not be required to have a privacy fence. Almost the whole backyard if you want, as long as there is 40% of open space in a patio.

Vice-Chair Baker said going back to the fire code, the idea is to have 3 feet difference in between structures. Mr. Penrod said there are different requirements once you get within 3 feet of two residential structures. On the commercial side, there is still a 6-foot requirement. But when it comes to residential structures, they have lowered that from 6

feet to 3 feet. He doesn't know of any requirements in talking with Director Yost or the Building Official that would be of too much issue if the building were unwallled. It is the same thing as an attached patio. Vice-Chair Baker reiterated that an attached patio would have to be set back 15 feet. Mr. Penrod said yes. Vice-Chair Baker is asking because that would mean essentially that there wouldn't be a fire break of 3 feet between a house and a patio and then it would be 3 feet from the neighbor's property. There are many places where they are nonconforming, where a detached garage goes right up to a property line on two sides. They could be within 3 feet of another property structure. Mr. Penrod said that again, we are talking about an unwallled accessory building. An accessory garage to the house, would not have any bearing on it whatsoever. Vice-Chair Baker said if someone were to build this and go to 3 feet on their property line, and then the neighbor has a structure right up to the property line, it would be 3 feet. Mr. Penrod said they could.

Mr. Penrod said that staff recommendation is we cannot find a compelling reason to permit accessory patio covers to be located less than six feet from the principal structure but as the discussion has gone tonight, we are trying to figure out what the difference is between having it 6 feet off or within the 6 feet when you can still do a sizeable structure in the whole backyard. Or have something attached to your house and still have a pretty sizeable unwallled patio in the backyard.

If the Planning Commission desires to recommend the applicant's amendment, we recommend that we change the ordinance to the City Council by changing footnote number 10 to allow the 6 foot required distance from a principal structure shall not apply to rear yard unwallled patio covering that is not connected to the principal structure. All other accessory use structure requirements shall apply to the unwallled patio coverings that are not connected to the principal structure. The reason is, if it is going to be allowed, we think it should just be allowed. In the applicant's suggested language, it says that the City may issue a permit. We think it should just be allowed if that is the direction we are going.

Commissioner Heaps did some research on other Cities for this, and Alpine requires detached to have at least 15 feet. These are all going to be walled structures too. The difference he is learning tonight is the unwallled feature. Spanish Fork requires 5 feet, Orem requires 6, Provo requires 6, Utah County website for building codes says that most residential zones are to be placed within 3 feet of the rear side property lines as long as you have 6 feet between the structures. So that seems to be the standard. He thinks what we are doing seems right in line with what is happening around us.

Mr. Penrod said we would argue more forcefully if we were talking about walled structures. Because there are combustibles inside walled structures, vehicles, furniture, other things that if they catch fire, it is going to be a pretty good fire that could transfer to the house. Where we are talking about unwallled, we are not as worried about it.

Commissioner Heaps wasn't able to see anything about this kind of exception, so we would be on the front edge of this. He is not opposed to this but asked if are we OK setting the code for perhaps one applicant. He asked how many times this would come up. Commissioner Parker said that if we approve the code, it won't come up again. We are talking strictly about a patio vs a walled structure, so he thinks we should listen to the applicant and then make our determination. Mr. Penrod responded to Commissioner

Heaps and said in this situation, the applicant did go out and build a structure before they came in for a building permit. If they would have come to get the building permit, they could have adjusted the structure to meet the 6-foot setback. He thinks they would still have pretty much the same structure, it would just be 3 feet further away from the house.

Paxton Guymon, the applicant's attorney, addressed the Planning Commissioners. He feels that we are talking about a very narrow circumstance: unwallled patio coverings. When you look at the unintended consequences we might deal with, we are narrowing the requested amendment to only apply to unwallled covered patios. When you look at the rationale to the other city's codes, it seems to me that all of those contemplated wall structures, and that is a very different scenario. When you are dealing with walled structures that have no airflow, potentially combustible items within the structure, that makes sense to be 6 feet away from the residence. Today we are talking about a resident that wants a shade cover on their patio. We will show some photos because it is important to know the situation we are talking about. It is unusual. Typically, he is here asking to construct something in the future. And we got the cart before the horse because this patio cover has already been built. We are saying that we are in a situation where we are not compliant with the City ordinance, but maybe there is a reason to revisit this city ordinance and ask if it makes sense. There is not a fire hazard whether the unwallled patio covering is 6 inches from the home or 6 feet from the home. We would be comfortable having any Fire Marshall look and this and he thinks you would see that they would agree with him on that. We are talking about a very unique situation and are not dealing with unintended consequences. Once this is approved, he doubts you will see this issue come up again. People will say that we go through the process of building unwallled patio covers that comply with the code and it will never come before you again.

The York's installed a swimming spa in their backyard last year. The patio cover design was to accommodate that. They wanted privacy. It is open air. If the code enforcement officer came in and said they would have to come into compliance with the code today, they would have to remove 3 or 4 feet of this patio covering to give greater separation. He asked what purpose that serves. He submits none. On the contrary in the winter months, it would allow snow to fall between the home and the patio covering and create slippery conditions out there. The patio covering extends 3 feet to the home at the closest point. Commissioner Heaps asked if it was 3 feet at the closest distance. Mr. Guymon said that it was 2 to 3 feet. Mr. York said it is taller. Commissioner Heaps asked how tall it is. Mr. York said that it was about 12 feet. Mr. Guymon said it was at the highest point. Vice-Chair Baker said it was 3 feet from the fence. Mr. York said the back 3 feet measures from the property line to the post. They don't allow any overhang into the 6 feet area. Mr. Guymon said part of the patio cover is higher than the roof of the house. Mr. York said the designers told him too it is not uncommon for them to design roofs that overlap to keep leaves and things from falling into the rain gutter. Mr. York asked to show pictures where it is not common for these structures to be closer than 6 feet. When we first built there, they said everything was going to be one story. Now they are going two stories. Privacy has become an issue, much more than the view. He doesn't dislike his neighbors, it just feels like you are in your own private backyard. Mr. Guymon said that when you are looking at the power of the City to enforce ordinances, you have to ask yourself is there a rational basis, something health, safety or welfare concern that is being addressed. It is addressed when we have walled structures, that

we don't want closer than 6 feet to the house. But with an unwallled patio covering, he doesn't see any legitimate health, safety or welfare reason to require 6 feet of separation. We are here tonight to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend the City ordinance. And he likes Mr. Penrod's alternative language, as it makes more sense. Mr. Guymon is comfortable substituting our proposed language for the City Attorney's proposed language on the text amendment. It is easier to interpret and apply.

Vice-Chair Baker opened the Public Hearing at 7:46 p.m.

Colt Christensen
587 S 2000 E

Mr. Christensen is the neighbor to the North of the York's and they are the envy of the neighborhood with this patio cover. It is a beautiful structure, the neighborhood around us loves it, we are jealous. Privacy in that area of Springville is becoming a high commodity. Whatever we can do to afford people a little more privacy in their backyard is awesome. He thanked the Commissioners for their time.

Chad Rigtrup
2036 E 600 S

The York's live just North of us. He agrees with Colt, we are envious of their structure, it is beautiful. He can see why they built it. The home right behind them has almost no backyard and their deck looks right into the back of their house. They had no privacy in their backyard. When they built it, he and his wife said that would be so awesome to have some privacy in your backyard and not feel that people are right on top of you. He thinks it is beautifully designed and well done. He would have an issue if Mr. York was out there by himself putting it together, but this is beautifully done and designed. Hopefully, they will receive permission to keep it up.

Commissioner Heaps motioned to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Farrer seconded. The vote to close the Public Hearing was unanimous. Vice-Chair Baker closed the Public Hearing at 7:48 p.m.

Commissioner Ellingson doesn't see much difference between this particular type of structure being close to a fence versus a line of trees which you can use to screen. Vice-Chair Baker said that there is a fire difference between a live tree and wood, but essentially, yes. Commissioner Parker said in regards to the fire concern, we are talking about a walled structure vs. an open structure, the fire issue set by the City Attorney is null and void when it comes to an open structure. He asked Mr. Penrod if that is correct. Mr. Penrod said you could still have a fire. Commissioner Parker agreed. Mr. Penrod also said if you have a patio connected to your house, it could catch fire and that is more of a fire hazard than having something (inaudible). Vice-Chair Baker said she is not as concerned about having it as close to the house. Her concern is when reducing the setback, is it effectively increasing the fire risk, because many parts of Springville have non-conforming structures. And especially knowing that the eve can come into that 3-foot area, not to say that it should not be allowed, but Commissioner Heaps had mentioned something in an ordinance that it has to be 6 feet from another structure. Commissioner Heaps said he was talking about the accessory building and the home. He said in response to Vice-Chair Baker's comment, if it is a detached structure and it is 6 feet or more now, it could go up to 3 feet anyway. Vice-Chair Baker said that you have

to have a break between a house and the structure. Commissioner Heaps said the initial concern was on the back side rather than the house side. Vice-Chair Baker agreed. She is not saying there is no concern, she is just not concerned about the fire going from the house to a patio. Her concern is a fire going from a house to a patio to her garage. Her garage is right up next to the property line. Essentially extending a house all the way to 3 feet from the property line, then an eve going into that 3 feet, then that puts it very close to many non-conforming structures. She wonders if there is a way to say they can do that unless there another structure within 6 feet of it. Commissioner Parker said that he doesn't think the 6 foot is an issue on an open structure, as far as a fire situation. He is not concerned about it. If you are 6 feet away, the ember can jump and set fire to the home anyway. So that 6 feet barrier isn't a magical number that is going to suppress any kind of a fire. To Vice-Chair Baker's point of non-compliance, he has a neighbor that has a garage that sits right on the property line. It is a walled structure. If you want to control this, the ordinance is written so that we can as long as it's submitted by a licensed contractor and permitted and properly done, you can control what it looks like and give us privacy. Homes are very close together now. We need to develop an ordinance so people can gain some privacy in their own backyard while being safe and smart about what we are trying to do.

Vice-Chair Baker's concern is that living in the Historic District, there are many non-conforming structures that have been there 70 plus years. Having something that comes right up to the property line and next to her garage, which is on the property line, is essentially making the property continuous property. Commissioner Parker said it isn't coming right up to the property line. It in no way looks as if it is a continuation of another building. Commissioner Heaps asked how far the overhang can go into the setback. Director Yost said he had to look at the code. He wasn't aware that there were permitted encroachments into that 3-foot setback for the accessory structure. Commissioner Heaps asked Director Yost to look that up right now.

Commissioner Ellingson said another question she had is with the new proposed language, under what circumstances would that apply that you need to have a general contractor and you have to have a privacy fence. She asked if it is just when it goes up to that 3-foot line, or is it all patio covers. Mr. Penrod said that with the proposed language from the applicant, it can only be when they are within the 6 feet, under that footnote and exception. Right now, you can have an unwallled patio that is farther than 6 feet from your home. Footnote 10 says that if we come closer than 6 feet, we have to have a fence around the yard. Commissioner Ellingson asked if any person who builds a patio cover or pergola that is attached to the home would now have to follow this. Mr. Penrod said it isn't attached. The ordinance says if it is attached it has to be 15 feet from the rear property line. Vice-Chair Baker said that anyone in that 6-foot range would have to. Mr. Penrod said yes and in that 6-foot range, they would have to have a fence before putting up the unwallled structure. Commissioner Heaps said the way it is written, the fence is not in there anymore. Mr. Penrod said with what we are proposing, but we put the applicants' suggestion in there as well. Vice-Chair Baker is for not having a fence requirement. Commissioner Heaps agrees and feels that what the City is proposing is good.

Commissioner Heaps asked Director Yost if he had found the ordinance. Director Yost said that it is found in 11-6-106.

Vice-Chair Baker said that in this specific case, it is not an issue because the neighboring home didn't have structures that were within the area. This would apply to all the areas in the City. Those that are newer that would be compliant and those that are non-compliant.

Director Yost said that this section is a lot of projections into yard areas. If we interpret it to mean that an accessory structure requires a 3-foot rear yard, then roofs, eaves, overhangs, cornices, may project up to 2 feet into any required yard space. Commissioner Heaps said that it could still go 2 feet in which would still give a 1-foot separation between the non-conforming garage. If the fire department is OK with being an inch away from the house, would we not assume it would be OK to be a foot away from the non-conforming garage on the other side. Mr. Penrod said he could ask the fire department that same question. Commissioner Farrer said that what the fire department is worried about is access to the property. In Murray, you can have a dwelling, with a wall, 1 foot from their back property line. But there has to be access from both sides so the fire department can get in and access both structures. He doesn't feel that the fire department is going to be concerned about this. Commissioner Heaps added that it is unwallled. Commissioner Farrer agreed and is in favor of allowing this motion and thinks that we should vote on this.

Commissioner Ellingson said that if we were to move to accept it, we could have a contingency that the fire department signs off on the recommendation to address any concerns.

Vice-Chair Baker said that this would apply to carports too. Mr. Penrod said that is correct noting that a carport that is not attached to the house. She asked about front yard patios and if there is a different setback. Mr. Penrod said that there is. The language only applies to rear-yard patio covers. This is a narrow situation. Vice-Chair Baker said it wouldn't apply to carports on side yards. Commissioner Heaps said that if it needs to be contingent on the fire, but just with the recommendation to have the fire department review it and report back through staff or them through City Council.

Mr. Penrod said we used the same language when it came to a rear-yard unwallled patio covering that is not connected to a principal structure. The 6-foot distance requirement on a rear yard, unwallled patio covering that is not connected to the principal structure. Commissioner Parker said it is straightforward.

Director Yost asked for a clarification on what attached means and if it is defined. Do we mean that detached is structurally independent? Mr. Penrod said we haven't gotten that far in thinking through it, but he thinks if it isn't physically attached to the house then we consider it not being attached. Vice-Chair Baker said it could be touching the house. Mr. Penrod said it could be, but if we look at the building code requirements, a structure like a patio that is not attached to the house still needs to go through the building permit process, so the building code would still apply to the structure itself.

Commissioner Farrer said the building inspector would go out and look at it and also do a fire inspection, so there is no need for the fire language. Commissioner Heaps agreed. Mr. Penrod said that is why they thought to talk to the Building Official and see what is acceptable under the building code. Commissioner Parker said it would all be wrapped together. Mr. Penrod said yes.

Commissioner Heaps recommended approval of the proposed amendment as outlined by City Staff in Section 11-4-405 of Springville City Code pertaining to setbacks for detached accessory structure rear yard setbacks. Commissioner Parker seconded. The vote to approve the Legislative Item was 4 aye and 1 nay. The motion passes.

Commissioner Parker was excused at 8:06 p.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE SESSION

1. A presentation and discussion of the Lakeside Landing Special District Plan and Code.

Director Yost introduced the applicants. He said tonight we have a presentation from the proponents of a development and planning process that has been underway for more than a year in the Lakeside area, everything West of I-15. This planning process encompasses the area to the North of 400 South and generally everything to the West of the existing development along the frontage road or the Flying J. It includes property currently under the ownership of the Central Utah Valley Waste District, the Transfer Station, and to the North and West of that. The proposal encompasses a new to us zoning method that will supersede the zoning in the area and the other requirements in our zoning essentially stand alone as a special zoning district. And would be applied to this area and facilitate this development. If this were to move forward, it would come back to you as a zone text ordinance amendment and a zone map amendment. One, to adopt this new ordinance and its plan and second, to apply it to the property on our zoning map. You would make a recommendation to the City Council on both of those items and then the City Council would legislatively adopt and apply this plan.

Ed Axley, Davies Design Build President, presented. He is a long-time land development company and contracting firm that has done 18 Parade of Homes, making them the number one Parade builder in the valley and have won 16 People's Choice awards. This is the kind of development we put out into the community. We have teamed up with Alpine Development. Glen Lent introduced himself. They are a company from Orem and he has a background in Engineering and specifically land development. He is excited about his opportunity and thinks they will be as well. A lot of this land was zoned agriculture a lot was HC and some industrial. There was a section for residential and there was a Lakeside Overlay Zone that had been codified but never applied. In December 2019, we made application to apply that overlay on 70 acres that we had under contract. Nothing happened for the first 6 months, then we started talking to the Council and working with Staff more and we got feedback that the area needed an overhaul and maybe City was envisioning something else.

Mr. Axley said that he came into looking at this, the initial thought was because it was HC, we would just put a bunch of industrial boxes out there because it is hot on the market now. But then they talked with Mr. Lent and got the concept to do something quite beautiful and spectacular that could be a crowning jewel for the entire valley. We don't have time to get into all the details tonight. It is 200 acres that represents everything from affordable housing to high-end housing with 27 different residential products in a nice mix throughout the community.

We have a chance to show what a community can be in a creative way. The diversity of housing goes from the availability of affordability up to the high end. There is a major housing issue in Utah now. We are trying to do something that will allow for healthy neighborhoods and a healthy lifestyle from the beginning of life to the end of life. We worked with Staff to subcontract some of this out to a third party and we found a superb group. Korkut Onaran is the main Director and planner on this. He is out of Colorado and has a lot of experience in Western community design. He has done this with form-based code. He showed examples of single-family homes, cottages, townhomes, condos and apartments. The products mix and work together. Trails connect things, parks, tree-lined streets with shade and natural growth. The parks have amphitheaters and other community gathering assets in them. There is an area for a new school.

Commissioner Heaps asked how many acres this is. Mr. Axley said it is 212 acres on the left and another 2-300 acres on the West side. We are talking about a monumentally large project. Commissioner Heaps asked how many units will be in there. Mr. Axley doesn't know the total number of units, but Staff has described the complexity of this project could increase the population of Springville by 20%. This is a long build-out. It will take some time for this. It will be well thought out. Commissioner Ellingson said it would probably be phased out. Mr. Axley said yes. Mr. Lent said that that it would be best to include the rest of the property that we don't control. That is where the City has the benefit. We don't own it all, but we are going to master plan the entire area. We look at it as a public/private partnership. We are helping facilitate what the City would have done otherwise. The biggest difference in a community like this is like Daybreak, with alley-loaded garages, you see the fronts of the houses, porches, front doors, as opposed to garages. It's the wave of the future. Millennials want it. They are not concerned about the number of acres they have. Another guiding principle is a road that acts like a Main Street that will allow a live/work product.

Commissioner Heaps said they have been looking at a true mixed-use with not only residential but also commercial. Mr. Axley said absolutely, we have it focused on the South side, closer to the main off-ramp. We have proposed about 30-40,000 feet of just office space and other types of commercial space.

Commissioner Farrer asked how far North this presentation goes. Mr. Axley said 500 North. Mr. Lent said in general, on product type, we have mixed it together. On Main Street, we need to come up with a different name, but that is where the live/work area is, then as you fan out you get lower density and up in the Northwest corner, you can see a single-family type. Vice-Chair Baker said that with that, it looks like on the East if it fairly high density. Mr. Lent said that the lower things are what the City needs and wants, then up here is industrial, so it is tricky on how you put the product in to buffer the industrial. Mr. Axley said the developers are working together to put together this massive project and get the architecture to work together. All the neighboring properties out there are in support of this and they like how it is developing out. We are overlaying their property with a master plan, they are not upset by it and have been part of the discussions. Mr. Axley said this is a very neat opportunity.

Commissioner Ellingson asked how far North the project goes. Mr. Lent said that the top road is 500 North. The section right above that is the Industrial section. Eventually, the City is going to go West. We have talked to the Crandall's and they are in support of

starting development in this area. This would become Title 9 in the code that would govern this development. It would be a text amendment and a map amendment.

Mr. Axley said that another interesting point is that in Springville, there were only 13 available apartments on Rentler. Many people want to live here and there isn't anything available. There are 6 houses available for sale. We have seen a 60% increase in the last 24 months in Utah County. That is a major problem. As developers and municipalities, we need to be part of a planned reaction as opposed to a knee-jerk reaction.

Mr. Lent said that they wanted to get acquainted with the Planning Commission and to get feedback on the project. Commissioner Farrer said that he is excited.

Commissioner Heaps said that they are pocketing the 27 different product types. He sees that they are not mixed in together like in the Simpson property. That is why he asked how many units. Mr. Lent said there are about 1500. Commissioner Heaps calculated that with 4 people in a household that is 6000 people. It is a lot of people and you talk about intermingling. We like the multiple types and that is a suggestion to dovetail them together. Mr. Axley said that there are products in there that will attract people. Mr. Lent said they are going through the requirements with Josh to get the diversity. We want the streetscape to look unique. We may have townhomes mixed in here, then a duplex and then 3-4 single-family homes. Commissioner Heaps said that is what they like to see. We just want to give you that feedback.

Vice-Chair Baker said that there is that chunk that looks like it is all single-family homes. Mr. Axley said that is outside of their development right now. That is a zoning overlay and we populated it with some boxes. That will have to come back to the City. Director Yost said no, that everything shown on the illustrative plan map as part of the Lakeside Landing plan is currently controlled by the applicant.

Mr. Lent said that what we do in areas of the single-family, we required different elevations. You can't have the same elevation at the two homes next to you or the 3 homes across the street. They may have the same floor plan, but they have a different color of the house and elevation. That is how you mix a single-family development. Commissioner Ellingson said she sees developers that get around that. There are homes in her neighborhood where you look at 5 in a row and say those are all the same thing. Mr. Axley said that in this the architectural details have to be changed up. Mr. Lent said that Josh and Troy won't let us. They push back on all of the issues you are concerned about.

With nothing further to discuss, Commissioner Farrer moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Heaps seconded the motion. The vote to close the meeting was unanimous.

Vice-Chair Baker adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.