REGULAR MEETING
OF THE VINEYARD PLANNING COMMISSION,
May 5, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the Vineyard City Planning Commission will hold a regularly scheduled meeting at City Hall, 125 South Main Street, Vineyard, Utah. You can also view the meeting on our live stream channel.

REGULAR SESSION

Call to Order

1. **INVOCATION/INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHTS/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE –** *to be announced*

2. **OPEN SESSION -** Time dedicated for public comment. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes. No actions may be taken by the Planning Commission due to the need for proper public noticing.

3. **MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL:**
   - 3.1 February 3, 2021
   - 3.2 April 7, 2021

4. **BUSINESS ITEMS**
   No business items will be presented.

5. **WORKSESSION**
   - 5.1 **Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) Lighting Standards**
     - The Planning Commission will discuss city-initiated code amendments to VZC 15.36.030 Project Site Planning and Building Design Requirements and VZC 15.38.030 Parking Requirements.
   - 5.2 **Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) for Home-Based Occupations in Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and Multi-Family Dwellings**
     - The Planning Commission will discuss city-initiated code amendments to VZC 15.34.150 Home Occupations regarding home occupations in single family homes with an ADU.
   - 5.3 **Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) Accessory Dwelling Units**
     - The Planning Commission will discuss city-initiated code amendments to VZC 15.34.060 Accessory Dwelling Units as it relates to code updates aligning with recent Utah State Code changes.
   - 5.4 **Zoning Text Ordinance for Retaining Walls**
     - The Planning Commission will discuss city-initiated code amendments regarding retaining walls and fencing located on top of retaining walls.

6. COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS AND EX PARTE DISCUSSION DISCLOSURE

7. ADJOURNMENT

The next regularly scheduled meeting is May 19, 2021.

The Public is invited to participate in all Planning Commission meetings. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during this public meeting should notify Cache Hancey, Planning Technician, at least 24 hours prior to the meeting by calling (801) 226-1929 or email at cacheh@vineyardutah.org.

The foregoing notice was posted on the Utah Public Notice Website and Vineyard Website, posted at the Vineyard City Offices, delivered electronically to city staff, and each member of the planning commission.

AGENDA NOTICING COMPLETED ON: 4/30/2021

NOTICED BY: /s/ Cache Hancey
Cache Hancey, Planning Technician

REGULAR MEETING
OF THE VINEYARD PLANNING COMMISSION,
Wednesday, February 3, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

_____

This meeting was held electronically because of the gathering restrictions in force due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Present:
Commissioner Amber Rasmussen
Commissioner Jessica Welch
Chair Bryce Brady
Vice-Chair Shan Sullivan
Commissioner Tay Gudmundson
Commissioner Tim Blackburn

Absent: Commissioner Anthony Jenkins

Staff Present: Community Development Director Morgan Brim, Planner II Briam Amaya Perez, Planning Technician Cache Hancey

Others Present: Resident David Lauret, Resident Alisha Sabin, Resident Devon Guymon, Resident Lori Hooper, Resident Mary Pendleton, Resident Ryan McCarty, Resident Emily Vance, Resident Eileen Erekson, Resident Nicole Reichman, Resident Brett Pendleton, and Resident Pam Adams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Brady called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and then read the following statement:

1. WRITTEN DETERMINATION

This meeting will be an electronic meeting according to Vineyard Municipal Code Section 3.08.030.

I, Bryce Brady, as the Chair of the Vineyard Planning Commission, do hereby find and declare as follows:

1. Due to the Emergency conditions which currently exist in the State of Utah, and specifically in Utah County and Vineyard City as a result of the COVID-19 Pandemic and the recent surge in COVID-19 infections across the state and in Utah County, the holding of public meetings with an anchor location as defined in the *Utah Open and Public Meetings Act*, presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location; and

2. The risk to those who may be present at an anchor location can be substantially mitigated by holding public meetings of the Planning Commission pursuant to electronic means that allow for public participation via virtual means; and

DRAFT

3. The City has the means and ability to allow virtual participation in the public meetings in accordance with the *Utah Open and Public Meetings Act*;

NOW THEREFORE, BASED UPON THE FOREGOING,

For thirty days from the date of this Order, meetings of the Vineyard Planning Commission shall be conducted by virtual means without an anchor location.

2. INVOCATION/INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHTS/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Tim Blackburn gave an invocation.

3. OPEN SESSION

Chair Brady asked for a motion to open up the meeting for public comments**.**

MOTION: COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN MOTIONED TO BEGIN THE OPEN SESSION. COMMISSIONER GUDMUNDSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN, COMMISSIONER GUNDMUNDSON, VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN, COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, CHAIR BRADY VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Rasmussen expressed concern for unleashed dogs stating that they can be both annoying and somewhat traumatic. She asked if this could be enforced. Community Development Director, Morgan Brim, stated that the city does have an off-leash regulation and that animals are not allowed to be off leash. This code is enforced through a complaint basis through the County Sheriff's Office and that the city has a phone number for Utah County Sheriff's office for non-emergencies on our website. Residents should call that number if it is not an emergency. Law enforcement would inform the resident of the code but they could also issue a ticket if there are multiple violations. Staff cannot go out and issue a ticket for off-leash dogs.

Commissioner Rasmussen expressed that this is a situation that needs to be taken seriously. It is threating the security of residents. Mr. Brim stated that if Commissioner Rasmussen could email him the comments she received from residents and he could forward that information on to the Sheriff's Office so they are made aware. He suggested that if it is commonly happening in specific places, signage can also help as well.

Chair Brady asked for a motion to close the session.

MOTION:
AT 6:11 PM VICE-CHAR RASMUSSEN MOVED TO CLOSE THE OPEN SESSION. COMMISSIONER GUNDMUNDSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN, COMMISSIONER GUNDMUNDSON, VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN, COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, CHAIR BRADY VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL:

4.1 January 6, 2021

DRAFT

Chair Brady asked for a motion to approve the minutes from January 6, 2021.

MOTION: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN, COMMISSIONER GUNDMUNDSON, COMISSIONER WELCH, CHAIR BRADY VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Vice-Chair Sullivan dropped from the call and did not vote aye or nay to approve the minutes. Commissioner Jessica Welch voted in the stead of Vice-Chair Shan Sullivan.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

5.1 Public Hearing - Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) for 15.34.100 Parking Requirements of Private Recreational Vehicles in Residential Zoning Districts

Mr. Brim provided background regarding the issue. He introduced Planning Technician, Cache Hancey who provided a presentation regarding the issue. Mr. Brim asked the public to wait until the end of his presentation to ask questions.

Mr. Hancey presented proposed changes to the code. He stated that about a month ago a consensus was reached among the Commissioners that they were in favor of keeping the ordinance but wanted to see the language proposed in a Zoning Text Amendment. Mr. Hancey presented the proposed text amendment and stated that the amendments would remove screening from the ordinance and that recreational vehicles would be required to still park in the rear or side yards. They would not be allowed to be parked in driveways or streets for longer than 48 hours. The staff was looking for a recommendation from the Commission to approve or deny the Zoning Text Amendment to present to council in a week.

Mr. Brim recommended that Commissioners provide their insights and feelings regarding the proposed changes and then open it up to public hearing. Chair Brady stated that, in the previous Planning Commission Meeting, most of the Commissioners were in favor of keeping the screening as a part of the ordinance. In the last meeting there were not a lot of people making public comments. He assumed that there were more people wanting to make public comments about this now.

Commissioner Tim Blackburn asked about changing the 48-hour unloading parking limit to 24-hours. Mr. Brim suggested that if the Commission would like to implement this change, they should propose it as an amendment tonight. Mr. Brim stated there were three (3) Commissioners that did not want to change the street parking requirements. If the Commissioners include that change in the motion tonight, he would be more than happy to add that change.

DRAFT

Commissioner Rasmussen asked to know how this subject became a topic of discussion. Mr. Brim stated that this was in response to several public complaints from the Sleepy Ridge community presented to staff. The Council then asked the staff to do a city-initiated text amendment. The Council then directed staff to bring it to the Commission for a recommendation.

Commissioner Rasmussen asked to know what solutions exist for residents that do not have a side yard large enough to store a RV vehicle or trailer. Chair Brady said that they would have to park in their garage or in a private storage lot within or outside the city. Mr. Brim stated that there are storage facilities where people can pay to store their vehicles. Commissioner Rasmussen asked if there are storage facilities within the City. Mr. Brim responded that there are not any in Vineyard. Commissioner Rasmussen asked if a storage facility lot could be something we look into within Vineyard because people need options. Mr. Brim stated it is in the code to allow self-storage and he has talked to a few people that would be interested in doing a commercial storage but that it is not something the City would put in.

Commissioner Welch asked about the language when the code states rear yard and side yard. She asked if there is a place that those are defined to be more specific. Mr. Brim stated that it is defined under our code in the definition section. Under the definition section there is front yard, side yard and rear yard listed. Commissioner Welch said it might be helpful to explain the definition more to make it really clear.

MOTION:
COMMISSIONER GUDMUNSON MOTIONED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, COMMISSIONER GUDMUNSON, COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN, COMMISSIONER WELCH, CHAIR BRADY VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resident, Alisha Sabin, from Sleepy Ridge, stated she had a number of comments from some of her neighbors. She stated that she felt that this ordinance change was very reasonable. She did not feel that this ordinance jeopardized public safety. She stated that due to the diverse background of incoming residents to the community, this ordinance, if not approved, will continue to be a topic of controversy in the future. Ms. Sabin stated that, in the previous meeting, a lack of support of a change of the ordinance had much to do about a previously existing HOA in the area. She said that she and many of her neighbors felt that this had become irrelevant as an HOA no longer exists in that part of the city. The city should not be enforcing what an HOA would enforce. The job of the city is to please everyone with in the city not just the Sleepy Ridge community. This is a more than fair modification and this ordinance serves all of Vineyard and not only those living in the Sleepy Ridge community. Ms. Sabin read several comments from neighbors.

Ms. Sabin stated that a reasonable compromise could be achieved. She said that she is aware that some residents would like to keep the screening element of the ordinance. She

DRAFT

also stated that many new types of residents have moved in and that their needs should be considered. She asked the city to please consider the minor change to save residents thousands of dollars.

Resident Emily Vance stated that she agreed with all the comments provided by Ms. Sabin and her neighbors. She said she agreed that she moved into her neighborhood because there was not an HOA. She felt like this ordinance does fall into an HOA style of control. She stated she felt that the proposed adjustments were fair and reasonable. She stated that they have a fence and park their recreation vehicles behind their fence however they have a lot of neighbors that do not. All of her neighbors are parked correctly on the side of the home and she has no issues with how they are parked. She asked to know if the city is aware of other neighborhoods that are also in violation of this ordinance. She stated that there are other neighborhoods that are not abiding by the ordinance. Mr. Brim stated that the City operates on a complaint-basis. Ms. Vance expressed the importance of holding all neighborhoods to the same standard.

Resident Ryan McCardy also expressed support for the proposed ordinance change. He said the main and most important purpose of the ordinance is safety and this would not be jeopardized by the change. The second purpose is appearance which would not really be affected by the modification.

Resident Joseph Smith also spoke in support of the ordinance change. He expressed that it is crucial that vehicles do not block any public right-of-way. He expressed that a fence does not do much for appearance as most RV's are taller than residential fences or screening methods.

Resident David Lauret pointed out a few questions concerning the issue. He asked where in Vineyard are lots large enough to store RV trailers. He stated in the Water's Edge community there are not a lot of place that residents can store their RV and be in compliance with the current code.
He asked that if we do not have enough land to build parking lots for normal, private vehicles, why would we have room enough to welcome businesses to specifically store RV trailers? He also asked why would a private property owner be okay with not being able to park their trailer in a driveway.

Resident James Vance spoke in support of the ordinance change. He pointed out that the Sleepy Ridge neighborhood is not an HOA and should not be treated as such, especially considering that the ordinance proposal does not affect safety in a negative way. If parking is done on the side of the home and not blocking anything then it is reasonable to have it parked there. He stated that if Sleepy Ridge is the only community within Vineyard getting hit with violations that it seems unbalanced. He continued that if there is not enough man power within Vineyard how will they enforce stricter rules. Vineyard does not have the zoning enforcement power needed to enforce these restrictions.

Resident Brett Pendleton expressed support of the ordinance change. He further stated that all Vineyard neighborhoods should be treated equally in terms of enforcement. He stated

DRAFT

that there should not be a law that cannot be enforced. He stated that fences can be problematic because sometimes the RV is too large and goes passed the garage. He also expressed support to keep the 48-hours loading time. He felt that 24-hours is not always sufficient for all loading events. He stated that part of the problem stems from the City proposing and building narrow roads. He stated that the narrow roads are horribly unsafe.

Resident Brett Hooper expressed previous issues with this ordinance and how it has been scripted until now. He stated that he has gone to great lengths to accommodate off-street parking on his property for RVs and visitors. He feels that a lot of residents have fulfilled their responsibility for creating RV parking to keep it parked off the roads and that should be sufficient. He stated that the screening only creates more obstruction in his neighborhood. And he does not like the isolation and feeling of enclosure created by a screening requirement. He ended by stating he is in favor of the ordinance change.

Resident Devon Guymon was not made aware of the ordinance as previously written. He was not in support of screening requirements upon moving into the neighborhood. He would also like an amendment on how far an RV can be parking on the side of the yard.

Resident Nicole Reishman spoke in support of the ordinance change.

Chair Brady looked for additional public comments. Seeing none, he called for a motion to close the public hearing.

MOTION:
COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN MOTIONED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. COMMISSIONER WELCH SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, COMMISSIONER GUDMUNSON, COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN, COMMISSION WELCH, CHAIR BRADY VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chair Brady called for comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Rasmussen stated she was not in support of micro-management and that she felt that is what the ordinance, as written, has done. She stated it is important that city ordinances evolve with the type of residents moving in. She would not suggest a giant parking facility but a smaller one that is contained could work. She stated that she was not in support of RV's and trailers being allowed to park in driveways because of the safety concerns.

Mr. Brim responded to questions presented by Mr. Lauret. He stated that that there are indeed other places in Vineyard where residents would be able to have lots large enough to park RVs properly. These neighborhoods included The Hamptons, James Bay, Holdaway Road, and more. He stated that a lot of the development within the city is set to provide variety of housing to attract people from different income levels. This ordinance has not only affected Sleepy Ridge. He further stated that the ordinance, as has existed, was

DRAFT

originally scripted to ensure public safety and local aesthetics, design, and continuity. RVs can extend very close to the sidewalk and the city would enforce anything parked over the sidewalk but even RVs close to the sidewalk could create visibility issues creating a safety issue. The reason for the fences was probably due to an aesthetic need and continuity by creating a defined line. Mr. Brim spoke about the city's complaint-basis approach to code-enforcement. Vineyard City does not function as a 'big-brother' municipality. Nevertheless, the city's code enforcement procedure has been very effective at addressing problems related to this thus far. The city has acted when called upon. We have the needs and ability to bring code-enforcement to a resolution.

Commissioner Tim Blackburn reminded the Commission of a comment made by resident Jim Britton in the previous Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Britton had stated the importance of living by the Rule of Law. New residents must adjust expectations prior to moving into a new neighborhood based on the laws put in place. It is unfair to those already living in the community to change ordinances. He also spoke about the delineating qualities of a fence. He stated having a fence creates an area for the RV, by not having a fence the area can easily be expanded and moved. He stated that fences have increased the overall appeal of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Blackburn recounted much of what he personally had spoken in the previous Planning Commission meeting about past promises and commitments made by the city and now Mayor, Julie Fulmer. The Mayor had promised to uphold all HOA rules and regulations after the HOA had been disbanded. Commissioner Blackburn stated that he understands the importance of laws changing but this is an ordinance he feels strongly about. He expressed the importance of aesthetics in any community, having the RVs and boat screened helps the aesthetics of the neighborhood. Commissioner Blackburn presented research and statistics that propose greater crime (theft and burglary) when RV's and trailers are exposed to the street. He concluded by stating that he was not in support of the ordinance changes. He further stated that it is not fair to those residents that have gone to great expenses to abide by the ordinance as written until now.

Commissioner Jessica Welch thanked everyone who has spoken up until now. She stated this is a city code not about an HOA. She expressed the screening requirement has been pretty consistent with other neighboring cities. She felt that this issue, at its core, is about aesthetics—a subject topic of discussion because it is subjective. She is open to the changes but she is most in favor of keeping the requirements that call for RV parking in the rear and side yards of homes.

Commissioner Tay Gudmundson stated that it is hard to know where to sit on this decision. She mentioned that this issue does not affect all city neighborhoods equally. She stated, that both sides made good points and she does not love the aesthetics of not having a screen but she also is not opposed to changing it. She did not know if the Commission was fully prepared to make a decision on the subject. Mr. Brim stated that each Commissioner is not required to vote if they did not feel prepared to. He also stated that this discussion could be pushed further back to another meeting if necessary. She asked to know why the code should be changed. Commissioner Blackburn responded, that complaints regarding the

matter have been brought up most recently. Mr. Brim also pointed out that a fence can be very costly, especially considering the public health crisis that exists due to the Coronavirus Pandemic. Commissioner Gudmundson expressed support of the existing 48 hour loading parking code. She asked if the Commission should survey the city about this. Commissioner Blackburn responded that he felt that majority of the subdivisions within Vineyard do not have the side yard parking for RVs.

Commissioner Brady asked the Commission about the 48-hour loading code. Commissioner Welch expressed that she liked 24 hours better, but she understood that some residents may require a 48-hour window. Commissioner Blackburn was also in support of keeping the 48-hour window.

Chair Brady stated that he is fine with the code written as is. He said personally that having a fence would be annoying and time consuming. From a safety standpoint, he stated that if one believes theft is an issue, then they should install a fence and that requiring a fence limits people. He also stated that he would like the 48-hour loading code to be 24-hours. He stated it is not necessary for the Commission to vote unanimously.

Commissioner Welch stated that this ordinance does not officially change the code just yet. The Planning Commission simply make recommendations to the City Council to approve or disapprove a change. Commissioner Gudmundson stated that the definition and related graphics should be found all in one place. Mr. Brim read the definition of 'side yard'. He stated that the City could absolutely provide graphics to go along with the definition and provide a reference within the RV parking code for convenience.

Chair Brady asked if the Commission was prepared to make a motion. Commissioner Rasmussen motioned to recommend approval of the code as presented tonight with the addition of the clarifying language regarding the side yards.

MOTION: COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN MOTIONED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE CODE AS PRESENTED TONIGHT WITH THE ADDITION OF THE CLARIFYING LANGUAGE REGARDING THE SIDE YARD. COMMISSIONER GUDMUNDSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWED: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN VOTED NAY, COMMISSIONER GUDMUNDSON VOTED AYE, VICE-CHAIR RASUMSSEN VOTED AYE, CHAIR BRADY AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. WORKSESSION

6.1 General Plan Review

Planner II Briam Amaya Perez introduced the general plan as a guiding document on how growth and development will occur in the City. It discusses areas such as economic growth, parks, open space, etc. It is important to frequently review the plan and make needed changes. This presentation reviewed inaccuracies and errors that staff found in the General Plan.

This project was not meant to be an overhaul and just to make minor amendments to certain areas. He stated that staff will be updating maps, tables and diagrams. The main

DRAFT

focus for 2021 will be the open space, park, trails, and lake front and the moderate-income housing. The current plan is an excellent starting point as it displays history and a vision. It lays out worthwhile goals and strategies for smart growth and development. It functions at a great plan and an action plan that gives the City specific actions to take. Communities grow so the plan has to continue to evolve and grow as the city does.

The areas of improvement include fixing spelling and grammar errors, punctuation, redundancies, word choice have been reviewed, rereview and will be fixed. One big improvement is to create the plan to be more educative, meaning that concepts and vocabulary will be further defined to make it easier to understand. Benefits and rationale behind decision are not explained well. The role of local governing bodies is not clearly laid out and needs to be addressed. The plan is 151 pages and could be condensed or shortened to make it more user friendly. A glossary or index could be included to help navigate its length. The city could make the document interactive by including PDF bookmarks and clickable links. The language in the plan can be vague at times such as “consider doing this… or consider doing that...”. they do not specifically provide an outline. It provides the importance of working with institutions and agency organizations without laying out the intended and specific organizations. Funding is mentioned without including sources, amounts, or deadlines. The plan also mentions plans and programs that are currently in development and could lead to misinformation as they are not fully functioning programs. It might be helpful to specify that they are still being worked on. There are some tables, charts, and diagrams that are outdated and do not reflect the most recent 2020 census. The maps and tables need to be up to date with the most recent and accurate information.

The Vision Statement shows up 26 pages into the plan and could be better placed towards the beginning of the plan. The plan does not quantify goals or strategies. Goals needs to be smart meaning, specific, measurable, attainable, reasonable, and time sensitive. Design Workshop, the consultant that helped us create the general plan provided sample goal matrix that are not concrete and an implementation matrix is lacking throughout the document. We can work towards having smart goals to keep ourselves accountable.

Moderate-income housing is bare bones throughout the plan. There is more that the city could be doing to bring more affordable income housing throughout the city. Parks, open space, parking, and ADA accessibility are lacking detail.

As a review of the General Plan Survey, 6 Commissioners completed the survey and 4 staff members did as well. It laid out specific strategy to the General Plan with a rubric to mark how well the city has addressed the strategy. Biases were recorded. With only 10 people completing the survey, the sample size limits how accurate the information provided was. There were a number of non-response biases. With how long the survey was, there were issues with participants tiring.

Historic Preservation was rated the highest in that the City is not doing enough to address the issue. Mr. Amaya stated that due to a lack of resources, he believes that Historic Preservation could improve with more funding. There were many comments about historical artifacts and historical locations missing.

DRAFT

Land use is one of the elements that has been given a healthy amount of attention and support. It had the least amount of "no" votes and the second highest of "yes" votes with a high amount of "high priority" votes. Comments included that language was vague. Mixed use spaces were frequently mentioned as popular. Creating a community brand is important.

Parks and Open Space has been an area of greatest accomplishment within the city. It has the greatest number of strategies. There were healthy amounts of "yes" votes. Comments included the importance of dog parks, preserving and building wetlands, parks and open space in East Vineyard, finishing trail connections, and maintaining continual partnerships with neighboring municipalities.

Economic Development was responded to in a positive way. "Yes" and "in progress" were the most frequent votes with some more N/A votes. Comments included creating a Vineyard Chamber of Commerce, promoting Vineyard tourism, targeting specific industries, and how the city can foster startups.

Transportation was the third highest "yes" vote categories. Most strategies are in progress. Traffic and roadways showed to not be a concern. Comments included increased trail connections, increased density and mixed use to support public transit, supporting alternative modes of transportation such as electric vehicles and scooters to help with the last mile problem to public transit. How we are going to creating significant entrances to Vineyard.

Public Facilities received the highest about of "NA" votes. Not a lot of attention is brought to this area. Comments included increased high-quality communications infrastructure for the growth within the city. And partnering with surrounding municipalities for water, public safety, fire, and recreational facilities.

Moderate-income Housing strategies is not mentioned frequently throughout the plan. There is a low standard so goals have been easy to accomplish. Priority is quite low. Comments included identifying affordable housing programs, increasing social programs provided through the city, and increase in variation of housing.

Technology is a chapter that is generally not fully understood. Comments included providing public WIFI in strategic places throughout the city, utilizing new technology to resolve parking issues, weather stations, keep road and map data up to date, and prepare to welcome new technology such as autonomous vehicles.

The last table provided shows a list of priorities.

He stated that the next steps include the Planning Department updating the language of goals and strategies. The two elements the city will focus on are open space and moderate-income housing. Along with updating the maps and diagrams. Mr. Amaya stated that it is important to incorporate the Corridor Plan with the General Plan. Taking the chance to

DRAFT

capitalize on the opportunity we have in the heart of the city. As a staff we are ready to move forward. Mr. Amaya asked if anyone had any questions.

Mr. Brim followed up that staff is going to focus a lot of time on moderate-income housing and open spaces. Transit pairs very nicely with a wide variety of income and home types.

Commissioner Welch stated that she loved this plan and agreed that the Commission should split up different areas for each Commissioner to focus on. It is huge to think of all of it at once so it might be easier to think of one or two specific areas.

Commissioner Rasmussen agreed that the Vision Statement needed to be brought closer to the beginning of the plan. She believed that the presentation addressed much of the concerns she had such as specific goals and steps to take.

Mr. Brim stated that there will be a smaller work session soon for Commissioners to take on separate sections of the General Plan. He asked the Commissioners to email Chair Brady what categories they are most interested in.

7. COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS AND EX PARTE DISCUSSION DISCLOSURE

None were presented.

8. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: COMMISSIONER GUDMUNDSON MOTIONED TO ADJOURN. COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN SECONDED. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWED: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, COMMISSIONER GUDMUNSON, COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN, COMMISSION WELCH, CHAIR BRADY VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NOTICED BY: /s/ Cache Hancey

Cache Hancey, Planning Technician

DRAFT

REGULAR MEETING
OF THE VINEYARD PLANNING COMMISSION,
April 7, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

_____

REGULAR SESSION

Commissioners Present:	**Commissioners Absent:**
Chair Bryce Brady	Commissioner Jeff Knighton
Commissioner Tim Blackburn	Commissioner Jessica Welch
Vice-Chair Shan Sullivan	Commissioner Tay Gudmundson
Commissioner Anthony Jenkins	
Commissioner Amber Rasmussen	

Staff Present: Planner II Briam Amaya Perez, Planning Technician Cache Hancey, Assistant Public Works Director Chris Wilson, Water Manager Sullivan Love

Others Present: Rick Magness with Yesco Signs and Kirk Beecher with Central Utah Water Conservancy District

Call to Order

1. INVOCATION/INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHTS/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice-Chair Sullivan led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. OPEN SESSION

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MOTIONED TO BEGIN THE OPEN SESSION. VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR BRADY, COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN, COMMISSIONER JENKINS VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

No comments were addressed before the Commission.

Motion: VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE OPEN SESSION. COMMISSIONER JENKINS SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR BRADY, COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN, COMMISSIONER JENKINS VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DRAFT

3. MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL:

3.1 **1.20.2021 Minutes**

3.2 **2.17.2021 Minutes**

Vice-Chair Sullivan verified that her requested change was fixed in the 01.20.2021 minutes.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED. VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR BRADY, COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN, COMMISSIONER JENKINS VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. BUSINESS ITEMS

4.1 **DISCUSSION AND ACTION- <u>YESCO Sign Standard Waiver</u>**

The applicant is requesting approval of a sign standard waiver for Maverik located at 78 S Geneva Rd within the Regional Mixed-Use (RMU) Zoning District. Parcel ID 40:454:0018. The Planning Commission will act to approve (or deny) the sign waiver.

Planner Briam Amaya Perez introduced the subject as well as Rick Magness with Yesco Signs. The applicant was seeking a waiver due to the height and total area of the sign. The property was also proposing three (3) additional box cabinet signs that are utilized for directions and safety.

Mr. Perez displayed the multi-tenant sign and described it. It measured at 18 feet high which follows the requirement for the sign standard waiver. The total square feet of the sign is 94 square feet. He described the process he used to measure the total area. The applicant would be able to go up to 100 square feet within the waivers allowance.

Mr. Perez then displayed the cabinet signs that are proposed. The signs will give directions for a new road behind the building. He then displayed a map of the property and the locations for each sign.

Mr. Perez displayed the Vineyard sign that the applicant is providing for the city. It will be attached to the existing wall located at the northeast corner of the property.

Mr. Magness with Yesco Signs introduced himself and described the box signs that are giving directions around the property. He mentioned that the Vineyard wall sign was not an issue and they were happy to provide it for the city. The multi-tenant sign complies with the sign standard waiver requirements. He concurred with staff approval and opened the time to questions.

Commissioner Jenkins asked if ethanol free fuel will be sold at this gas station. Mr. Magness replied that they will be selling “blue fuel”.

Vice-Chair Sullivan asked if the cabinet signs are lit up at all times. Mr. Magness replied that due to Maverik being opened 24/7 the signs need to be lit at all times to provide directions. The lighting is dim and should not pose any issues for the residents nearby.

DRAFT

Commission Blackburn asked if all of the box signs are only directional to exit the property. Mr. Magness described that the purpose of those signs was to give directions to the larger vehicles to split up the traffic from the smaller pedestrian vehicles. Commissioner Blackburn asked why they chose 18 feet for the multi-tenant sign. Mr. Magness replied that Yesco does sign studies in which they sit at the street corner and observe traffic flow and speeds. They then design a sign that would fit best for the property and traffic. He stated that the cost of the sign was around $60,000. Commissioner Blackburn replied that his role is to help keep things standard throughout the city which means he needs to observe the standard in regards to the waiver. He stated that he preferred shorter signs rather than larger signs and fewer commercial signs in general. He then asked about how much of the sign will be lit. Mr. Magness replied that the lighting is captured in a cabinet and will not cause a hazard. The LED gas price lights can be changed and it could take roughly one (1) year to find the best setting for the property. The Alloy letters will also be lit in a manner that will not protrude.

Mr. Magness stated that a multi-tenant sign would provide for fewer signs in the city. As Maverik and the Alloy were is discussion of acquiring this new property, they discussed the importance of a shared sign for both interests. This sign will replace the current gas price sign. Commissioner Blackburn asked if the Vineyard wall sign will for sure be installed as Maverik promised a sign on that wall 4 years ago. Mr. Magness replied that he believes that was overlooked but Marverik does believe there is a commitment to be fulfilled.

Motion: COMMISSION JENKINS MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE SIGN STANDARD WAIVER. VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR BRADY, COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN, COMMISSIONER JENKINS VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4.2 **DISCUSSION AND ACTION - <u>Geneva Retail Frontage Preliminary Plat B</u>**
The applicant is requesting an approval of a preliminary plat for the Geneva Retail Frontage Plat B. Parcel ID's 40:513:0011, 40:513:0010, and 40:513:0009. The Planning Commission will act to approve (or deny) recommendation of the proposed application to the City Council.

Mr. Perez introduced Kurt Beecher with Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD) and described the property and staff report. He then displayed the original plat and mentioned that this application was for parcels 9, 10, and 11. The total area of the plat is 2.7 acres. He stated that back in February the Commission approved a conditional use permit (CUP) for a well that would be constructed at this site. As part of the CUP, the Planning Department asked for CUWCD to create a new preliminary plat. In this plat, CUWCD has proved the appropriate utility easements and 35-foot access easement. They will be locating all their utilities through that as well. Mr. Perez stated that Planning Department had no issue with this application.

Kurt Beecher described that the circle in the diagram is a well protection zone. It is 100-foot radius that cannot have anything put into it that would contaminate the fresh water source.

Assistant Public Works Director Chris Wilson asked for Mr. Beecher to describe what can and

DRAFT

cannot be placed in that zone. Mr. Beecher replied that curb, gutter, and asphalt are permitted. Septic drain fields, gas tanks, and underground storage tanks are not permitted. He also stated that CUWCD will need an easement from the Edgewater Townhome complex that is included in their protected circle.

Chair Brady asked Mr. Perez what the change to the original preliminary plat was. Mr. Perez replied that there was a recommendation from engineering to continue the numbering on the plat from 11, so this plat would become 12, 13, 14, and 15. This would become Plat B. There would be a temporary easement for a hammerhead turnaround for the fire department. When the other lots get developed, they will work with the developers to secure their access to the well site. Mr. Wilson said that the original plat provides access protection for each parcel.

Commissioner Rasmussen asked if Water Manager Sullivan Love had anything to say about this project. Mr. Love stated that CUWCD have been more than happy to work with the city and he fully supports this new well.

Mr. Beecher stated that construction for the drilling of the well will begin this week or next. A 40-foot sound wall will go up around the area.

Motion: COMMISSIONER JENKINS MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE GENEVA RETAIL FRONTAGE SUBDIVISION B PRELIMINARY PLAT. COMMISSIONER RASMUSSEN SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR BRADY, COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN, COMMISSIONER JENKINS VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Jenkins mentioned that this area is being used as a defacto parking lot. He asked staff if that is allowed. He stated that he wanted the city to act sooner than later to prevent parking in that area. Mr. Wilson stated that the issue with this area is that it is public and private property. The Sheriff's Department has been working to remove the vehicles parked in public property. Mr. Wilson stated that some private property owners have been providing parking for a fee. This area would have to be investigated by code enforcement to see if this area allows for parking.

Commissioner Blackburn asked if CUWCD placed notices on the surrounding properties to inform the public about what is happening in the area. Mr. Wilson stated that CUWCD has hired a group to ensure the public is notified and are willing to field all questions. Planning Technician Cache Hancey mentioned that the Edgewater Townhome HOA has notified their residents of the drilling as he as already received complaints about it.

5. WORKSESSION

No items were presented before the Commission for the work session.

6. COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS AND EX PARTE DISCUSSION DISCLOSURE

Commissioner Blackburn stated that cattle are now present at Walkara Way. Mr. Wilson stated

DRAFT

that staff has noticed an impact on the phragmites from the cattle. It appears to be a successful project.

Commissioner Jenkins mentioned that issues of parking should be handled by enforcing what is currently on the books such as parking by fire hydrants. He continued that if street parking is a public safety is a hazard, all street parking should be prohibited regardless of who is parking. After biking through Sleepy Ridge, he noticed that the corners had been red curbed. Mr. Wilson stated that Public Works is opposed to red curbing because it because a maintenance issue at a cost to taxpayers. Commissioner Jenkins stated that if enforcement for parking on corners was followed, red curbing would not be an issue. Commissioner Rasmussen agreed with Commissioner Jenkins desire to ensure current rules are being enforced by the Sheriff's Department. Mr. Wilson described that red curbing can clutter the city with a cost and that Sheriff patrols are effective but also come with a cost.

Commissioner Rasmussen asked Mr. Wilson what his solution for the parking issue was if not to red curb. From his perspective, he believed that subdivisions need to provide enough parking for every resident. He expressed concern about the parking structure for downtown. He is opposed to on street parking being counted toward designated parking. There are solutions such as to add parking to collector roads. If you add parking, asphalt would need to be added and parking strips would be eliminated. Traffic on collector roads needs to remain uncongested. He advised only allowing on street parking on the multi-family side of the road and not on the other side. Commissioner Jenkins mentioned that if the city builds it, people will come and could cause more parking issues. If more parking is provided, more people will bring cars. Mr. Wilson mentioned that the HOA once provided on street parking but has recently prohibiting it, causing parking to get flooded into adjacent neighborhoods. If people cannot find parking, the problem will eventually solve itself. People are only willing to park so far from their destination. Commissioner Jenkins replied that the city should not be responsible for solving this problem. Rasmussen stated that there is a parental relationship with the city. The city is currently not giving resident boundaries and they need to. Mr. Wilson stated that this is difficult to solve as no one is breaking the law.

Commissioner Jenkins mentioned that the City Council had approved funds for a fence for the center street bridge. The bridge is safe if driving properly and following the laws. This bridge was built for the perception of safety. If the city is willing to spend money on the perception of safety, actual safety measures should be made a higher priority.

Chair Brady stated his opinion that as the city owned the streets, parking can be banned. The city has rights to do what they want for their property. He agreed that the bridge fence was unnecessary. Other more dangerous roads do not have barriers. He followed up with a report from his retreat with City Council.

Vice-Chair Sullivan asked if the Lake trail will be completed soon. Mr. Wilson stated that it should before this summer. The Lindon Trail should continue to the marina soon and connect to the Vineyard Trail. The County will take over the asphalt of the Vineyard Trail soon. The

DRAFT

Walkara Way Trail will have funding soon to connect in as well. The Clegg farm is going to be a gap in the trail.

Chair Brady asked when Vineyard Road will close. Mr. Wilson stated that it could be closed by next Monday. It will become a t-intersection with 300 West. Part of the downtown phase includes the expansion of 300 West.

Commissioner Blackburn mentioned his comments he made in City Council about a cemetery. The city has not been good at projecting the need for a cemetery as they plan for open spaces. He would like the Planning Commission to approve of a cemetery in the city somewhere.

Chair Brady asked the commission to read up on the General Plan to make informed decisions. He also mentioned that Penny Springs Park has officially opened.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MOTIONED TO ADJURN THE MEETING. VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR BRADY, COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN, VICE-CHAIR SULLIVAN, COMMISSIONER JENKINS VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

NOTICED BY: /s/ Cache Hancey

Cache Hancey, Planning Technician

DRAFT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

DATE: May 5, 2021
FROM: Morgan Brim, Community Development Director
TO: Planning Commission
ITEM: Work Session – ZTA ADUs, Home Occupations, Lighting Height and Retaining Walls
APPLICANT: City Initiated

BACKGROUND:
The Planning Commission will discuss possible city-initiated text amendments to the VZC. Staff would like guidance from the Planning Commission on several text amendments. Staff will overview a marked-up draft version of the text during the work session. A brief description is provided below.

- 15.34.060 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)
  The Utah State Legislature recently adopted amendments to single family residential provisions to require municipalities to allow ADUs as a permitted use. Legislation prohibits municipalities from establishing restrictions or requirements for ADUs with limited exceptions. These state code amendments will impact our code in regards to the ADU size limitations, exterior entrance requirements, and allows the internal conversion of a carport or garage into an ADU.
- 15.34.150 Home Occupations
  City staff is proposing to limit home occupations within an ADU to home occupations without impact. This would allow tenants of an ADU, with consent of the home owner, to operate a home business with no clientele or employees that do not live on the premises. All standards applicable to home occupations would still apply.
- 15.36.030(17)(c) & 15.38.030(1)(l) Pole Lighting
  These sections have conflicting pole height provisions that need to be clarified.
- 15.32.230 Fences and Walls
  Clarification is needed regarding fence height located on top of retaining walls. Currently wall height is limited to six feet, but city code is not clear in regards retaining walls placement and attached top fencing.

Following the work session, staff will update the draft ordinances and notice for a public hearing for the next meeting.