



# EAGLE MOUNTAIN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

July 26, 2022, 5:30 p.m.  
Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers  
1650 East Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, Utah 84005

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeremy Bergener, Matthew Everett, and Christopher Pengra. Commissioner Erin Wells arrived at 5:50 p.m.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY: Jason Allen.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY: Councilmember Colby Curtis, Liaison to the Planning Commission.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Robert Hobbs, Planning Manager; Todd Black, Wildlife Biologist/Environmental Planner; Jed Shum, Planner; and Lianne Pengra, Chief Deputy Recorder.

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

Commissioner Everett called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

### 1. Discussion Items

#### 1.A. Proposed Code Changes

Planning Manager Robert Hobbs presented potential Municipal Code amendments as drafted by Senior Planner David Stroud, who was unable to attend the Planning Commission meeting. Proposed changes include:

- EMMC 17.25.040 – Accessory Structures: the additions of a maximum lot coverage of 10 to 15% for accessory structures in certain zones.
- EMMC 15.70.090 – Street Lights: Remediation of conflicting language for streetlight distances.
- EMMC 17.25.050 and EMMC 17.72 – Architectural Design Standards: Amending one and two-family architectural requirements to comply with State Code.

Discussion ensued regarding the following:

- The purpose of adding percentage limitations for accessory structures in the RD2, FR, R1, R2, R3, and RC zones and the desire to see additional examples to better evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed percentages;
- Support for amending streetlight standards to resolve contradictory language;
- The unlikelihood of aluminum being desired as a building material due to supply and cost constraints; and
- Whether State Code allows the prohibition of carports.

Commissioner Everett recommended for staff to have the proposed changes return as action items with additional examples of ADU configurations on various lot sizes.

1.B. WORK SESSION DISCUSSION ITEM – Various City Proposed Code Amendments Modifying Public and Private Right(s)-of-Way (ROW) Standards

Mr. Hobbs presented a draft version of changes to Municipal Code regarding rights-of-way widths and street tree requirements. The amendment would amend Municipal Code to require private streets to conform to public street standards, to specify the class of street tree required along collector and arterial rights-of-way, to acknowledge acceptable general types of traffic calming devices or methods for streets, and to repeal and replace dimensional standards for certain rights-of-way types.

Commissioner Pengra recognized the impacts of street parking on private streets on emergency access and safety. He is generally supportive of the proposal; however, is concerned the standards would increase the cost of homes to residents, particularly multifamily units. Nevertheless, he desires to guard against developers classifying streets as private to save themselves money without reducing the unit cost to residents. He is in favor of requiring private roads to have the same standards as local roads without the increased widths. He expressed concern with landscaping in the mid-road islands and monuments obstructing vision.

Commissioner Wells stated that she supports requiring private streets to meet the same standards as public streets and the street tree amendments. She is against increasing the travel lane width, especially for local road widths due to safety concerns. Motorists tend to increase their speed on wider roadways.

Mr. Hobbs confirmed that should private roads have equal requirements as public roads; speed bumps and similar traffic calming measures would be prohibited. He recommended the standards allow for service drives and alleys for rear-loaded units to have exemptions from some requirements.

Commissioner Bergener concurred with safety concerns and would rather endure the minor inconvenience caused by street parking by reducing the drive lane to one car width than escalating traffic hazards.

Commissioner Allen expressed support for requiring private streets to meet the same public street standards for safety and use as other roads in the City. He agrees with Commissioner Wells regarding safety hazards created by wider roads especially due to the number of children in Eagle Mountain.

Commissioner Everett expressed favor for the street tree standards to mitigate roots damaging roads. He is unsure if the City should completely prohibit private streets but agrees with implementing private road standards as the City could become responsible for the maintenance of those roads in the future. He recommends retaining the verbiage in EMMC 16.35.070(L), “Traffic calming improvements and designs *shall* be constructed on local streets,” rather than replacing *shall* with *may*. He does not agree with prohibiting mid-road islands at subdivision entrances or

forbidding speed bumps. He agrees with the safety concerns raised and feels the proposed increase in the travel and emergency lane widths is excessive but he would be willing to consider smaller width increases. He does not have concerns with the proposed standards for rural streets. He advocated for having road standards be appropriate for the type and usage of the various road types.

Commissioner Wells said in addition to her safety concerns, she fears the proposed standards would further augment house prices making them unattainable for many people. If Council decides to increase the right-of-way width for local roads, she strongly encourages them to require traffic calming measures. She concurs with allowing mid-road islands at subdivision entrances and would entertain allowing speed bumps in specified areas requiring City approval. She recognizes the need to codify private street standards to improve safety and access.

Mr. Hobbs noted that speed bumps are problematic for emergency response vehicles. A key reason for adding standards for private roads is the possibility of the City assuming control of road maintenance and repair in the future.

Per Commission discussion, Commissioner Everett requested for the proposed amendments to be placed as a policy session item on a future agenda.

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

Commissioner Everett called the policy session to order at 6:38 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Everett led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes

4.A. July 12, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Bergener moved to approve July 12, 2022 minutes. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.*

<i>Those Voting Yes</i>	<i>Those Voting No</i>	<i>Those Abstaining</i>	<i>Those Absent</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>

***The motion carried with a vote of 4:0. Commissioner Wells abstained as she was not in attendance at the July 12, 2022 meeting.***

5. Status Report

None.

6. Action and Advisory Items

6.A. PUBLIC HEARING (CONTINUED, OFF TABLE) – Parkway Fields Phase C Preliminary Plat & Site Plan

Mr. Hobbs reviewed the item as presented during the July 12, 2022 meeting. The preliminary plat and site plan requests a 234-lot, single-family attached townhouse subdivision on 31.28 acres of land within the Parkway Fields master-planned development. The application complies with the unit count and acreage for the MF1 Zone, roof, parking, street access, connectivity, screening, and open space and amenities requirements. Right-of-way widths and alignment and dedication needs have been evaluated and changes made to plat drawings to accommodate development review committee comments. The Planning Commission has the discretion to recommend an exemption or to require additional architectural detailing and to determine if the building rear articulation, building materials, building colors, garage door location and dominance, and lighting sufficiently comply with Municipal Code standards.

Should the Commission vote to recommend approval to the Council of Parkway Fields Phase C preliminary plat and site plan, staff recommends the following conditions:

1. Prior to Council review of the applicant's request for the preliminary plat and site plan approvals for the Parkway Fields Phase C subdivision, the developer shall adjust townhouse building elevations to fully conform to architectural details listed in EMMC 17.72.040(E)(2), materials usage requirements listed in EMMC 17.72.040(F)(1), and garage door orientation as listed in EMMC 17.72.050(H);
2. Prior to Council review of the applicant's request for the preliminary plat and site plan approvals for the Parkway Fields Phase C subdivision, the developer shall adjust detailed mechanical equipment screening plans for the clubhouse based on standards in EMMC 17.72.040(K); and,
3. Any other conditions as determined appropriate by the Commission.

Applicant representative Kameron Spencer explained their motivation for the fencing plan for the three-foot, two-rail, ranch-style fence is to accentuate open space and amenities with gate openings at the common areas to provide resident access. Six-foot privacy fencing would be used in other areas of the development and to screen the mechanical equipment for the pool and clubhouse. Single-family homes border the property to the north and south. The renderings of the townhomes have been updated to be similar to those used in SilverLake and comply with articulation standards.

Commissioner Pengra inquired regarding the deviation from the original phasing plan by beginning construction on phases C3, F2, and G1 and skipping phases C1, C2, and all D phases.

Mr. Spencer stated utilities are available in the northwest corner of the development and they are working in a southwest direction for the project. The altered phases allow the development of additional portions of Tiffany Lane and expedite some amenities. He explained a benefit of this layout is a full, public-width street, improving traffic flow, and staggered setbacks, rather than several alleyways oriented in a perpendicular direction. The articulation and design of the back of the rear-loaded product have been improved to the standard of a front façade.

Commissioner Everett stated the installation of three-foot fencing along Tiffany Lane is appropriate for that area. He suggested the inclusion of a condition regarding architectural standards and expressed confidence in the applicant's compliance with the requirements. He is concerned with the elevations and front-loaded garage products, especially with the design placing rear-loaded and front-loaded units fronting the same street. Although Municipal Code does allow for front-loaded garage products, he feels this design meets neither the letter nor the intent of the standards found in EMMC 17.72.030(C), "If garages are placed on the front facade, they shall be staggered and set back so as to minimize their appearance from the street. Garages shall never dominate the street-facing facade of a building."

Discussion ensued debating whether the rear-loaded product is compliant because they front a street across from the front of other units rather than an alley with other rear-loaded units.

Commissioner Allen said he is amenable to the three-foot fencing to create a front yard rather than a backyard environment for the residents. His opinion has changed regarding the front-loaded garages. Although he has no personal objection to the front-loaded product, because the design is garage-dominant it fails to meet Municipal Code requirements.

The Commission discussed whether a man door would be required for units that are on a public width street rather than an alley.

Commissioner Pengra stated that in his opinion, the units meet the intent of Municipal Code due to the articulation of the units. He feels requiring changes to the unit design to further reduce the garage dominance would have a negative impact on the internal functionality and desirability of the units.

Discussion ensued regarding the deviation from the approved phasing plan in the MDA.

Mr. Spencer stated they realized they needed to run utilities along Tiffany Lane to provide connections to the east side of their development and to fast-track the central park. They have 511 single-family homes ready for market and felt it would be appropriate to begin to offer multifamily. Where the units on the southside of Tiffany Boulevard are a part of the same townhome development and homeowner's association, they desire to develop them concurrently with the other townhomes and believe it is a minor deviation from the phasing plan rather than a major deviation requiring approval by the Planning Director.

Hr. Hobbs suggested a condition of approval requiring a letter of approval from the Planning Director approving the deviation from the phasing plan prior to the review of the item by the City Council.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Wells moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the Parkway Fields Phase C preliminary plat and site plan with the following conditions:*

1. *Prior to Council review of the applicant's request for the preliminary plat and site plan approvals for the Parkway Fields Phase C subdivision, the developer shall adjust townhouse building elevations to fully conform to architectural details listed in EMMC 17.72.040(E)(2), materials usage requirements listed in EMMC 17.72.040(F)(1), and garage door orientation as listed in EMMC 17.72.040(H);*
2. *Prior to Council review of the applicant's request for the preliminary plat and site plan approvals for the Parkway Fields Phase C subdivision, the developer shall adjust detailed mechanical equipment screening plans for the clubhouse based on standards in EMMC 17.72.040(K); and,*
3. *The applicant shall receive approval from the Planning Director for the deviation in phasing as outlined in 5.2.2 of the MDA.*

*Commissioner Pengra seconded the motion.*

**AMENDED MOTION:** *Commissioner Wells moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the Parkway Fields Phase C preliminary plat and site plan with the following conditions:*

1. *Prior to Council review of the applicant's request for the preliminary plat and site plan approvals for the Parkway Fields Phase C subdivision, the developer shall adjust townhouse building elevations to fully conform to architectural details listed in EMMC 17.72.040(E)(2), materials usage requirements listed in EMMC 17.72.040(F)(1), garage door orientation as listed in EMMC 17.72.040(H), and multifamily parking/garages listed in EMMC 17.72.030(C);*
2. *Prior to Council review of the applicant's request for the preliminary plat and site plan approvals for the Parkway Fields Phase C subdivision, the developer shall adjust detailed mechanical equipment screening plans for the clubhouse based on standards in EMMC 17.72.040(K); and,*
3. *The applicant shall receive approval from the Planning Director for the deviation in phasing as outlined in 5.2.2 of the MDA.*

*Commissioner Pengra seconded the motion.*

<i>Those Voting Yes</i>	<i>Those Voting No</i>	<i>Those Abstaining</i>	<i>Those Absent</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>

*The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

6.B. PUBLIC HEARING – EAGLE HEIGHTS VILLAGE MASTER PLAN, DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND ASSOCIATED PRELIMINARY PLAT AMENDMENTS

Fieldstone Homes is eager to provide attainable owner-occupied homes within the Eagle Heights Village community. To accomplish this, Fieldstone is working directly with City Council members to amend the current master development agreement (MDA). The following summarizes the previously discussed changes to the MDA and site plan to provide attainable single-family or twin owner-occupied homes in Eagle Mountain City:

- Reduce the number of housing units by ten.
- Add lot lines to twin home lots to allow the units to be sold individually.
- Add single-family lots to create a better transition to the east, south, and west.
- Add open space to the backyards of single-family lots.
- Add a half basketball court to increase overall amenities.
- Upgrade architecture on the clubhouse.
- Allow the homebuyer the option to add accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or to remove the basement from the single-family home design plan.

*Commissioner Everett opened the public hearing at 7:50 p.m. As there were no comments, he closed the hearing.*

Applicant representative Jason Harris with Fieldstone Homes explained their history with the project and summarized conversations with City representatives and the resulting improvements to the projects as detailed in the staff report. His preference would be to have the original unit count rather than reducing the project by ten units in order to reduce the price of the homes. The trail plan has been removed because it was determined unfeasible. He is agreeable to amending the language to allow rather than encourage ADUs.

Discussion ensued regarding front-loaded products and garage dominance.

Commissioner Everett noted the historical challenges with this development. He feels this proposal is far superior to the previously approved plan. He appreciates the applicant working with the City Council to improve the project to provide attainable housing.

Mr. Harris explained their average lot size square footage is just below the standard for the RC Zone. Additional square footage has been added to the backyards.

Commissioner Wells expressed concerns with some of the setback reductions while recognizing the overall improvements to the development mentioned by Commissioner Everett.

Commissioner Bergener said he felt it was odd to include the language regarding ADUs in the agreement because they are permitted in Municipal Code.

Discussion ensued regarding the impact of ADUs on the affordability of the product and the neighborhood.

Commissioner Pengra said given the unique circumstances of this project and his desire to not further complicate or impede its progress, he advocated for making a recommendation of approval to the City Council.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Everett moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the Eagle Heights Village Master Development Plan, Master Development Agreement, and preliminary plats with the following changes:*

1. *In the MDA page 6, section 2.2, change the final sentence to “The elevation and design of buildings must be consistent with the previously approved building elevations and newly proposed building elevations as illustrated in Exhibit E;” and*
2. *On page 7, change Section 2.5 to “ADUs are allowed in the project as a way to encourage additional affordable housing options in the City.”*

*Commissioner Wells seconded the motion.*

<i>Those Voting Yes</i>	<i>Those Voting No</i>	<i>Those Abstaining</i>	<i>Those Absent</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>

*The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

7. Discussion Items

8. Next scheduled meeting

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for August 9, 2022.

9. Adjournment

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Bergener moved to adjourn at 8:24 p.m. Commissioner Wells seconded the motion.*

<i>Those Voting Yes</i>	<i>Those Voting No</i>	<i>Those Abstaining</i>	<i>Those Absent</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jason Allen</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Jeremy Bergener</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Matthew Everett</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Chris Pengra</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Erin Wells</i>

***The motion passed with a unanimous vote.***

The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

Approved by the Planning Commission on August 9, 2022.

  
Steve Mumford (AICP) 2022.15.17 A/D/1

---

Steve Mumford, AICP  
Assistant City Administrator/Community Development Director