

**MINUTES OF THE VINEYARD
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Vineyard Town Hall, 240 East Gammon Road, Vineyard, Utah
Friday April 17, 2015 at 9:00 AM**

Present:

Mayor Randy Farnworth
Councilmember Nate Riley
Councilmember Dale Goodman
Town Planner Nathan Crane
Town Engineer Don Overson
Town Clerk/Recorder Pamela Spencer
Planning Commission Chair Wayne Holdaway
Planning Commissioner Chris Judd
Planning Commissioner Angela Kohl
John Janson, Planning Solutions
Michael Taylor, Civil Solutions
Jake Young, Civil Solutions
Aric Jensen, Knowlton General
Gerald Anderson, Anderson Development
Jerry Grover, Anderson Geneva
Rich Bennion, Anderson Realty Group
Richard Brockmyer, UTA
Frank Young, UVU Facilities
Tim Hereth, Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG)

Absent:

Councilmember Julie Fullmer
Councilmember Sean Fernandez
Planning Commissioner Garrett Smit
Planning Commissioner Daniel Pace
Planning Commissioner Kelly Wixom

Others Present:

Resident Tyce Flake
Benjamin Becker, Zions Bank
Susan Becker, Zions Bank
Orem Resident Derek Whetten

John Janson with Civil Solutions opened the meeting at 9:10 AM.

1. Portland and local fieldtrip review - what did we like, what was not important to the Vineyard

Mr. Janson led the discussion. The committee discussed their visits to other cities in Utah and Portland Oregon.

- Highlights of the visit to the Utah cities were:
 - close proximity to amenities
 - property values were rising
 - internal parking, parks
 - housing and retail shops
 - close to schools and surrounded by residential
 - connectivity to the freeway and rapid transit.

- Highlights of the Oregon visit were:
 - established transit system
 - close to amenities
 - walkable community
 - a destination place

- mixed high density to single family homes
- large open spaces and parking around the apartments
- a terraced park was on top of carports
- between the apartments and other buildings
- waterfall features and paths to the river
- one city had their city hall right at the transit station
- a lot of young people using the train and street cars
- upper floor terraces
- patios
- good architecture
- corners on the street were set back with architectural features that made them unique
- huge office complex with a lot of jobs
- did not sacrifice open space
- it was quiet
- parking not visible
- active spaces
- university transit with an overhead walkway
- north/south and east/west connectivity
- boxed out windows
- great interior spaces

There were parallels to Vineyard with a main arterial like the Vineyard Connector and the open space.

Gerald Anderson with Anderson Development suggested that they look at what was working and what was not and why. He felt that in the next 20 years people would be moving away from automobiles and using more transit. He asked how they could develop projects that would make that transition. Mr. Janson replied that they have a good transit system with possible “Uber” and “Lift” options.

Councilmember Goodman asked how they were capturing the rainwater to water the landscaping. Mr. Janson replied that they had a rainwater gathering system to keep it in the area instead of running back to the river. Town Engineer Don Overson felt that the issue was how to clean up the rainwater before using it. Mr. Janson said that it was becoming a trend to plant rain gardens. Mr. Anderson thought that they did not have the rights to capture the rain. Mr. Overson replied that they could only capture a certain amount. Mr. Crane suggested that they could use it for part of their open space features. He also felt that they could address the Vineyard heritage issue.

2. **Online Survey results (if available)** – This item was not discussed.
3. **National station information** – This item was not discussed.
4. **Zions Bank market information** - What the current trends are in Utah County/developer interviews.

Mr. Janson turned the time over to Susan Becker & Benjamin Becker with Zions Bank.

Mr. Becker mentioned that their report showed projections for different areas. He explained the base information, which included population and employment projections, competitive retail, and business centers.

Mr. Becker said that the highlights for Utah County retail included the addition of new grocery stores in 2015 in Spanish Fork, Provo, Pleasant Grove, and Lehi. He stated that the report gave projections for the planned expansion and renovation of the former University Mall. He mentioned that the current retail vacancy rate for Utah County is at its lowest level in ten (10) years. He said that for the retail market space report, he spoke with local developers to see how they were doing in Utah County and their perspective for Vineyard. He explained how the capitalization rate of return worked and what an investor would accept for the first year’s rate of return on a development. He mentioned that apartments are less risky than retail right now.

Mr. Becker said that the report shows buying power and how many dollars are going outside of the community. Jake Young with Civil Solutions mentioned that most of the cities listed were more built out than Vineyard. He asked how close the retail communities were to being built out. Mr. Becker replied that the developers were looking at southern Utah County for development and that they felt that northern Utah County

was built out. He said that brokers anticipate two (2) million in new retail space in the next ten (10) years in Utah County.

Mr. Becker explained how the retail buying power works using the per capita buying power. He said that Vineyard could support 130,000 square feet of retail space based on the current population, which is about 25 new stores. He said that in 2030 there could be 625,000 square feet of retail space. They discussed the current population in Vineyard and the projected growth compared to what the state shows.

Mr. Becker did a quick review of the remainder of the report. He highlighted the market statistics and the residential summary showing how the home prices had changed in the past year. He mentioned that some of the developers did not like how high the land prices were and were waiting to see if they would come down or if home prices would go up. He discussed the retail changes in Utah County and Transit Oriented Developments. He ended the report with suggestions that could work for Vineyard.

Mr. Janson asked for questions.

Planning Commissioner Chris Judd asked if the developers they spoke to were thinking along the scale of the Orenco station in Oregon or smaller. Mr. Becker replied that developers said that there was already an employment base and it was continuing to come. He stated that they would not need to attract a large headquarter type building here but could attract supporting / secondary office or multi-tenant use buildings. Ms. Becker mentioned that Orem was known as the place to start or build a company but there was no place for them to grow so they needed to move.

5. Visioning/Chip exercise – this item was moved to the April 24, 2015 meeting.

6. Next meeting/schedule for the next two (2) months

It was decided that the remainder of the TAC meetings would start at 8:30 AM and end at 10:30 AM.

Tim Hereth with MAG asked what the vision was for the Vineyard connector. Michael Taylor with Civil Solutions replied that it was a limited access category 3.

Mr. Hereth asked what the possibilities were of bringing a regional road through the slag piles. He stated that they were doing a FrontRunner/I-15 study in the northern part of the state and he wanted it to extend to Utah County. He said because of the Vineyard Connector design it detracts from people using it with the limited access. He explained that it would only attract 1700 to 1800 trips by 2040 at the current demographic. He said that the slag pile could be used as a regional road with 35,000 trips. Mr. Taylor suggested that this would be a good discussion point. He mentioned that there were challenges in putting a regional road in a walkable community. Mr. Hereth suggested that they could use the Connector as a more localized road if they had an expressway for through trips. It was decided to discuss it further at another meeting.

Mr. Janson asked the committee what they would like to discuss next. The committee chose to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 10:40 AM.

These minutes are for informational purposes only

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer

P. SPENCER, TOWN CLERK/RECORDER