

**MINUTES OF A JOINT MEETING OF THE
VINEYARD TOWN COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
SERVING AS A TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
240 East Gammon Road, Vineyard, Utah
Friday August 21, 2015 at 8:30 AM**

Present

Mayor Randy Farnworth (10:36)
Councilmember Dale Goodman (left at 9:17)
Councilmember Nate Riley
Planning Commission Chair Wayne Holdaway
Town Planner Nathan Crane
Town Engineer Don Overson
Town Clerk/Recorder Pamela Spencer
John Janson with Civil Solutions
Jake Young with Civil Solutions
Michael Taylor with Civil Solutions
Gerald Anderson with Anderson Development
Mike Hutchings with Anderson Development

Absent

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

Others Present

Resident Tyce Flake

John Janson with Civil Solutions opened the meeting at 8:45 AM. He welcomed everyone and then turned the time over to Michael Taylor with Civil Solutions.

Transportation modeling – Mr. Taylor explained how transportation modeling worked. He then reviewed the transportation model for Vineyard. He mentioned that the grid designed in the Town Center worked well in distributing traffic. The issue was the congestion coming in and out of the development.

Gerald Anderson with Anderson Development asked if the town had a transportation plan. Town Engineer Don Overson replied that they wanted nothing below a Class C road. Mr. Anderson asked if the town could add a turn lane on a state road. Mr. Overson explained that they could, but they would have to go through (Utah Department of Transportation) UDOT’s process. He said if it met the Class D criteria then they would have to follow UDOT’s process, even if someone else was willing to pay for it.

Mr. Anderson said that the greatest thing they needed to do would be to preserve right-of-way. Mr. Overson mentioned that the Vineyard Connector overpass was only four lanes. He added that they might be able put turn lanes in but unless UDOT was willing to install two more lanes, that was where they would have constrictions.

Mr. Anderson mentioned the River Park in South Jordan and how adding an extra turn lane helped the development. Mr. Overson expressed concern with the logistics of the Town Center area. He said that with everyone dropping off at the train station, even if they added the extra turn lane it would still be backing up.

49 There was a discussion about the intended use of the Vineyard Connector. Mr. Anderson mentioned
50 the growth at Thanksgiving Point and their traffic concerns.

51
52 Councilmember Riley stated that people were paying attention now that the appearance of success was
53 imminent. He said that they had been talking about population densities above what people were
54 giving the town credit for and people were seeing that it was possible.

55
56 Councilmember Riley asked if the road was going to fail did they need to look at acquiring property to
57 the north and have a dedicated two-lane road that would exit to the Town Center.

58
59 Jake Young with Civil Solutions explained that the model was based on development happening to the
60 max it was planned for. He added that they had also put together a model that looked at having less
61 traffic and more transit.

62
63 Mr. Anderson stated that they had not planned for having a Walmart on the corner, and so they might
64 end up with more regional commercial than anticipated. He said that more retail uses created more
65 disproportional trips per day.

66
67 Mr. Taylor said that the model counted for two percent biking/walking traffic. Mr. Janson felt that they
68 should look at the simulation. Mr. Taylor explained that the model showed that four lanes would be
69 sufficient on Main Street. Traffic flowed well inside of the development. The promenade, coupled with
70 the local road, would be sufficient to get people to the station. Mr. Taylor said that the regional models
71 looked for broad patterns. The low traffic scenario showed a significant reduction in traffic coming
72 from the north. From the east the traffic pattern was similar, and flowed better within the development.
73 He said that they still had the issue of coming in and out of the development. The simulations took the
74 volumes of traffic and put them into intersection layouts and showed how they could perform.

75
76 Mr. Anderson asked if they had differentiated between light rail and FrontRunner. He felt that there
77 would be different traffic patterns with an intermodal hub. Mr. Janson thought that they would expect
78 to see more activity with the intermodal hub.

79
80 Councilmember Goodman left the meeting at 9:17 AM.

81
82 Mr. Taylor showed a video of the two different scenarios. There was a discussion about the different
83 types of vehicles that would use the roads.

84
85 Mr. Janson felt that the constriction would be east of Main Street. Mr. Anderson suggested that they
86 show another right in and right out. There was continued discussion about the traffic flow.

87
88 Mr. Taylor pointed out concerns with roads crossing at the promenade and people not being able to get
89 out. Mr. Anderson felt that they would need to have the ability to have a control light on Main Street.
90 Mr. Taylor mentioned that the promenade would be signalized, but they could add a light on Main
91 Street. There was further discussion about traffic patterns and signal lights. Mr. Anderson felt that now
92 was the time to design the road.

93
94 Mr. Taylor reviewed the lower traffic model, which showed no major backups. Mr. Anderson asked if
95 they would be able to petition UDOT to get another signal mid-range between the north intersection
96 and Main Street. Mr. Taylor replied that they were successful in securing the intersection at the boat

97 harbor road. Mr. Overson explained that Vineyard had signed an agreement with UDOT which gave
98 them the three intersections. The discussion about signal lights and the traffic patterns continued.

99
100 Mr. Taylor said that one solution was to expand the Vineyard Connector to six lanes. Mr. Anderson
101 felt that it would not be a problem. Vineyard would only have to worry about the property from the
102 railroad tracks to Main Street. Mr. Taylor suggested that they plan that the road might carry 60,000
103 vehicles. There was further discussion about the traffic plan.

104
105 Mr. Janson said that they needed to think about setbacks onto the Connector from the developments on
106 the south side and the Town Center. Mr. Overson asked if they could plan where they were going to
107 put the footprints of the buildings, etc., in the Town Center. Mr. Anderson felt that they needed to
108 understand what the infrastructure would look like. Mr. Overson responded that they needed to look at
109 what the abutments for the overpass would look like. He added that UDOT was adding the abutments
110 two lanes at a time and would need to change their plans. The discussion continued. The model
111 included UVU traffic and light rail and FrontRunner being on different sides of the tracks.

112
113 Mr. Anderson mentioned that UVU could not buy enough land to expand on the Orem site. He said
114 that studies were being done showing that there were more students going to UVU than the University
115 of Utah (U of U) south of 3900 South in Salt Lake County. Councilmember Riley mentioned how busy
116 the FrontRunner station was in the mornings. Mr. Anderson stated that the model for UVU was to
117 recruit students in the state from the south and the north. He noted that it cost less to attend UVU than
118 the U of U. He added that UVU was planning on drawing students out of Davis County etc., if they
119 could provide transportation at a reasonable cost. Mr. Taylor explained that they tried to add land uses
120 that could convert into jobs.

121
122 Mr. Taylor felt that there could be a lot of people coming to the office area via mass transit. He pointed
123 out that there was a gap from FrontRunner to the office area. He felt that buses could bridge that gap.
124 Mr. Young mentioned that green bikes were successful in Salt Lake City.

125
126 Councilmember Riley felt that they needed to look at getting people to the business park and the lake
127 front. He said that not everyone would want to walk the entire promenade. He felt that people could
128 conveniently ride FrontRunner, take the bus, and spend their time and money at the lake. He asked if it
129 would be a Utah Transit Authority (UTA) system. Mr. Anderson responded that they needed to figure
130 out what type of transit it was and how to fund it. He said that if it was bikes then they needed to have
131 more bike lanes. Mr. Overson hoped that the trail system would allow for bike ridership. If they
132 connect the points with a good trail system then it would be used. Mr. Anderson said that there would
133 be some places with a lot of walkers and bikers on the same trail. Mr. Taylor explained that there were
134 two types of bikers: commuters and recreational bikers. Commuter bikers tend to use the roads and
135 recreational bikers tend to use the trails. He said that there was a lot of data that showed how transit
136 systems fail when they had the transit end away from the major jobs. Mr. Young said that transit
137 systems usually fail in the first and last mile. He said that a high percentage of people live within one
138 mile of a significant transit system.

139
140 Mr. Anderson asked if they had the right road to use a bus. Mr. Overson hoped that the bus stops were
141 not on the major corridor roads. Mr. Anderson felt that there was not a way to move people from the
142 transit center to the lake without going onto the Vineyard Connector. Mr. Taylor responded that they
143 could use the promenade area. Mr. Overson explained that if they were going to congest the roads in
144 the Town Center with buses then they would fail earlier. There was further discussion about transit in

145 the Town Center area. Mr. Overson stated that they needed to figure out how to get people to the
146 attractions.

147
148 Mr. Overson suggested that if they were putting in a pedestrian crossing, that they add a one-way road
149 for buses only and create a loop.

150
151 Mr. Taylor said that if they could provide another way into the development it would solve the
152 congestion problems. The traffic discussion continued.

153
154 Mr. Overson said that they needed to have conversations with Mountainland Association of
155 Governments (MAG) and UDOT. They needed to look at reserving the right-of-way now so they did
156 not have to purchase a building later to get the road expansion. The biggest concern was the overpass
157 on the Vineyard Connector and meeting with UDOT soon enough to add it.

158
159 **Promenade** – Mr. Young discussed the updates on the design for the promenade.

160
161 **Block 1:**

- 162 • Turnaround removed
- 163 • More shade added
- 164 • Inside parking
- 165 • Bike lockers

166
167 **Block 2:**

- 168 • Architectural water feature not meant for children to play in
- 169 • Bathrooms
- 170 • Shade structures and gazebos
- 171 • Bollards big enough to allow food trucks to enter

172
173 Councilmember Riley asked if there would be electricity for the events. Mr. Young replied in the
174 affirmative.

- 175
176 • Sidewalks that lead to picnic tables, etc.

177
178 Mr. Young felt that this would be a great location for a farmer's market.

179
180 Mr. Anderson asked if they could include a parking stall count per block on the diagram. Mr. Young
181 replied that there would be about 160 parking stalls on Block 2. He added that they were trying to keep
182 parking closer to transit. He felt that Block 1 was where people would want to park. He suggested that
183 the city have restricted parking.

- 184
185 • Midblock crossings for pedestrians
- 186 • Pedestrian alleys throughout the development
- 187 • Metal gates with iconic structures and grapevines going over them. The gate would open into
188 the promenade with plantings to force people to go the corners to cross.

189
190 Mr. Anderson expressed concern that trails could become places for stalkers. He asked if they needed
191 to have law enforcement input. Mr. Janson felt that at this level they were okay; they were not trying to

192 get to the actual site planning level. He suggested that they change the name from alley to a pedestrian
193 way. He also suggested that they make the design pedestrian-safe through open sight lines.

194
195 Mr. Anderson asked if the one lane road's speed limit would be posted at 20 miles per hour. Mr.
196 Young assumed that they would be.

197
198 **Block 3:**

- 199 • Splash pad with a destination playground
- 200 • Outdoor museum with historic artifacts
- 201 • Same gates as in Block 2

202
203 **Block 4:**

- 204 • Parking lot
- 205 • Bathrooms
- 206 • Shade structures
- 207 • Pickle ball
- 208 • Basketball
- 209 • Open Sight lines going into the tunnel for safety
- 210 • Storm water on the two west corners and the middle grass area

211
212 **Block 5:**

- 213 • 90-degree parking
- 214 • The towers for the electrical lines would be north and south of the areas
- 215 • Pedestrian walkway to the lake
- 216 • Shade structure
- 217 • Picnic areas
- 218 • Slope going to the beach

219
220 Councilmember Riley asked if the shoreline trail had been widened. Mr. Young replied that they were
221 showing it "as is". Councilmember Riley felt that it should be widened because it was currently very
222 narrow. There was a discussion about the Utah Lake Trail and where to widen it. The committee
223 agreed to widen the trail to 12 feet.

224
225 Mr. Young mentioned that the cost estimate for just the promenade improvements was coming in at
226 \$2.5 million.

227
228 There was a discussion about having a destination playground. Mr. Anderson asked if they envisioned
229 a lot people coming to the playground. The discussion continued.

230
231 Councilmember Riley asked if there would be enough attractions to keep people in the area who were
232 using FrontRunner and were willing to walk the promenade.

233
234 Mr. Anderson felt that a parked car along the road was dangerous. Councilmember Riley asked what
235 the committee's feelings were about adding interior parking. Mr. Anderson replied that the problem
236 was when they mandated retail use along the road and did not include enough parking. Mr. Young
237 stated that they were not mandating retail. He said that they liked the idea of adding the interior
238 parking for people going to the promenade.

240 Mr. Hutchings asked what the promenade acreage was. Mr. Young replied that it would be about 16
241 acres. Mr. Hutchings asked if this included the roads and parking. Mr. Young replied that it was from
242 the curb in and included the two parking lots.

243
244 Planning Commission Chair Holdaway asked if they would be giving credit to the building developers
245 for their required open space if they contributed to the promenade.

246
247 **Draft Ordinance** – Mr. Janson said that in the proposed ordinance was a clause “in lieu of”
248 substitutions for the open space requirement. The buildings near the promenade could get a credit for
249 participating in the promenade. He said that everyone had agreed that the promenade was important to
250 the design and success of the development.

251
252 Mr. Anderson asked if there should be an impact fee. Mr. Janson mentioned that there was a state law
253 that allowed for special assessment areas. Mr. Young said that the impact fees were based on existing
254 conditions and you could not create a standard that was higher. Mr. Anderson stated that the impact
255 needs were based on the capital facilities plan.

256
257 Councilmember Riley asked what the 10 percent open space would look like. Mr. Hutchins asked if
258 they had discussed whether or not the developer could put all of their required open space into the
259 promenade. Mr. Janson replied that there was a chapter in the code that described usable open space.
260 There was further discussion about open space. Mr. Anderson expressed his concern about snow on
261 required open space rooftops, and about open space being in the parking lots and behind buildings.

262
263 Mr. Janson mentioned that they had discussed onsite versus outside amenities. He said it came down to
264 how good they wanted to make the developments versus people hanging out on the promenade. The
265 discussion about open space continued.

266
267 Mayor Farnworth entered the meeting at 10:36 AM.

268
269 Mr. Janson explained that they needed land use ratios to avoid the area having too much residential. He
270 mentioned that they needed to have another ordinance proposal ready for September 2nd.

271
272 Going back to the open space allowances, Mr. Anderson stated that if the buildings were only 400 feet
273 deep with 3500 feet in length and they took 20 percent of that, then the contribution would be about
274 6.5 acres. The discussion about open space continued. Mr. Anderson felt that they would get a better
275 finished product if they put the promenade in first. Town Planner Nathan Crane felt it was a
276 development agreement issue. Mr. Anderson stated that they would donate the ground and then find a
277 way to get reimbursed or receive credit for the donation.

278
279 Mr. Janson stated that they needed the ratios for the buildings. Mr. Anderson said that they were in the
280 process of modeling what would be the maximum buildout.

281
282 There was a discussion about density. Planning Commission Chair Wayne Holdaway felt it was not a
283 good idea to have high density close the road going into the development. The discussion continued.

284
285 Mr. Anderson said that the problem was that the WatersEdge high density was along the corridor. Mr.
286 Young suggested mansion homes, which were houses that looked like a house but was a 4-unit
287 building. Mayor Farnworth asked how tall they wanted to allow the buildings to be. Mr. Hutchings felt
288 that they could be three to four stories. Mayor Farnworth felt that people would want to buy these

289 places to be near the lake, but would want to maximize the cost. Mr. Hutchings felt that mansion
290 houses were a nice concept.

291
292 Resident Tyce Flake asked how high the road would be raised. Mr. Overson explained that it needed to
293 be high enough to put a pedestrian walkway under it.

294
295 Mayor Farnworth felt that the design of the Orenco Station in Oregon would look nice in the Town
296 Center. Mr. Janson mentioned that the buildings were four to six stories near the station with the
297 smaller homes on smaller lots and mansion homes near the park.

298
299 The committee agreed with three to four story buildings with no maximum height.

300
301 Mr. Anderson felt that the best way to sell a subdivision was to put the park in first.

302
303
304 **Final Ordinance** – Public Hearings scheduled for the Planning Commission meeting on September 2,
305 2015 and the Town Council meeting on September 9, 2015.

306
307 The meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.

308
309
310
311 *These minutes are for informational purposes only.*

312
313
314
315
316
317
318 CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer
319 PAMELA SPENCER, TOWN CLERK/RECORDER