

MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Town Hall, 240 East Gammon Road, Vineyard Utah
Friday May 29, 2015 at 8:40 AM

Present

Councilmember Julie Fullmer
Councilmember Dale Goodman
Councilmember Nate Riley
Councilmember Sean Fernandez (electronically)
Planning Commission Chair Wayne Holdaway
Planning Commissioner Chris Judd
Town Planner Nathan Crane
Town Clerk/Recorder, Pamela Spencer
Anderson Development, Gerald Anderson
Anderson Geneva, Stewart Park
Anderson Development, Mike Hutchings
Civil Solutions, John Jansen
Civil Solutions, Jake Young
Knowlton General, Aric Jensen
Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham, Cody Deeter
UTA - Richard Brockmyer

Absent

Mayor Randy Farnworth
Planning Commissioner Angela Kohl
Planning Commissioner Daniel Pace
Planning Commissioner Garrett Smit

Others in attendance: Resident Tyce Flake, Developers Josh Bush and Bryan Stevenson

Welcome

John Janson with Civil Solutions opened the meeting at 8:40 AM. Cody Deeter with Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham introduced himself.

Revised Map and districts

Mr. Janson went over the revised map. He said that one change from the current map was that they removed the roundabout from the promenade. There was a discussion about the roads.

Districts:

- Promenade with a UDOT Pedestrian Tunnel
- Town Center Station – changed from Town Center Mixed Use – High Density
- Town Center Mixed Use
- Village District – primarily residential
- Lake Front Commercial
- Lake Front Residential
- Office
- Geneva Park (CAMU)

There was a discussion about where the promenade should be located. Mr. Janson was willing to double check the location with the state GIS.

There was a discussion about the Lake Front Road. Mr. Anderson suggested that it could be a cul-de-sac. Mr. Janson said that they currently had it as a one lane each direction and partially under the power lines. Mr. Park mentioned that it would be a challenge to design a road there. Where the road terminates, the retail should terminate as well. They wanted to allow retail without taking up space with a road.

District descriptions

The Vineyard Town Center Village is the place in Utah County where people will want to live and stay because of its design, mobility options, and connections to Utah Lake, the state's largest freshwater lake. Within the Vineyard Town Center Village there are six Districts that create distinct neighborhoods, as follows:

- The Town Center Station (TCS) area represents the greatest height, density and intensification of uses lying just west of the Vineyard Station. The building form is a storefront along the Lake Promenade with a minimum of 4 stories. Single purpose buildings are included and auto oriented commercial are encouraged at the intersection of Main and the Connector. The Lake Promenade emanates from the Vineyard Station, providing open space relief from the tallest buildings in the Village. Commuters are daily visitors who are encouraged to linger after work to patronize the events, activities, shops and restaurants that line Main Street and the Lake Promenade. The Vineyard Station is the eastern focal point that includes a large iconic pedestrian link to the UVU campus on the east side of the rail road tracks.
- The Town Center Mixed Use (TCMU) district located west of Main Street frames the Lake Promenade and relies on it for views and recreational activities. The corners adjacent to Main Street are set back and buffered, creating outdoor rooms for activities and dining. Building heights along the Connector are a minimum of three stories to reduce traffic noise and reinforce the Town Center. Building heights at the intersections of Main Street and the Lake Promenade are also three stories but the minimum height for other areas of this district is two stories. The building form includes the storefront on the corners of Main and the Lake Promenade, single purpose, and auto-oriented commercial buildings near the Connector on Main.
- The Village District is located north of the TCMU district and west of Main Street. It is a community of medium density homes that includes townhouses, mansion homes, and small lot single family. With a focus on internal open spaces, the homes address the streets and may include private backyards through site design incentives. Potential commercial development adjoins the Main Street frontage.
- The Village Office District promotes office buildings located on a grid system. The Main Street intersection begins with a roundabout, allowing continuous traffic flow and includes potential corner auto oriented commercial use. The building forms emphasize single purpose buildings throughout, but provide for storefronts near the roundabout. Two stories are required along Main.
- The Lake Front Commercial district is intended to be a resort area promoting access to Utah Lake and potential marina functions. Building forms include storefront and single purpose types.
- The Lake Front Residential district promotes the connection to the edge of the lake and adjacent trail system. Homes front on 300 West and on the lake with internal open spaces and

access. Building forms include townhouses, mansion homes, and small lot single family homes. The Lake Promenade terminates at the shore of Utah Lake with connects to the Lake Trail.

Mr. Judd asked if the Village District was supposed to be TCMU. Mr. Janson replied that there was discussion at the last meeting to allow for more ownership. It would be a townhome, mansion style, small lot single-family area. The TCMU would be more rentals. Mr. Hutching stated that Anderson Geneva was not in favor of the Village District; they felt there should be more office space in the area. There was a discussion about the ownership concepts from past discussions. Mr. Janson asked how strongly they felt about ownership. Mr. Crane said that low to medium residential had been considered. He added that the zoning was written with traditional medium density in the secondary area. Mr. Anderson felt that there was plenty of room for residential to the south of the Town Center. There was a discussion about the housing to the south. Mr. Judd understood the need for a sense of ownership but did not want to limit the area or the economic potential. Mr. Park said that they had always envisioned part of the area as being a corporate campus. He said that Utah County was generating a lot of high tech. Mr. Brockmyer suggested that if UVU had a master's program they would like to have a joint venture with companies in the same area. Mr. Anderson explained how small companies could grow and be able to stay in the area. Mr. Young asked if they wanted the village to become office space. Mr. Janson suggested they have flexibility there. Mr. Hutchings stated that they would like to have offices in that area. He suggested that they have the flexibility in the train station area.

Councilmember Goodman left the meeting at 9:10AM.

Mr. Judd was concerned that with an open-ended mixed use they would see a lot of apartments. There was further discussion about housing and office space. Mr. Judd felt that the height should be by the train station. Mr. Anderson wanted all of the buildings to be at least six stories.

Mr. Crane stated that it was a classic conflict with the developer wanting flexibility and the town wanting to preserve land for non-residential. He added that they originally had the Regional Mixed Use with ultimate flexibility and now they had mostly residential. He felt that they needed to have a balance. He suggested that they commit to a percentage. Mr. Anderson felt that there was a chance to have one developer developing the whole Town Center, which would give them better projects and continuity in design. He wanted more density in the office sector and not limiting it in height. Mr. Young explained that there would be a maximum in height as they built closer to the lake. There was a discussion about the height limits and number of residential to commercial units. Mr. Anderson anticipated that there would be at least three-quarters office with some retail and residential. Mr. Crane suggested that they provide incentives to go non-residential. The discussion continued.

Mr. Janson explained the changes to the map. There was discussion as to where they wanted to place office, retail and residential.

Summary:

- Anderson Geneva wanted to keep the flexibility to move the uses around.
- Expand the Town Center Mixed-Use into the Village District
- Limit residential height in the south area of the TCMU
- Retail in all areas
- Building height should determine the requirement for parking structures

- Determine what the ratio requirement would be
- Convert surface parking to parking structures as needed
- No large surface parking
- Mix of housing and offices
- Concern with allowing a lot of apartments in the mixed-use area
- Corporate Campus in the Office area
- Option for a development agreement
- Lake Front Commercial north of the Promenade

Zions Bank Study

Zions Public Finance Market Demand Information Summary:

Phase 1

- Developers see the existing and planned transportation improvement as the key to the area
- Retail within the Town Center should be focused on neighborhood needs, while larger, community centers could be supported outside of the center
- Vineyard's location would result in a solid market for Class A office space. Absorption may come from less desirable markets in Orem and Provo
- 100,000 to 200,000 square feet leased per year

Phase 2 – Site Advantages

- Transportation
- New infrastructure
- Location
- Clean slate
- Education facilities nearby
- Need the FrontRunner station
- Structured parking is difficult to justify financially
- Limited retail market – no big box stores
- Good office market
- Up to 4-story residential market – higher may need a subsidy
- Low ownership potential (many rentals)

There was a discussion about fiber network potentials.

Draft Ordinance

Street layout

- Cross access requirement
- Modified grid pattern
- Main Street as a Grand Boulevard
- Buildings address the street
- Wide pedestrian friendly sidewalks
- On street parking
- Median

There was a discussion about the size of the roads.

Highlights:

- Concern that the main roads would not be wide enough
- Need for a traffic study
- Extra lane from the Vineyard Connector to the promenade
- Extra lane from the north into the office park
- Expand the roads up to the roundabout
- Vineyard Connector will be seven (7) lanes to the overpass
- Office buildings generate more traffic
- Main and promenade are the most important roads
- Publicly owned
- Parking on the street is public and not for full-time use of residents
- Bike lanes
- Promenade angled parking

Councilmember Fullmer left the meeting at 10:00 AM.

There was a discussion about overhangs on porches shading the sidewalk in the winter and creating sheets of ice. They needed to be set back from the sidewalk.

The discussion continued about the road requirements. Highlights:

- One way street is a loop going into the station
- Accommodate buses – 12 to 14 feet of roadway
- Buses travel on Main to the promenade and then to the station

There was a discussion about trees along the streets and views. There was a suggestion to include tree types in the ordinance.

Councilmember Fernandez left the meeting at 10:10 AM.

Building Types

- Store front larger windows to accommodate commercial / flex space. Push the building back in a triangle area on Main Street. 20 percent required open space per building, could be dedicated in other areas such as the promenade. Discussion ensued in regards to open space and requirements.
- Commercial building on Main Street and the Vineyard Connector – Basic standard auto-oriented commercial with no store front requirement.
- Single Purpose – multi-family or office building, dedicated to one use. No store front window required. Leave it up to the end user to choose the building type they want.
- Townhomes
- Mansion style
- Small lot Single-Family
- Civic Building – A discussion ensued about the types of civil uses allowed. Civic means type of use. Suggested no outdoor storage.
- Parking structures – Set back on the street and need to have a commercial first floor or other use. Discussion ensued about parking structures, required number of stalls, and allowed uses. Bike storage facilities in the building, provide transit passes, student housing, in control of the on-street parking close to the station. Need adequate parking for buildings and uses.

Other chapters in the ordinance:

- Signs,
- Landscaping
- Open Space
- Administration
- Building Materials
- Building Types
- Differentiation between floors

There was a discussion about the Orenco Station in Hillsboro Oregon, having one developer controlling the shapes, forms, and color schemes.

Mr. Anderson mentioned that there could be two stops for light rail, one on the UVU property and one on 400 North.

- Lakefront residential – Three building types, small lot Single-Family, Mansion and Townhomes. There was a discussion about the uses along the lake front.
 - Homes front on the street and the lake
 - Alley-loaded philosophy
 - Ownership
 - Taking advantage of the lake front
 - Density up to 8 to 12 buildings – Suggested four stories. Discussion ensued about what was buildable on the property east of the lake trail. Would not be enough space to hold events, etc.
 - Suggested to have a small trail next to residential with a 50 to 100-foot boardwalk
 - Road under the powerline corridor
 - An amphitheater with a flat deck and raised seating
 - People could take FrontRunner and walk to the lake
 - Parking facility
 - Public park
 - Types of events – Car Shows, craft shows, framers markets, etc.
 - Proposed a marina and a pier
 - More of the lower lake front being retail such as restaurants, rental of kayaks, paddle boats, paddle boards, etc.
 - Green space
 - Higher density housing south of the promenade
 - Move the commercial south towards the park
 - Move the park farther south
 - Mixed Commercial – high-rise building

There was further discussion about the uses, space available, housing and commercial types, and road layouts along the lake front.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM.

These minutes are for informational purposes only.

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer

PAMELA SPENCER, TOWN CLERK/RECORDER

Page 6 of 5; May 29, 2015 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting