



VINEYARD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Site Visit: 330 E 1750 N, Vineyard, Utah at 5:30 PM
Regular Meeting: Vineyard City Hall, 125 S Main St.
Wednesday, August 15, 2018 at 6 PM

Present	Absent
Madam Chair Cristy Welsh	Commissioner Shan Sullivan
Commissioner Bryce Brady	
Commissioner Anthony Jenkins	
Commissioner Tim Blackburn	
Commissioner Jeff Knighton	
Commissioner Stan Jenne	
Commissioner Nate Carter	

Staff Present: Engineer Don Overson, Planning Director Morgan Brim, Planner Elizabeth Hart, Planning Technician Joshua Smith

Others Present: Mark Wadsworth, Hadsworth, LLC; Steve Maddox, Edge Homes; Jacob Holdaway

1. CALL TO ORDER

Madam Chair Welsh called the meeting to order at 6:11 PM

2. INVOCATION

Invocation given by Commissioner Tim Blackburn

3. OPEN SESSION

Madam Chair Welsh opened the open session at 6:13 PM and asked for public comment on items not on the agenda. No comment was given and the session closed at 6:13 PM.

4. MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

April 18 and May 2 minutes for approval.

Before making a motion, Commissioner Blackburn asked to make editorial modifications to the May 2nd minutes. Specifically, line 40 - words were possibly missing creating confusion on what the sentence was; line 43 - when speaking about elevations Commissioner Blackburn recommended adding the phrase “which is difficult to determine with accuracy in many situations” because he felt it didn’t make a lot of sense the way it was previously stated; & line 294 - words missing that did not make the sentence complete.

Mr. Brim recommended to Madam Chair Welsh to not approve the May 2nd minutes but to leave them for another time and only approve the April 18th minutes.

MOTION: COMMISSIONER JENKINS AMENDED HIS MOTION TO APPROVE ONLY THE APRIL 18th MINUTES AND COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN SECONDED THE MOTION AND ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS:

5.1 Site Visit and Consideration – Hadsworth Ph. 2 Site Plan

The applicant, Mark Wadsworth, is requesting site plan approval of a second warehouse building on a lot within the Flex Office Industry (FOI) district with an existing building.

Madam Chair Welsh mentioned the site visit to the Hadsworth property and asked if Mark Wadsworth would like to speak.

Ms. Hart gave a quick zoning overview of the site. This included showing the site plan, zoning district (FOI), & describing the applicant's proposal.

Building - (warehouse-21,700 sq. ft., which includes office/warehouse space). The building does meet all set back requirements for the FOI district.

Parking - House staff calculated the parking as combining the square footage for both buildings and then calculating the 1 stall per 1,000 sq. ft. of warehouse and 1 stall per 300 sq. ft. of office space which came to a total of 68 parking stalls, which they meet.

Landscaping - Mostly existing. 1 tree and 10 shrubs are required for every 20 ft. street frontage. In front of existing building they have about 111 ft. of street frontage, they are required to add 3 additional trees to that street frontage per condition by staff.

Madam Chair Welsh clarified that there are 6 current trees and Ms. Hart added that 3 additional trees need to be added to the new building side.

Ms. Hart mentioned other conditions from staff. First, that the applicant provides a plant schedule for any new landscaping. Second, the landscaping plan that was submitted showed existing landscaping that was not on site, so that would need to be put in. Lastly, the storage in the back will need to be removed and parking put in place. These would need to be met before a Certificate of Occupancy is issued.

Staff is recommending approval of this site plan.

Madam Chair Welsh asked about the last condition and whether or not it is written down. Ms. Hart cited Number 4, "the applicant must install all of the required parking stalls prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy".

Madam Chair Welsh asked if that includes cleaning up the storage and that it is assumed and Ms. Hart says yes it does.

Madam Chair Welsh asked if there are any questions concerning the property.

Commissioner Blackburn stated that he didn't have any questions but he did compliment the owner and developer and say that it looked really good. He spoke of the style and design of the buildings and how impressed he was with everything that he saw.

Commissioner Knighton asked about the name, saying the owner is Mark Wadsworth but it's still Hadsworth, was that a typo? Mark Wadsworth explained that his wife is a Haddock and he's a Wadsworth and so they just combined the two names to make the LLC.

Madam Chair Welsh states that she likes it even more because of that. Continuing that she also enjoyed seeing the facility and mentions that the company has been a part of Vineyard for eight years.

Madam Chair Welsh asked for a motion.

MOTION: COMMISSIONER BRADY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED SITE PLAN FOR THE HADSWORTH PHASE 2 WITH THE PROPOSED CONDITIONS LISTED. COMMISSIONER KNIGHTON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR AND THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Brim then explained the next steps for the applicant, stating that they will need to contact the Building Department and submit a building permit.

5.2 Vineyard Shores Preliminary Plat

The applicant, Edge Homes, is requesting preliminary plat approval for the Vineyard Shores. The subject property is located within the Town Center Lake Front Residential district. The subject property extends north from 400 North to just south of the Vineyard Connector and extends west from the Waters Edge subdivisions, the Preserve and Villas to the edge of the existing Vineyard Road and Utah Lake. The applicant is proposing fifteen (15) Single-Family Lots, forty-one (41) Condo buildings and fifty-five (55) Townhome buildings for a total of 695 residential units.

Madam Chair Welsh asked Ms. Hart to give a review of the Vineyard Shores Preliminary Plat. Ms. Hart said that they are having some technical difficulties and asked if the applicant can go first. Madam Chair Welsh invited Steve Maddox from Edge Homes to the podium.

Mr. Maddox began by introducing himself to the commission and states that he brought a team with him to answer any questions that the Commission might have. He also stated that they have brought several displays in case any questions need further information.

Mr. Maddox gave a brief history on how they acquired the parcel and discussed the meetings held with Mr. Brim, Mr. Overson and other staff.

Discussion ensued detailing what they needed to do concerning infrastructure, roads and what the plan was of the area before their involvement.

Madam Chair Welsh asked for clarification of what constituted questions about minute

Mr. Maddox stated that he believed what they were presenting tonight was what would be most beneficial to the community and the main item to which Edge Homes had asked for and believe has consideration for is the new road alignment. Mr. Maddox and his partner walked along the shoreline and road and found the environment to be uncomfortable and felt that if they can pull that road into the community, build a brand-new road and run the utilities down the center of

the project for future and current the City would be able to preserve a shoreline. There are a couple of cracks at this as the shoreline is developed that became the paramount focus on what we wanted to do was to create accessibility to the shoreline for the general public and for our community. We have spent time working on what our proposal will be as we come forward with final on what that shoreline renovation would look like, we have met with the appropriate agencies on what our rights are with wetlands and what they are not and were given a warm and welcome reception on how and what we would need to do, we reached out to the consultants and we will be presenting that to you in the future.

There was a consideration on the north of the property to make sure our road alignment worked with the future promenade. They believe they have shown and exhibited how they would tie into the north with the road alignment and they hoped that this will work with what the ideas are on the promenade and how this will tie into the project. They are open to consider whatever detail the City wants even though it isn't on the project. They certainly want to be in congruent the next item on the south of the property.

On the south of the property the developers want to put in some single-family dwelling units. There will be an amenities package included. The developers did not anticipate the aging population in Utah would live there. They had predicted it would be students who would live there. Another item is the elevations of the project. They will be presenting brand new elevations.

Morgan sent an email about the parking problem. The developers have included more parking in their plan than what the city code requires and they would like to do a work session with staff to see what should happen. Not what the ordinance calls for, but what should happen. They want to find a long-term solution.

Mr. Maddox asked for general questions and requested that they not get into the minute details of the plan.

Madam Chair Welsh asked for clarification of Mr. Maddox's request to not get into the minute details.

Mr. Brim clarified that this was a preliminary plat and they will have a site plan coming forward in January that will address specifics (open space, elevations, bike lanes, etc.). There are specific design standards built into the code to regulate form. They wanted to focus on the preliminary plat, but the applicant was prepared to answer. Mr. Brim asked for them to keep questions to the 10,000 ft level and not get into questions about the window design and where front doors are.

Mr. Maddox added that one of the items that is not included is the powerlines. He explained cost and placement of the powerlines.

Madam Chair Walsh turned the time to Ms. Hart for the staff report.

Ms. Hart said that this property is located in the Town Centre and is the area called Lake Ridge Residential. The subject property is 51 acres, which includes 13.38 acres of open space. For projects within the Town Centre it does require 20% of the project to be open space. The developers have exceeded that with 26.2%. It does not include the Utah Lake improvements – it is only what is within the project. The Lakefront Residential area allows for residential. The

developer proposed three different types of residential: small lots single family dwellings, condo buildings, and townhome buildings. There will be a total of 695 residential units in this property. It comes to 13.61 units per acre. There is no maximum density for this area. Within the district there are two different street types: 1. A side street (proposed for 88 feet, 30 total parallel parking spaces proposed). 2. Lakefront Street (extension of 300 North, proposed for 100 feet, proposed 100 alternate parallel parking along the street.

Staff has a few conditions: 1. Applicant works with staff on the northern extension of the Lakefront Street. 2. Applicant must provide documentation from the State regarding the improvements to Utah Lake to give confirmation to the City that the State will allow them to do this.

Ms. Hart asked for any zoning questions.

Commissioner Jenkins asked a question concerning the parallel parking on the extension of the street if allowing parallel parking on one side of the street, but not the other is justifiable.

Mr. Brim intersected and said that because it's in the Town Centre it must follow the specifications from the city code and also from the Town Centre code. Even though that street is an extension of another street it still is a special design street from the code. The street is designed so that parking is built into the street. The graphic didn't show the extension very well, but the extension will have the parking built into the street. The applicant knew that by providing such a great amenity more than just the townsfolk will use that. Street parking is a good thing if you actually build it into the street so it doesn't block traffic.

Madam Chair Walsh asked how bike lanes will work.

Mr. Maddox answered that what they have planned is to push the parking out so that the bike lane will still continue in the street. The only conflict will be when people back out of the parking lane to ensure there are no bikes behind them.

Mr. Overson interjected that another thing they could look at, which would take up more room, is called slip parking with 45-degree parking. It takes the lane plus the parking so it's a little bit deeper, but if you don't have enough room it doesn't make sense. With the amenity the developer is talking about putting at the Lakefront, public parking will be necessary so the public doesn't go onto private parking.

Commissioner Brady asked about the trail on Loop Road making sure it will continue.

Mr. Overson responded that yes, it would continue.

Commissioner Brady also asked about the alleyways.

Mr. Overson answered that those alleyways will stop there.

Another commissioner asked if it was possible to connect the road with the Vineyard Connector Road because adding those additional units will increase traffic.

Mr. Overson remarked that the road will continue up and connect at 1200 N

The commissioner added a follow-up question asking why they don't connect them sooner so that you won't have to cross any roads in the Promenade.

Mr. Brim inserted that if you look at the design of Promenade it follows it pretty closely and shows a surfaces crossing. He said that Mr. Overson had done a good job working on the crossings for other places in Vineyard. They're trying to do overpasses and decrease potential conflicts with pedestrians, but due to costs staff pinpointed Main Street as a hub of activity because that's where the train will be.

Commissioner Brady asked if it would be easy to turn that road east and connect it to Vineyard Connector.

Mr. Overson said that the problem with that would be that the road would be 12 or 15 feet about the existing freeway. You would have to wait for it to come back down to grade.

Commissioner Brady asked if there would be confusion about the amenities for the lake being mistaken as something only residents could use.

Mr. Maddox answered that with appropriate management and signage there should not be confusion about the area.

Commissioner Brady asked if there would be any retail.

Mr. Maddox answered no there won't be.

Commissioner Brady asked if there has been any resistance from the county or state.

Mr. Maddox answered that there hasn't been and there is actually funding from the state to help improve that area. They envision a lot of native sand in that area being reclaimed.

Mr. Overson mentioned that north and south of this project the City plans on incorporating the shoreline in future projects.

Mr. Maddox foresees that residents will be the future eyes of this area.

Commissioner Blackburn clarified that there will be future presentations on shoreline improvements. He was concerned that there may not be any tie-in with the mayors of other cities and their plans on what they will do with their shoreline. He encouraged the developer to stay and take part in those conversations to make sure they're moving forward as one unified force. He's concerned that the condos and townhomes will block a lot of the view of the lake. The only people who will have a view of the lake will be the people who live on the lakeshore. It felt high-density to the commissioner. He projected it will be three to four thousand people. He was very concerned about that. He would prefer density reductions as developers move closer to the lake.

Mr. Maddox said that they have tried to be creative and examine many different areas that are high and low density. Their buildings will put a damper on the view-scape, but they felt that they are justified because they are trying to make the powerlines and such more accessible. He

thanked Commissioner Blackburn for his concern of the land and said they will try to care for the land as they build as well.

Madam Chair Walsh asked a follow-up question to Commissioner Blackburn's comments. She advocated to get rid of a line of condos by the pool so that residents who are driving east to west will have a view of the lake. It would open that whole section and stated that otherwise there will be no moment to glimpse the lake while driving that road.

Mr. Maddox replied that that is in their notes.

Madam Chair Walsh asked another question about parking.

Discussion ensued about parking and high density.

Commissioner Jenkins asked staff about the amenities. Will they be deeded to the city, county or who?

Mr. Brim responded that his understanding is that the city would lease the property from the state so it would be a public amenity that the city would control but be lease through the state. The city would also need to work closely with the HOA about security, etc.

Commissioner Jenkins responded that cool amenities are also expensive to maintain. He questioned the approach of building 10 parking spots per unit and added that he felt the better approach is to clearly let renters and buyers know how many parking stalls have been allocated and approved per unit and enforce that. He felt that was the best way to go.

Discussion ensued about parking expectations and public transit.

Ms. Hart asked a question for Mr. Maddox. She asked if it was the developer's plan to only have two phases.

Mr. Maddox replied that those are macro and there will be two more phases within those.

Commissioner Knighton added his thoughts to the parking/public transit/density discussion saying that he agreed that public transit is the future. He said that density done wrong has a lot of bad ripple effects. He said that many places over the valley have done density wrong so many people are worried about it. Other places in the county have succeeded in their density planning. He asked for strong connections to the lake from the roadway. He also asked about the parking area by the clubhouse.

Madam Chair Walsh asked for clarification for the public amenities.

Mr. Maddox showed all the public amenities on the map. They expect very low maintenance area that is beautiful.

Other commissioners voice their support of Madam Chair Walsh's opinion that the condo blocking the lakeview needs to go.

Madam Chair Walsh stepped in and voiced her support of the product and all the public space that will be in this project. Other commissioners agreed.

Discussion ensued about the connections (roads and trails) to the public amenities.

Commissioner Jenne mentioned how he felt like this will only be an amenity to the people who live there.

Further discussion ensued about whether these amenities will feel like a public amenity or just for the use of those who live in that area.

Mr. Brim recommended that public comment be included in this plan because it is affecting so much.

Madam Chair Walsh opened up the meeting to public comment.

No comments were made.

Madam Chair Walsh gave appreciation to the developers and what they have brought. She spoke briefly on the actual product that will be there. She hoped that the shorelines and lake will attract buyers from a less transient population.

Mr. Maddox replied yes, they are taking into consideration how to attract more stable buyers.

Madam Chair Walsh asked for a motion.

MOTION: COMMISSIONER JENKINS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED SITE PLAN WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND TO REMOVE THE SITELINE BY REMOVING THE BUILDING NEAR THE CLUBHOUSE AREA. COMMISSIONER BRADY SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR EXCEPT COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN. THE MOTION DID NOT PASS UNANIMOUSLY.

5.3 Jacob Holdaway – Walkara Way Conservation Project Presentation (Slides into official minutes)

Mr. Holdaway stood to present the idea of a Walkara Way Conservation Project. He has had previous experience in these types of conservation projects throughout the nation. He began by going over the history of Vineyard. The city was organized by Mr. Holdaway's grandfather and uncle. He gave a little background on himself and then gave a little background on Vineyard.

There are 1,024 acres of land that are not underwater from Provo Boat Harbor to Lindon Boat Harbor. It's famous for the migratory status and animals that have been housed there. The lower slew used to be the number one hunting area for duck and geese when Mr. Holdaway was a child. In 1970 the State made a mistake and thought the shoreline belonged to them. All the farmers were forced to leave their land for a period of about 30 years. The phragmite really grew and invaded during this time. It wasn't until about

12 years ago that the State came back and said "Wait, there a lot of land here." It's deemed Wetlands so it can never be developed. The only thing the owners can do is graze cattle. Over the years many fires happen and so the fence lines that used to be there are no longer there.

The only place on the upper slew that is left for wildlife to go is the Sleepy Ridge Golf Course. That's a danger to the golfers and you can't do anything about the wildlife that's there. Only if the area floods will it go underwater, but most of it is dry ground.

In November of last year, the government went in that area and sprayed for weeds. The weeds are already 15 feet tall. The Lake Commission rotates through each area every 5 years so they're not coming back for another 5 years to spray those weeds.

One of the biggest resources on this land is the hunting, fishing, and wildlife. The litigation destroyed much of the beach property that the phragmites when over. The cattle grazing kept the weeds down. The State has invested 2.5 million dollars in phragmite removal and that's for a six-year process. From Lindon to Provo there is a mosquito habitat like no other.

The deadfall from all the foliage and weeds every year is so high and the fire danger is so high there too. That area is so close to homes and clubhouses.

There are grinding stones and arrowheads that have been found on the property. Chief Walkara build wickiups on the east side of the lake somewhere between Lindon and Spanish Fork. There is a remnant of those remains there. The state wants to connect from their trails all along the lake. The sandy beaches would take 3-4 years of heavy grazing to get back to their sandy state. These projects are hard. There's a lot of government entities and private owners that would take part in this project. The property owners do have hard feeling of their legacy being taken away for so long.

Mr. Holdaway has created a general plan for all three cities and properties owners. 1st all property owners must be brought together and create a special land use contract for the entire project from Lindon to Provo. It would public use policy, not private use. 2nd Establish an entity that would retain the revenue sources needed to create a long-term maintenance of the entire project. There's state money, federal money and grants for this conservation efforts. There could be camping for various groups. Eventually we could get to a point where this would be self-sustaining. 3rd Once the entity is created go back to the 100-year-old plan that worked. Put a boarder fence up and divide the entire project into sections for cattle to graze on over time. It won't be a cattle operation so

you just move the cattle to the areas to other areas. Vineyard area has the best beach area. 4th Go into the nine field drains that were dug over 100 years ago that are under 15 feet of phragmites. Each city gets to designate and design their own purposes for their beach property. Once all of that has been done you can go into Phase Two: Introducing the public. You'll pass a cattle grate so that the area can provide clear accessible area. Ensure there are access area. Property owners can continue to graze on the property. Everybody wants different things. Things just need to be hashed out to see what everybody wants, and the project needs funding.

Madam Chair Walsh thanked Mr. Holdaway for his presentation.

Mr. Brim added that Edge wanting to do a project right along the shoreline and that may be something they want to include in the project.

Discussion ensued about the importance of the lakefront property and grazing.

Vineyard can help by bring people together and bringing more voices to the table. Ultimately Phase 1 is to clear the property, Phase 2 is to bring the owners to the table and figure out what everybody wants. Vineyard can help with political support.

Discussion ensued about when the Planning Commission could agendize this and see the property.

6. COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS AND EX PARTE DISCUSSION DISCLOSURE

7. STAFF REPORTS

- Morgan Brim, Community Development Director
 - General Plan
 - Citizen Open House: 18 September at 5:30pm. It is open to the general public. There will be questions on the screen and everyone will vote on a keypad.
 - Business Community Scoping Session: 18 September at 2:30pm for businesses owners and community leaders.
 - Working Group: 19 September at 9:00am to review results.
 - Bicycle Friendly Community
 - People need to take the survey in order for us to be qualified as a bicycle friendly community.
- Don Overson, City Engineer

- City is moving forward with the bidding on the over pass. The UP permit is 90 days out and they will soon begin building all the offsite construction so that everything will be ready once they do get the UP permit.
- The train station design and master plan has chosen CRSA, which is a very good company – the best out of the four companies that proposed on it. It is a Utah company with offices nationwide. This is the office that will design it. The design has two phases.
 - 1st Phase: The masterplan of the train station area (train station, parking, and first buildings around the train station).
 - 2nd Phase: Construction of the platforms and parking.
- Approved to purchase two large pieces of equipment (the largest purchases Vineyard has ever made). \$400,000 for a vactruck (sewers, land-drain, etc.) and \$100,000 for a street sweeper.

8. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION OF APPROVAL (Who gave, who second, who approved/denied) Bryce, Jeff Second, all in favor

MOTION: COMMISSIONER BRADY MADE A MOTION TO ADJURN. COMMISSIONER KNIGHTON SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR AND THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MINUTES APPROVED ON: December 5, 2018

CORRECTED BY: /s/ McKenna Marchant

McKenna Marchant, Planning Technician