

**PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING
OF THE VINEYARD PLANNING COMMISSION,
Wednesday, June 17, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.**

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the Planning Commission of Vineyard, Utah, will hold a public hearing and regular planning commission meeting, on Wednesday, June 17, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. *This meeting will be held electronically because of the gathering restrictions in force due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. This meeting can be viewed live through Zoom.*

Please click on this link:

<https://zoom.us/j/97331051550?pwd=VWM1TUlnbW9ZRG5iODJTR3FZODV2dz09>

Or Dial in using: +1 253 215 8782

The agenda will consist of the following:

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. INVOCATION/INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHTS/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. OPEN SESSION

“Open Session” is defined as time set aside for citizens to express their views for items not on the agenda. Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. Because of the need for proper public notice, immediate action cannot be taken in the Planning Commission Meeting. If action is necessary, the item will be listed on a following agenda. However, the Planning Commission may elect to discuss the item if it is an immediate matter of concern.

Public comments can be submitted ahead of time to elizabeth@vineyardutah.org. Public comments will also be taken through the zoom app by either clicking the ‘chat’ feature or by using the ‘raise hand’ feature when prompted.

4. MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Minutes from the April 1, 2020 Planning Commission Regular and Joint City Council Meeting.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS:

5.1 PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION: Lilypad Preschool Conditional Use Permit

The applicant is requesting approval of a conditional use permit for a preschool within the home and up to ten (10) students per class.

5.2 Lakefront at Vineyard Town Center Site Plan Amendment.

The applicant is requesting approval for a site plan amendment.

6. WORK SESSION

6.1 Maverik Site Plan Amendment

6.2 Chickens

6.3 Accessory Dwelling Units

7. COMMISSION MEMBERS’ REPORTS AND EX PARTE DISCUSSION DISCLOSURE

8. STAFF REPORTS

- Morgan Brim, Planning Director
- Don Overson, City Engineer

9. ADJOURNMENT

The next regularly scheduled meeting is July 1, 2020.

This meeting may be held electronically to allow a commissioner to participate by teleconference.

The Public is invited to participate in all Planning Commission meetings. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during this public meeting should notify Elizabeth Hart, Planner, at least 24 hours prior to the meeting by calling (801) 226-1929.

The foregoing notice and agenda was emailed to the Salt Lake Tribune and Daily Herald, posted on the Utah Public Notice Website and Vineyard Website, posted at the Vineyard City Offices and City Hall, delivered electronically to city staff and each member of the planning commission.

AGENDA NOTICING COMPLETED ON: June 15, 2020

NOTICED BY: /s/ Elizabeth Hart

Elizabeth Hart, Planner



**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL
AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

This meeting was held electronically,
via Zoom, due to the COVID-19 gathering restrictions

Wednesday, April 1, 2020 at 6:01 PM

Present

Absent

CITY COUNCIL

Mayor Julie Fullmer
Councilmember John Earnest
Councilmember Tyce Flake
Councilmember Chris Judd
Councilmember Cristy Welsh

PLANNING COMMISSION

Chair Anthony Jenkins
Vice-Chair Jeff Knighton
Commissioner Tim Blackburn
Commissioner Bryce Brady
Commissioner Shan Sullivan
Alternate Commissioner Jessica Welch
Alternate Commissioner Tay Gudmundson
Alternate Commissioner Amber Rasmussen

Staff Present: City Manager Jacob McHargue, Public Works Director/City Engineer Don Overson, Assistant City Engineer Chris Wilson, City Attorney David Church, Sergeant Holden Rockwell with the Utah County Sheriff's Office, Community Development Director Morgan Brim, City Planner Elizabeth Hart, Water/Parks Manager Sullivan Love, City Recorder Pamela Spencer

Others Speaking: Resident David Lauret; Ethan Moon with Swig; Steve Hutchings with X Development; Real Estate Agents Truett Chamberlain and Andy Flamm representing the buyer and seller of the Geneva Nitrogen property; Jeff Speck with Jeff Speck LLC; Ryan Hales with Hales Engineering; Reid Ewing with the University of Utah; Pete Evans and Bronson Tatton with Flagship Homes and Anderson Geneva

6:01 PM REGULAR SESSION

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Fullmer opened the meeting at 6:01 PM. She gave the invocation.
Roll call went as follows: Mayor Fullmer, Councilmembers Earnest, Flake, Judd, and Welsh were present.

Planning Commissioner Chair Jenkins, and Planning Commissioners Knighton, Blackburn, Brady, and Sullivan were present. Other Planning Commissioners present were: Tay Gudmundson and Amber Rasmussen.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS *(4:39 minutes in)*

Mayor Fullmer called for public comments.

City Manager Jacob McHargue read the public comments submitted via email.

Resident Cody Smith living in the Elms subdivision asked if the 5' area between the wetlands and the sidewalk in his subdivision could be landscaped to minimize the weeds that were growing out of control. He asked if the rocks between the city-owned property and Zinfandel Lane would be maintained. He also asked when the landscaping between the Sycamores and The Elms subdivisions would be installed. Mayor Fullmer asked Public Works Director/City Engineer Don Overson to respond to Mr. Smith's questions after the meeting.

Resident Zach Bishop living in the Windsor subdivision asked for an update on the golf driving range that was to be built off of Mill Road. He asked what the city was doing to ensure that retail in the Town Center would be successful. He also asked if the city could place trash cans throughout the city to help with litter and dog waste. Mayor Fullmer replied that they would be discussing ways to help the Town Center be successful later in tonight's meeting. She suggested that the Public Works department look into the trash cans. Mr. McHargue replied that they were still working with the landowners and developers on the golf range project.

Mayor Fullmer called for further comments. Hearing none, she closed the public session.

Mayor Fullmer turned the time over to Planning Commission Chair Anthony Jenkins.

3. CONSENT ITEMS *(9:32 minutes in)*

PLANNING COMMISSION

3.1 Approval of the February 24, 2020 Joint Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

3.2 Approval of the March 4, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Chair Jenkins called for a motion.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MOVED TO APPROVE THE TWO CONSENT ITEMS. COMMISSIONER SULLIVAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY, AND SULLIVAN VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CITY COUNCIL *(10:45 minutes in)*

3.3 Approval of the March 11, 2020 City Council Meeting Minutes

3.4 Approval of the Hamptons D Final Plat

Mayor Fullmer called for a motion.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT ITEMS AS PRESENTED ON THE AGENDA. COUNCILMEMBER EARNEST SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS

98 EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND WELSH VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED
99 UNANIMOUSLY.

100
101 Mayor Fullmer turned the time over to Chair Jenkins.

104 4. BUSINESS ITEMS

105 **4.1 DISCUSSION AND ACTION – Little Caesars Sign Standard Waiver** *(12:00 minutes in)*

106 The applicant is requesting approval of a third wall sign located at 554 N. Mill Rd., Suite
107 E. Parcel ID: 56:038:0003. The Planning Commission will act to approve (or deny) the
108 proposed application.

109
110 Chair Jenkins explained that this was a standard approach to a sign waiver and that staff was
111 recommending approval. He turned the time over to City Planner Elizabeth Hart.

112
113 Ms. Hart explained that Little Caesars was requesting a third wall sign. It would add nine (9)
114 square feet for a total 67 square feet of signage, which was under the 120 square foot maximum.
115 This would be an awning to provide customer shelter and recognition of the drive-thru. Ms. Hart
116 added that this would only allow for the logo. She added that staff was recommending approval.

117
118 Chair Jenkins called for questions from the commission. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

119
120 **Motion:** COMMISSIONER SULLIVAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE SIGN STANDARD
121 WAIVER FOR THE LITTLE CAESARS' AWNING SIGN WITH THE LIST OF
122 CONDITIONS FROM STAFF.

123 CONDITIONS:

- 124 1. THE APPLICANT SHALL BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE,
125 AND LOCAL LAWS.
- 126 2. THE SIGN PERMIT SHALL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE SIGN
127 ORDINANCE AND SIGN STANDARD WAIVER.

128 COMMISSIONER BRADY SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS
129 FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY,
130 AND SULLIVAN VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

132 **4.2 DISCUSSION AND ACTION – Swig Sign Standard Waiver** *(16:30 minutes in)*

133 The applicant is requesting approval of a third wall sign located at 554 N. Mill Rd., Suite
134 F. Parcel ID: 56:038:0003. The Planning Commission will act to approve (or deny) the
135 proposed application.

136
137 Chair Jenkins turned the time over to City Planner Elizabeth Hart.

138
139 Ms. Hart explained that this request was similar to Little Caesars' request of an additional wall
140 sign. She said that this sign would face Mill Road and would be 36 square feet, giving them a
141 total of 94 square feet, which would still meet the sign code. She said that the sign would provide
142 additional visibility and that staff was recommending approval. Ethan Moon with Swig stated
143 that Ms. Hart had covered everything in their request.

144
145 Commissioner Brady asked when they planned on being open. Ms. Hart replied that Swig hoped
146 to be open in the next couple of months. Building Official George Reid explained that they were

still in the process of completing the shell, and that the tenant improvements had been approved and were also in the process, so it was hard to estimate a timeline. He also agreed that they were on track to open within the next couple of months. Steve Hutchings with X Development agreed that they hoped to open within the next 90 days.

Mr. McHargue asked when Little Caesars expected to open. Mr. Reid replied about the same time as Swig.

Councilmember Judd asked how the sign ordinance process was going. Ms. Hart replied that there had been a few sign standard waivers for wall and larger signs. She added that they had approved all of the waiver requests so far. She mentioned that they were in the process of updating the sign code to allow for more signage. Chair Jenkins felt that the requests had not been burdensome so far.

Chair Jenkins called for further questions.

Commissioner Blackburn asked if there was something wrong with the sign standard because they were getting so many waiver requests. Mr. Hart replied that a lot of the requests were for stand-alone buildings so they may need to reassess the standard for those types of buildings. She said that, in terms of signage areas, the developers had met the sign area requirements unless they requested a sign waiver for it. There was a discussion about the sign code.

Chair Jenkins called for further questions.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BRADY MOVED TO APPROVE THE SIGN STANDARD WAIVER WITH LISTED CONDITIONS BY STAFF FOR SWIG. COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN SECONDED THE MOTION.

CONDITIONS:

1. THE APPLICANT SHALL BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAWS.
2. THE SIGN PERMIT SHALL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE SIGN ORDINANCE AND SIGN STANDARD WAIVER.

ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY, AND SULLIVAN VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4.3 DISCUSSION AND ACTION – Yard C Preliminary and Final Plat (24:20 minutes in)

Fifty Mill LLC is requesting preliminary and final approval for Yard C Plat located at 681 East 450 North (Northeast corner of 400 North and Mill Road Intersection)

4.3.1 The Planning Commission will consider and take action.

4.3.2 The mayor and City Council depending on action from the Planning Commission will consider and take action.

Chair Jenkins turned the time over to the staff.

Community Development Director Morgan Brim explained that this request was to subdivide the former Lot 4 of Yard B subdivision, just south of the Megaplex, into two parcels. The corner parcel would be retail and the interior parcel would be a medical office building. He said that this would affect A-2, which was the expansion of 400 North for light rail. Staff was recommending

196 approval. Mr. Hutchings said that they were planning for a professional office with the potential
197 for medical tenants.

198
199 Chair Jenkins called for questions from the commission.

200
201 Commissioner Brady asked about the retail planned for the corner lot. Mr. Hutchings replied that
202 the corner would hopefully be a restaurant. He said that they had some interest but were being
203 picky about what that corner would look like.

204
205 Resident David Lauret living on Holdaway Road asked where the light rail would go on the plat.
206 Mr. Brim replied that the light rail was on Mountainland Association of Governments' long-
207 range plans and would run along 400 North. Mr. Overson explained that the plan was to have
208 light rail go down the center of 400 North with parking on both sides.

209
210 Commissioner Kington asked about access for the corner lot. Mr. Hutchins replied that there
211 would be no access off of 400 North because it would be too close to the corner. He thought
212 there might be an access off of Mill Road, the internal road, and 450 North.

213
214 Chair Jenkins asked about accessibility for sidewalks and pedestrians. Mr. Brim replied as the
215 development occurred, they were adding accessibility. Mr. Overson said that staff wanted to
216 have the Mill Road sidewalks done as soon as possible.

217
218 Commissioner Sullivan asked if the retail space on the corner would be mostly restaurants. Mr.
219 Hutchings replied that it would most likely be a single level sit-down restaurant. Commissioner
220 Sullivan asked if the professional building would be single or multi-level. Mr. Hutchings replied
221 that the building was located on the left side of the parcel and would be a two-level building.
222 Chair Jenkins added that more details would be coming when the site plans come in.

223
224 Chair Jenkins called for additional questions.

225
226 Commissioner Blackburn asked who would own the buildings. Mr. Hutchings replied that they
227 had a joint venture with another developer. Commissioner Blackburn asked if the tenants would
228 own any of the buildings. Mr. Hutchings replied that they do offer partial ownership to the
229 tenants. He added that some tenants wanted to have ownership of their building and those who
230 did, tended to stay longer.

231
232 Chair Jenkins called for further questions or to make a motion.

233
234 **Motion:** COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF
235 THE PRELIMINARY AND FINAL YARD C PLAT WITH CONDITIONS AS
236 RECOMMENDED BY STAFF.

237 CONDITIONS:

- 238 1. THE APPLICANT PAYS ANY OUTSTANDING FEES
239 2. THE APPLICANT MAKES ANY REDLINE CORRECTIONS PRIOR TO THE
240 RECORDATION OF THE PLAT.
241 3. ALL CITY AND COUNTY REQUIREMENTS WILL NEED TO BE MET PRIOR TO
242 RECORDATION OF THE PLAT.

COMMISSIONER SULLIVAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY, AND SULLIVAN VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jenkins turned the time back to Mayor Fullmer.

Mayor Fullmer called for questions. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO APPROVE THE YARD PLAT C SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLAT WITH THE CONDITIONS AS RECOMMEND BY PLANNING COMMISSION. COUNCILMEMBER WELSH SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND WELSH VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4.4 DISCUSSION AND ACTION – Final Plat Approval of the 1600 North Extension

Road Dedication (38:25 minutes in)

(this item was continued from the last City Council meeting)

City Planner Elizabeth Hart will present a request for final plat approval of the 1600 North Extension Road Dedication Plat. The mayor and City Council will take appropriate action.

Mayor Fullmer turned the time over to City Planner Elizabeth Hart.

Ms. Hart explained that the applicant was proposing dedicating four (4) acres to the city. The applicant was proposing an extension of 1600 North to 250 West. There was a portion of the property that was owned by CUWCD so the road would go above it. He added that there would also be a trail. She reviewed the changes to the plat. She said that staff was recommending approval. She added that everything to the east would remain a private road. Mr. Overson explained that until the access across the railroad tracks at 1600 North was removed, the road to the cul-de-sac would remain a private road. He said that if Anderson Geneva wanted to restrict access, they would have to put up a barrier. Mayor Fullmer asked what would happen with the road if the rail spur was removed. Mr. Overson replied that the road was being built to the City's standards and would become public once the spur was removed. He added that the private road was different.

Mayor Fullmer called for questions from the council. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER FLAKE MOVED TO APPROVE BUSINESS ITEM 4.4, 1600 NORTH EXTENSION ROAD DEDICATION FINAL PLAT, ALONG WITH NOTED REQUIREMENTS BY STAFF.

CONDITIONS:

1. THE APPLICANT PAYS ANY OUTSTANDING FEES.
2. THE APPLICANT MAKES ANY REDLINE CORRECTIONS PRIOR TO THE RECORDATION OF THE PLAT.

COUNCILMEMBER JUDD SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND WELSH VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mayor Fullmer turned the time over to Chair Jenkins.

292 **5. ORDINANCES/PUBLIC HEARINGS**

293 **5.1 General Plan Land Use Map Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment (Former**
294 **Geneva Nitrogen Property) Ordinance 2020-** (44:24 minutes in)

295 Vineyard staff is requesting General Plan Use Map and Zoning Map amendments for the
296 former Geneva Nitrogen Property.

297
298 *5.1.1 The Planning Commission will consider and take action.*

299
300 Chair Jenkins turned the time over to staff.

301
302 Mr. Brim explained the Geneva Nitrogen General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map
303 amendment. One of the conditions in the Redevelopment Agency's agreement with them was
304 that the property be rezoned from I-1. He said that staff thought, as this was a gateway into the
305 city, this would be a good time to put some type of commercial zoning in place. The current
306 property owner and a potential buyer provided the city with a concept plan to rezone 24.11 acres
307 plus the right of way at 1200 North to Regional Commercial and 2.613 acres to Business Park.
308 Their proposal was to zone part of it as Business Park for potential office use. He added that staff
309 was recommending approval. The current property owner requested that if the Planning
310 Commission recommended approval, that the City Council continue their approval to the May
311 13, 2020 City Council meeting to allow for the sale of the property to go through. Truett
312 Chamberlain explained that he was the real estate agent representing the buyer. He said that the
313 buyer felt that the land could be used for a potential event center, office park, recreation facility,
314 etc. Andy Flamm, representing the seller, stated that he had nothing to add at this time.

315
316 Chair Jenkins called for a motion to open the public hearing.

317
318 **Motion:** COMMISSIONER SULLIVAN MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT
319 6:51 PM. COMMISSIONER BRADY SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS
320 FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY,
321 AND SULLIVAN VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

322
323 Chair Jenkins called for public comments.

324
325 Mr. Lauret asked about the illustration on lot 6. Mr. Flamm replied that it was a proposed
326 fairway for a golf course. Mr. Brim added that there was an approval for the golf club near the
327 Megaplex and this was another potential location. The staff report showed a concept plan
328 provided by the future landowner.

329
330 Councilmember Judd asked if they were adding any new zones. Mr. Brim replied no, they were
331 just adding it to this parcel. Councilmember Judd asked why they were needing to wait until May
332 to approve the proposal. Mr. Brim replied that the potential buyer would like to see the city
333 moving towards the recommended zoning. Mr. Flamm explained that the buyer wanted to
334 see what the city was willing to do. He added that the seller did not want to rezone the property
335 until the sale had finalized.

336
337 Chair Jenkins called for further comments. Hearing none, he called for a motion to close the
338 public hearing.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:57 PM. COMMISSIONER KNIGHTON SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY, AND SULLIVAN VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jenkins called for questions from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Knighton asked what the soil conditions were at the site after the previous use and if there needed to be any remediation done. He also asked about the access points off of Geneva Road. Mr. Overson replied that the Utah Department of Transportation's (UDOT) Access Management Plan allowed for two access points: One at would be a fully signalized intersection at 1200 North and the other would be a full unsignalized intersection at 1400 North. He said that they were hoping to continue the roads through to Mill Road. He mentioned that until the rail spur was removed, they would only have one access point. There was a discussion about the timeline for the spur removal.

Chair Jenkins called for further questions.

Commissioner Brady asked what the difference was between Business Park and Regional Commercial. Mr. Brim replied that Regional Commercial would allow for a large-scale shopping centers but did not allow for stand-alone professional offices. The Business Park allowed for stand-alone professional offices. Chair Jenkins explained that the Town Center zoning would accommodate a lot of the stand-alone office space.

Commissioner Blackburn asked why that particular plot was chosen for the Business Park. Mr. Brim replied that this was a city-initiated application and that he had worked with the potential buyers for the proposal. Mr. Chamberlain explained that they had a buyer ready to go vertical who wanted to add office next to the golf fairway or driving range.

Commissioner Sullivan felt that the strip for the access road was not wide enough. Mr. Chamberlain explained that Anderson Geneva had a master plan for the road to extend through the Geneva property.

Commissioner Knighton asked about the soils. Mr. Flamm replied that the sellers and owners of Geneva Nitrogen had been working on the cleanup of the soils since the early 2000s and they were expecting to have a clean bill of health from the state.

Chair Jenkins called for further questions.

Commissioner Brady felt that the zoning changing from industrial was good for the city and the general plan.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BRADY MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 2020-03, GENEVA NITROGEN GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT. COMMISSIONER KNIGHTON SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY, AND SULLIVAN VOTE AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jenkins turned the time over to Mayor Fullmer.

5.1.2 The mayor and City Council, depending on action from the Planning Commission, will move to continue their consideration and action until the May 13, 2020 City Council meeting.

Mayor Fullmer called for comments from the council. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO CONTINUE BUSINESS ITEM 5.1.2 TO THE MAY 13, 2020 CITY COUNCIL MEETING BASED UPON THE APPLICANT'S REQUESTS. COUNCILMEMBER EARNEST SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND WELSH VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mayor Fullmer turned the time over the Chair Jenkins.

5.2 Zoning Text and Map Amendment to the Town Center Form Based Code Special Zoning District 3 Ordinance 2020- *(1:09:39 minutes in)*

Anderson Geneva, the applicant, will present proposed changes to the Town Center Code and map.

5.2.1 The Planning Commission will consider and take action.

Chair Jenkins turned the time over to staff.

Mr. Brim thanked all of the staff and the applicant who had helped with this amendment. He added that there had been several meetings with Planning Commission and City Council and that this had gone through three (3) revisions.

Mr. Brim highlighted a few of the amendments:

- Extend the Lakefront Commercial district all the way to the north
- Public facilities acreage was increased to 1.2 acres. Mr. Brim felt that this was a nice benefit to the city.
- Geneva Park – they took educational facilities off. The park was to be a shared space but they did not want a school. If there was to be one it would have been on the park.
- The Lake Promenade – they straightened the road. He said that there had been discussions about the road as an alternate location and staff felt that this was a future project in the lake front design.
- The lake and rail trails were shown.
- Residential Amenities:
 - 1/8-mile - All residential units to have three of the following within 1/8 mile:
 - Secure bicycle storage
 - Community gathering area or meeting room
 - Playground
 - Water feature
 - Barbecues
 - Pocket park

- 1/4-mile - All residential units to have three of the following within 1/4 mile:
 - Fitness center
 - Swimming pool
 - Hot tub
 - Splash pad
 - Sport courts
 - Plaza
- Parking - staff was not concerned with the commercial parking. They found that commercial uses tended to overbuild parking.
 - On-street parking allowed on all street types (They could make adjustments for fire lanes, utility vehicles, timed parking on surface streets.)
 - Residential Parking:
 - 1 parking space required per bedroom
 - Maximum of 2 parking spaces required per unit
 - 0.25 visitor parking spaces required per unit
 - Translates to over 11,000 parking spaces
 - Provides city planner and city engineer the ability to reduce parking requirements based on built conditions within the Downtown. (Upon certain build out conditions, allows for the planner and engineer to look at a parking study and if the study showed that it was overparked then it would allow staff to decrease the parking.) Mr. Brim explained that they wanted the parking to fit the use.
 - If ordinance is approved, a condition should be added to require 0.8 spaces per occupant of student housing units. Chair Jenkins asked Mr. Brim to explain what student housing was. Mr. Brim replied that it would have shared a common space with separate bedrooms. It could have multiple beds in each room. The applicant may look at student housing, which could help the downtown.
- Designate retail on the ground floor in the Square-about, Boardwalk, Train Plaza, and Market Street.

Staff is recommending approval of the ordinance approving the Town Center Zoning Text and Zoning Map Amendments with the following additions:

- Traffic Impact Study (TIS) shall be updated and submitted to the city engineer prior to construction of roadways based on approved road configurations.
- Amend ordinance graphics and text to ensure parking strips maintain a minimum of 8' in width.
- Amend ordinance to add parking category for student housing in all districts, requiring a minimum of 0.8 parking spaces per unit occupant with no cap.

Mr. Brim mentioned that the other changes in the code had been discussed at previous meetings.

Chair Jenkins called for a motion to open the public hearing.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:27 PM. COMMISSIONER BRADY SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY, AND SULLIVAN VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jenkins called for public comments.

Mr. Lauret asked, given the COVID-19 pandemic, if it wise to create a transit-oriented district (TOD) with high-rise housing and crowded transit. Chair Jenkins felt that it was still wise to create the housing and transit, but needed to make sure it was kept safe. Mr. Brim suggested that the applicant address it after the public hearing. Alternate Planning Commissioner Amber Rasmussen mentioned that she had sent Chair Jenkins and Mr. Brim information about high standards for building well-ventilated places and residential units.

Alternate Commissioner Rasmussen felt that the 8-foot park strip was better for trees. She asked if there was a way to make sure that all of the amenities would not be the same. She suggested that they have a limited number of specific things in each area. Mr. Brim felt that with the way the code was written they could not put three (3) of the same type of amenity in one area. Commissioner Rasmussen asked if the 1/4-mile and 1/8-mile were big enough. Mr. Brim replied that residents would get six (6) amenities with that distance. He said that staff wanted to ensure that amenities were not clustered in or too close to the buildings, would meet walkability, and provide a social environment. There was a discussion about bike storage.

Commissioner Brady asked if they would see all of the amenities in the whole development or would they have the three (3) same amenities in each area.

Pete Evans with Anderson Geneva thanked the city for their work on this amendment. He explained that the plan was to put a variety of amenities throughout the community. The promenade area would be programmed in sections and each section would include different amenities and themes. The amenities would be different in the residential than the commercial and retail area. They would also be spaced out in the plan and accessible to the community.

Commissioner Blackburn asked if they would have doubling up of the 1/8-mile amenities every 1/4-mile. Mr. Evans replied that the areas would run independent of each other.

Councilmember Welsh expressed concern that the amenities could be repetitive. She said that bike storage did fill a lot of things they were trying to do to make it a bikeable community. She asked for clarification on what barbecues meant. Mr. Evans replied that a lot of the features were taken off of the current code. He explained that it would be a commercial park barbecue to create a place for people to congregate. He said that these amenities would be a tradeoff for the private and public open space. He said that these would be in addition to the amenities connected to the individual buildings.

Councilmember Welsh felt that they needed to add clarification, in the code, to some of the amenities. Mr. Evans felt that it should happen at the site plan, where there would be more details included. Councilmember Welsh asked what staff's thoughts were on this issue. Mr. Brim replied that there were three (3) pieces of zoning to be clear, concise, and objective. He suggested that they could add words of clarification on some of the items such as adding "Secure and covered bicycle storage", "barbecue areas with a pavilion," etc. Mr. Brim explained how staff would be enforcing the zoning code.

Ms. Hart explained that the staff report had a comparison between the General Plan and the Zoning Code. She said that the General Plan open space requirement was 9 acres per 1,000 per residents and the Town Center required 2 acres per 1,000 residents. She said that this did not include the lake shore, trails, pedestrian walkways, and the possibility of the pocket parks. She said that the open space code met the General Plan vision of the city.

Councilmember Judd echoed, as a resident, what had been said. He felt the they needed more detail of what they wanted. He asked if they would be okay with all three (3) of the required amenities being found in one location. He said that typically there were levels of what they would consider such as having three (3) different tiers for the amenities and require one from each tier.

Commissioner Blackburn felt that not all bicycle storage was equal and they needed to talk about the potential number of bikes. Mr. Overson explained that they had a tool to guarantee that something was constructed through a bond. He said that they did not have that with the development on Geneva Road. There was a discussion about bonding.

Chair Jenkins called for further public comments. Hearing none, he called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Motion: COMMISSIONER KNIGHTON MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:52 PM. COMMISSIONER BRADY SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY, AND SULLIVAN VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Knighton suggested that they add an additional requirement for the amenities, that all of the residents had access to most of the amenities within a certain radius. He asked why they were not requiring Main Street to have the non-residential ground floor designation. Mr. Brim explained that Main Street could have retail. He said that Market Street was seen to be the more traditional main street and would be shared with traffic and pedestrians. He mentioned that the applicant had prepared a presentation.

Chair Jenkins asked if it was okay for the city to have their own commercial parking requirements. Mr. Brim replied that some cities had their requirement but he felt that what was in the code would be sufficient.

Chair Jenkins felt that with the incorporation of the sustainability practices, they could tighten up the wording and have sustainability throughout the entire development.

Chair Jenkins turned the time over to the applicants.

Mr. Evans suggested that Jeff Speck with Jeff Speck LLC could address the retail and that Ryan Hales with Hales Engineering and Dr. Reid Ewing with the University of Utah could address the parking.

Mr. Speck explained that the street called Main Street was designated as the main access into the development with stores along the roadway. He felt that the main idea was to put the retail where the traffic was. He felt that the greatest opportunity for retail was on a market street which would be pedestrian oriented. He added that there would be retail along the lake front and where the main street hit the North Promenade. This would ensure that residential was within a five-minute walk of retail.

Dr. Ewing said that they reviewed about 640 mixed-use developments around the country. He explained that parking was not free; it was added to the cost of doing business. He added that parking in the United States tended to be oversupplied. He explained that there were different

584 peak demand times for commercial and residential uses. He felt that the suggested number of
585 parking spaces was much greater than the demand would be. He said that they did not want to
586 under- or overpark the development because that would create streetscapes and parking lots that
587 would be underused. He said that they had looked at transit-oriented developments (TOD) in
588 other cities and the amount of parking supplied was a little over one (1) space per unit and the
589 amount demanded was just under one (1) space per unit. He said that often the parking was
590 unbundled and the renter had to pay extra for a parking space. He felt that the city was better off
591 with one (1) space per unit for the area closest to the station. He said that people tended to
592 compare the amount of parking supplied and demanded to standards in the Parking Generation
593 Manual from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). He said that if they follow the ITE
594 guidelines they would end up with about a third more parking than needed. He felt that they
595 needed less parking near the train station and mixed-use areas. He said that they should use the
596 demand numbers for the area farther from the train station. He said that what they had
597 recommended in the Point of the Mountain report was to use the demand numbers in the most
598 suburban area and use much less in the transit/walkable areas. He said that in the Orem study,
599 they found that parking was over supplied. They also found that they needed more spaces in the
600 student housing areas. While parking was oversupplied, Vineyard was still concerned about
601 reducing parking for multi-family areas.

602
603 Mr. Hales explained that they looked at the downtown station area and identified it as TOD. The
604 rest of the site was mixed-use and they dropped the parking requirements on the fringes. He said
605 that they looked at the road system and the uses in each block. They compared the Orem rates
606 versus the Point of the Mountain rates and obtained a lower parking rate than they were
607 recommending. They looked at how many spaces were needed per unit, per occupant, and the
608 times of day parking demand would peak. He said that the supply was about 11,800 spaces and
609 the demand was projected at about 10,100. He explained that they had added 5 percent so that
610 vehicles did not have to circulate the lot looking for a space. The other 5 percent they added was
611 to ensure that they did not miss the target. He felt that the rates would end up being a lot lower
612 than projected. He added that they would be able to check the parking rates as the development
613 built out. He recommended that Vineyard go with the Orem rates at 11,084 and continue to
614 monitor each phase of the development. Mr. Ewing added that the ITE manual said explicitly
615 that the sites studied, in the manual, were suburban auto-oriented sites and this was not what the
616 city was trying to create in the Town Center. The discussion continued. Mr. Brim explained the
617 parking ordinance in the code. He expressed concern about overparking the TOD area and felt
618 that it should have less parking. Mr. Ewing felt that 2.25 parking spaces per unit would be too
619 high and would defeat the purpose of having a walkable/transit-oriented area. He mentioned that
620 most visitor parking would be shared parking spaces. Mr. Evans felt that based on the research,
621 the standards suggested would overpark the downtown area. He suggested that having the
622 opportunity to re-evaluate the parking as they built out the development was a good compromise
623 to ensure that there was enough parking and to create a successful community.

624
625 Mr. Brim said that one of the proposed conditions was to increase the park strip width to 8 feet.
626 Matt Lambert with DPZ said that they were planning on using a 6x6 tree grate in the commercial
627 corridors, which was the largest they could buy. Water/Parks Manager Sullivan Love said that he
628 wanted make sure they had adequate room for mowing, etc. Mr. Overson mentioned that a
629 standard sprinkling system would waste water if the park strip was under 8 feet. Chair Jenkins
630 suggested that they install a drip system instead of sprinklers in the park strips. There was a
631 discussion about the park strips. It was agreed that the city adopt landscape plan standards and
632 planting guidelines and leave the park strip sizes as they were. The discussion continued.

Councilmember Flake said that he would be willing to work with Mr. Overson, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Love to update the tree manual.

Chair Jenkins asked about sustainability. Mr. Evans replied that they had been working with engineering and Public Works staff on sustainability from a land development standpoint. He said that from a building standpoint, sustainability was market driven. He said that in most of the commercial buildings, the tenant would require it. He suggested that as they were building out, they highlight the sustainability to the approving body. He gave some examples of how they could do that, such as using irrigation water in the six-acre park pond. Chair Jenkins said that they wanted to make sure they were building for the future and had sustainability in the plan.

Chair Jenkins called for comments from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Brady asked if on-street parking counted as visitor parking. Mr. Evans replied that on-street parking would not be marked as visitor parking but any designated visitor parking would be clearly marked.

Commissioner Brady asked how much of the Geneva Park area would be usable. Mr. Evans replied that they did not want to categorize it as usable park space. He said that it was one of their main goals to maximize the usability of the park. He added that they were working with a civil engineer to make the park the most usable as possible and they were several months away from knowing. He felt that it was too early to make any promises of what they could do with the park. Commissioner Brady stated that he wanted to make sure it was usable space.

Commissioner Blackburn asked if student housing would be part of the 5,000 to 6,000 residents in the Town Center. Mr. Evans replied that it was. He said that he did not want to have other housing used as student housing. He added that student housing would create different parking requirements. He mentioned that they did not have any student housing planned for the development at this time but wanted to have it in code in case they needed it.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if they needed to have specific language about enforcement and vision added to the code. Mr. Brim replied that if they were concerned about an amenity, they should be more specific. There was a discussion about the amenities and how they could clarify them. Mr. Evans felt that the only amenity he would look at was the pavilion and being more specific with features that worked together.

Commissioner Blackburn mentioned that, based on current numbers in Vineyard, 70 percent of the residences were multi-family or high density. He said that the surrounding municipalities were around 30 to 40 percent. He felt that, based on projected build out, they would be at 90 percent multi-family residences. Mr. Reid said that based on current records, it would be mostly multi-family units. Commissioner Blackburn felt that it was important for Vineyard residents to understand what the city had moved to.

Chair Jenkins called for further comments.

Commissioner Blackburn said that he would like to see historic preservation added to the plan and recognized as a goal. Chair Jenkins asked where it would go in the code. Mr. Brim replied that heritage could be added to the vision statement and the open space section. There was a discussion about where to add heritage to the Town Center code.

Chair Jenkins read the conditions for the motion:

- TIS shall be updated and submitted to the city engineer prior to construction of roadways based on approved road configurations.
- The developer shall work with city staff to define allowable tree types and plantings permitted in each park strip type.
- Amend ordinance to add parking category for student housing in all districts, requiring a minimum of 0.8 parking spaces per unit occupant with no unit cap.
- Add a heritage statement within the vision statement and update the Town Center language into the General Plan
- Amend ordinance to further clarify residential amenities with 1/8-mile of units as follows:
 - All residential units to have three of the following within 1/8-mile:
 - Secure covered bike storage
 - Community gathering area or meeting room
 - Playground with park-quality features
 - Park-quality water feature
 - Park-quality barbecues and associated seating areas
 - Pocket park

Chair Jenkins called for a motion.

Commissioner Blackburn asked about using either Town Center or Downtown Vineyard. Chair Jenkins replied that if the ordinance was adopted, the new name would be Downtown Vineyard.

Motion: COMMISSIONER SULLIVAN MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ORDINANCE WITH CONDITIONS AS STATED BY THE CHAIR.

CONDITIONS:

- TIS SHALL BE UPDATED AND SUBMITTED TO THE CITY ENGINEER PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION OF ROADWAYS BASED ON APPROVED ROAD CONFIGURATIONS.
- THE DEVELOPER SHALL WORK WITH CITY STAFF TO DEFINE ALLOWABLE TREE TYPES AND PLANTINGS PERMITTED IN EACH PARK STRIP TYPE.
- AMEND ORDINANCE TO ADD PARKING CATEGORY FOR STUDENT HOUSING IN ALL DISTRICTS, REQUIRING A MINIMUM OF 0.8 PARKING SPACES PER UNIT OCCUPANT WITH NO UNIT CAP.
- ADD A HERITAGE STATEMENT WITHIN THE VISION STATEMENT AND UPDATE THE TOWN CENTER LANGUAGE INTO THE GENERAL PLAN
- AMEND ORDINANCE TO FURTHER CLARIFY RESIDENTIAL AMENITIES WITH 1/8-MILE OF UNITS AS FOLLOW:
 - ALL RESIDENTIAL UNITS TO HAVE THREE OF THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 1/8-MILE:
 - SECURE COVERED BIKE STORAGE
 - COMMUNITY GATHERING AREA OR MEETING ROOM
 - PLAYGROUND WITH PARK-QUALITY FEATURES
 - PARK-QUALITY WATER FEATURE
 - PARK-QUALITY BARBECUES AND ASSOCIATED SEATING AREAS
 - POCKET PARK

COMMISSIONER KNIGHTON SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONERS KNIGHTON, BLACKBURN, BRADY, AND SULLIVAN VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Jenkins turned the time over to the Mayor Fullmer.

5.2.2 The mayor and City Council depending on action from the Planning Commission will consider and take action. If approved the mayor and City Council will act to adopt the amendments by ordinance.

Mayor Fullmer stated that she wanted to give the public the opportunity to comment on the parking presentation. There were no public comments.

Mayor Fullmer explained that this area was one of the most extensive crossroads for state transit and transportation in the state. She said that the states' 2050 Transportation/Transit Plan showed a multi-modal hub in Vineyard. She explained that the Vineyard Connector would connect the west side of the lake to the east side of the lake and would connect people to one of the main east-to-west crossings for the region. She said that they needed to remember that Vineyard had been placed as a transit-oriented development and as a crossroads for this system. She asked that the council continue the discussion to the next meeting.

Councilmember Judd felt that the amenities were too wide open and that there should be different tiers for them. He wanted to see more details on parking and examples of other developments that had gone through this. He added that he struggled with the on-street parking and how it looked. He asked if, having the ability to go back and assess the parking, would allow them to add more parking if necessary. He said that the Town Center was originally designed by original Vineyard people and he felt that what was done in the past compared to now was a vast improvement and was moving in a positive direction.

Councilmember Earnest said that he wanted make sure they got the amenities right. He felt that they did not want to overprice themselves with too much parking but wanted to make sure there were mechanisms in place to determine the amount of parking needed.

Councilmember Welsh felt that Councilmember Judd had hashed out a lot of the issues. She thanked everyone for their work on the project and was in favor of continuing the discussion and fine-tuning the ideas.

Councilmember Flake said that he appreciated the efforts of all parties and was supportive of continuing the discussion.

Mayor Fullmer called for a motion.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER FLAKE MOVED TO CONTINUE THE ACTIVITY ON ITEM 5.2.2, ZONING TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENT TO THE TOWN CENTER FORM BASED CODE UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL. COUNCILMEMBER WELSH SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND WELSH VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mayor Fullmer called for council and staff updates. (3:25:10 minutes in)

Councilmember Judd reported that with the recent events, everyone was reassessing their income and expenses. He wanted to make it known to the residents that the city was also looking at the

budget and making sure that they could take care of the city and its residents. He asked the council and staff to reach out the Mr. McHargue, himself, and the mayor with any concerns. He added that businesses were still excited to come to Vineyard. Mr. McHargue said that the biggest impact to the city revenue would be on the sales tax side. They were almost to the end of the fiscal year and they had most of the revenue needed to finish out the year.

Mr. Love explained that he was working with the developer on the punch list for Penny Springs Park. Mr. Tatton said that they were working on the punch list and hoped to have it open soon. Mr. Love said that, officially, the park was not yet open and asked everyone to stay out of the park.

Councilmember Earnest reported that he was acting in the capacity of the emergency management role for the city and would be willing to send the council the updates that he gets, if they wanted them.

Mayor Fullmer said that the city was on top of the COVID-19 issues. She said that they were also working with businesses on the Governor's "Stay Home, Stay Safe" initiative. She said that the last update received was that if they could keep doing this for a little while longer, they could maintain the systems and health care would be able to take care of the pandemic. She added that the city was prepared in case any kind of situation came into the city itself.

6. ADJOURNMENT (3:33:10 minutes in)

Mayor Fullmer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER EARNEST MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:34 PM. COUNCILMEMBER FLAKE SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL WENT AS FOLLOWS: MAYOR FULLMER, COUNCILMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND WELSH VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The next regularly scheduled City Council meeting is April 8, 2020 and the Planning Commission meeting is April 15, 2020.

MINUTES APPROVED BY CITY COUNCIL ON: May 13, 2020

MINUTES APPROVED BY PLANNING COMMISSION ON: _____

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer

PAMELA SPENCER, CITY RECORDER

Community Development

Date: June 17, 2020
From: Elizabeth Hart, Senior Planner
To: Planning Commission
Item: Conditional Use Permit – Lilypad Preschool
Address: 44 N 350 E
Applicant: Emily Hagen, WE Willows Subdivision



INTRODUCTION:

The applicant Emily Hagen, owner of Lilypad Preschool, is requesting a conditional use permit approval for a childcare facility within her home, which is located at 44 North 350 East. The applicant's residence is located within the Waters Edge community and is zoned SFD-6500 which allows a child day care as a conditional use.

ANALYSIS:

The applicant was approved for a CUP by the Planning Commission in March of 2019. The CUP was approved for up to six (6) students per class. The applicant is now requesting approval of ten (10) students per class.

The zoning ordinance defines a daycare facility as a facility, operated by a person qualified and licensed by the State of Utah, which provides children with day care and/or preschool instruction as a commercial business and complying with all applicable State standards and licensing and having regularly scheduled, ongoing enrollment for direct or indirect compensation that provides child care for less than twenty-four (24) hours per day.

The home occupation ordinances states that preschools must meet the following:

Lilypad Preschool

44 North 350 East
Vineyard, UT



Narrative

Lilypad preschool is for children 3-5 years of age. We focus on combined play and learning to create a fun and exciting way to develop knowledge and skills, which will prepare them for kindergarten. Up to 10 students are accepted per class.

Classes

- 3-4 year olds: Monday & Wednesday 9-11am
- 4-5 year olds: Tuesday & Thursday 9-11am


Safety


All basement windows have window well covers.

The backyard (play area) is fully fenced with a latching gate.



Preschool square footage is 115.5 ft. and is on the main level of home.





Parking

Up to 6 cars may be waiting at my home to pick up children at 11am each day. I have room for 3 of those cars to park in the driveway – I will instruct parents to park in the driveway first. The majority of my students are walked over by a parent, so parking has not been an issue during our first year of operation.

Parents are asked not to come more than 10 minutes prior to class ending and to leave within 10 minutes after class has been dismissed.



Community Development

- 1) Only a maximum of two (2) sessions are permitted per day.
- 2) Preschool programs shall only be permitted only between 8 am and 8 pm.

The applicant is proposing a preschool facility for children between 3-5 years of age, where play and learning is combined to create a fun and exciting way to develop knowledge and skills, which will prepare them for kindergarten. There will be one class each day and each class will include up to ten (10) students. A proposed class schedule is below.

Proposed Class Schedule

AGE	CLASS DAYS	CLASS TIMES
4-5 yrs.	T, Th	9AM – 11AM
3-4 yrs.	M, W	9AM – 11AM

The total square footage of the home to be used for the preschool is 2,380 square feet. The home occupation ordinance states that no more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the home may be used for the home occupation. The applicant is planning to use one room in the home that is 115.5 square feet. This meets the maximum allowed floor area of a home occupation.

The applicant has stated she will have up to six (6) cars waiting during pick-up at 11 am each day. The applicant has the minimum four (4) required parking spaces on site, the site has a three (3) car garage and driveway. The three (3) driveway spaces will be used during the pick-up and drop-off hours. The applicant has stated that she will let the parents know to use the drive-way first and to not come more than ten (10) minutes before class and to leave within ten (10) minutes after class has been dismissed.

FINDINGS:

The proposed conditional use meets the Home Occupation Zoning Ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the conditional use application.

1. The applicant is subject to federal, state and local laws.

PROPOSED MOTION:

"I move to approve the conditional use permit for the Lilypad Preschool with the conditions listed above."


ATTACHMENTS:

CUP Project Narrative and Details



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

DATE: June 17, 2020
FROM: Morgan Brim, Community Development Director
TO: Planning Commission
ITEM: Consideration of an amended site plan and preliminary plat for the Lakefront @ Town Center development
APPLICANT: Edge Homes



INTRODUCTION:

On February 6, 2019, the Planning Commission approved a site plan and recommended approval to the City Council of a preliminary plat for the Lakefront @ Town Center development. This approval entitled the project with 685 residential units: 400 condominiums, 270 townhomes and 15 single family units. Due to conflicts with wetland delineation within the project area, the developer is now requesting a site plan amendment to reallocate units on the site. This amendment will maintain the same overall unit count, but removes the 15 single family units and increases the number of townhome and condominium units. This project primarily impacts the southern portion of the original project area.

ANALYSIS:

The Lake Front Residential district is within the Town Center zoning district, the intent of this area is to promote the connection to the edge of Utah Lake and adjacent trail system. Buildings

front on Utah Lake with internal open spaces and access. The applicant is proposing similar design elevations as already previously approved last year. The road alignment for Vineyard Loop Road and 300 West will not change. The internal road system will see minor changes, including straightening and moving of proposed 415 North slightly to the south and elimination of stub road 480 North on the south east side of the project.

CONCEPT NARRATIVE RESIDENTIAL

LOCATED IN:	VINEYARD, UTAH		
CONDO UNITS	120		
TOWNHOME UNITS	66		
TOTAL UNITS	186		
GARAGE STALLS	252		
(2 PER TOWNHOME/SINGLE FAMILY UNIT; 1 PER CONDO UNIT)			
DRIVEWAY STALLS	252		
(2 PER TOWNHOME/SINGLE FAMILY UNIT; 1 PER CONDO UNIT)			
NEW PUBLIC STALLS	28		
(TO BE ADDED TO 300 W IN PHASES 5-9)			
GUEST PARKING STALLS	84		
TOTAL PRIVATE PARKING	504		
TOTAL GUEST & PUBLIC PARKING	112		
ADA CONDO BUILDINGS:	0		
<u>UNIT COUNT BEFORE:</u>		<u>UNIT COUNT AFTER:</u>	
PHASE 5 (1-E)	45	PHASE 5 (1-E)	30
PHASE 6 (1-F)	100	PHASE 6 (1-F)	105
PHASE 7 (1-G)	10	PHASE 7 (1-G)	20
PHASE 8 (1-H)	38	PHASE 8 (1-H)	17
PHASE 9 (1-I)	15	PHASE 9 (1-I)	14
PHASE 1 TOTAL:	208		186

BUILDING COMPLIANCE:

Requirement	Staff Comment	Compliant
Minimum 5' front setback	Buildings have a setback of 18'-20'	Yes
Maximum 20' front setback		
Minimum 5' side setback	Buildings have 5-15' of side setback/between neighboring buildings	Yes
Minimum 5' rear setback on alley	No alley is present	NA

Minimum 20' rear setback without an alley	The plan indicates 5', 10' and 15' of separation between the lot line and the project boundary lines. With the addition of individual backyard space, this setback should increase to meet the minimum requirement.	Updated site plan of building layouts will need to be reviewed for compliance with this requirement.
Vineyard Connector ROW setback of 14'	The Vineyard Connector is located further to the north of the impacted area.	NA
Minimum 1 story height	Building will contain 2-3 stories	Yes
Maximum 4 stories in height		
Minimum ground story transparency of 25%	Plans appear to meet minimum transparency requirements.	Full elevation views will be required at building permit and will be reviewed for compliance.
Minimum upper story transparence of 20%		

RECOMMENDATION:


The applicant has provided two options for the planning commission consideration. The first includes a seven single family home lots and the second include the single family lots being replaced with town homes. Staff is recommending approval of both concepts.

PROPOSE MOTION:

"I move to approve the amended site plan and preliminary plat for the Lakefront at Vineyard Town Center."

ATTACHMENTS:

- Proposed plans



SITE PLAN NARRATIVE


LOCATED IN: VINEYARD, UTAH COUNTY, UTAH		
ORIGINAL PROPERTY	ORIGINAL	PROPOSED
OPEN SPACE	15.91 ACRES	15.91 ACRES
OPEN SPACE PERCENTAGE	2.73 ACRES	3.85 ACRES
	17.2 %	24.2%
SINGLE FAMILY LOTS		
	15	7
CONDO BUILDINGS		
TOTAL CONDO UNITS	10	13
	100	130
TOWNHOME 6-PLEX UNITS		
TOWNHOME 5-PLEX UNITS	48	12
TOWNHOME 4-PLEX UNITS	30	25
TOWNHOME 3-PLEX UNITS	12	28
	3	6
TOTAL TOWNHOME UNITS	93	71
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS		
	208	208
TOTAL DENSITY		
	13.07 UNITS/ACRE	13.07 UNITS/ACRE
PARKING		
PUBLIC GUEST STALLS (300 WEST)	33	29
CONDO DRIVEWAY/GARAGE STALLS	200	260
CONDO GUEST STALLS	28	62
TOWNHOME DRIVEWAY/GARAGE PRIVATE STALLS	372	284
TOWNHOME GUEST STALLS	44	70
SINGLE FAMILY STALLS	60	28
TOTAL PARKING STALLS PROVIDED		
	737	733

CONNECT NEW ASPHALT TRAIL TO EXISTING

3,528 SQUARE FEET TO BE DEDICATED TO VINEYARD CITY

CONNECT NEW ASPHALT TRAIL TO EXISTING

BRIDGE OVER NATURAL OUTFALL



GENERAL NOTE:


INFORMATION PROVIDED ON THIS PLAN IS BASED ON THE BEST AVAILABLE DATA AT THE TIME OF PREPARATION AND MAY CHANGE AT ANYTIME FOR ANY REASON. THIS PLAN IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY.



LAKEFRONT AT VINEYARD TOWN CENTER
VINEYARD, UT
SITE PLAN

REVISION BLOCK		DESCRIPTION
#	DATE	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		

Scale: 1"=60'		Drawn: TMB	
Date: 4/16/20		Job #: 18-006	
Sheet:		1	




LAKEFRONT AT VINEYARD TOWN CENTER
VINEYARD, UT
PRELIMINARY PLAT

REVISION BLOCK		
#	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	10-1-82	10-1-82
2	10-1-82	10-1-82
3	10-1-82	10-1-82
4	10-1-82	10-1-82
5	10-1-82	10-1-82
6	10-1-82	10-1-82

PRELIMINARY
PLAT

Scale: 1"=50'	Drawn: DRP
Date: 03/24/20	Job #: 18-006

—



PRELIMINARY PLAT TABULATIONS

LOCATED IN:	VINEYARD, UTAH COUNTY, UTAH
ORIGINAL PROPERTY	15.91 ACRES
OPEN SPACE	4.07 ACRES
OPEN SPACE PERCENTAGE	25.6%
SINGLE FAMILY LOTS	7
CONDO BUILDINGS	14
TOTAL CONDO UNITS	140
TOWNHOME 6-PLEX UNITS	12
TOWNHOME 5-PLEX UNITS	25
TOWNHOME 4-PLEX UNITS	28
TOWNHOME 3-PLEX UNITS	6
TOTAL TOWNHOME UNITS	71
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS	218
TOTAL DENSITY	13.70 UNITS/ACRE
CONDO STALLS PROVIDED	280
CONDO GUEST STALLS PROVIDED	62
TOWNHOME STALLS PROVIDED	872
TOWNHOME GUEST STALLS PROVIDED	70
PUBLIC STALLS PROVIDED	28
TOTAL PARKING STALLS PROVIDED	1312



GRAPHIC SCALE




(IN FEET)
1 inch = 50 ft

GENERAL NOTE:

INFORMATION PROVIDED ON THIS PLAN IS BASED ON THE BEST AVAILABLE DATA AT THE TIME OF PREPARATION AND MAY CHANGE AT ANYTIME FOR ANY REASON. THIS PLAN IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY.




Know what's below.
Call 811 before you dig.




CONCEPT NARRATIVE RESIDENTIAL

LOCATED IN:		VINEYARD, UTAH	
CONDO UNITS		120	
TOWNHOME UNITS		88	
TOTAL UNITS		210	
GARAGE STALLS		296	
(2 PER TOWNHOME/SINGLE FAMILY UNIT; 1 PER CONDO UNIT)			
DRIVEWAY STALLS		296	
(2 PER TOWNHOME/SINGLE FAMILY UNIT; 1 PER CONDO UNIT)			
NEW PUBLIC STALLS		28	
(TO BE ADDED TO 300 W IN PHASES 5-9)			
GUEST PARKING STALLS		141	
TOTAL PRIVATE PARKING		592	
TOTAL GUEST & PUBLIC PARKING		169	
ADA CONDO BUILDINGS:		0	
<u>UNIT COUNT BEFORE:</u>		<u>UNIT COUNT AFTER:</u>	
PHASE 5 (1-E)	45	PHASE 5 (1-E)	30
PHASE 6 (1-F)	100	PHASE 6 (1-F)	105
PHASE 7 (1-G)	10	PHASE 7 (1-G)	20
PHASE 8 (1-H)	38	PHASE 8 (1-H)	17
PHASE 9 (1-I)	15	PHASE 9 (1-I)	14
		PHASE 16 (1-J)	22
PHASE 1 TOTAL:	208		208



LAKEFRONT AT VINEYARD TOWN CENTER site plan

VINEYARD CITY, UTAH COUNTY
6/10/2020
18-006






CONDO UNITS	120
TOWNHOME UNITS	66
TOTAL UNITS	186

TOTAL PRIVATE PARKING	504
TOTAL GUEST & PUBLIC PARKING	112

UNIT COUNT BEFORE: UNIT COUNT AFTER:

PHASE 5 (1-E)	45	PHASE 5 (1-E)	30
PHASE 6 (1-F)	100	PHASE 6 (1-F)	105
PHASE 7 (1-G)	10	PHASE 7 (1-G)	20
PHASE 8 (1-H)	38	PHASE 8 (1-H)	17
PHASE 9 (1-I)	15	PHASE 9 (1-I)	14

PHASE 1 TOTAL: 208 186




LAKEFRONT AT VINEYARD TOWN CENTER site plan

6/10/2020

18-006



0.0040) to 0.0060 Vol-% and Me₂SiO₂ (4.4 vol-% to 0.0060 Vol-%) to 0.0060 Vol-%. The concentration of the A (NO DISSOLV) was 0.0040 to 0.0060 Vol-%.




CONCEPT NARRATIVE RESIDENTIAL

LOCATED IN:		VINEYARD, UTAH	
CONDO UNITS		120	
TOWNHOME UNITS		88	
TOTAL UNITS		210	
GARAGE STALLS		296	
(2 PER TOWNHOME/SINGLE FAMILY UNIT; 1 PER CONDO UNIT)			
DRIVEWAY STALLS		296	
(2 PER TOWNHOME/SINGLE FAMILY UNIT; 1 PER CONDO UNIT)			
NEW PUBLIC STALLS		28	
(TO BE ADDED TO 300 W IN PHASES 5-9)			
GUEST PARKING STALLS		141	
TOTAL PRIVATE PARKING		592	
TOTAL GUEST & PUBLIC PARKING		169	
ADA CONDO BUILDINGS:		0	
UNIT COUNT BEFORE:		UNIT COUNT AFTER:	
PHASE 5 (1-E)	45	PHASE 5 (1-E)	30
PHASE 6 (1-F)	100	PHASE 6 (1-F)	105
PHASE 7 (1-G)	10	PHASE 7 (1-G)	20
PHASE 8 (1-H)	38	PHASE 8 (1-H)	17
PHASE 9 (1-I)	15	PHASE 9 (1-I)	14
		PHASE 16 (1-J)	22
PHASE 1 TOTAL:		208	208

Bailey Townhomes

Chantelle Townhomes

Aaron Condos



LAKEFRONT AT VINEYARD TOWN CENTER site plan



Ch(4)1J

Chantelle (4 Plex)
1 - J



Ch(5)1J

Chantelle (5 Plex)
1 - J



Ch(6)1J

Chantelle (6 Plex)
1 - J



Ch(4)1K

Chantelle (4 Plex)
1 - K



Ch(5)1K

Chantelle (5 Plex)
1 - K



Ch(6)1K

Chantelle (6 Plex)
1 - K



Ch(4)1L

Chantelle (4 Plex)
1 - L



Ch(5)1L

Chantelle (5 Plex)
1 - L



Ch(6)1L

Chantelle (6 Plex)
1 - L

NAMING KEY

BUILDING NAME
Chantelle

Plex Number
(3, 4, 5,...)

ELEVATION MATERIAL
1, 2, 3,...

COLOR PALETTE
J, K, L,...

PALETTE LEGEND

J Stone - White Sand Divino
Brick - Dartmouth
Shakes - Light Mist/Aged Pewter
Lap Siding - Cobblestone/Light Mist/Cobblestone
Stucco - Intellectual Gray
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B - Extra White
Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal

K Stone - White Sand Divino
Brick - Charcoal Smooth Norman
Shakes - Extra White
Lap Siding - Night Gray/Extra White/Light Mist
Stucco - Dorian Gray
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B - Night Gray/Extra White
Siding Trim - Extra White/Light Mist
Roof - Charcoal

L Stone - White Sand Divino
Brick - Canvas Boral Stone
Shakes - Night Gray/Cobblestone
Lap Siding - Extra White/Cobblestone/Night Gray/Aged Pewter
Stucco - Amazing Gray
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B - Cobblestone/Extra White/Aged Pewter
Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal



Ba(3)1A

Bailey (3 Plex)
1 - A



Ba(4)1A

Bailey (4 Plex)
1 - A



Ba(5)1A

Bailey (5 Plex)
1 - A



Ba(3)1B

Bailey (3 Plex)
1 - B



Ba(4)1B

Bailey (4 Plex)
1 - B



Ba(5)1B

Bailey (5 Plex)
1 - B



Ba(3)1C

Bailey (3 Plex)
1 - C



Ba(4)1C

Bailey (4 Plex)
1 - C



Ba(5)1C

Bailey (5 Plex)
1 - C

NAMING KEY

BUILDING NAME

Bailey

PLEX NUMBER

(1, 2, 3,...)

ELEVATION MATERIAL

1, 2, 3,...

COLOR PALETTE

A, B, C,...

PALETTE LEGEND

A

Stone - Slate Dry Stone
Shakes/Lap Siding - Night Gray
Stucco - Seaside
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B/Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal

B

Stone - Flint Hills Limestone
Shakes/Lap Siding - Cobblestone
Stucco - Gun Metal
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B/Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal

C

Stone - Echo Ridge Country LedgeStone
Shakes/Lap Siding - Adged Pewter
Stucco - Foghorn
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B/Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal



Ba(6)1A

Bailey (6 Plex)
1 - A



Ba(6)1B

Bailey (6 Plex)
1 - B



Ba(6)1C

Bailey (6 Plex)
1 - C

NAMING KEY

BUILDING NAME

Bailey

PLEX NUMBER

(1, 2, 3,...)

ELEVATION MATERIAL

1, 2, 3,...

COLOR PALETTE

A, B, C,...

PALETTE LEGEND

A Stone - Slate Dry Stone
Shakes/Lap Siding - Night Gray
Stucco - Seaside
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B/Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal

B Stone - Flint Hills Limestone
Shakes/Lap Siding - Cobblestone
Stucco - Gun Metal
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B/Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal

C Stone - Echo Ridge Country LedgeStone
Shakes/Lap Siding - Adged Pewter
Stucco - Foghorn
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B/Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal



Aa(10)1A

Aaron (10 Plex)
1 - A



Aa(10)2A

Aaron (10 Plex)
2 - A



Aa(10)3A

Aaron (10 Plex)
3 - A



Aa(10)1B

Aaron (10 Plex)
1 - B



Aa(10)2B

Aaron (10 Plex)
2 - B



Aa(10)3B

Aaron (10 Plex)
3 - B



Aa(10)1C

Aaron (10 Plex)
1 - C



Aa(10)2C

Aaron (10 Plex)
2 - C



Aa(10)3C

Aaron (10 Plex)
3 - C

NAMING KEY

BUILDING NAME

Aaron

Plex Number

(10, 12...)

ELEVATION MATERIAL

1, 2, 3,...

COLOR PALETTE

A, B, C,...

PALETTE LEGEND

A Stone - Slate Dry Stone
Shakes/Lap Siding - Night Gray
Stucco - Seaside
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B/Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal

B Stone - Flint Hills Limestone
Shakes/Lap Siding - Cobblestone
Stucco - Gun Metal
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B/Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal

C Stone - Echo Ridge Country LedgeStone
Shakes/Lap Siding - Adged Pewter
Stucco - Foghorn
Stucco Trim - Extra White
B&B/Siding Trim - Extra White
Roof - Charcoal

SITE PLAN NARRATIVE

Lakefront at Vineyard Town Center
LOCATED IN: VINEYARD, UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

	ORIGINAL	PROPOSED
ORIGINAL PROPERTY	15.91 ACRES	15.91 ACRES
OPEN SPACE	2.73 ACRES	3.85 ACRES
OPEN SPACE PERCENTAGE	17.2 %	24.2%
SINGLE FAMILY LOTS	15	7
CONDO BUILDINGS	10	13
TOTAL CONDO UNITS	100	130
TOWNHOME 6-PLEX UNITS	48	12
TOWNHOME 5-PLEX UNITS	30	25
TOWNHOME 4-PLEX UNITS	12	28
TOWNHOME 3-PLEX UNITS	3	6
TOTAL TOWNHOME UNITS	93	71
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS	208	208
TOTAL DENSITY	13.07 UNITS/ACRE	13.07 UNITS/ACRE
PARKING		
PUBLIC GUEST STALLS (300 WEST)	33	29
CONDO DRIVEWAY/GARAGE STALLS	200	260
CONDO GUEST STALLS	28	62
TOWNHOME DRIVEWAY/GARAGE PRIVATE STALLS	372	284
TOWNHOME GUEST STALLS	44	70
SINGLE FAMILY STALLS	60	28
TOTAL PARKING STALLS PROVIDED	737	733