

**REGULAR MEETING
OF THE VINEYARD PLANNING COMMISSION,
Vineyard City Hall, 125 S Main St., Vineyard, Utah
Wednesday, October 21, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.**

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

Present

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

Absent

Commissioner Tim Blackburn

Other Commissioners Present: Alternate Amber Rasmussen

Staff Present: Community Development Director Morgan Brim, Planner II Briam Amaya Perez,
and Assistant City Engineer Chris Wilson

Others Present: Jason Peery with Circustrix and resident David Lauret

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jenkins called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

2. INVOCATION/INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHTS/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Jenkins asked Commissioner Bryce Brady for an innovation

3. OPEN SESSION

Chair Jenkins asked if anyone from the public had any questions for the open session.
Hearing none, he closed the open session.

4. MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL:

No minutes were presented for review and approval.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS:

No items of business were presented.

6. WORK SESSION

6.1 ZTA Parking Regulations: VZC 15.38.030(2)[c]

The applicant requested a code amendment to change the required amount of parking stalls required for his business.

Chair Jenkins turned the time over to Community Development Director Morgan Brim.

Mr. Brim explained that the purpose of this discussion is for a zoning text amendment for Jason Peery. Mr. Peery is wanting to build a pickleball facility but wants the parking code to be amended for this specific use. Currently, there is a requirement for 5 parking spaces per thousand square feet. Mr. Peery believes that a parking study would determine the actual need of space for this facility. Mr. Brim discussed similar parking requirements from Sandy, Logan, Saratoga Springs, and Lehi.

Chair Jenkins stated that he is typically against commercial parking minimums, as business owners know exactly how much parking they might need. Extra parking is costly for business owners

The applicant, Jason Peery, discussed his involvement in the indoor recreation sector. He is one of the co-owners of Circustrix, the largest indoor trampoline park company in the world. He believes that an indoor pickleball facility would be put to use by the community and be successful. He is concerned with purchasing more land than what is needed for his use, which he believes is 3 per thousand square feet. With 17 indoor courts, the facility would reach full capacity at 68 people. With this size of building, only 1 per thousand would be necessary for parking needs.

Commissioner Knighton stated that he agreed with Chair Jenkins. He stated he understands that parking requirements can be very restrictive. He does not want to over-pave and over-park. Counseled to be aware that parking may increase if tournament seating is included. He asked if this would be a staff administrative process. Mr. Brim indicated that the standard process would be to have a baseline up to 20%-25% could be reduced through a parking study and anything above that would be approved through the planning commission. The parking study would be submitted with the site plan.

Mr. Brim asked Mr. Peery if he intended on including tournament seating. The applicant responded that is not currently in the plans. Minimal seating will be included for the center court. He doesn't believe more than 100 spectators would be attending the facility.

Mr. Brim stated that the City could perform a parking study based on the proposed site plan. The City could make sure to account parking for all proposed uses within the facility. Mr. Peery stated that Ryan from Hales Engineering would be performing the parking study.

Mr. Brim discussed how parking uses in other categories such as restaurants need revision as different types of restaurants have different turnover times, thus requiring more or less parking than others.

Chair Jenkins stated that the City should be open to what the parking studies say. Where neighboring businesses exist, shared parking could be considered. Chair Jenkins asked for opinions from Commissioner Rasmussen and Commissioner Brady. Mr. Brady said that he believes most businesses know what they need and the city's role is to help them make good decisions regarding parking. He mentioned how different uses need different parking requirements such as a shooting range compared to an art facility. Ms. Rasmussen stated she was pro-parking study, but asked what happens if the parking study improperly predicts the amount of parking needed.

Mr. Brim stated several solutions in the case that parking problems surface. Retroactive planning might need to be adapted to fix issues that arise. It would be up to parking enforcement to regulate any overflow parking. From a legal aspect, if any issues arise after the plan has been improved, the city is not able to enforce any new rules. Mr. Peery stated that it is in their best interest to get the parking right. They want to avoid being forced to buy extra land.

Mr. Brim stated that the City has the benefit of having this proposal reviewed by a professional engineer. In the end, Staff will analyze the proposed parking strategy and make recommendations based on discovered issues. Ms. Rasmussen asked if the parking study would apply only for this business or if it would be applied to the whole City. Mr. Brim replied that by including it into the parking code, it would allow 4-5 different types of uses to apply for a parking reduction based off a parking study. Ms. Rasmussen asked if the city would pay for the study or the business. Mr. Brim stated that the applicant would pay for the parking study.

Chair Jenkins asked if the facility includes tennis and restaurants also. The applicant responded only pickleball courts with food trucks. He compared this to a Chicken and Pickle.

Chair Jenkins indicated that he was in favor of a parking reduction as long as a parking study was included. Similarly, if someone was to overbuild parking, Chair Jenkins would want a study done to determine if that is actually needed.

Mr. Brim informed Mr. Peery that we will put this on the agenda for a public hearing for November 4th. He asked Mr. Peery to have a parking study prepared before the public hearing.

Chair Jenkins concluded by speaking for the counsel saying that they are flexible and open to new, and innovative businesses.

6.2 ZTA Front Yard Parking Coverage: VZC 15.38.030(2)[b]

Chair Jenkins turned the time over to staff to present the next issue.

Mr. Brim detailed the history regarding the code on front yard parking coverage. He read this part of the code into the record: “parking shall not exceed a maximum of thirty- five percent (35%) of the front yard area, except on lots less than seven thousand (7,000) square feet in which case the excess vehicle and visitor parking may be located on up to fifty percent (50%) of the front yard. This standard is similar to most cities in the valley. Except that other cities were developed historically, meaning that they had a main street and downtown with .5-1-acre farmland around. Vineyard meanwhile was built much more compact. The code reflects a standard adopted long ago when lots were much larger.

Mr. Brim stated that this code has created some issues in that historically the building and planning department didn’t enforce this code. Due to this being an administrative error, we can no longer retroactively deny already approved building permits and cause residents to take out hardscape in their front yards.

Mr. Brim also included that because the city’s housing program allows for accessory dwelling units, more hardscape is necessary to accommodate needed parking. Accessory dwelling units are beneficial to the city in that they help resident supplement their income and also provides more housing availability within the city. He said that the city believes that making both size standards the same easier administratively as well as ease the code for larger lots. This would not cause issues with storm water capacity. He asked the commission how they feel about the increased size of hardscape for larger lots.

Chair Jenkins asked Mr. Brim if a permit is need to pour cement. Mr. Brim stated that it is not. Nevertheless, the City wants to encourage anyone who wants to pour additional cement that this action should be discussed with the city engineer or their designee. This could be written into the city code. A public education outreach could be commenced to reestablish where the threshold is.

Ryan Erdmann came to the pulpit. He lives in the Willows. He decided to move to the Willows from Bridgeport due to the availability of larger lots. Expressed support for the 50% parking across the board. Additional parking space would allow for accommodating ADU tenants and their guests, and safer streets for their children. Expressed frustration for how the ordinance measures the front yard-based on the face of the house closet to the street. Mr. Brim suggested that the code should measure front yards from the

corners of the house out the entire width of the property. This would require a change in the definition of front yard.

Ms. Rasmussen expressed concern that the code, as written, may prefer wealthier residents and provide an added benefit. Mr. Knighton expressed that concrete does not determine aesthetics. A front yard which is 50% paved will not negatively affect aesthetics. This regulation significantly provides moderate income housing stock.

Mr. Erdmann spoke to a parking issue in Windsor with driveways that are too short. To secure safety, he encouraged the City to require developers to design house with driveways that are long enough to comfortably accommodate cars.

A conversation regarding the process for submitting a code enforcement complaint regarding illegal ADUS and driveway coverage ensued.

Commissioner Sullivan expressed support for an Assemble Poll regarding public sentiment regarding ADU's. She also expressed support for the 50% driveway coverage.

A conversation ensued regarding the management of public versus private streets. Mr. Brim stated that the City cannot prohibit parking on private streets.

Commissioner Rasmussen asked Mr. Erdmann if he feels that the general public understand why the City designed narrow streets and created what could be considered strict parking requirements.

Bryce Brady suggested that when the Assemble poll is sent out, residents should submit first what neighborhood they reside in. Chair Jenkins suggested that any questions in the poll should remove emotions.

6.3 ZTA Home Occupations: VZC 15.34.150

The core of this issue was previously well discussed. It was included in this discussion so that the issue is not forgotten on the staff agenda.

6.4 ZTA Accessory Structures within Side Yards: VZC 15.34.030

Chair Jenkins introduced the subject and then turned the time to Mr. Brim to explain. Requests have been made to allow detached garages in side yards in places such as James Bay and Holdaway Cove. Accessory buildings in side lots of corner lots cannot exceed a height limit of 10'. Mr. Brim suggested that this should be revisited. This text amendment could limit it to detached garages only.

Chair Jenkins stated that staff should ask themselves what they are trying to avoid when scripting this code.

7. COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS AND EX PARTE DISCUSSION DISCLOSURE

Commissioner Knighton thanked Ryan Erdmann for showing up to the meeting and encourage all Vineyard residents to come speak to the City whenever a concern arises. They will be heard.

Mr. Brim stated that the Planning Department will have a meeting once a year discussing the goals and plans of the General Plan.

Chair Jenkins called for a motion to close the meeting.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BRADY MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. VICE-CHAIR KNIGHTON SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL WENT AS FOLLOWS: CHAIR JENKINS, COMMISSIONER BRYCE BRADY, COMMISSIONER SHAN SULLIVAN, ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER TAY GUDMUNDSON, VICE CHAIR KNIGHTON, AND ALTERNATE JESSICA WELCH VOTED AYE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

MINUTES APPROVED: December 2, 2020

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Cache J. Hancey

Cache J. Hancey, Planning Technician