

APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
APRIL 21, 2021

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on April 21, 2021 in an electronic meeting on the Zoom platform, viewable on the City's YouTube link, commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Vice-Chairwoman Christine Anderson
Chris Christiansen
Geoff Dupaix
Rod Brocious

Absent: Chairman John Woffinden
Ryan Hunter
Harold Dudley – present for part of meeting

Staff Present: Adam Olsen, City Planner
Wendelin Knobloch, Planner
Ben Hunter, Engineer
Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant

Others Present: Ken Berg, Ginger Romriell, Buck Swaney

Public Comments Received: None

Vice-Chairwoman Anderson referred to the "Notice of Electronic Meeting."

1. Hearing, review and action on the preliminary and final plats of Autumn Crest Phase 1 Plat E Subdivision, located in the vicinity of 930 East 1040 North

Mr. Olsen stated that Autumn Crest Subdivision was preliminarily approved in 2012 and 2015 but not all plats received final approval. The area of Plat E is one such example. The preliminary plan has lapsed, and the applicants have returned with a new preliminary plan and final plat for Plat E.

Access is provided off an existing stub-street, 1040 North. Plat E is an infill area of the Autumn Crest subdivision, consisting of 10 lots and located directly north of Plat A and west of Plat D. All lots meet or exceed the requirements of the R1-9,000 zone.

Mr. Ben Hunter said that the engineering division has reviewed the plans and they meet the requirements. Some roadway dedications to UDOT are being worked on, he recommended approval.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Ken Berg, civil engineer, indicated that Autumn Crest Plat F will be coming soon.

2

3 **Public Hearing Opened**

4 No comments were received.

5 **Public Hearing Closed**

6

7 **Mr. Brocious moved to approve the preliminary plan of Autumn Crest Plat E, subject to any**
8 **findings, conditions, and modifications found in the engineering report.**

9

10 **Mr. Dupaix seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

11

12	Christine Anderson	Aye
13	Chris Christiansen	Aye
14	Rod Brocious	Aye
15	Geoff Dupaix	Aye

16 **The motion passed.**

17

18

19 **Mr. Brocious moved to approve the final plat of Autumn Crest, Plat E, with the findings**
20 **listed in the staff report, and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications found in**
21 **the engineering report.**

22

23 **Mr. Dupaix seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

24

25	Christine Anderson	Aye
26	Chris Christiansen	Aye
27	Rod Brocious	Aye
28	Geoff Dupaix	Aye

29 **The motion passed.**

30

31

32

33 2. Review and action on the North Binch Annexation agreement located in the vicinity of 800
34 West 500 South

35

36 Mr. Olsen told commissioners that the North Binch Annexation consists of 26.02 acres and is
37 located in the area of 800 West 500 South, south of the Willow Glen townhome development.
38 Existing use of the area is agriculture. The City's Land Use Map designates the property as TOD
39 (Transit Oriented Development). Within that TOD designation, the property lies within the

APPROVED MINUTES

1 General Mixed-Use and Neighborhood Edge sub-designations, with density ranges of 8-20 du/ac
2 in the General Mixed-Use area and 4-14 du/ac in the Neighborhood Edge area. Rights-of-way
3 for 700 West and 620 South will be dedicated as part of the annexation and are identified in the
4 agreement. The annexation agreement is the first step toward ultimate development of the
5 property.

6 Mr. Ben Hunter said that there are rights-of-way to be dedicated, they are shown on the master
7 plan and meet the requirements shown in the street cross-sections. Developer may end up adding
8 another road for an adjoining development, engineering staff recommend approval.

9 Ms. Ginger Romriell, representing developer, agreed with staff's characterizations.

10 Mr. Brocious asked about the power and water easements that bisect the property, and if
11 anything regarding this is needed for the annexation.

12 Mr. Olsen replied that nothing further is needed for the annexation, easements will be addressed
13 in future submittals.

14 Mr. Ben Hunter added that annexation is to define the geographic boundaries of the property,
15 other issues and concerns will be addressed in the future.

16 Mr. Dupaix asked if there are any concerns with how the easement will affect the development
17 from an engineering point of view.

18 Mr. Ben Hunter replied that the developer is aware of the easements, they will probably put open
19 space or roadway in that area.

20 Mr. Brocious asked what the width of the easements are.

21 Mr. Ken Berg said that the water easement is 30 ft and the sewer is 20 ft. It will be reflected on
22 the drawings.

23

24 **Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the North Binch Annexation Agreement.**

25 **Mr. Dudley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

26 **Christine Anderson Aye**

27 **Chris Christiansen Aye**

28 **Rod Brocious Aye**

29 **Geoff Dupaix Aye**

30 **Harold Dudley Aye**

31 **The motion passed.**

32

33

34

APPROVED MINUTES

1 3. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 17.7.507.F.6 of the American Fork
2 City Municipal Code regarding building primary orientation

3
4 Mr. Olsen stated that the proposed City-initiated code text amendment deals with building
5 primary orientation for multi-family structures within the PC (Planned Community) zone. Staff
6 recommends that a building’s primary orientation, in addition to being “toward a street” be
7 expanded to include drive aisle, common area or other public or private open space. This will
8 allow buildings to orient toward open spaces (whether public or private), drive aisles as found in
9 traditional multi-family developments or public/private streets. In so doing, this will allow
10 greater flexibility in siting structures--as intended by the PC zone--and be similar to allowances
11 given for building placement in the TOD (Transit Oriented Development) zone.

12 Mr. Ben Hunter has no engineering concerns or comments.

13
14 **Public Hearing Opened**

15 No comments were received.

16 **Public Hearing Closed**

17
18 **Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the**
19 **Development Code.**

20 **Mr. Brocious seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

21	Christine Anderson	Aye
22	Chris Christiansen	Aye
23	Rod Brocious	Aye
24	Harold Dudley	Aye
25	Geoff Dupaix	Aye

26 **The motion passed.**

27
28
29 4. Hearing, review and action on an amendment to the Lake City Row Planned Community
30 Master Plan, located in the vicinity of 860 East Utah Valley Drive in the PC Planned
31 Community and the PI-1 Planned Industrial zones

32
33 Mr. Olsen reminded commissioners that this item was tabled at the April 7th Planning
34 Commission meeting. The Planning Commission requested additional information regarding the
35 shared parking areas, numbers of stalls included and any buffering proposals. Discussion
36 centered around shared parking, reduced housing units, and the appropriateness of office
37 warehouse uses in a mixed-use community setting. Staff remains opposed to the amended

APPROVED MINUTES

1 concept plan, for the same reasons as stated in the original memo and at meeting. Regardless of
2 any potential reduction in units, areas for shared parking or buffering, staff is of the feeling that
3 office warehouse is more conducive to an industrial or light industrial area, not a traditional
4 mixed use higher density development.

5 Lake City Row comprises of properties that were annexed under the Vest Annexation (2019).
6 The property was zoned PC (Planned Community) in anticipation of mixed-use development
7 consisting of office space, retail space, and higher density residential.

8 The Lake City Row master plan was approved in November 2019. The master plan envisioned
9 up to 2,500 residential units located both independently and within mixed-use commercial areas.
10 Additionally, areas of commercial office were approved as part of the overall master plan. The
11 applicants were also granted approval of a reduced parking ratio of 1.8 stalls per unit; provided
12 that a large area of shared parking would be present in-between office commercial and high
13 density residential, in order to provide overflow parking for the adjacent residential; the peak
14 demand for each use being offset. This area is called out as cross-hatched on both the original
15 (approved) plan and the proposed amended plan.

16 The applicants have proposed a change to the master plan, altering the “commercial” in Phase 1,
17 by removing the “office” designation and “2-5” story from the anticipated product type. In its
18 place, they propose a “1-5” story “commercial” building product type, consisting of office-
19 warehouse. Staff recommends against the proposed change. Following are reasons for such a
20 recommendation of denial:

21 The master plan approval granted a unit count of up to 2,500 units (corresponding overall density
22 of 25 du/ac) on the premise that this is a true mixed-use development. Office-warehouse uses are
23 typically found within largely industrial/light-industrial locations, not within traditional high
24 density mixed-use developments. Office and traditional commercial such as retail create the
25 mixed-use environment conducive for high density, where residents can conveniently access
26 workspaces and other traditional commercial and retail uses.

27 Parking requirements for the residential portions of the project were reduced from the City
28 standard of 2.25 stalls per unit, to 1.8 stalls per unit. This was based on a proposed count of
29 approximately 1,500 commercial parking spaces being provided from the commercial office area
30 in Phase 1. Office warehouse uses have a reduced parking requirement; warehouse portions
31 requiring only 1 space per 1,000 sq. ft. While the applicants propose a reduction in the number of
32 units from 2,500 to 2,250, the reduction in units is proposed in the northern area of Phase 3, well
33 outside of the area designated for shared parking space. Phase 3, directly adjacent to Phase 1 and
34 adjacent to the area proposed for shared parking has already received site plan approval for over
35 500 units at the ratio of 1.8 stalls per unit. Parking for the office use (Phase 1) adjacent to Phase
36 3 was intended to alleviate parking pressure from this area. Office warehouse use, if approved,
37 will reduce the number of shared parking spaces available. In addition, the remaining,
38 undeveloped Phase 3 is located north of Quality Drive. While the applicants state that parking

APPROVED MINUTES

1 pressure will be minimized by a decrease in units, there is still, in effect, approval to park at a
2 reduced 1.8 stalls per unit.

3 Staff is concerned that if the master plan is amended to allow office warehouse uses in Phase 1,
4 not only will the shared parking be greatly reduced, but additional requests may be made to
5 convert the remaining commercial areas to office-warehouse, which will further reduce the
6 intended mixed-use community that was promised with the original approval.

7 Mr. Buck Swaney, applicant, displayed maps of the original proposal and the amended proposal.
8 A shared parking amenity would be removed under the proposed amendment. Many of the
9 remaining apartments are larger (2-3 bedroom) and don't require any additional parking.
10 Originally this area was approved for a density of 50 units per acre because it was closer to the
11 shared parking. Actual density numbers along with a demand for use and parking have come
12 down so that the net result of the highest density phase in the development is that parking
13 demand has been reduced. Their shared parking easement with Twin Lab remains intact. Only a
14 portion of the planned shared parking would have been oriented for use by the apartments,
15 parking stalls in this area will reduce from 200 to 150. This is a minor reduction compared with
16 the reduction in demand. Regarding the area of 207 parking stalls – if the zoning were industrial
17 then 93 stalls would be required. They are providing almost double that amount to be used by
18 office space as well.

19 The proposed warehouse building will be glassy and have a high-quality finish. It is intended to
20 be highly usable and desirable as possible corporate headquarters. He then showed a table of
21 parking counts. The table named projects west of 860 East, the master plan had a deficit of 912
22 stalls. If office designation was allowed on all sites, 600 parking stalls would be required. Under
23 their proposal, density goes down to 31 units per acre and the plan reflects lighter parking use
24 because of larger units. The actual parking stall deficit would be 572. Shared stalls under an
25 office/flex use provide 453 spaces. The entire parking picture would end up with large decrease
26 in demand along with modest decrease in parking and still ends up with more parking than
27 expected.

28 Mr. Swaney discussed the issue of walkability, they propose significant pedestrian infrastructure.
29 He displayed a map of pedestrian use, their plans prioritize pedestrian connections along 860
30 East. He showed the site plan for the office/warehouse and pointed out walking connections
31 along 860 East and good pedestrian circulation.

32 He then spoke about buffering and asked what the planning commission would like to see. He
33 believes that distance will be a buffer for the parking areas, and he added that they could look at
34 landscaping for noise buffering.

35 Mr. Dupaix would like to see landscaping as a buffer along the roadway.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Swaney stated that they will do as much landscaping as they can responsibly and they can
2 add enhancements at the site plan level. They will use a landscape architect and defer to the
3 wishes of the planning commission.

4 Mr. Dupaix indicated that he's gone to the area several times with the map as a reference. It
5 looks like they are close to meeting the 1.8 parking standard. He references the development
6 across the city boundary in Pleasant Grove. There is an LDS church, a school (Liahona Prep
7 Academy), and other commercial development. This area is mostly industrial, with a church and
8 school. As you move east you get into higher-density housing. He feels comfortable allowing the
9 adjustments because he thinks the parking can work and he thinks it is more consistent to allow
10 the office/warehouse because it's what is already there. He doesn't see it as an issue. The whole
11 west side of the road is already office or industrial.

12 Vice-Chairwoman Anderson stated that she keeps going back to the basics that would make a
13 mixed-use area work. She sees a big difference between office/retail and office/warehouse. The
14 proposed changes would result in less office/retail space, fewer employment options for the
15 residents of the high-density area, increased truck traffic, and decreased parking availability. She
16 feels that the density in this area was approved on the basis that it would be mixed-use.

17 Mr. Dupaix knows what will be coming into the surrounding area and feels that the truck traffic
18 will be miniscule compared to what is going to be on 860 East. He doesn't feel the increase in
19 truck traffic will be substantial.

20 Vice-Chairwoman Anderson added that the idea of a mixed-use area is to bypass the traffic
21 problem by putting residential and commercial in close proximity so that driving is decreased.
22 She wants to support the developer as much as possible, but the commission's main
23 responsibility is to the residents.

24 Mr. Swaney clarified that this proposal is a less intense land use. Office use requires four stalls
25 per 1000 sf, this proposed adjustment would be less intense. Regarding walkability- everything
26 in this area is walkable to residents. That has always been the developer's intent.

27 Vice-Chairwoman Anderson asked if all of phase 3 has been approved.

28 Mr. Olsen replied that the lower portion below Quality Drive has been approved.

29 Vice-Chairwoman Anderson added that this part would be impacted by a change in parking.
30 They have already been approved for over 500 units and it seems likely they will come up short.

31 Mr. Swaney replied that there is a right-of-way on the west side of the parcel which is allocated
32 to the shared parking amenity. The final calculation was 1.97 stalls, it will be a couple of years
33 before it reaches capacity. This will be supplemented by shared parking that's already built, they
34 have the right-of-way leading to it.

35 Vice-Chairwoman Anderson asked other commissioners for their input.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Christiansen asked a question about the table displayed by Mr. Swaney. There appears to be
2 a typo in one of the numbers. He was not at the last meeting and he is hesitant. He doesn't feel
3 that this will mesh well like previous projects.

4 Mr. Brocious wasn't in attendance at the last meeting either, he feels that changing the
5 designation would result in less available parking. He feels that mixed-use will be more
6 appropriate for the project.

7 Vice-Chairwoman Anderson asked if planning staff would give an overview of their position for
8 those that were not able to attend the last meeting.

9 Mr. Olsen stated that Mr. Swaney has done a good job crunching the numbers and selling their
10 proposed amendment. Overall, office designation has a lower parking requirement than
11 commercial so there would be less area for shared parking. Staff feels that the proposed
12 amendment also goes against how it was sold and promoted as mixed-use. The developer wants
13 to change to office/warehouse and the city council will ultimately decide. As planning staff we
14 felt it went against the original proposal as parking stalls would be reduced while density
15 remained the same. Staff do not feel that the office/warehouse use is conducive to the mixed-use
16 vision. The planning commission tabled this at the last meeting because they wanted more
17 information about buffering and parking numbers, so Mr. Swaney agreed to come back tonight
18 with more details.

19 Mr. Swaney added that the developers originally desired to build office/retail on this site. They
20 were working toward this with Woodbury until COVID-19 pulled the carpet out from under
21 office use. Their proposed amendment is driven by economics and the unforeseen change from a
22 pandemic, not by being disingenuous or playing shell games. They agree that mixed-use is the
23 original intent, but this amendment is how they can keep the project going.

24 Mr. Dudley agrees that things have changed over the past year and the analysts aren't sure where
25 it will go. The state of Utah is reducing their office space by 50%. How do you plan for this new
26 situation? He agrees with both Mr. Dupaix and Vice-Chairwoman Anderson and also with Mr.
27 Olsen. He feels very torn about the decision. He believes that a decision needs to be made and
28 there are valid reasons to be on both the developer's side and city staff side. He doesn't know
29 what the right decision will be. He believes that industrial mixed-use developments can be done
30 right. He gives the example of such a development along Jordan Parkway at about 9000 South.
31 He feels this is very nicely done and can stay vibrant because it allows for a lot of uses such as
32 corporate headquarters, etc. He doesn't have a strong opinion either way.

33 Vice-Chairwoman Anderson expressed her high hopes for different areas of the city. This may
34 be an area where we have the option to make it a really nice mixed-use area, she wants to hold to
35 that. She doesn't know what the future looks like for office/warehouse, but she thinks they have
36 a responsibility to the residents to hold to the general plan.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Olsen stated that a quorum of four will be required to move this amendment forward. City
2 council will read the minutes and can reach out to staff for clarification and council will make
3 the final decision. This item will only move forward (approval or denial) with four votes. Five
4 commissioners are in attendance, so a vote does not need to be unanimous to move it forward.

5 Mr. Swaney gave final remarks by displaying an image of their proposed building. He indicated
6 that it is designed to function more as a corporate headquarters and will have a mixed-use
7 function.

8 Commissioners thanked him for his work.

9 Mr. Christiansen has listened to the views of his colleagues and feels that this amendment is
10 different from the original intent of the project. He pointed out that if commission agrees to the
11 change, we are locked in to the difference. If we stick with the original plan, we can always
12 change it later if the situation demands. He is leaning toward holding to the original intent.

13

14 Public Hearing Opened

15 No comments were received.

16 Public Hearing Closed

17

18

19 **Mr. Christiansen moved to recommend denial of the proposed Lake City Row master plan**
20 **amendment, with a finding that conversion of office commercial to office warehouse does**
21 **not follow the original intent to create a mixed-use community and the removal of “office”**
22 **from Phase 1 will reduce availability of parking intended as shared parking (as identified**
23 **in the original master plan).**

24 **Mr. Brocious seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

25	Christine Anderson	Aye
26	Chris Christiansen	Aye
27	Rod Brocious	Aye
28	Harold Dudley	Aye
29	Geoff Dupaix	Nay

30

31

The motion passed.

32

33

34

35

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.

2

3

4

5

6

7 Lisa Halversen

8 Administrative Assistant

