PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
Thursday, June 21, 2018
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Herriman Planning Commission shall assemble for a meeting in the City Council Chambers, located at 5355 W Herriman Main Street, Herriman, Utah.

6:00 PM - Work Meeting (Fort Herriman Conference Room)
1. Review of landscaping and other items for JCW's
   File Number: C2018-15
2. Review of landscaping and other items for Les Schwab
   File Number: C2018-18
3. Review of updates to Section 3 of the Engineering Standards
4. Review of City Council Decisions
5. Review of Agenda Items

7:00 PM - Regular Planning Commission Meeting
1. Call to Order
   1.1 Invocation/Thought/Reading and Pledge
   1.2 Roll call
   1.3 Approval of Minutes for: 04/05/18, 04/19/18, 05/03/18
   1.4 Conflicts of Interest

2. Administrative Items
   Administrative items are reviewed based on standards outlined in the ordinance. Public comment may be taken on relevant and credible evidence regarding the applications compliance with the ordinance.
   2.1 Request: Plat Amendment for a Lot Line Adjustment
      Applicant: Ben Johnson, property owner
      Address: 5937 W 12900 South
      Zone: A-.25 (Agricultural – 10,000 sq. ft. min.)
      Acres: 1.25
      File Number: S2018-13

   2.2 Request: One Lot Subdivision for an LDS Seminary
      Applicant: Evans & Associates Architecture
      Address: 14000 S Autumn Crest Blvd
      Zone: A-1 (Agricultural – 1 acre min.)
      Acres: 1.097
      File Number: S2018-11

   2.3 Request: Site Plan Review for an LDS Seminary
      Applicant: Evans & Associates Architecture
      Address: 14000 S Autumn Crest Blvd
      Zone: A-1 (Agricultural – 1 acre min.)
2.4 Request: Preliminary Plat Approval for 116 Single Family Lots in Creek Ridge West
   Applicant: Edge Homes
   Address: 6400 W Herriman Pkwy
   Zone: R-2-10 (Medium Density Residential)
   Acres: 25
   File Number: S2018-01

2.5 Request: Final Planned Unit Development Approval for 116 Single Family Lots in Creek Ridge West
   Applicant: Edge Homes
   Address: 6400 W Herriman Pkwy
   Zone: R-2-10 (Medium Density Residential)
   Acres: 25
   File Number: C2014-09-01

2.6 Request: Two Lot Subdivision for an LDS Church/Stake Center
   Applicant: BHD Architects
   Address: 5661 W 12900 South
   Zone: A-.50 and A-1 (Agricultural)
   Acres: 7.3
   File Number: S2018-12

2.7 Request: Conditional Use Permit for an LDS Church/Stake Center
   Applicant: BHD Architects
   Address: 5661 W 12900 South
   Zone: A-.50 and A-1 (Agricultural)
   Acres: 7.3
   File Number: C2018-27

3. Legislative Items
   Legislative items are recommendations to the City Council. Broad public input will be taken and considered on each item. All legislative items recommended at this meeting will be scheduled for a decision at the next available City Council meeting.

3.1 Request: Text change to the Land Development Code Chapter 16, Table of Uses (Public Hearing) ***CANCELED***
   Applicant: Herriman City
   File Number: Z2018-12

4. Chair and Commission Comments

5. Future Meetings

5.1 City Council – Wednesday, June 27, 2018 @ 7:00 PM ***CANCELED***
5.2 Planning Commission Meeting – July 5, 2018 @ 7:00 PM ***CANCELED***
5.3 Planning Commission Meeting – July 19, 2018 @ 7:00 PM

6. Adjournment

The Planning Commission Rules of Procedure and Ethical Conduct can be found on the City website at www.herriman.org
In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, Herriman City will make reasonable accommodation for participation in the meeting. Request assistance by contacting Herriman City at (801) 446-5523 and provide at least 48 hours advance notice of the meeting.

**ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION:** Members of the planning commission may participate electronically via telephone, Skype, or other electronic means during this meeting.

**PUBLIC COMMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE:** The purpose of public comment is to allow citizens to address items on the agenda. Citizens requesting to address the commission will be asked to complete a written comment form and present it to Wendy Thorpe, Deputy Recorder. In general, the chair will allow an individual three minutes to address the commission. A spokesperson, recognized as representing a group in attendance, may be allowed up to five minutes. This policy also applies to all public hearings.

I, Wendy Thorpe, certify the foregoing agenda was emailed to at least one newspaper of general circulation within the geographic jurisdiction of the public body. The agenda was also posted at the principal office of the public body, on the Utah State Website [www.utah.gov/gov/index.html](http://www.utah.gov/gov/index.html) and on Herriman City's website [www.herriman.org](http://www.herriman.org).

*Posted and Dated this 15th day of June, 2018*

Wendy Thorpe
Deputy Recorder
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Thursday, April 5, 2018
Awaiting Formal Approval

The following are the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting held on Thursday, April 5, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. in the Herriman City Community Center, 5355 W. Herriman Main Street (12090 South), Herriman, Utah. Adequate notice of this meeting, as required by law, was posted in the Community Center, on the City’s website, and delivered to members of the Commission and media.

**Presiding:** Chris Berber

**Commission Members Present:** Adam Jacobson, Jackson Ferguson, Lorin Palmer, Andrew Powell, Andrea Bradford

**Council Members Absent:** Jessica Morton, Curtis Noble

**City Staff Present:** City Planner Michael Maloy, Community Outreach Coordinator Sandra Llewelyn, Communications Specialist Jon LaFollette, Planner Craig Evans, Assistant City Engineer Jonathan Bowers, City Attorney John Brems, and Deputy City Recorder Wendy Thorpe.

6:00 PM - **Work Meeting** *(Fort Herriman Conference Room)*
Meeting commenced at 6:02 p.m.

1. **Training – Planning Commission Orientation**
All the members present at the work meeting introduced themselves. City Planner Michael Maloy began by mentioning a recent Land Development Code adopted by the city. Within that code, there are more engineering requirements and application materials. This may be a bit of a transition process as many developers are used to the old system. In addition, some of these developers became vested in the City with the old process, and will use that still as promised. There will be a balance now between the ideal system and what a developer was promised. The City will conduct an internal review of each application. The departments will be given two weeks to review and add comments. Once this period is over, the developer will be called in to discuss the comments with the City before it goes before the commission. Some projects require a public hearing notice and the Commission wants to make these deadlines for the developers.
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City Planner Michael Maloy continued with an explanation of the agenda planning deadlines and the packet disbursement. If there are questions with the packet, he recommended contacting Assistant City Planner McCarty or Planner Craig Evans. The binders contained recently updated policies and procedures, maps, and other important updated information. He explained the protocol for alternates. The alternate who is a voting member of the Commission will sit on the Dias. The others would sit in the audience. Planner Evan would send out the Notice of Decision the day after the meeting. If appeal is filed, they are heard by a hearing officer and ultimately may be heard in a District Court. If Commissioners are named in appeal, the City would provide legal support. The decisions made are based on ordinances and the General Plan. The city would provide ongoing training and a free membership to the American Planning Association. This provides free online access to trainings and other online amenities. It was also mentioned that the City has the possibility to send two of the planners to a national conference next year.

City Planner Maloy reminded everyone to sign the roll every week for attendance and let staff know if commissioners will miss meetings. City Planner Maloy mentioned that there is a new code on the front page of the packet. The packets, meeting minutes and agendas are all on the website. Another recommended resource for the Commissioners would be the Utah State Public Notice website. Commissioners should not discuss issues away from meetings, in person or on social media. They were instructed to direct any residents with questions to call City staff. If there is a Conflict of Interest, it needs to be stated at each meeting. On a side note of duties, the City recently was divided into districts. Also, staff reports will explain expectation of the Planning Commission. Another note for the Commissioners to remember is that they do not look at financials, which is for the City Council to configure.

2. Review of Council Decisions

3. Review of Agenda Items

2.1 Before discussing the specifics, City Planner Maloy reminded the commissioners that the best manners when the public are commenting is to not engage with them and allow them to state their opinions. The staff would announce the items and the Communications team would track comment time on screen.

The discussion turned to subdivisions. City Planner Maloy affirmed that subdivisions are permitted if they meet the standards. The lot must be legally subdivided to have a house built. Commissioner Jacobson asked a few questions of clarification about the standards. John mentioned that building permits should be submitted for legal lots only. City Planner Michael Maloy stated that the staff would look into the best policy for title searches. The City is able to search far back and find whether or not a property was created under subdivision regulations. The group looked over a picture of certain land area to determine how it would be split up between roads and home properties. Assistant City Engineer Jonathan Bowers drew lines to show where the home lots and trails intersect. The property not on the trail will be vacated and deeded to landowners. Commissioner Jacobson asked about the potential flooding issues in the discussed area. City Planner Maloy and Engineer Bowers explained bermsing would assist in drainage and avoid downhill flooding issues. Commissioner Jacobson stressed that this specific issue needs to be addressed now. Drainage issues should be fixed before vacating lots back to landowners.

2.2 The Commission discussed the approval of 29 single lots. City Planner Maloy pointed out that this is in the
April 5, 2018 – Planning Commission Minutes

A-.25 zone. They begin at 8.25 acres and can expand later. There are three elements the landowners are applying for with this proposal. Engineer Bowers mentioned that the southeast corner appears to need grade for storm drain issues. It is possible that there will be a full retention, making the space much bigger than currently seen. Lot 17 would be impacted in that scenario. The storm drain would need to be tied in through a 20-foot trail in the area.

7:00 PM - Regular Planning Commission Meeting

1. Call to Order
   Chair Chris Berbert called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

   1.1 Invocation/Thought/Reading and Pledge
      Scout Jeffrey Lindon Jones led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

   1.2 Roll call
      The full quorum was present for the meeting. Commissioners Jessica Morton and Curtis Noble were absent.

1.3 Approval of Minutes for: February 1, 2018
   Commissioner Bradford moved to recommend approval of item 1.3 Minutes for: February 1, 2018. Commissioner Jacobson seconded the motion.

   The vote was recorded as follows:
   Commissioner Andrea Bradford      Aye
   Commissioner Adam Jacobson        Aye
   Commissioner Jackson Ferguson     Aye
   Commissioner Lorin Palmer         Aye
   Commissioner Andrew Powell        Aye

   The motion passed with a 5:0 vote.

1.4 Conflicts of Interest
   Commissioner Lorin Palmer mentioned that he used to be involved in item 2.2 in the community, but that the ties no longer remain. Commissioner Adam Jacobson mentioned that he lives in the area next to the land discussed in 2.2.

2. Administrative Items
   Administrative items are reviewed based on standards outlined in the ordinance. Public comment may be taken on relevant and credible evidence regarding the applications compliance with the ordinance.

   Chair Chris Berbert explained procedures for public hearings.

2.1 Request: Proposed One-Lot Subdivision (Public Hearing)
   Applicant: Jory Dalling
   Address: 6308 W 14300 S
   Zone: A-.25
   Acres: 1
   File Number: S2018-005
Chair Chris Berbert opened the discussion on this item. City Planner Maloy explained the proposal with a presentation. He explained that the request was a resident hoping to create a one-acre lot to build one home on with a hammerhead turn around. Approval from the neighbor had already been received. Berming had also been requested to prevent water run-off. The single-family home plat needed approval before the building process could begin.

Applicant Jory Dalling approached and had no specific comments aside from what had already been presented.

Chair Berbert opened the Public Hearing.

There were no comments offered.

Chair Berbert declared the Public Hearing closed.

Attorney John Brems explained that a continuance had been requested by proposal.

Commissioner Jacobson moved to continue without a date for staff-recommend approval of item 2.1 for Proposed One Lot Subdivision. Commissioner Lorin Palmer seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Commissioner Andrea Bradford    Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson      Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson   Aye
Commissioner Lorin Palmer       Aye
Commissioner Andrew Powell      Aye

The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.

2.2 Request: Proposed Subdivision of 31 single-family lots (Public Hearing)
Applicant: Carmen Freeman
Address: 6000 W 13200 S
Zone: 16.35
File Number: S2018-006

Assistant City Planner McCarty informed the Commission that this item has been noticed for a Public Hearing. She oriented the Commission with the A-.25 zone information. Any development has an A-.25 zone density requirement. She explained that the staff recommendation and density requirements have been met. Currently there is a trail on the south side with retention area. She showed the layout with pictures and reaffirmed that street lights would eventually need to be added. The ordinance would also require a semi-private, six-foot slotted vinyl fence south of the trail. A public hearing had already taken place on the matter and the associated minutes were included in the packet given to each commissioner. An additional point brought up briefly was that there would be no driveways on 6000 west.

Chair Chris Berbert invited the applicant to podium. Mr. Cory Shoop approached with the architects and
designers representing Carmen Freeman. He believed resident concerns had all been met at the neighborhood meeting. Some of the concerns were regarding the size of lots, fencing and looking forward to the changes.

Chair Chris Berbert opened the Public Hearing.

No comments were offered.

Chair Berbert closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Jacobson mentioned that typically at this point a Master Plan should have been created. He was curious what the timing would be on the plan. He also questioned if there were plans for a curb, gutter and sidewalk. He mentioned his concern with potential impact to the nearby school and also asked if a traffic study could be completed. Andy clarified that the goal for the future is a subdivision.

Applicant Cory Shoop approached the stand and thanked the Planning Commission for their concerns. He first addressed the question regarding Parcel A and the vacant adjacent pieces of land. He mentioned that the current owner has no desire to develop at this time. If it were to be developed in the future, it would be after the owner’s passing when the land fell to a new owner. If there were to be an intersection in the future, his guess would be that it would align with 5600 West. Commissioner Jacobson voiced his concern about transportation issues with backup traffic at the drop off and pick up locations for the bordering school. Applicant Cory Shoop had previously discussed this with City Engineer Blake Thomas. The residents mentioned not wanting traffic to go on the existing roads and for this reason Applicant Cory Shoop added the south access road. He also stated that a retention pond could be extended. Chair Chris Berbert asked him to clarify the density table.

Commissioner Jacobson reiterated that he wanted to include a traffic study. Chair Chris Berbert mentioned that he didn’t think 31 lots could have much impact on traffic. However, Commissioner Jacobson was concerned that the traffic would cut through the neighborhood. Engineer Jonathan Bowers stated that a traffic study had not been done but that the standard could allow for a study. The engineering department did not see a need for a traffic study but the Planning Commission could request one to be completed. If 100 trips per day are anticipated then a traffic study could be requested. Commissioner Andy Powell mentioned his concerns with the school entrance. Carmen Freeman asked if a potential second access would be required. Assistant City Planner McCarty McCarty responded in the negative. The cul-de-sac could be closed off on the end but this could also create more problems in the end as well. Commissioner Ferguson mentioned that school parents might park along road. Commissioner Jacobson also voiced his concern with the school proximity.

Commissioner Jacobson moved to continue without a date for the area highlighted on the map and to mitigate transportation. This included item 2.2 for Proposed Subdivision of 31 single family lots. Commissioner Powell seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Commissioner Andrea Bradford  Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Lorin Palmer  Aye
2.3 Request: Proposed Plat Amendment to the Anthem Commercial Plat for a lot line adjustment and to add one lot (Public Hearing)
   Applicant: Anthem Center LLC
   Address: 5264 W Anthem Peak Lane
   Zone: C-2
   Acres: 8.06
   File Number: S2017-028-01

Assistant City Planner McCarty informed the Commission that this item had been noticed for a Public Hearing. She oriented the Commission with staff recommendations. Applicant Trish Smith with the Anthem approached the podium and stated she was available for questions.

Chair Chris Berbert opened the Public Hearing.

There were no comments offered.

Chair Chris Berbert closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Andy Powell moved to recommend Approval of item 2.3 for Proposed Plat Amendment to the Anthem Commercial Plat for a lot line adjustment and to add one lot. Commissioner Jacobson seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Commissioner Andrea Bradford Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson Aye
Commissioner Lorin Palmer Aye
Commissioner Andrew Powell Aye

The motion passed with a 5:0 vote.

2.4 Request: Proposed Subdivision Amendment to add 1 lot (Public Hearing)
   Applicant: Kim Rindlisbacher
   Address: 15000 S Academy Parkway
   Zone: C-2
   Acres: .74
   File Number: S2018-002-01

Assistant City Planner McCarty informed the Commission that this item had been noticed for a Public Hearing. She oriented the Commission with proposal and staff recommendation. Applicant Kim Rindlisbacher with Scenic Development explained the possible commercial properties such as Starbucks and Burger King, who like to maintain ownership of their properties.

Chair Chris Berbert opened the Public Hearing.
Chair Chris Berbert closed the Public Hearing

*Commissioner Palmer moved to recommend Approval of item 2.4 for Proposed Subdivision Amendment to add one lot. Commissioner Ferguson seconded the motion.*

The vote was recorded as follows:

- Commissioner Andrea Bradford  Aye
- Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye
- Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
- Commissioner Lorin Palmer  Aye
- Commissioner Andrew Powell  Aye

The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.

2.5 Request: Final Planned Unit Development approval of 600 apartment units as part of the South Hills Master Development Agreement

- Applicant: Camelot South Hills LLC
- Address: 14700 S Academy Parkway
- Zone: R-2-15
- Acres: 31
- File Number: C2008-044-05

Assistant City Planner McCarty explained the proposal and the staff recommendations. The location would be across the street from the RSL Academy. She presented color renderings, floor plans, and a density tracking summary. The setbacks were also determined.

Applicant John Lindsley represented the Camelot homes and mentioned that the crew had taken into consideration the design and information associated with the RSL Academy. Appearance has been created to be modern and cutting edge with the product. He also explained the micro grid with Rocky Mountain Power. The goal was to create a green community with recycling bins and other amenities that will hopefully attract a tech crowd. The curb, gutter, sidewalk and roads will all be in place. He mentioned that all necessary documentation has been supplied to the City. The 35-percent open-space requirement has also been met. Commissioner Jacobson mentioned that 50-percent of a building would be required to be built up before adding the parking areas. He then clarified with John Lindsley on if he would anticipate an approval of the elevations. John Lindsley responded that elevations are not required for approval, but would submit them with the building permit. Commissioner Jacobson asked if the Commission could put the additional changes into the approval process, such as the electrical and other environmental-friendly aspects. John Lindsley commented that he would agree to what has already been approved, rather than adding additional approval steps that may then become difficult during the construction process. The amenities would be constructed when half of the apartments have been built. Commissioner Jacobson asked for clarification on how this model would differ from the original Four Seasons complex in Logan, Utah. John Lindsley stated that this model will be more modern in look and feel as well as have a more environmental aspect. Commissioner Jacobson commented on his preference that those differing aspects be added to the approval forms for clarification. The applicant mentioned that there would be
enough sidewalks in the area, and is happy to address any other issues as the process proceeds.

Commissioner Jacobson moved to recommend Approval of item 2.5 for Final Planned Unit Development approval of 600 apartment units as part of the South Hills Master Development Agreement with an adjustment to number 11; the staff recommendations will be constructed like 4 Seasons and show adherence towards element to include regarding energy efficiency solar elements. Commissioner Andy seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Commissioner Andrea Bradford  Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Lorin Palmer  Aye
Commissioner Andrew Pavell  Aye
The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.

2.6  Request: Proposed 2 lot subdivision  (Public Hearing)
    Applicant: Camelot South Hills LLC
    Address: 14700 S Academy Parkway
    Zone: R-2-15
    Acres: 45.57
    File Number: S2018-007

Assistant City Planner McCarty informed the Commission that this item had been noticed for a Public Hearing. She oriented the Commission. The applicant John Lindsley had nothing specific to add.

Chair Chris Berbert opened the Public Hearing.

There were no comments offered.

Chair Chris Berbert closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Ferguson asked for clarification on whether or not the new developers would adhere to the same HOA and current approved processes. He mentioned that the current formats are wonderfully done and he hoped that the next set would adhere to the same requirements. John Lindsley and Assistant City Planner McCarty both affirmed that although the future section might differ in housing type (i.e. town homes), it would go through the same approval process. The guidelines would remain.

Commissioner Jackson moved to recommend Approval of item 2.6 for Proposed 2 lot subdivision. Commissioner Jacobson seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Commissioner Andrea Bradford  Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Lorin Palmer  Aye
4. **Chair and Commission Comments**
Commissioner Jacobson requested information regarding title search history by city staff.

5. **Future Meetings**
   5.1 City Council – Wednesday, April 11, 2018 @ 7:00 PM
   5.2 Planning Commission Meeting – April 19, 2018 @ 7:00 PM

6. **Adjournment**
Commissioner Jacobson moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting. The meeting adjourned at 8:07 pm.

I, Wendy Thorpe, Deputy City Recorder for Herriman City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on April 5, 2018. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Herriman City Planning Commission Meeting.

[Signature]

Wendy Thorpe
Deputy City Recorder
The following are the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting held on Thursday, April 19, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. in the Herriman City Community Center, 5355 W. Herriman Main Street (12090 South), Herriman, Utah. Adequate notice of this meeting, as required by law, was posted in the Community Center, on the City’s website, and delivered to members of the Commission and media.

Presiding: Chair Jessica Morton

Commission Members Present: Chris Berbert, Andrea Bradford, Curt Noble, Andrew Powell, Adam Jacobson, Jackson Ferguson and Brody Rypien

City Staff Present: City Planner Michael Maloy, Assistant City Planner Bryn McCarty, Communications Specialist Jon LaFollette, Planning Coordinator Craig Evans, City Engineer Blake Thomas, Assistant City Engineer Jonathan Bowers, City Recorder Jackie Nostrom, City Attorney John Brems, Water Manager Luke Sieverts, and Community Development Coordinator Sandra Llewellyn.

6:00 PM - Work Meeting (Fort Herriman Conference Room)
Chair Jessica Morton called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

1. Discussion of the Herriman Crossroads Development
City Planner Michael Maloy offered a brief overview of the proposed Herriman Crossroads Development proposal and the approval process for a development agreement. He explained this project already has density approvals and the applicant is willing to reconsider plans. Applicant Ken Olsen presented an overview of the different pods throughout the development and noted they would look to include townhomes in the development rather than apartments. He observed the 45 acres of commercial property which is more than what would be required. Mr. Olsen oriented the Commission of the location of the development as requested by Commissioner Andrew Powell. Commissioner Brody Rypien asked if traffic would be able to be diverted through the development because of congestion along Redwood Road. Mr. Olsen confirmed and noted of the Utah Department of Transportation access that had already been granted.
Planner Maloy indicated the first part of the development agreement would lock in the zoning, required amenities and the lifestyle living. Mr. Olsen explained the change to a more traditional architectural style to accommodate a mountain resort theme and reviewed the proposed concept designs for the two story townhomes. He depicted the metal or cement proposed fencing for the project and reviewed the natural features of the development that would incorporate into the Herriman Trails Master Plan. Mr. Olsen suggested the project would be a 10-15 year buildout for the project.

Planner Maloy stated the key exchange for the discussion would be to review that the development agreement would conceptually lock in the zoning and would commit the developer to commit to a phased schedule, certain materials would be required, and the amenities that would be incorporated into the project. This development would move away from a large apartment complex to one of a mixed use approach. Mr. Olsen added this project would look to attract individuals who would like a more active community lifestyle with commercial in the vicinity. Planner Maloy anticipated scheduling this project for a future meeting for continued discussion. Commissioner Rypien asked if the agreement would cover system improvements or more project improvements and be allowed impact fee credits. Assistant City Planner Bryn McCarty reviewed the infrastructure that would be eligible for impact fee reimbursements. She noted the amenities throughout the project would be private; however, the trails would be open to the public. Commissioner Curtis Noble asked of the location for the proposed fencing. Mr. Olsen responded the fence would be installed along Redwood Road and along the Jacob Welby Canal for safety measures. Planner Maloy added the Development Agreement would depict fencing requirements. Assistant Planner McCarty informed the Commission they would still have to review and approve each pod. Commissioner Chris Berbert expressed his concern of the fencing being too close to the busy road. Mr. Olsen anticipated the location of the location of the fencing and street lights would be a great distance from Redwood Road.

2. Review of City Council Decisions
City Planner Maloy informed the Commission the City Council adopted the General Plan Amendment with all ten areas being considered commercial primarily because of potential opportunities. He noted they would look at all areas of the City with the forthcoming amendment. The amendment would look at moving against multi-family and reviewing all of the commercial zoning throughout the City to find the correct balance.

Planner Maloy indicated the City has been working on the next year fiscal budget and noted the continued support of Planning Commission trainings.

3. Review of Agenda Items
   2.1 Proposed One lot Subdivision for Jory Dalling
Planner Maloy indicated the proposed one lot subdivision for Jory Dalling had been revised to address engineering concerns.

   2.2 Proposed Subdivision of 30 single family lots for Carmen Freeman
Planner Maloy observed the future plans for this property including the cul-de-sac. He noted the trail connection throughout the development and added the trail could not be used for educational safe walking routes.
2.3 Conditional Use Permit for Ace Hardware for Brad Murdock
Assistant City Planner McCarty indicated the Ace Hardware addressed the fencing and building material concerns expressed at the previous meeting.

2.4 Conditional Use Permit for a Gorilla Car Wash and Grease Monkey Quick Lube for Steve Cloward
Assistant City Planner McCarty reviewed the conditional use permit and reviewed the issues pertaining to the elevations, parking, fencing and landscaping that had been addressed.

2.5 Conditional Use Permit for a Holiday Oil Gas Station/Convenience Store for John Linton
Assistant City Planner McCarty oriented the Commission of the location of the Holiday Oil gas station adjacent to Academy Parkway and noted the building would have 60-percent brick or stone on the front and any side elevation visible from the street. The proposed elevations showed compliance. She reviewed the proposed site plan indicating that parking requirements would be adhered. The applicant had provided additional landscaping along 15000 South to mitigate any noise and light pollution that may affect abutting residential properties. The proposed site plan also depicted the project would meet the setback requirements. Assistant City Planner McCarty indicated staff has been working with the developer on the timing and construction of the required fencing.

2.6 Conditional Use Permit for a Wireless Utility Communications Tower for Herriman City
Assistant City Planner McCarty indicated the City is looking to install a wireless utility tower which is a conditional use in the residential zone. The tower would be utilized for the water facilities telemetry system.

2.7 Request: Proposed Two lot Subdivision for Jared Kelsch
Assistant City Planner McCarty indicated applicant Jared Kelsch requested an approval of a two lot subdivision. A home currently exists on the parcel and a future home has been proposed for the newly-created lot. Street frontage would not be an issue for the development. Right-of-way would need to be dedicated to the City and road improvements of a fee-in-lieu would be required. The Engineering Department has been working with the applicant to determine how much property would need to be dedicated as well as the cost of improvements. This subdivision would be contingent upon the City Council granting the rezoning request.

3.1 Rezone from A-1 (Agricultural- 1 acre min.) to A-.50 (Agricultural-.50 acre min.) for Jared Kelsch
This request is the second part to the proposed two lot subdivision. The Planning Commission would have to make a recommendation to the City Council whether or not to approve the rezone, then the Commission could act on the proposed subdivision.

The Planning Commission adjourned by consensus at 6:59 p.m.
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7:00 PM - Regular Planning Commission Meeting

1. Call to Order
Chair Morton called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

1.1 Invocation/Thought/Reading and Pledge
Mr. Dave Murdock led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1.2 Roll call
Full quorum present.

1.3 Conflicts of Interest
No Conflicts of Interest were noted.

2. Administrative Items
Administrative items are reviewed based on standards outlined in the ordinance. Public comment may be taken on relevant and credible evidence regarding the applications compliance with the ordinance.

2.1 Request: Proposed One lot Subdivision (Public Hearing held on April 5, 2018)
Applicant: Jory Dalling
Address: 6308 W 14300 S
Zone: A-25
Acres: 1
File Number: S2018-005

Assistant City Planner McCarty relayed the request for the one lot subdivision that held the Public Hearing during the last meeting. She noted the applicant would have to provide turn around access for emergency personnel. She indicated there had been concerns regarding the storm water runoff and protecting adjacent properties. The applicant had been working with the City Engineer to address those concerns.

Staff recommendations are as follows:

1. Meet with the Staff for review and final approval of the site plan.
2. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies.
3. Install curb, gutter, street lights, and sidewalk on all public streets or pay a fee in lieu of all required improvements. Coordinate with engineering on timing of installation of required improvements.
4. The plat shall be approved and recorded prior to a building permit being issued for the lot.
5. Provide a hammerhead to meet UFA requirements.
6. The proposed home shall meet the single-family design criteria.
7. Plat shall include easements for existing City utilities.
8. Provide storm water report and plans to show that post-development flows leaving the lot are less than or equal to pre-development flows leaving the lot.
   a. Impoundment of storm water must be accomplished with a retention pond whereas there is no existing outfall location.
   b. Applicant may obtain a drainage easement and install an outfall pipe to 14200 South if a detention pond is desired.
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9. Applicant must enter into a long term storm water maintenance agreement for the storm water pond and other storm water management features on the site.
   a. If this water enters the storm water retention/detention pond, those flows must be accounted for in the storm water report and reflected in the site design grading and drainage plan.

10. Applicant to install or pay a fee-in-lieu for roadway improvements along parcels that have frontage on 14300 South.

Commissioner Jacobson moved to approve item 2.1 file number S2018-005 for a one lot subdivision located at 6308 West 14300 South with staff recommendations. Commissioner Powell seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Commissioner Chris Berbert    Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson     Aye
Commissioner Curtis Noble      Aye
Commissioner Andrew Powell     Aye
Commissioner Brody Rypien      Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

2.2 Request: Proposed Subdivision of 30 single family lots (Public Hearing held on April 5, 2018)

Applicant: Carmen Freeman
Address: 6000 W 13200 S
Zone: A-.25
Acres: 16.33
File Number: S2018-006

Assistant City Planner McCarty indicated the proposed subdivision had a public hearing for a 30 lot development. The remaining parcel would continue to be utilized for farming and would ultimately be a future development. She compared the original plan with the revised plan to address engineering concerns. The proposal would qualify for 2.1 lots per acre which meets the density requirements. The Commission reviewed the traffic concerns for the development.

Applicant Carmen Freeman thanked the Commission for their service and noted all of the concerns had been addressed and added a couple of trail connections throughout the development.

Staff recommendations are as follows:

1. Meet with staff for review and final approval of the site plan.
2. Each of the lots shall be a minimum of 85 feet wide and 10,000 square feet.
3. Install curb, gutter, street lights, and sidewalk on all public streets, including 13200 South. Street lights on 6000 West shall be installed at the pre-determined locations.
4. Dedicate property needed to accommodate a 60 foot right of way for 6000 West and 13200 South.
5. Install a 6-foot vinyl privacy fence along 6000 West, making sure to maintain the clear view on the corner of 13200 South.
6. Install a 6-foot vinyl privacy fence along the east side of the development.
7. Install a 6-foot semi-private vinyl fence along the south property line, adjacent to the trail, and along both sides of the trail connection, except where adjacent to the detention pond.
8. All homes shall meet the Single-family design criteria.
9. Density is approved at 2.1 units per acre, which is 34 lots. The proposed plan shows 30 lots, and a “Parcel A” that could be developed in the future. No density is being approved for Parcel A at this point.
10. No lots shall be accessible from or onto 6000 West.
11. The detention pond should be landscaped to meet City standards and dedicated to the City.
12. Developer is responsible for locating the existing storm drain pipe that is stubbed into Parcel A and connecting the pipe into the roadway drainage system in the development. Offsite flows collected by this pipe will need to be accounted for in the on-site detention basin.
13. Developer is responsible for the installation of sidewalk, curb, gutter, and lighting along the entire project frontage (13200 South from 6000 West/Mirabella to 5900 West). Work with engineering on the proper alignment of improvements on 13200 South.
14. Install a trail connection to the existing trail system. The trail should be concrete 16 feet wide, with landscaping along each side, and provide maintenance access to the detention pond. The trail shall be dedicated to the City.
15. Applicant needs to provide storm water detention or retention to meet Herriman City Engineering Standards. Retention will be required if constructability of a pipe in the existing trail and drainage easement is found to be unfeasible.
16. If any of the trails will be also used for utility loops (i.e. waterline alignment) the trail will need to be sized to the appropriate width required for future utility maintenance work (20 ft. typical)

Commissioner Berbert moved to approve Item 2.2 File Number S2018-006 approving a subdivision at approximately 6000 West 13200 South with staff recommendations. Commissioner Jacobson seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Commissioner Chris Berbert    Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson    Aye
Commissioner Curtis Noble     Aye
Commissioner Andrew Powell    Aye
Commissioner Brady Rypien     Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

2.3 Request: Conditional Use Permit for Ace Hardware (continued from March 15, 2018)

Applicant: Brad Murdock
Address: 13548 S Rosecrest Rd
Zone: C-2
Assistant City Planner McCarty reviewed the conditional use permit proposal for the Ace Hardware located west of the Smith’s Market Place 5600 West 13400 South. She noted the brick and stone concerns had been addressed. Commissioner Berbent asked about the fence being installed prior to the construction of the Hardware Store. Assistant Planner McCarty confirmed the requirement for the north side of the property and would review the specific condition.

Applicant Dave Murdock presented samples of the building material products along with the colors depicting the elevations. He noted the color may vary slightly and noted there would be 65-percent of the elevation in brick or stone. Assistant Planner McCarty relayed the 60-percent requirement on the front and side elevations that would face a public street. Commissioner Rypien asked about the materials being used along the rear elevation. Applicant Murdock responded it would be colored CMU block. Commissioner Powell asked about what would be placed along the north side of the building. Applicant Murdock explained the Garden Center would be located there. Assistant Planner McCarty indicated the Garden Center would be fenced with a wrought iron material. Commissioner Jacobson asked if the rear parking would be for employees or for customers. Applicant Murdock indicated it would mostly be used for employees. Commissioner Jacobson observed the rear door that could be used by patrons. Applicant Murdock indicated the entrance was not designed for that purpose. The access doors would be for emergency and employee use. Commissioner Rypien agreed with the aesthetics. Commissioner Berbent expressed his concern of not having actual customers use the rear parking lot, and couldn’t guarantee that it would happen. He suggested the layout of the site would entice people to park in the back. Commissioner Rypien noted it would be used for deliveries. Commissioner Jacobson noted the retail to the south has not been approved and the land could be vacant for a long period of time.

Staff recommendations are as follows:

1. Meet with the Staff for review and final approval of the site plan.
2. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies.
3. Provide a 15 foot landscape buffer along the north and west property lines adjacent to the residential areas. Evergreen landscaping anticipated to grow to more than six feet in height shall be provided at distances sufficient to provide a visual and noise reducing barrier. Such landscaping shall consist of at least one tree for every 20 feet of fencing.
4. Building elevations approved as submitted.
5. No signs are approved with this request, separate approval will be required.
6. At least 15% of the total site must be landscaped. At least 5% of the parking lot interior must be landscaped. Landscaping shall meet all requirements of the ordinance and standards.
7. Parking shall be provided at one space per 250 square feet of floor area, which would be 64 spaces.
8. Screen all outside trash and dumpster areas with precast or masonry walls.
9. Provide an addendum to the original traffic impact study for review and approval. This should include information on access points.
10. Detention shall be provided on site as required by City standard. This may be in underground detention.
11. All exterior lighting must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, including a photometric plan. Lights must meet City standard.

12. Any and all trash pickup shall only occur between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. of the same day.

13. Install a 6 foot precast wall along the entire west property line of the Herriman Corners Subdivision prior to a building permit being issued for this lot. Also provide a 6 foot precast wall along the north property line prior to building permit.

14. Construct the backbone road for the Herriman Corners development. This should be built curb to curb, and include street lights.

15. Fencing around the garden center shall be wrought iron.

16. Provide ADA access to a public street.

Commissioner Power moved to approve item 2.3 File Number C2017-056 approving a conditional use permit for an Ace Hardware with the following change to staff recommendations to have item no four read building elevations shall have 60-percent stone or brick on all four (4) sides of the building. Commissioner Berbert seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Commissioner Chris Berbert   Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson    Aye
Commissioner Curtis Noble     Aye
Commissioner Andrew Powell    Aye
Commissioner Brody Rypien Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

2.4 Request: Conditional Use Permit for a Gorilla Car Wash and Grease Monkey Quick Lube (continued from March 15, 2018)

Applicant: Steve Cloward
Address: 5708 W 13400 S
Zone: C-2
Acres: 1.395
File Number: C2018-005

Assistant City Planner McCarty oriented the Commission of the locatoin of the project and noted some of the changes had been addressed. West of the development are residential homes which would need to have additional buffering to be installed to mitigate the noise and light pollution from affected neighbors. She displayed the potential precast wall that would be installed if the subdivision did not install a fence along the western portion of the development. Assistant Planner McCarty presented the revised landscaping plans and proposed elevations.

Applicant Steve Cloward requested the Commission be aware of the additional landscaping that had been incorporated into the plan and observed the available walkways for patrons to utilize. Commissioner Noble asked about the vacuum areas to be covered. Applicant Cloward presented the elevations depicting the three rows of vacuumeas. Commissioner Jacobson thanked the applicant for the changes.
Commissioner Noble addressed the temporary fencing requirements would have to be changed. Applicant Cloward suggested a vinyl fence could be installed for screening purposes, if necessary. Commissioner Berbert requested the fenced match the one that will be installed on the adjacent property for consistency. Assistant City Planner McCarty confirmed.

Staff recommendations are as follows:

1. Meet with the Staff for review and final approval of the site plan.
2. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies.
3. Work with the Herriman City Water Department to comply with State requirements for the Well Source Protection Area. The source protection plan should be in place prior to final engineering approval.
4. The front yard area which faces 13400 South shall be landscaped and maintained with live plant material, including shrubs, flowers and 2-inch caliper trees for a minimum distance of twenty feet (20'), or 15 feet with a berm. This should also include trees in the park strip every 30 feet.
5. 15% of the total site shall be landscaped and shall also include a minimum of 5% of the parking area landscaped. Additional landscaping, including evergreen trees, should be incorporated into the landscaping in the northwest corner of the lot to provide year round screening.
6. No signs are approved with this request, separate approval will be required.
7. Parking is approved as provided.
8. Screen all outside trash and dumpster areas with precast or masonry walls.
9. Provide a traffic impact study for review and approval. This should include information on access points.
10. The access off of 13400 South shall be on the east side of the subject property and shared with the adjacent lot.
11. Detention shall be provided on site as required by City standard. This may be in underground detention.
12. Install curb, gutter, sidewalk, street lights, and park strip landscaping on all public streets.
13. All exterior lighting must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, including a photometric plan. Lights must meet City standard.
14. Any changes made to existing street lights will be at the cost of the applicant, not the City.
15. Any and all trash pickup shall only occur between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. of the same day.
16. Install a 6 foot precast wall along the west property line.
17. Provide a temporary 6 foot vinyl privacy fence on the north property line until a precast wall is constructed along the entire west property line of the Herriman Corners development. The temporary fence is to mitigate the light and sounds from impacting the adjacent residential properties. Work with staff on the required length of the fence.
18. Building elevations are approved as submitted. Canopy elevations shall add brick to the outside columns to match the building. Brick shall also be on the payment kiosk columns.

Commissioner Berbert moved to approved Item 2.4 File No. C2018-003 approving a Conditional Use Permit for a Gorilla Car Wash and Grease Monkey Quick Lube with the following change to staff requirements that the precast wall shall match the precast wall of the surrounding subdivision and to work with the Engineering Department to make sure that occurs. Commissioner Jacobson seconded the motion.
The vote was recorded as follows:

Commissioner Chris Berbert  Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye
Commissioner Curtis Noble  Aye
Commissioner Andrew Powell  Aye
Commissioner Brody Rypien  Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

2.5 Request: Conditional Use Permit for a Holiday Oil Gas Station/Convenience Store  
(continued from March 15, 2018)

Applicant: John Linton
Address: 15000 S Academy Pkwy
Zone: C-2
Acres: 1.48
File Number: C2018-006

Assistant City Planner Bryn McCarty informed the Commission of the conditional use permit for the Holiday Oil Gas Station located at 15000 South Academy Parkway which had been continued from the March 15, 2018 meeting. She presented the site and landscaping plans for the development and compared them to previous renditions. Assistant Planner McCarty observed the submitted elevations for the building showing compliance with commercial building requirements. The car wash and canopy elevations also notated brick would be utilized.

Assistant Planner McCarty indicated they addressed landscaping concerns identified during the previous meeting. A precast wall would be required and must be installed around the perimeter prior to the commencement of construction. The store hours also had been adjusted listed in the conditions which would be 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Assistant Planner McCarty acknowledged a traffic study had been conducted for the site which had been previously disseminated to the Commission.

Commissioner Berbert referenced the lack of the six-foot precast wall requirement in the guidelines and asked if it should be included. Assistant Planner McCarty noted the Commission could add the requirement to meet the previous conditions of the subdivision to have the wall installed prior to construction.

Applicant John Linton informed the Commission there would be five pine trees installed along 15000 South in addition to the detailed landscaping and welcomed the aspect to be placed as part of the conditions. Assistant Planner McCarty interjected there would also be City street trees planted adjacent to 15000 South and Academy Parkway.

Commissioner Berbert empathized with the owners of the neighboring houses that would face the development, and noted this parcel had always been designated as commercial. He suggested it was unfortunate those homes have been built there; however, landscaping has been incorporated to buffer light pollution for the residents. He suggested the developer had done everything in their power to minimize the impact to surrounding residents. The Commission agreed.
The Holiday Oil Staff recommendations are as follows:

1. Meet with the Staff for review and final approval of the site plan.
2. All exterior lighting, including a photometric plan, must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer which will mitigate or eliminate detrimental impacts of light.
3. At least 15% of the total site must be landscaped. At least 5% of the parking lot interior must be landscaped which will mitigate or eliminate detrimental visual impacts. Landscaping should be provided adjacent to the west side of building, and also on the south side on the patio.
4. The front yard area and the side yard area which faces on a street shall be landscaped and maintained with live plant material, including shrubs, flowers and trees for a minimum distance of twenty feet (20') which will mitigate or eliminate detrimental visual impacts. This should include trees in the park strip every 30 feet.
5. Building elevations and canopies are approved as submitted which will mitigate or eliminate detrimental visual impacts.
6. Install curb, gutter, sidewalk, street lights, and park strip on all public streets.
7. No signs are approved with this request, separate approval will be required. No monument sign will be allowed on 15000 South, which will mitigate detrimental lights and glare.
8. Screen all outside trash and dumpster areas which will mitigate or eliminate detrimental visual impacts.
9. Parking calculated at 1 space for each 250 square feet gross floor area for a total of at least 19 stalls.
10. Hours of operation to be from 5:00am to 11:00pm which will mitigate or eliminate detrimental light and noise impacts.
11. A traffic study for the entire development shall be reviewed as part of the engineering approval. Left-turns may be limited as recommended in the traffic study.
12. Provide storm drain retention for the property. This can be provided in shared facility for the entire commercial center. A maintenance agreement for any retention ponds will be required for engineering approval.
13. Receive approval from UFA prior to installing underground tanks.
14. Certificate of Occupancy for the building will not be granted until a precast wall is constructed on the south and east sides of the commercial development.

Commissioner Chris Berbert moved to approve Item 2.5, Conditional Use Permit for a Holiday Oil Gas Station/Convenience Store with the following adjustments made to staff recommendations under item no. 4 to add an additional requirement incorporating five (5) additional pine trees located on the north side of the property, and to add item number 16 to fulfill the need to meet the previous subdivision condition of requiring a 6-foot precast wall on the east side of the detention basin pond before any building permit is offered. Commissioner Noble seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

- Commissioner Chris Berbert  
  **Aye**
- Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  
  **Aye**
- Commissioner Adam Jacobson  
  **Aye**
2.6 Request: Conditional Use Permit for a Wireless Utility Communications Tower

Applicant: Herriman City
Address: 14200 S 4000 W
Zone: R-2-10
Acres: 4.81
File Number: C2018-013

Assistant City Planner McCarty indicated Herriman City Water Department requested a 60-foot wireless utility communications tower which requires a conditional use permit in the R-2-10 zone.

Water Manager Luke Seivert indicated the infrastructure located on the tower would be limited to City owned equipment. He explained a survey had been conducted to concluded the tower would need to be 60-feet tall to meet the current and future SCADA system needs.

Staff recommendations are as follows:

1. The height of the pole is limited to 60 feet above grade.
2. The monopole and the site the pole occupies are to be properly maintained. The pole must be removed within sixty (60) days after the communications use is discontinued.

Commissioner Jacobson moved to approve item 2.6 File No. C2018-013 conditional use permit for a wireless utility communications tower with an additional requirement to only allow city equipment to be placed on the tower. Commissioner Ryjen seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Commissioner Chris Berbert  Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye
Commissioner Curtis Noble  Aye
Commissioner Andrew Powell  Aye
Commissioner Brody Ryjen  Aye

The motion passed unanimously.

2.7 Request: Proposed Two Lot Subdivision (Public Hearing)

Applicant: Jared Kelsch
Address: 13705 S 7300 W
Zone: A-1
Acres: 1.125
File Number: S2018-003
Assistant City Planner McCarty explained this request has two different applications for the one acre subdivision to create two lots. First, the zoning would have to be changed to the A-.5 zone and then the Planning Commission could approve the subdivision. One home already exists on the existing parcel and a future home would be added to the new lot. The property is located on a corner so each parcel would have street frontage.

Applicant Jared Kelsch indicated there would be property dedicated to the City for the right-of-way and a fee in lieu for improvements would have to be considered and may warrant an exception.

Chair Morton opened the Public Hearing.

There were no comments offered.

Chair Morton closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Berbert indicated that Gina Road does not have sidewalks. This was confirmed. He recommended the consideration for an exception would be for the lot that would face Gina Road, not 7300 West. Commissioner Jacobson expressed his concern about amending a prerecorded subdivision and relayed his understanding of not continuing the practice. He recommended this concern be taken to the Council to have the ordinance reflect the desire. Commissioner Berbert agreed. Commissioner Rypien suggested other applicants would also request exceptions based on this request. Commissioner Jacobson agreed with the statement. He explained the subdivision couldn’t occur until the zoning had been changed and the subdivision would have to come back to the Commission for approval. He relayed his position he wasn’t supportive of the request and would like to see developed subdivisions maintain their original format as it would not be advantageous for the City. Commissioner Berbert suggested the subdivision be continued to see if the rezoning request has been approved.

*Commissioner Jacobson moved to continue item 2.7 File No. S2018-003 to a future Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Berbert seconded the motion, and all voted aye.*

3. **Legislative Items**

Legislative items are recommendations to the City Council. Broad public input will be taken and considered on each item. All legislative items recommended at this meeting will be scheduled for a decision at the next available City Council meeting.

3.1 **Request: Rezone from A-1 (Agricultural-1 acre min.) to A-.50 (Agricultural-.50 acre min.)** *(Public Hearing)*

- **Applicant:** Jared Kelsch
- **Address:** 13705 S 7300 W
- **Zone:** A-1
- **Acres:** 1.125
- **File Number:** Z2018-006

Assistant City Planner McCarty informed the Commission this item was for the rezone of the property.

Chair Morton opened the public hearing.
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Gordon Kelsch informed the Commission they have lived there since 1996 and have watched lots be subdivided and couldn’t understand their opposition to the request.

Chair Morton closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Berbert indicated Herriman needed to have a balance of different lot sizes including half acre parcels. He expressed his opposition to recommending the approval of the rezone when it would take away from the feel of Herriman. He noted the property was zoned a specific way for a purpose and would like to keep the same feel in the area. Commissioner Noble agreed and noted the Planning Commission has not recommended approval of any “spot zonings”. Commissioner Jacobson explained his desire to maintaining a transition buffer and would like to have the zoning stay as currently designated.

Commissioner Jacobson moved to recommend denial of item 3.1 rezoning property from A.1 to A.50 for Jared Kelsch to the City Council to stay consistent with the zoning in the area. Commissioner Noble Seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

- Commissioner Chris Berbert Aye
- Commissioner Jackson Ferguson Nay
- Commissioner Adam Jacobson Aye
- Commissioner Curtis Noble Aye
- Commissioner Andrew Powell Aye
- Commissioner Brody Rypien Nay

The motion passed with a vote 4:2.

4. Chair and Commission Comments

5. Future Meetings

5.1 City Council – Wednesday, April 25, 2018 @ 7:00 PM
5.2 Planning Commission Meeting – May 3, 2018 @ 7:00 PM

6. Adjournment

Commissioner Berbert moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:12 p.m. Commissioner Powell seconded the motion and all voted aye.

I, Jackie Nostrom, City Recorder for Herriman City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on April 19, 2018. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Herriman City Planning Commission Meeting.

Jackie Nostrom, MMC
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Thursday, May 3, 2018
Awaiting Formal Approval

The following are the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting held on Thursday, May 3, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. in the Herriman City Community Center, 5355 W. Herriman Main Street (12090 South), Herriman, Utah. Adequate notice of this meeting, as required by law, was posted in the Community Center, on the City’s website, and delivered to members of the Commission and media.

Presiding: Chair Chris Berbert

Commission Members Present: Jackson Ferguson, Adam Jacobson, Curtis Noble, Lorin Palmer, Andrew Powell, Brody Rypien

Commission Members Absent: Curtis Noble, Jessica Morton, Andrea Bradford

City Staff Present: City Planner Michael Maloy, Assistant City Manager Gordon Haight, Communications Specialist Mitch Davis, Planning Coordinator Craig Evans, Assistant City Engineer Jonathan Bowers, City Attorney John Brems and Deputy Recorder Wendy Thorpe.

6:00 PM - Work Meeting (Fort Herriman Conference Room)

1. Training
Chair Chris Berbert called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm and welcomed those in attendance.

City Planner Maloy explained that a population of 50,000 was anticipated with completion of 2020 Census. He also expressed a desire to get to know the Commissioners better by scheduling lunches or dinners with them all individually. As part of ongoing training he planned to articles of interest to the Commissioners as well as continue formal training opportunities.

City Planner Maloy presented a training video hosted by the State Ombudsman Brett Bateman.
He communicated to the Commissioners the City code was still being codified. The codifying company sent questions to the City, Assistant Planner McCarty was working on responding to their inquiries.

He communicated that the City Council was not the appeals authority for Herriman City and that David Church filled that role. An appeal was received recently regarding the Holiday Oil gas station. Planning Commission was identified as a Land Use Authority.

Commissioner Jacobson asked if closed meetings would be released if the City received a GRAMA request. Attorney Brems stated they would not be, as they were protected records.

2. **Review of Accessory Buildings Chapter**

Planner Craig Evans distributed the packet containing the new accessory buildings chapter. He requested that the Commissioners review it and contact him with any questions or comments. The Commissioners were asked to consider side yard size and maximum structure lot coverage allowed, based either on percentage or square feet. Staff would approve up to 1600 square feet with conditional use permit. Measurements from final grade to peak would be altered back to original grade to midpoint. City Planner Maloy added that the older ordinance had different language. Commissioner Jacobson inquired about placement of accessory buildings on corner lots. Different requirements for corner lots, side yard, 20 feet from street and back yard 3 feet from street requirements were clarified. Front yard was defined as measurement from front corners of the house to the side, same for the backyard, side yard was the area in between. Setback varies from side yard to back yard. Side yard accessory building had to be 20 feet from the property line, accessory buildings in backyard had to be 3 feet from property line. Commissioner Berbert clarified that visible side yard buildings were required to match structure, material and color of house. Planner Evans clarified that pre-made sheds were required to match the color but not the material. Commissioner Jacobson questioned if distance from main structure was defined. Fire code required fire grade construction within 6 feet of the main home. City Planner Maloy stated Commissioners had authority to limit the size of accessory buildings. Planner Evans provided recent samples that showed how proposed accessory building sat on the lots and asked if Commissioners wished to approve placement on unique lots or have routine requirements approved by Staff. Commissioner Berbert stated they should be at least parallel with the neighboring house. Commissioners discussed options for locations of accessory buildings and emphasized the importance for people to understand the placement depended on the orientation of abutting homes. Commissioner Jacobson stated smaller structure placement should not be dictated by City. Commissioner Berbert added that very small lots had no room for accessory structures. Commissioner Berbert commented that cul-de-sacs can have unique yard sizes. Commissioner Jacobson recommended measurement from fence with some unique lots, not from distance to street. Rear setback and side setback sizes were further discussed. Commissioner Berbert asked for example of 45-foot tall accessory building. Planner Evans proposed that a structure of that size would probably be business related. City Planner Maloy advised that accessory structures that large were rarely seen in dense communities. Staff would provide Commissioners with an updated version at the next meeting. Commissioner Jackson Ferguson inquired if covered parking would be covered under accessory building considerations. Planner Evans defined accessory structures as anything with a roof.
3. **Review of City Council Decisions**
City Planner Maloy informed the Commissioners that no land use items were discussed at the last Council meeting. However, he did provide the Commissioners with information regarding the license regulation changes that affected ‘Bout Time. The State had changed alcohol licensing requirements, Restaurant licensing required a greater percentage of sales than they could meet. Council would need to consider a text amended to allow bars as conditional use in a C-2 zone for the establishment to maintain an alcohol license with the State.

City Planner Maloy requested feedback regarding the level of involvement and planning for the development at the south end of Herriman. He inquired if the Commissioners were ready to re-visit the proposal on the next meeting agenda. Commissioners expressed a desire to meet with the applicant after they had updated plans to match the Commission requirements.

4. **Review of Agenda Items**
City Planner Maloy expressed interest to have more preliminary presentations during work session meetings that would explain projects in detail before the final package was presented. Commissioners requested more accurate design and concept drawings that include Commission requirements.

*Planning Commission work meeting adjourned by consensus at 7:00 p.m.*

---

**7:00 PM - Regular Planning Commission Meeting**

1. **Call to Order**
Chair Berbert called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm and welcomed those in attendance. Chair Berbert reviewed the Public Hearing and Comment procedures.

1.1 **Invocation/Thought/Reading and Pledge**
Steve Cloward led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1.2 **Roll call**
Full Quorum Present.

1.3 **Approval of Minutes for: February 15, 2018**

*Commissioner Jacobson moved to approve item 1.3 Approval of Minutes for February 15, 2018. Commissioner Powell seconded the motion.*

The vote was recorded as follows:
- Commissioner Lorin Palmer      *Aye*
- Commissioner Brady Ryphen     *Aye*
- Commissioner Jackson Ferguson *Aye*
The motion passed with a 5:0 vote.

1.4 Conflicts of Interest
No conflicts were reported.

2. Administrative Items
Administrative items are reviewed based on standards outlined in the ordinance. Public comment may be taken on relevant and credible evidence regarding the applications compliance with the ordinance.

2.1 Request: Review of a permitted use for Jordan School District Elementary School #6

Applicant: Jordan School District
Address: 14120 S Greenford Ln
Zone: R-2-10
Acres: 12.5
File Number: C2018-001

Planner Evans explained the applicant request for a permitted use for Jordan School District Elementary School on east side of Mountain View Corridor.

Applicant Scott Thomas spoke on behalf of Jordan School District and set forth the basics for the construction of the school. Commissioner Berbert requested clarification regarding roads in the area. Mr. Thomas explained Autumn Crest Boulevard would be separated from the school by a precast wall. Greenford Lane would provide access to the school on the Northeast side of the building for residents, with a separate drop off for buses available on the North side. Mr. Scott thanked the staff for feedback regarding roads and traffic patterns.

Commissioner Jacobson requested information regarding fencing. Mr. Scott described fence and wall locations were all along the full length of Autumn Crest Boulevard. Commissioner Berbert asked where additional parking would be available and Commissioner Jacobson asked where faculty parking was located. Mr. Thomas stated there were locations for overflow parking across the street for school events and programs. Commissioner Powell questioned if safe walking routes had been designated. Mr. Thomas reported the safe routes would be discussed after boundaries were established and that the District would work with the City to determine the best locations for crosswalks. Commissioner Rypien inquired as to community access to soccer fields. Mr. Thomas replied there would be no access from Autumn Crest Road to the sport fields, due to installation of fence or wall along that property line. Mr. Thomas expressed his appreciation for the assistance from City staff.

Commissioner Powell moved to recommend approval of item 2.1 permitted use for Jordan School District Elementary School #6. Commissioner Rypien seconded the motion.
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The vote was recorded as follows:

Commissioner Lorin Palmer      Aye
Commissioner Brady Rypien       Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson   Aye
Commissioner Andy Powell        Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson      Aye

The motion passed with a 5:0 vote.

The requirements are as listed:

1. A plat for a one lot subdivision shall be approved and recorded before issuance of a building permit.
2. No access permitted on Autumn Crest Boulevard.
3. Access road must meet or exceed the 60-foot standard road cross section.
4. School district will provide boundary information to the city by November 2018 to establish the school safe walking route and install appropriate safety measures as per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control devices (MUTCD).

2.2 Request: Subdivision Plat Amendment to add one lot to the Herriman corners subdivision

Applicant: Steve Cloward
Address: 5708 West 13400 South
Zone: C-2 (Commercial)
Acres: 1.395 Acres
File Number: S2018-009

Planner Craig Evans stated that Planning Commission recently approved the car wash and quick lube. Since then the fencing had been approved and presented site plan to divide lot, one for each location.

Chair Berbert invited the applicant to the podium.

Applicant Steve Cloward stated he thought Planner Evans explained the amendment very well. He expressed a desire to have the lots separate to be prepared for the possibility of selling one at a later date.

Commissioner Berbert opened the Public Hearing.

There were no comments offered.

Commissioner Berbert closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Rypien inquired if parking would be shared by both businesses. Mr. Cloward indicated that parking would be shared. Commissioner Ferguson asked if there was access between each property. Commissioner Jacobson stated requirement for ingress and egress would need to be added to an approval motion. Mr. Cloward stated the intent is to have open access for traffic between the businesses.
Commissioner Jacobson moved to recommend approval of item 2.2 Subdivision Plat Amendment for a Lot Line Adjustment in Miller Crossing Pod 5 Phase 2, File Number: S2016-05-02 with two staff requirements and an additional third requirement that states the ingress and egress and easements be denoted on the plat for conveying traffic through both parcels. Commissioner Powell seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Commissioner Lorin Palmer  Aye
Commissioner Brady Rypien  Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Andy Powell  Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye

The motion passed with a 5:0 vote.

The requirements are as listed:

1. Final subdivision plat to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.
2. Any utilities, utility boxes, or street lights that need to be relocated shall be done at the expense of the property owner.

3. Legislative Items

Legislative items are recommendations to the City Council. Broad public input will be taken and considered on each item. All legislative items recommended at this meeting will be scheduled for a decision at the next available City Council meeting.

3.1 Request: Text Change to the Land Development Code Regarding Planning Commission and Appeals Authority Appointments (Public Hearing)

Applicant: Herriman City
File Number: Z2018-008

Planner Craig Evans explained this item was referred by City Council and it would modify the ordinance to establish how Planning Commissioners and Appeals Authority were appointed. The ordinance stated that the Planning Commission was appointed “by the Mayor, with the advice and consent of the City Council”. The proposed change would state the Planning Commissioners would be “appointed by the City Council”. This amendment also affected the process of appointing and removing members from the Planning Commission and Appeals Authority.

Chair Berbert opened the Public Hearing.

There were no comments offered.

Chair Berbert closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Jacobson moved to recommend approval of item 3.1 Request for Text Change to the Land Development Code Regarding Planning Commission and Appeals Authority Appointments, File Number: Z2018-008. Commissioner Lorin seconded the motion.
The vote was recorded as follows:

Commissioner Lorin Palmer     Aye
Commissioner Brady Rypien      Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Andy Powell       Aye
Commissioner Adam Jacobson     Aye

The motion passed with a 5:0 vote.

4. **Chair and Commission Comments**
   
   No comments were offered.

5. **Future Meetings**
   
   5.1 City Council – Wednesday, **May 9, 2018 @ 7:00 PM**
   
   5.2 Planning Commission Meeting – **February 15, 2018 @ 7:00 PM**

6. **Adjournment**

   Commissioner Berbert moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 7:23 p.m. Commissioner Jacobson seconded the motion and all voted aye.

I, Wendy Thorpe, Deputy City Recorder for Herriman City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on May 3, 2018. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting.

   
   [Signature]
   
   Wendy Thorpe
   
   Deputy City Recorder
Date of Meeting:
06/21/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File #</th>
<th>C2018-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Mo Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>5251 W Anthem Peak Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit for a JCW’s Restaurant with Drive-Thru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST: Landscape Plan and Materials Board Approval
Applicant: Mo Myers
Address: 5251 W Anthem Peak Lane
Zone: C-2
Acres: 1.17
File Number: C2018-15

Request

The applicant is requesting approval for the JCW’s landscape plan and materials board.

Site

The lot is located at approximately 5251 W Anthem Peak Lane and contains 1.17 acres.

Zoning

The site is zoned C-2.

Discussion

The Planning Commission, at their June 7, 2018 meeting, approved JCWs with a number of conditions. The three listed below are being brought back to this work meeting for further review by the Commission:

9. Update the traffic study to include the left hand right-in right-out along Angel Falls Ln and Anthem Park Blvd.
19. The landscaping plan is to come back to the Planning Commission for approval of the applicant’s final version, working in conjunction with the Les Schwab applicant.
20. Elevations are to come back before the Planning Commission, including a materials board.
**Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval of landscape plan and elevations for the JCW's restaurant.
Memo

To: Michael Maloy
From: Jonathan Bowers
Date: June 15, 2018
Re: Traffic Surrounding JCW’s (C2018-15) & Les Schwab (C2018-18)
cc: Blake Thomas, Bryn McCarty, Craig Evans

Mr. Maloy,

This memo is intended to clarify staff recommendation regarding traffic movement surrounding both JCW’s and Les Schwab and provide additional insight and traffic study information that wasn’t represented in the recent Planning Commission when these conditional uses were conditionally approved.

For both applications, staff recommendation number nine (9) states “A traffic study for the entire development shall be reviewed as part of the engineering approval. Left-turns may be limited as recommended in the traffic study.” This recommendation is a result of the traffic concerns highlighted in the Anthem Park Traffic Impact Study prepared in August 2015 (TIS), attached as Exhibit A. In the context of the overall development, the TIS points out two items of concern:

1. The impact of development trips to adjacent intersection operation and the surrounding traffic network.
2. The full-movement access from the development onto Anthem Park Boulevard operating as both a full-movement access and right-in/right-out access.

Additionally, the 2015 TIS indicates that the traffic concerns “…may be addressed at a later stage in the project development and design.” I suggested that the Planning Commission require the developments provide a traffic memo to address the concerns above in response to Planning Commission’s request for clarification to the staff recommendation.

Since the recent Planning Commission meeting Blake Thomas and the Master Developer provided me a copy of a Trip Generation Memo prepared in August 2017 (Trip Memo),
that was specifically intended to address the concerns outlined in the 2015 TIS (attached as Exhibit B). This memo accounts for the updated uses in the Anthem Commercial development and quantifies their respective trip generation.

The updated Trip Memo addresses the 2015 TIS concerns and states that Angel Falls Lane, the access onto Anthem Blvd, “…will function for the short term as a full motion access which will need to transition into a ¾ movement access where the north-south left turn movements be shifted to the signalized intersection at the future Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard intersection. In the distant future, this Access may need to be restricted to a right-in / right-out as traffic increases and the connection to MVC is modified to account for the grade separation of the MVC.”

Based on the information provided in the updated Trip Memo, the proposed uses will not warrant the need for a right-in/right-out onto Anthem Blvd at this time and it may function as a full motion access with the understanding that the access will transition into a ¾ movement and eventually be restricted to a right-in/right in the distant future.

In light of this information, the Engineering Department recommends that the Planning Commission consider the updated Trip Memo as the additional information required to fulfill the condition of approval and allow Angel Falls Lane to function as a full motion access in association with recently approved development (i.e. JCW’s and Les Schwab).
ANTHEM PARK
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

DRAFT August 2015
Project Number 150411

InterPlan
7719 South Main Street
Midvale, Utah 84047
801.307.3400 Phone
801.307.3451 Fax
www.interplanco.com
**Introduction**

InterPlan was hired by Herriman City to evaluate the general traffic operations of a proposed development in Herriman, Utah. The overall purpose of this traffic study is to identify planning related issues associated with the design plans and concepts in order to mitigate any transportation related concerns and identify site specific design issues that may be addressed at a later stage in project development and design.

Of key concern for this project is the impact of a proposed full-movement development access on Anthem Park Boulevard between Main Street and Mountain View Corridor. Due to the already short spacing between the Main Street and Mountain View Corridor intersections and the anticipation of a future TRAX line envisioned along Anthem Park Boulevard, Herriman City plans for the development access to ultimately be converted into a right-in/right-out access. In addition to general site impacts, this document investigates the timing for which the conversion to right-in/right-out access should occur.

The proposed development is an approximately 50.9 acre site located in Herriman, Utah, at the intersection of Anthem Park Boulevard and Mountain View Corridor (SR-85). The site is located on the west side of Mountain View Corridor, and will straddle the north and south sides of Anthem Park Boulevard. Figure 1 shows the development site plan.

**Summary of Issues and Recommendations**

Through analysis of the traffic operations, current and planned land uses and local concerns, InterPlan has determined the major issues to be:

1. The impact of development trips to adjacent intersection operation and the surrounding traffic network.
2. The full-movement access from the development onto Anthem Park Boulevard operating as both a full-movement access and right-in/right-out access.

It was assumed the Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard intersection would be constructed as a signalized intersection with Day of Opening conditions. With the heavy westbound left-turn movements anticipated at this intersection for both Day of Opening and 2020 conditions, InterPlan recommends protected-permitted left-turn phasing for the westbound approach. Additionally, the signalized intersections at Mountain View Corridor will likely benefit from east-west protected-permitted left-turn phasing at Day of Opening conditions.

As a full-movement driveway, the access at Anthem Park Boulevard between Main Street and Mountain View Corridor will operate at LOS F, under Day of Opening conditions. InterPlan recommends this access be converted to a right-in/right-out only access for Day of Opening conditions. Expanding the right-in/right-out access to also permit westbound left-in movements to the south side of the development is an optional modification that offers some additional traffic flow benefits to both the development and the surrounding traffic network while avoiding the negative impacts from a full-movement access.
Figure 1 – Development Site Plan
Description of Existing Conditions and Proposal

The proposed development is located in northeast Herriman, Utah on the southwest side of Mountain View Corridor (SR-85) at Anthem Park Boulevard (11800 South). Main Street in Herriman will border the proposed development on the west. The 50.9 acre site is a proposed commercial development north and south of Anthem Park Boulevard. The south section is approximately 42.9 acres and the north section is approximately 8 acres. The south section will include approximately 450,000 sq/ft of retail and commercial space. This includes several large big box commercial stores, fuel pumps, a furniture store, and several other commercial buildings and restaurant pads. The north section will include a hotel as well as approximately 37,000 sq/ft of retail and commercial space.

The development site fronts Anthem Park Boulevard, an arterial roadway which will eventually connect Mountain View Corridor at 11800 South with Herriman Parkway. Currently Anthem Park Boulevard is only constructed south and west of the development site, connecting to Herriman Parkway on the south. Adjacent to the development site, Anthem Park Boulevard will be 122 feet wide with two lanes in each direction, a two-way center turn lane, and 10’ shoulders. The posted speed limit on Anthem Park Boulevard is 35 mph.

Main Street will run along the west side of the development as a north-south roadway that intersects with Anthem Park Boulevard. Main Street is currently not completed adjacent to the development, and only currently exists as far north as 12600 South where it transitions to an east-west roadway. The section of Main Street south of Anthem Park Boulevard and adjacent to the development is anticipated to have two travel lanes in each direction and a two-way center turn lane. North of Anthem Park Boulevard, Main Street is expected to have one lane in each direction with a two-way center turn lane.

Mountain View Corridor (SR-85) runs along the northeast side of the proposed development. The section of Mountain View Corridor adjacent to the development has only been completed through Phase 1 as a frontage road system, but is planned to be upgraded to a full freeway with limited access on-ramps and off-ramps by 2040. Mountain View Corridor will eventually connect I-80 in Salt Lake County with SR-73 and I-15 in Utah County.

The proposed development will have several access points onto Main Street; three driveways for the south section of the development and two access driveways for the north section of the development. There will also be two driveways on either side of Anthem Park Boulevard that will align and provide access to the north and south section of the development, acting as one stop-controlled intersection. The current site plan also shows a proposed right-in/right-out access directly onto Mountain View Corridor. After a review of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) access management policy for Mountain View Corridor, and in discussion with Herriman City, it was determined to assume no access directly onto Mountain View Corridor for this analysis.
The proposed development is zoned (C-2) Community Commercial (MU-2) Mixed Use-2 Zone. The surrounding land use is mostly residential and open space. The large master planned Daybreak community lies just to the northeast. Herriman High School and Copper Mountain Middle School are located just to the west.

**Trip Generation**

For purposes of evaluation and planning, transportation engineers have defined a unit of measure as a vehicle trip. A trip is a one-direction vehicle movement with either the origin or the destination (exiting or entering) inside the study site. (Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation User’s Guide 2003) In general terms, any time a vehicle passes through a driveway, a trip is registered. The ITE has performed studies on various types of land uses and the trips generated by those individual land uses. The ITE has published detailed average trip counts by type of development. ITE trip generation rates are available for various periods of the day including AM and PM peaks on weekdays and on weekends. InterPlan typically uses these industry-accepted standards when evaluating traffic impacts unless local variations to the standards are readily apparent or are an area of concern.

Trip generation for the proposed development was calculated using the ITE’s trip rate for Discount Superstore (ITE Land Use Code 813), Gasoline Pumps, (ITE Land Use Code 944), Shopping Center (ITE Land Use Code 820), Hotel (ITE Code 310), Drive-In Bank (ITE Land Use Code 912), High Turnover (Sit Down) Restaurant (ITE Code 932) and Fast Food Restaurant (ITE Land Use Code 934). Based on the site plan and square footage of each building footprint, InterPlan assigned a land use to each parcel within the development. Additionally, given the size of the development and the potential for complimentary land uses (hotel, restaurants, retail, gas station), an internal capture trip reduction was applied to the development. Trip totals for each land use were adjusted down 20 percent to account for the internal capture, except for the Gasoline Pumps which were reduced by 50 percent. Table 1 summarizes the trip generation for the PM peak hour. The development is anticipated to generate approximately 2,191 total PM peak hour trips. Since commercial retail trips have a relatively small impact in the AM peak hour compared to the PM peak hour, this analysis focused on PM peak hour impact.
Table 1 – Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>In/Out Split</th>
<th>Internal Capture</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Trips Out</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount Superstore</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>49/51</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Pumps</td>
<td>944</td>
<td># Pumps</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Store</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit Down Restaurant</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-In Bank</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Section Subtotal: 818 | 824 | 1,642

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th># of Rooms</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>In/Out Split</th>
<th>Internal Capture</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Trips Out</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>310</td>
<td># Rooms</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>51/49</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit Down Restaurant</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Section Subtotal: 286 | 263 | 549

Total: 1,103 | 1,088 | 2,191


Trip Distribution

With the calculated trip generation, InterPlan estimates how the trips impact adjacent roads and intersections. Anthem Park Boulevard and Main Street do not currently exist adjacent to the proposed development. Therefore the regional travel demand model was used for all travel modeling and to develop future traffic volumes for Anthem Park Boulevard, Main Street, and Mountain View Corridor. From these model projections, Day of Opening and 2020 peak hour forecast volumes were developed. Based on existing traffic patterns, adjacent land use, and consideration of the location of major urban centers, the following trip distribution were used for Day of Opening development-generated PM trips:

- 60 percent to/from the east on Anthem Park Boulevard
- 40 percent to/from the west on Anthem Park Boulevard

It is not anticipated that Main Street will connect to the surrounding traffic network at day
of opening, therefore, only trips coming to and from Anthem Park Boulevard were used to determine Day of Opening trip distribution. Figure 2 details the traffic volumes at each access driveway that are expected to be generated during the PM peak hour by the proposed commercial development.

For 2020 conditions, it was assumed that Main Street would be extended from the study area south to 12600 South and north to 11400 South. This new connectivity increases the options for travelers to the proposed development site. Considering the impacts of increased connectivity and likely 2020 growth patterns, InterPlan utilized the following trip distribution for 2020 PM trips:

- 40 percent to/from the east on Anthem Park Boulevard
- 20 percent to/from the west on Anthem Park Boulevard
- 20 percent to/from the north on Main Street
- 20 percent to/from the south on Main Street

Figures 2 and 3 detail the traffic volumes at each access driveway that are expected to be generated during the PM peak hour by the proposed commercial development for Day of Opening and 2020 conditions.

Figure 2 – PM Peak Hour Volumes Generated by Proposed Development
In analyzing how well an intersection operates, the capacity and/or operational Level of Service (LOS) for the intersection is determined. Level of Service is defined as how well an intersection or road operates based on levels A through F. Level A represents the best operating conditions and level F the worst. Typically, LOS C or D service flow rates are used as minimally acceptable standards in order to ensure acceptable traffic operations.

- A – free flow operation
- B – reasonably unimpeded operation
- C – stable operation
- D – small increases in flow may cause substantial delay
- E – operates with significant delays
- F – operates with extremely slow speeds and/or intersection failures

InterPlan calculates Level of Service using Synchro, a traffic engineering software program published by Trafficware. Synchro methods are comparable with the methods and procedures of the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 to calculate vehicle delay on the roadway network. Built-in default parameters of Synchro, such as the use of a peak hour
factor of 0.92, are generally used in our analysis. Field observations validate the appropriateness of default parameters. Table 2 illustrates the LOS definitions for stop sign controlled (unsignalized) intersections and signalized intersections. It should be noted that Highway Capacity Manual definitions for level of service do not apply to uncontrolled movements.

Table 2 – LOS - Criteria for Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Stop-Controlled Intersection Approaches</th>
<th>Signalized Intersections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Control delay (seconds/vehicle)</td>
<td>Average Control delay (seconds/vehicle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 10 – 15</td>
<td>&gt; 10 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 15 – 25</td>
<td>&gt; 20 – 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 25– 35</td>
<td>&gt; 35– 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 35 – 50</td>
<td>&gt; 55 – 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>&gt; 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Analysis

Day of Opening Level of Service

Day of Opening LOS was analyzed for the PM peak hour for the following intersections:
1. Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard
2. Access Driveway / Anthem Park Boulevard
3. Mountain View Corridor SB / Anthem Park Boulevard
4. Mountain View Corridor NB / Anthem Park Boulevard

In coordination with Herriman City, it was determined to assume the intersection at Main Street and Anthem Park Boulevard would be signalized for Day of Opening conditions. Additionally, given the volume of left-turning vehicles, this signal, as well as both Mountain View Corridor signals, were assumed to feature protected-permitted left-turn phasing for the east-west approaches.

For LOS analysis, PM peak hour volumes are used, as they represent the worst traffic conditions of the day. For stop-controlled intersections, the reported LOS and vehicle delay are for the worst approach. Day of Opening traffic volumes for each movement are shown in Figure 4. Table 3 contains a summary of the intersection level of service and vehicle delay.
Figure 4 – Day of Opening PM Peak Traffic Volumes

Table 3 – Day of Opening PM LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>F (&gt;50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Day of Opening, the three signalized intersections all operate at an acceptable LOS B or LOS C. The full-movement Access Driveway at Anthem Park Boulevard, however, fails under Day of Opening Conditions with a LOS F.
Impacts of the Full-Movement Access

As stated above, the full-movement access on Anthem Boulevard operates with a failing LOS. Essentially, given the traffic volumes turning into the site via this driveway, as well as the conflicting through traffic volumes on Anthem Park Boulevard, vehicles exiting the development at the full-movement access are anticipated to experience high levels of delay during the PM peak hour.

Access spacing between the Anthem Park Boulevard access and the intersection at Main Street also indicates that the driveway may not allow adequate left-turn pocket storage for both intersections, especially for the westbound left-turn pocket at Main Street, which is expected to be a heavy traffic movement during the PM peak hour. Analysis indicates that the 95th percentile westbound left-turn queue lengths onto Main Street are approximately 175 feet. By comparison, there is only about 300 feet between the Main Street intersection and the driveway. This leaves little distance to develop tapers and appropriate left-turn storage for both movements.

Given the operation challenges anticipated from a full-movement access on Anthem Park Boulevard, InterPlan recommends installation of a right-in/right-out for Day of Opening conditions. Anticipating that the intersection at Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard will be signalized with Day of Opening conditions, conversion of the access driveways onto Anthem Park Boulevard into right-in/right-out configuration will still allow vehicles wanting to turn-left onto Anthem Park Boulevard to use the signalized intersection. Conversely, vehicles that still want to turn left into the development from Anthem Park Boulevard will be able to turn left at the signalized intersection and use one of the five access points off of Main Street. Therefore, a right-in/right-out configuration will not have a detrimental effect on the overall traffic flow in and out of the proposed development.

Figure 5 and Table 4 document the turning volumes and LOS with a right-in/right-out configuration on Anthem Park Boulevard for Day of Opening conditions. The right-in/right-out configuration will mitigate the failing LOS and allow for appropriate left-turn storage on Anthem Park Boulevard.
Table 4 – Day of Opening PM LOS with Right-In Right-Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>B (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A modification to the right-in/right-out access configuration is to also allow left-turns into the south side of the development. This configuration preserves some left-turn access into the development and avoids the LOS and queue impacts of a full-movement access. The configuration could be accomplished by a raised median layout similar to that shown in Figure 6.

With this configuration, left turns into the south side of the development (one of the heaviest traffic movements for the development) are dispersed between both the Main
Street intersection and the Anthem Park Boulevard access. This actually improves intersection LOS at the Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard intersection. Additionally, because there is no left-turn access for the north side of the development, there are no left-turn storage conflicts between Main Street and the access. Although there would be a left-turn lane east of the access, this does not conflict with any left-turn storage requirements at the Mountain View Corridor Southbound intersection since eastbound left-turns are not permitted onto southbound travel lanes.

Figure 6 – Left-Turn Raised Median Layout

Day of Opening LOS with right-in/right-out and westbound left-in at the access driveway is shown in Table 5. Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard improves from LOS C to LOS B over the Day of Opening right-in/right-out scenario, while LOS at the Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard remains LOS B. For Day of Opening, the right-in/right-out with westbound left-in configuration gives the best overall LOS at all intersections while preserving some left-turn access into the development.

Table 5 – Day of Opening PM LOS with Right-In Right-Out and Westbound Left-In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>B (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Conditions

2020 Level of Service

2020 LOS was analyzed for the PM peak hour for the following intersections:

1. Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard
2. Access Driveway / Anthem Park Boulevard
3. Mountain View Corridor SB / Anthem Park Boulevard
4. Mountain View Corridor NB / Anthem Park Boulevard

Figure 7 shows 2020 PM peak hour traffic volumes, and Table 6 details the resulting intersection level of service and vehicle delay. For stop-controlled intersections, the reported LOS and vehicle delay are for the worst approach.

For 2020 conditions, the intersection at Main Street and Anthem Park Boulevard remains an acceptable LOS B. The intersections at Mountain View Corridor and Anthem Park Boulevard also remain an acceptable LOS C and LOS D by 2020. As a full-movement driveway, the Access Driveway at Anthem Park Boulevard remains at an unacceptable LOS F.

Figure 7 – 2020 PM Peak Traffic Volumes
Table 6 – 2020 PM LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>F (&gt;50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>D (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impacts of the Full-Movement Access

With the continued failing LOS for a full-movement access on Anthem Park Boulevard in 2020, the need to restrict left-turn access remains. Figure 8 and Table 7 document the volumes and intersection LOS with a right-in/right-out configuration. Under 2020 PM peak hour conditions, all intersections continue to operate at acceptable levels. Again, as a modification to the right-in/right-out configuration, the access could also allow westbound left-in movements to the south side of the development and preserve adequate LOS. The right-in/right-out plus westbound left-in configuration LOS is shown in Table 8.

Figure 8 – 2020 PM Peak Traffic Volumes with Right-In Right-Out
Table 7 – 2020 PM LOS with Right-In Right-Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>B (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>D (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 – 2020 PM LOS with Right-In Right-Out and Westbound Left-In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>B (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>D (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

The proposed development will not have a detrimental impact to intersection level of service or vehicle delay at surrounding signalized intersections. However, the westbound left turn movement at Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard intersection is expected to be heavy by Day of Opening conditions and InterPlan recommends protected-permitted left-turn phasing on Anthem Boulevard to serve the left-turn demand. Additionally, the signalized intersections at Mountain View Corridor will likely benefit from east-west protected-permitted left-turn phasing at Day of Opening conditions. This mitigation is brought on by a combination of development traffic and background traffic from the extension of Anthem Park Boulevard to Mountain View Corridor.

The Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard intersection operating at LOS F under Day of Opening conditions indicates that this intersection will need to be converted to a right-in/right-out configuration for Day of Opening conditions. With a full-movement access, the left-turn movements onto Anthem Park Boulevard causes this intersection to fail, as vehicles attempting to make a left-turn onto Anthem Park Boulevard are unable to find gaps in the cross-traffic. Day of Opening conditions assume fairly low background traffic volumes; therefore, the development trips alone will cause this intersection to fail as a stop-controlled intersection.
Alternatively, modifying the right-in/right-out access configuration to also include westbound left-turn movements into the south side of the development offers some advantages to both the development and the surrounding road network. This configuration allows for increased left-turn access for the development and improved LOS at the Main Street intersection, but avoids the poor LOS concerns and left-turn storage conflicts brought on by a full-movement access.

**About InterPlan Co.**

InterPlan Co. is a Utah-owned and operated firm founded in 2001 and dedicated to offering creative and client-focused solutions to transportation planning issues. This report has been performed by InterPlan and its staff and is not intended to advocate a position on behalf of any client. Further information and assistance about the contents of this report may be obtained from any of those who worked on this project including Charles Allen, Kai Tohinaka and Tim Peterson.

InterPlan Co.
7719 South Main Street
Midvale, UT 84047
(801) 307-3400
www.interplanco.com
Appendix
August 30, 2017

RE: Anthem Park Commercial Trip Generation Memo - Herriman City, UT

Introduction
The following memorandum addresses the trip generation for the proposed Anthem Commercial development in Herriman, UT. The proposed site is located west of the Mountain View Corridor to the north and south of Anthem Park Boulevard. A traffic study was performed in August 2015 by Interplan. The purpose of this memo is to identify the current counts in the area and how the latest site plan compares to this prior study.

Figure 1: Anthem Park Site – Herriman, Utah
Figure 2: Proposed Site plan
Trip Generation
The trip generation rate for land uses comes from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. Trip generation rates are based on a per unit basis as provided for the critical AM, PM and daily traffic rates. Multiplying the trip rate by the facility sizes provides the trip generation for the site by land use.

From the Interplan Traffic study, the following land uses and trip generation rates were applied.

“The 50.9 acre site is a proposed commercial development north and south of Anthem Park Boulevard. The south section is approximately 42.9 acres and the north section is approximately 8 acres. The south section will include approximately 450,000 sq/ft of retail and commercial space. This includes several large big box commercial stores, fuel pumps, a furniture store, and several other commercial buildings and restaurant pads. The north section will include a hotel as well as approximately 37,000 sq/ft of retail and commercial space.”
### Exhibit B Continued

#### Table 1 – Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>In/Out Split</th>
<th>Internal Capture</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount Superstore</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>49/51</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Pumps</td>
<td>944</td>
<td># Pumps</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Store</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit Down Restaurant</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-In Bank</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Section Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>818</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>310</td>
<td># Rooms</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>51/49</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit Down Restaurant</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Section Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>2,191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Anthem Park Boulevard

Existing Traffic
Counts were collected at three intersections to identify the current traffic levels.

- Anthem Park / Freedom Park
- MVC SB / Anthem Park
- MVC NB / Anthem Park

Based on the counts, the traffic in front of the Anthem Park Commercial area is estimated at 5,100 ADT. The current Anthem Park Drive is a 5-lane facility with an estimated 39,000 ADT. Anthem Park Drive is operating at site is operating at 13.1% of the roadway capacity.
Site Traffic
The proposed land uses include a projected 1636 AM and 1479 PM peak trips. Based on the type of land uses, the site is estimated to include 56% of external trips and 44% of pass-by related trips. In addition, it is estimated that 15% of the traffic will be internal captured trips traveling to multiple land uses.
For the proposed north and south areas proposed, the land uses are almost identical and therefore the trip generation is estimated as the same. Therefore, the Interplan analysis would still be applicable. The projected traffic for the site is shown in Figure 2 from the Interplan TIA for the opening day and Figure 3 for the 2020 future projected traffic level.

Figure 2 – PM Peak Hour Volumes Generated by Proposed Development
Queueing

Along Anthem Park Boulevard, there is a proposed access between Main Street and MVC. The proposed primary commercial access is 477 feet from MVC and the future signalized intersection at Main Street and Anthem Park Boulevard is 353 feet further west.

The queue analysis using the Interplan projected 2020 traffic volumes indicates that the critical westbound queue at the proposed full motion access may approach 400 feet. Normally, this would be a concern as it would back into the MVC intersection left turn storage area, however, since there are no eastbound left turn movements at the SB direction MVC intersection and therefore the center turn lane between the access and MVC can be utilized exclusively by the westbound left turn queue for the Access.

It is projected that the Access will function for the short term as a full motion access which will need to transition into a ¾ movement access where the north-south left turn movements be shifted to the signalized intersection at the future Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard intersection. In the distant future, this Access may need to be restricted to a right-in / right-out as traffic increases and the connection to MVC is modified to account for the grade separation of the MVC.
Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
A-Trans Engineering

Joseph Perrin, PhD, PE, PTOE
Principal
AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

Ped = 23

N-S STREET: MVC NB
E-W STREET: 11800 South

COUNT DATE: August 22, 2017
Day of the Week: Tuesday
NOTES:

COUNT TIME:
FROM: 7:00 AM
TO: 9:00 AM

FROM TO NBL NBT NBR EBL EBT EBR SBL SBT SBR WBL WBT WBR TOTAL 5' VOLUMES TOTAL 15' VOLUMES PEDESTRIAN E/W N/S
7:00 AM 7:05 AM 9 101 14 11 7 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 19 145 436 0 0
7:05 AM 7:10 AM 5 121 12 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 20 160 436 0 4
7:10 AM 7:15 AM 3 101 7 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 125 405 0 1
7:15 AM 7:20 AM 0 112 9 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 145 426 3 3
7:20 AM 7:25 AM 0 106 9 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 135 429 2 0
7:25 AM 7:30 AM 0 127 12 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 146 433 2 1
7:30 AM 7:35 AM 0 120 12 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 13 148 456 0 1
7:35 AM 7:40 AM 2 97 22 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 139 471 0 2
7:40 AM 7:45 AM 0 128 21 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 169 487 0 0
7:45 AM 7:50 AM 1 122 15 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 14 163 452 1 0
7:50 AM 7:55 AM 0 120 14 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 13 155 400 0 0
7:55 AM 8:00 AM 2 87 22 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 132 330 2 1
8:00 AM 8:05 AM 1 80 16 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 113 353 0 0
8:05 AM 8:10 AM 0 55 8 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 85 372 0 0
8:10 AM 8:15 AM 1 110 15 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 23 155 361 0 0
8:15 AM 8:20 AM 0 100 16 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 132 318 1 0
8:20 AM 8:25 AM 0 67 13 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 93 285 0 0
8:25 AM 8:30 AM 1 79 2 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 93 269 2 2
8:30 AM 8:35 AM 0 58 9 6 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 79 250 0 0
8:35 AM 8:40 AM 0 77 8 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 97 255 1 0
8:40 AM 8:45 AM 0 68 6 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 82 214 0 2
8:45 AM 8:50 AM 0 57 7 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 76 183 0 1
8:50 AM 8:55 AM 0 42 5 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 56 107 0 2
8:55 AM 9:00 AM 0 37 7 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 51 51 0 2

AM Traffic
COUNT DATA INPUT:
Name: Lynda
Name: Lynda
Name: Lynda
Name: Lynda

EXHIBIT B Continued
PM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

INTERSECTION MVC NB and 11800 South

PK HR VOLUME: 2,331

PKF: 0.96

PEAK HOUR: 4:50 PM TO 5:50 PM

COUNT DATE: August 23, 2017

Day of the Week: Wednesday

NOTES:

COUNT TIME: FROM 4:00 PM TO 6:00 PM

N-S STREET: 11800 South

E-W STREET: 11800 South

TOTAL VOLUMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>NORTHBOUND</th>
<th>EASTBOUND</th>
<th>SOUTHBOUND</th>
<th>WESTBOUND</th>
<th>PEDESTRIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM 4:00 PM TO 4:55 PM</td>
<td>2 65 11 4 21 0 0 0 0 0 0 25 9 137</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05 PM</td>
<td>1 59 8 7 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 14 8 148</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10 PM</td>
<td>4 80 11 9 16 1 0 0 0 0 0 25 21 187</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM</td>
<td>5 103 7 7 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 17 15 174</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20 PM</td>
<td>3 92 14 11 33 1 0 0 0 0 0 34 13 201</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25 PM</td>
<td>1 124 11 5 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 24 4 186</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>1 78 8 6 24 0 0 0 0 0 0 23 10 147</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35 PM</td>
<td>2 97 11 4 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 21 7 158</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40 PM</td>
<td>6 88 12 10 21 0 0 0 0 0 0 28 14 173</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM</td>
<td>3 94 7 7 36 0 0 0 0 0 0 29 15 191</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 PM</td>
<td>4 126 11 2 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 22 7 188</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55 PM</td>
<td>3 97 1 1 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 46 11 186</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>6 118 13 7 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 28 7 193</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05 PM</td>
<td>1 79 2 8 32 0 0 0 0 0 0 35 5 162</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10 PM</td>
<td>3 139 9 4 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 26 13 206</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>1 104 16 4 26 0 0 0 0 0 0 23 10 210</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20 PM</td>
<td>2 123 14 4 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 27 14 199</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25 PM</td>
<td>3 153 13 4 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 45 8 199</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 PM</td>
<td>3 120 7 3 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 27 7 179</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:35 PM</td>
<td>0 81 14 7 30 0 0 0 0 0 0 49 8 188</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40 PM</td>
<td>2 142 18 8 19 0 0 0 0 0 0 26 12 229</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 PM</td>
<td>4 85 14 6 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 31 15 177</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50 PM</td>
<td>6 111 15 4 17 0 0 0 0 0 0 21 10 182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PM Traffic

COUNT DATA NPUT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>NORTHBOUND</th>
<th>EASTBOUND</th>
<th>SOUTHBOUND</th>
<th>WESTBOUND</th>
<th>PEDESTRIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM 4:00 PM TO 6:00 PM</td>
<td>5 126 11 2 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 22 7 188</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit B Continued
# Exhibit B Continued

## AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
<th>MVC SB and 11800 South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK HR VOLUME:</td>
<td>1,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF:</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK HOUR:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO:</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>48 1,061 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COUNT DATE: | August 22, 2017 |
| Day of the Week: | Tuesday |

### AM Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>TO NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **11800 South 275 170**
- **7:00 AM 8:00 AM**
- **COUNT ME FROM:** 7:00 AM
- **TO:** 9:00 AM
PM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

INTERSECTION MVC SB and 11800 South

PK HR VOLUME: 2,502
PHF: 0.94
PEAK HOUR:
FROM: TO:
5:00 PM 6:00 PM

NORTH

0 107 1,517 187 0

11800 South

156 323

29

203

COUNTO:
FROM: 4:00 PM
TO: 6:00 PM

Day of the Week:
Wednesday

Notes:

COUNTRY:
COUNT DATE:
August 23, 2017

PM Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>TOTAL 3' VOLUMES</th>
<th>TOTAL 15' VOLUMES</th>
<th>PEDESTRIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>4:05 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05 PM</td>
<td>4:10 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10 PM</td>
<td>4:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM</td>
<td>4:20 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20 PM</td>
<td>4:25 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25 PM</td>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>4:35 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35 PM</td>
<td>4:40 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40 PM</td>
<td>4:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM</td>
<td>4:50 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 PM</td>
<td>4:55 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55 PM</td>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>5:05 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05 PM</td>
<td>5:10 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10 PM</td>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>5:20 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20 PM</td>
<td>5:25 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25 PM</td>
<td>5:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 PM</td>
<td>5:35 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:35 PM</td>
<td>5:40 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40 PM</td>
<td>5:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 PM</td>
<td>5:50 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50 PM</td>
<td>5:55 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:55 PM</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

**N-S STREET:** Freedom Park Drive  
**E-W STREET:** Anthem Park Blvd  

**COUNT DATE:** August 22, 2017  
**Day of the Week:** Tuesday  
**COUNT TIME:** 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **AM Traffic COUNT DATA NPUT:** Name: Julie Name: Julie Name: Julie Name: Julie
- **TIME PERIOD NORTHBOUND EASTBOUND SOUTHBOUND WESTBOUND TOTAL 5' VOLUMES TOTAL 15' VOLUMES PEDESTRIAN**
- **N-S:** E/W
PM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

INTERSECTION Freedom Park Drive and Anthem Park Blvd

PK HR VOLUME: 854
PHF: 0.94
PEAK HOUR: FROM TO: 5:00 PM 6:00 PM

N-S STREET: Freedom Park Drive
E-W STREET: Anthem Park Blvd

COUNT DATE: August 23, 2017
Day of the Week: Wednesday
NOTES:

COUNT TIME: FROM 4:00 PM TO 6:00 PM

PM Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>TO NBL NBT NBR EBL EBT EBR SBL SBT SBR WBL WBT WBR</th>
<th>TOTAL 5' VOLUMES</th>
<th>TOTAL 15' VOLUMES</th>
<th>PEDESTRIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4:00 PM 4:05 PM | 0 0 0 13 13 0 | 5 0 13 1 16 7 | 58 | 177 5 6
| 4:05 PM 4:10 PM | 0 0 0 14 13 0 | 2 0 12 0 8 1 | 50 | 166 0 3
| 4:10 PM 4:15 PM | 0 0 0 11 11 0 | 1 0 9 0 20 6 | 59 | 175 0 0
| 4:15 PM 4:20 PM | 0 0 0 13 9 0 | 6 0 13 0 15 2 | 57 | 163 0 0
| 4:20 PM 4:25 PM | 0 0 0 9 14 0 | 4 0 11 0 14 1 | 59 | 163 0 0
| 4:25 PM 4:30 PM | 0 0 0 9 7 0 | 3 0 10 0 17 1 | 47 | 156 0 0
| 4:30 PM 4:35 PM | 0 0 0 8 8 0 | 4 0 8 0 19 10 | 57 | 175 0 0
| 4:35 PM 4:40 PM | 0 0 0 10 10 0 | 1 0 15 0 14 4 | 54 | 170 0 0
| 4:40 PM 4:45 PM | 0 0 0 13 10 0 | 5 0 11 0 9 11 | 59 | 173 0 0
| 4:45 PM 4:50 PM | 0 0 0 13 8 0 | 3 0 13 0 15 5 | 57 | 175 0 0
| 4:50 PM 4:55 PM | 0 0 0 14 7 0 | 14 0 8 0 16 4 | 57 | 191 0 0
| 4:55 PM 5:00 PM | 0 0 0 12 8 0 | 4 0 9 0 19 9 | 61 | 215 0 0
| 5:00 PM 5:05 PM | 0 0 0 16 6 0 | 2 0 15 0 22 10 | 73 | 225 0 0
| 5:05 PM 5:10 PM | 0 0 0 14 14 0 | 8 0 25 0 15 5 | 81 | 204 0 0
| 5:10 PM 5:15 PM | 0 0 0 12 11 0 | 5 0 15 0 20 8 | 71 | 197 0 0
| 5:15 PM 5:20 PM | 0 0 0 8 6 0 | 5 0 14 0 12 7 | 52 | 186 0 2
| 5:20 PM 5:25 PM | 0 0 0 9 9 0 | 4 0 27 0 22 7 | 74 | 215 1 0
| 5:25 PM 5:30 PM | 0 0 0 10 6 0 | 6 0 15 0 20 5 | 62 | 211 0 0
| 5:30 PM 5:35 PM | 0 0 0 12 4 0 | 4 0 18 0 27 14 | 79 | 228 0 0
| 5:35 PM 5:40 PM | 0 0 0 8 9 0 | 7 0 18 0 22 6 | 70 | 212 0 0
| 5:40 PM 5:45 PM | 0 0 0 16 11 0 | 6 0 16 0 22 9 | 79 | 215 0 0
| 5:45 PM 5:50 PM | 0 0 0 11 11 0 | 3 0 17 0 16 6 | 63 | 213 0 0
| 5:50 PM 5:55 PM | 0 0 0 6 14 0 | 4 0 20 0 24 9 | 77 | 150 2 0
| 5:55 PM 6:00 PM | 0 0 0 6 16 0 | 5 0 21 0 20 3 | 78 | 72 0 0

Exhibit B Continued
To: Michael Maloy  
From: Jonathan Bowers  
Date: June 15, 2018  
Re: Traffic Surrounding JCW’s (C2018-15) & Les Schwab (C2018-18)  
cc: Blake Thomas, Bryn McCarty, Craig Evans  

Mr. Maloy,  
This memo is intended to clarify staff recommendation regarding traffic movement surrounding both JCW’s and Les Schwab and provide additional insight and traffic study information that wasn’t represented in the recent Planning Commission when these conditional uses were conditionally approved.

For both applications, staff recommendation number nine (9) states “A traffic study for the entire development shall be reviewed as part of the engineering approval. Left-turns may be limited as recommended in the traffic study.” This recommendation is a result of the traffic concerns highlighted in the Anthem Park Traffic Impact Study prepared in August 2015 (TIS), attached as Exhibit A. In the context of the overall development, the TIS points out two items of concern:

1. The impact of development trips to adjacent intersection operation and the surrounding traffic network.
2. The full-movement access from the development onto Anthem Park Boulevard operating as both a full-movement access and right-in/right-out access.

Additionally, the 2015 TIS indicates that the traffic concerns “…may be addressed at a later stage in the project development and design.” I suggested that the Planning Commission require the developments provide a traffic memo to address the concerns above in response to Planning Commission’s request for clarification to the staff recommendation.

Since the recent Planning Commission meeting Blake Thomas and the Master Developer provided me a copy of a Trip Generation Memo prepared in August 2017 (Trip Memo),
that was specifically intended to address the concerns outlined in the 2015 TIS (attached as Exhibit B). This memo accounts for the updated uses in the Anthem Commercial development and quantifies their respective trip generation.

The updated Trip Memo addresses the 2015 TIS concerns and states that Angel Falls Lane, the access onto Anthem Blvd, “…will function for the short term as a full motion access which will need to transition into a ¾ movement access where the north-south left turn movements be shifted to the signalized intersection at the future Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard intersection. In the distant future, this Access may need to be restricted to a right-in / right-out as traffic increases and the connection to MVC is modified to account for the grade separation of the MVC.”

Based on the information provided in the updated Trip Memo, the proposed uses will not warrant the need for a right-in/right-out onto Anthem Blvd at this time and it may function as a full motion access with the understanding that the access will transition into a ¾ movement and eventually be restricted to a right-in/right in the distant future.

In light of this information, the Engineering Department recommends that the Planning Commission consider the updated Trip Memo as the additional information required to fulfill the condition of approval and allow Angel Falls Lane to function as a full motion access in association with recently approved development (i.e. JCW’s and Les Schwab).
Introduction

InterPlan was hired by Herriman City to evaluate the general traffic operations of a proposed development in Herriman, Utah. The overall purpose of this traffic study is to identify planning related issues associated with the design plans and concepts in order to mitigate any transportation related concerns and identify site specific design issues that may be addressed at a later stage in project development and design.

Of key concern for this project is the impact of a proposed full-movement development access on Anthem Park Boulevard between Main Street and Mountain View Corridor. Due to the already short spacing between the Main Street and Mountain View Corridor intersections and the anticipation of a future TRAX line envisioned along Anthem Park Boulevard, Herriman City plans for the development access to ultimately be converted into a right-in/right-out access. In addition to general site impacts, this document investigates the timing for which the conversion to right-in/right-out access should occur.

The proposed development is an approximately 50.9 acre site located in Herriman, Utah, at the intersection of Anthem Park Boulevard and Mountain View Corridor (SR-85). The site is located on the west side of Mountain View Corridor, and will straddle the north and south sides of Anthem Park Boulevard. Figure 1 shows the development site plan.

Summary of Issues and Recommendations

Through analysis of the traffic operations, current and planned land uses and local concerns, InterPlan has determined the major issues to be:

1. The impact of development trips to adjacent intersection operation and the surrounding traffic network.
2. The full-movement access from the development onto Anthem Park Boulevard operating as both a full-movement access and right-in/right-out access.

It was assumed the Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard intersection would be constructed as a signalized intersection with Day of Opening conditions. With the heavy westbound left-turn movements anticipated at this intersection for both Day of Opening and 2020 conditions, InterPlan recommends protected-permitted left-turn phasing for the westbound approach. Additionally, the signalized intersections at Mountain View Corridor will likely benefit from east-west protected-permitted left-turn phasing at Day of Opening conditions.

As a full-movement driveway, the access at Anthem Park Boulevard between Main Street and Mountain View Corridor will operate at LOS F, under Day of Opening conditions. InterPlan recommends this access be converted to a right-in/right-out only access for Day of Opening conditions. Expanding the right-in/right-out access to also permit westbound left-in movements to the south side of the development is an optional modification that offers some additional traffic flow benefits to both the development and the surrounding traffic network while avoiding the negative impacts from a full-movement access.
Figure 1 – Development Site Plan
Description of Existing Conditions and Proposal

The proposed development is located in northeast Herriman, Utah on the southwest side of Mountain View Corridor (SR-85) at Anthem Park Boulevard (11800 South). Main Street in Herriman will border the proposed development on the west. The 50.9 acre site is a proposed commercial development north and south of Anthem Park Boulevard. The south section is approximately 42.9 acres and the north section is approximately 8 acres. The south section will include approximately 450,000 sq/ft of retail and commercial space. This includes several large big box commercial stores, fuel pumps, a furniture store, and several other commercial buildings and restaurant pads. The north section will include a hotel as well as approximately 37,000 sq/ft of retail and commercial space.

The development site fronts Anthem Park Boulevard, an arterial roadway which will eventually connect Mountain View Corridor at 11800 South with Herriman Parkway. Currently Anthem Park Boulevard is only constructed south and west of the development site, connecting to Herriman Parkway on the south. Adjacent to the development site, Anthem Park Boulevard will be 122 feet wide with two lanes in each direction, a two-way center turn lane, and 10’ shoulders. The posted speed limit on Anthem Park Boulevard is 35 mph.

Main Street will run along the west side of the development as a north-south roadway that intersects with Anthem Park Boulevard. Main Street is currently not completed adjacent to the development, and only currently exists as far north as 12600 South where it transitions to an east-west roadway. The section of Main Street south of Anthem Park Boulevard and adjacent to the development is anticipated to have two travel lanes in each direction and a two-way center turn lane. North of Anthem Park Boulevard, Main Street is expected to have one lane in each direction with a two-way center turn lane.

Mountain View Corridor (SR-85) runs along the northeast side of the proposed development. The section of Mountain View Corridor adjacent to the development has only been completed through Phase 1 as a frontage road system, but is planned to be upgraded to a full freeway with limited access on-ramps and off-ramps by 2040. Mountain View Corridor will eventually connect I-80 in Salt Lake County with SR-73 and I-15 in Utah County.

The proposed development will have several access points onto Main Street; three driveways for the south section of the development and two access driveways for the north section of the development. There will also be two driveways on either side of Anthem Park Boulevard that will align and provide access to the north and south section of the development, acting as one stop-controlled intersection. The current site plan also shows a proposed right-in/right-out access directly onto Mountain View Corridor. After a review of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) access management policy for Mountain View Corridor, and in discussion with Herriman City, it was determined to assume no access directly onto Mountain View Corridor for this analysis.
The proposed development is zoned (C-2) Community Commercial (MU-2) Mixed Use-2 Zone. The surrounding land use is mostly residential and open space. The large master planned Daybreak community lies just to the northeast. Herriman High School and Copper Mountain Middle School are located just to the west.

**Trip Generation**

For purposes of evaluation and planning, transportation engineers have defined a unit of measure as a vehicle trip. A trip is a one-direction vehicle movement with either the origin or the destination (exiting or entering) inside the study site. (Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation User’s Guide 2003) In general terms, any time a vehicle passes through a driveway, a trip is registered. The ITE has performed studies on various types of land uses and the trips generated by those individual land uses. The ITE has published detailed average trip counts by type of development. ITE trip generation rates are available for various periods of the day including AM and PM peaks on weekdays and on weekends. InterPlan typically uses these industry-accepted standards when evaluating traffic impacts unless local variations to the standards are readily apparent or are an area of concern.

Trip generation for the proposed development was calculated using the ITE’s trip rate for Discount Superstore (ITE Land Use Code 813), Gasoline Pumps, (ITE Land Use Code 944), Shopping Center (ITE Land Use Code 820), Hotel (ITE Code 310), Drive-In Bank (ITE Land Use Code 912), High Turnover (Sit Down) Restaurant (ITE Code 932) and Fast Food Restaurant (ITE Land Use Code 934). Based on the site plan and square footage of each building footprint, InterPlan assigned a land use to each parcel within the development. Additionally, given the size of the development and the potential for complimentary land uses (hotel, restaurants, retail, gas station), an internal capture trip reduction was applied to the development. Trip totals for each land use were adjusted down 20 percent to account for the internal capture, except for the Gasoline Pumps which were reduced by 50 percent. Table 1 summarizes the trip generation for the PM peak hour. The development is anticipated to generate approximately 2,191 total PM peak hour trips. Since commercial retail trips have a relatively small impact in the AM peak hour compared to the PM peak hour, this analysis focused on PM peak hour impact.
Table 1 – Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>In/Out Split</th>
<th>Internal Capture</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Trips Out</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount Superstore</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>49/51</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Pumps</td>
<td>944</td>
<td># Pumps</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Store</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit Down Restaurant</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-In Bank</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Section Subtotal 818 824 1,642

| Hotel                  | 310      | # Rooms     | 150        | 0.6       | 51/49        | 20%              | 37  | 35        | 72    |
| Shopping Center        | 820      | 1,000 Sq/ft | 16.1       | 3.71      | 48/52        | 20%              | 23  | 25        | 48    |
| Sit Down Restaurant    | 932      | 1,000 Sq/ft | 6.6        | 9.85      | 60/40        | 20%              | 31  | 21        | 52    |
| Fast Food Restaurant   | 934      | 1,000 Sq/ft | 14.4       | 32.65     | 52/48        | 20%              | 194 | 182       | 377   |

North Section Subtotal 286 263 549

Total 1,103 1,088 2,191


Trip Distribution

With the calculated trip generation, InterPlan estimates how the trips impact adjacent roads and intersections. Anthem Park Boulevard and Main Street do not currently exist adjacent to the proposed development. Therefore the regional travel demand model was used for all travel modeling and to develop future traffic volumes for Anthem Park Boulevard, Main Street, and Mountain View Corridor. From these model projections, Day of Opening and 2020 peak hour forecast volumes were developed. Based on existing traffic patterns, adjacent land use, and consideration of the location of major urban centers, the following trip distribution were used for Day of Opening development-generated PM trips:

- 60 percent to/from the east on Anthem Park Boulevard
- 40 percent to/from the west on Anthem Park Boulevard

It is not anticipated that Main Street will connect to the surrounding traffic network at day
of opening, therefore, only trips coming to and from Anthem Park Boulevard were used to
determine Day of Opening trip distribution. Figure 2 details the traffic volumes at each
access driveway that are expected to be generated during the PM peak hour by the
proposed commercial development.

For 2020 conditions, it was assumed that Main Street would be extended from the study
area south to 12600 South and north to 11400 South. This new connectivity increases the
options for travelers to the proposed development site. Considering the impacts of
increased connectivity and likely 2020 growth patterns, InterPlan utilized the following
trip distribution for 2020 PM trips:

- 40 percent to/from the east on Anthem Park Boulevard
- 20 percent to/from the west on Anthem Park Boulevard
- 20 percent to/from the north on Main Street
- 20 percent to/from the south on Main Street

Figures 2 and 3 detail the traffic volumes at each access driveway that are expected to be
generated during the PM peak hour by the proposed commercial development for Day of
Opening and 2020 conditions.

Figure 2 – PM Peak Hour Volumes Generated by Proposed Development
Level of Service (LOS)

In analyzing how well an intersection operates, the capacity and/or operational Level of Service (LOS) for the intersection is determined. Level of Service is defined as how well an intersection or road operates based on levels A through F. Level A represents the best operating conditions and level F the worst. Typically, LOS C or D service flow rates are used as minimally acceptable standards in order to ensure acceptable traffic operations.

- A – free flow operation
- B – reasonably unimpeded operation
- C – stable operation
- D – small increases in flow may cause substantial delay
- E – operates with significant delays
- F – operates with extremely slow speeds and/or intersection failures

InterPlan calculates Level of Service using Synchro, a traffic engineering software program published by Trafficware. Synchro methods are comparable with the methods and procedures of the *Highway Capacity Manual 2010* to calculate vehicle delay on the roadway network. Built-in default parameters of Synchro, such as the use of a peak hour
factor of 0.92, are generally used in our analysis. Field observations validate the appropriateness of default parameters. Table 2 illustrates the LOS definitions for stop sign controlled (unsignalized) intersections and signalized intersections. It should be noted that Highway Capacity Manual definitions for level of service do not apply to uncontrolled movements.

Table 2 – LOS - Criteria for Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Stop-Controlled Intersection Approaches</th>
<th>Signalized Intersections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Control delay (seconds/vehicle)</td>
<td>Average Control delay (seconds/vehicle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 10 – 15</td>
<td>&gt; 10 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 15 – 25</td>
<td>&gt; 20 – 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 25 – 35</td>
<td>&gt; 25 – 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 35 – 50</td>
<td>&gt; 55 – 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>&gt; 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Analysis

Day of Opening Level of Service

Day of Opening LOS was analyzed for the PM peak hour for the following intersections:
1. Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard
2. Access Driveway / Anthem Park Boulevard
3. Mountain View Corridor SB / Anthem Park Boulevard
4. Mountain View Corridor NB / Anthem Park Boulevard

In coordination with Herriman City, it was determined to assume the intersection at Main Street and Anthem Park Boulevard would be signalized for Day of Opening conditions. Additionally, given the volume of left-turning vehicles, this signal, as well as both Mountain View Corridor signals, were assumed to feature protected-permitted left-turn phasing for the east-west approaches.

For LOS analysis, PM peak hour volumes are used, as they represent the worst traffic conditions of the day. For stop-controlled intersections, the reported LOS and vehicle delay are for the worst approach. Day of Opening traffic volumes for each movement are shown in Figure 4. Table 3 contains a summary of the intersection level of service and vehicle delay.
Figure 4 – Day of Opening PM Peak Traffic Volumes

Table 3 – Day of Opening PM LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>F (&gt;50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Day of Opening, the three signalized intersections all operate at an acceptable LOS B or LOS C. The full-movement Access Driveway at Anthem Park Boulevard, however, fails under Day of Opening Conditions with a LOS F.
Impacts of the Full-Movement Access

As stated above, the full-movement access on Anthem Boulevard operates with a failing LOS. Essentially, given the traffic volumes turning into the site via this driveway, as well as the conflicting through traffic volumes on Anthem Park Boulevard, vehicles exiting the development at the full-movement access are anticipated to experience high levels of delay during the PM peak hour.

Access spacing between the Anthem Park Boulevard access and the intersection at Main Street also indicates that the driveway may not allow adequate left-turn pocket storage for both intersections, especially for the westbound left-turn pocket at Main Street, which is expected to be a heavy traffic movement during the PM peak hour. Analysis indicates that the 95th percentile westbound left-turn queue lengths onto Main Street are approximately 175 feet. By comparison, there is only about 300 feet between the Main Street intersection and the driveway. This leaves little distance to develop tapers and appropriate left-turn storage for both movements.

Given the operation challenges anticipated from a full-movement access on Anthem Park Boulevard, InterPlan recommends installation of a right-in/right-out for Day of Opening conditions. Anticipating that the intersection at Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard will be signalized with Day of Opening conditions, conversion of the access driveways onto Anthem Park Boulevard into right-in/right-out configuration will still allow vehicles wanting to turn-left onto Anthem Park Boulevard to use the signalized intersection. Conversely, vehicles that still want to turn left into the development from Anthem Park Boulevard will be able to turn left at the signalized intersection and use one of the five access points off of Main Street. Therefore, a right-in/right-out configuration will not have a detrimental effect on the overall traffic flow in and out of the proposed development.

Figure 5 and Table 4 document the turning volumes and LOS with a right-in/right-out configuration on Anthem Park Boulevard for Day of Opening conditions. The right-in/right-out configuration will mitigate the failing LOS and allow for appropriate left-turn storage on Anthem Park Boulevard.
A modification to the right-in/right-out access configuration is to also allow left-turns into the south side of the development. This configuration preserves some left-turn access into the development and avoids the LOS and queue impacts of a full-movement access. The configuration could be accomplished by a raised median layout similar to that shown in Figure 6.

With this configuration, left turns into the south side of the development (one of the heaviest traffic movements for the development) are dispersed between both the Main
Street intersection and the Anthem Park Boulevard access. This actually improves intersection LOS at the Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard intersection. Additionally, because there is no left-turn access for the north side of the development, there are no left-turn storage conflicts between Main Street and the access. Although there would be a left-turn lane east of the access, this does not conflict with any left-turn storage requirements at the Mountain View Corridor Southbound intersection since eastbound left-turns are not permitted onto southbound travel lanes.

Figure 6 – Left-Turn Raised Median Layout

Day of Opening LOS with right-in/right-out and westbound left-in at the access driveway is shown in Table 5. Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard improves from LOS C to LOS B over the Day of Opening right-in/right-out scenario, while LOS at the Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard remains LOS B. For Day of Opening, the right-in/right-out with westbound left-in configuration gives the best overall LOS at all intersections while preserving some left-turn access into the development.

Table 5 – Day of Opening PM LOS with Right-In Right-Out and Westbound Left-In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>B (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Conditions

2020 Level of Service

2020 LOS was analyzed for the PM peak hour for the following intersections:
1. Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard
2. Access Driveway / Anthem Park Boulevard
3. Mountain View Corridor SB / Anthem Park Boulevard
4. Mountain View Corridor NB / Anthem Park Boulevard

Figure 7 shows 2020 PM peak hour traffic volumes, and Table 6 details the resulting intersection level of service and vehicle delay. For stop-controlled intersections, the reported LOS and vehicle delay are for the worst approach.

For 2020 conditions, the intersection at Main Street and Anthem Park Boulevard remains an acceptable LOS B. The intersections at Mountain View Corridor and Anthem Park Boulevard also remain an acceptable LOS C and LOS D by 2020. As a full-movement driveway, the Access Driveway at Anthem Park Boulevard remains at an unacceptable LOS F.

Figure 7 – 2020 PM Peak Traffic Volumes
Table 6 – 2020 PM LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway/Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>F (&gt;50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>D (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impacts of the Full-Movement Access

With the continued failing LOS for a full-movement access on Anthem Park Boulevard in 2020, the need to restrict left-turn access remains. Figure 8 and Table 7 document the volumes and intersection LOS with a right-in/right-out configuration. Under 2020 PM peak hour conditions, all intersections continue to operate at acceptable levels. Again, as a modification to the right-in/right-out configuration, the access could also allow westbound left-in movements to the south side of the development and preserve adequate LOS. The right-in/right-out plus westbound left-in configuration LOS is shown in Table 8.

Figure 8 – 2020 PM Peak Traffic Volumes with Right-In Right-Out
Table 7 – 2020 PM LOS with Right-In Right-Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>B (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>D (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 – 2020 PM LOS with Right-In Right-Out and Westbound Left-In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Worst Approach</th>
<th>Level of Service (average delay) [seconds/vehicle]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>B (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Driveway / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>B (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC SB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>D (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC NB / Anthem Park Boulevard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>C (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

The proposed development will not have a detrimental impact to intersection level of service or vehicle delay at surrounding signalized intersections. However, the westbound left turn movement at Main Street/Anthem Park Boulevard intersection is expected to be heavy by Day of Opening conditions and InterPlan recommends protected-permitted left-turn phasing on Anthem Boulevard to serve the left-turn demand. Additionally, the signalized intersections at Mountain View Corridor will likely benefit from east-west protected-permitted left-turn phasing at Day of Opening conditions. This mitigation is brought on by a combination of development traffic and background traffic from the extension of Anthem Park Boulevard to Mountain View Corridor.

The Access Driveway / Anthem Park Boulevard intersection operating at LOS F under Day of Opening conditions indicates that this intersection will need to be converted to a right-in/right out configuration for Day of Opening conditions. With a full-movement access, the left-turn movements onto Anthem Park Boulevard causes this intersection to fail, as vehicles attempting to make a left-turn onto Anthem Park Boulevard are unable to find gaps in the cross-traffic. Day of Opening conditions assume fairly low background traffic volumes; therefore, the development trips alone will cause this intersection to fail as a stop-controlled intersection.
Alternatively, modifying the right-in/right-out access configuration to also include westbound left-turn movements into the south side of the development offers some advantages to both the development and the surrounding road network. This configuration allows for increased left-turn access for the development and improved LOS at the Main Street intersection, but avoids the poor LOS concerns and left-turn storage conflicts brought on by a full-movement access.
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Appendix
August 30, 2017

RE:  Anthem Park Commercial Trip Generation Memo- Herriman City, UT

Introduction
The following memorandum addresses the trip generation for the proposed Anthem Commercial development in Herriman, UT. The proposed site is located west of the Mountain View Corridor to the north and south of Anthem Park Boulevard. A traffic study was performed in August 2015 by Interplan. The purpose of this memo is to identify the current counts in the area and how the latest site plan compares to this prior study.

Figure 1:  Anthem Park Site – Herriman, Utah
Figure 2: Proposed Site plan
Trip Generation

The trip generation rate for land uses comes from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. Trip generation rates are based on a per unit basis as provided for the critical AM, PM and daily traffic rates. Multiplying the trip rate by the facility sizes provides the trip generation for the site by land use.

From the Interplan Traffic study, the following land uses and trip generation rates were applied.

“The 50.9 acre site is a proposed commercial development north and south of Anthem Park Boulevard. The south section is approximately 42.9 acres and the north section is approximately 8 acres. The south section will include approximately 450,000 sq/ft of retail and commercial space. This includes several large big box commercial stores, fuel pumps, a furniture store, and several other commercial buildings and restaurant pads. The north section will include a hotel as well as approximately 37,000 sq/ft of retail and commercial space.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>In/Out Split</th>
<th>Internal Capture</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount Superstore</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>49/51</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Pumps</td>
<td>944</td>
<td># of Pumps</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Store</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit Down Restaurant</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-In Bank</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Section Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>818</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>310</td>
<td># of Rooms</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>51/49</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit Down Restaurant</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,000 Sq/ft</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Section Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>2,191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit B Continued

Figure 3: Anthem Park Boulevard

Existing Traffic
Counts were collected at three intersections to identify the current traffic levels.

- Anthem Park / Freedom Park
- MVC SB / Anthem Park
- MVC NB / Anthem Park

Based on the counts, the traffic in front of the Anthem Park Commercial area is estimated at 5,100 ADT. The current Anthem Park Drive is a 5-lane facility with an estimated 39,000 ADT. Anthem Park Drive is operating at 13.1% of the roadway capacity.
Site Traffic
The proposed land uses include a projected 1636 AM and 1479 PM peak trips. Based on the type of land uses, the site is estimated to include 56% of external trips and 44% of pass-by related trips. In addition, it is estimated that 15% of the traffic will be internal captured trips traveling to multiple land uses.
For the proposed north and south areas proposed, the land uses are almost identical and therefore the trip generation is estimated as the same. Therefore, the Interplan analysis would still be applicable. The projected traffic for the site is shown in Figure 2 from the Interplan TIA for the opening day and Figure 3 for the 2020 future projected traffic level.

Figure 2 – PM Peak Hour Volumes Generated by Proposed Development
Queueing
Along Anthem Park Boulevard, there is a proposed access between Main Street and MVC. The proposed primary commercial access is 477 feet from MVC and the future signalized intersection at Main Street and Anthem Park Boulevard is 353 feet further west.

The queue analysis using the Interplan projected 2020 traffic volumes indicates that the critical westbound queue at the proposed full motion access may approach 400 feet. Normally, this would be a concern as it would back into the MVC intersection left turn storage area, however, since there are no eastbound left turn movements at the SB direction MVC intersection and therefore the center turn lane between the access and MVC can be utilized exclusively by the westbound left turn queue for the Access.

It is projected that the Access will function for the short term as a full motion access which will need to transition into a ¾ movement access where the north-south left turn movements be shifted to the signalized intersection at the future Main Street / Anthem Park Boulevard intersection. In the distant future, this Access may need to be restricted to a right-in / right-out as traffic increases and the connection to MVC is modified to account for the grade separation of the MVC.
Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

A-Trans Engineering

[Signature]

Joseph Perrin, PhD, PE, PTOE
Principal
### AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

**INTERSECTION:** MVC NB and 11800 South

**PK HR VOLUME:** 1,762  
**PHF:** 0 90  
**PEAK HOUR:**  
**FROM:** 7:00 AM  
**TO:** 8:00 AM

#### Notes:
- **N-S STREET:** MVC NB  
- **E-W STREET:** 11800 South  
- **COUNT DATE:** August 22, 2017  
- **Day of the Week:** Tuesday  
- **COUNT TIME:** FROM: 7:00 AM  
  TO: 9:00 AM

#### AM Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>FROM TO</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>TOTAL 5' VOLUMES</th>
<th>TOTAL 15' VOLUMES</th>
<th>PEDESTRIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit B Continued
PM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

INTERSECTION MVC NB and 11800 South

PK HR VOLUME: 2,331
PHF: 0.96
PEAK HOUR: FROM: 4:50 PM TO: 5:50 PM

NORTH

| COUNT DATE: August 23, 2017 |
| Day of the Week: Wednesday |
| NOTES: |
| COUNT TIME: FROM 4:00 PM TO 6:00 PM |

PM Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD TO</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM 4:05 PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05 PM 4:10 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10 PM 4:15 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM 4:20 PM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20 PM 4:25 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25 PM 4:30 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM 4:35 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35 PM 4:40 PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40 PM 4:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM 4:50 PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 PM 4:55 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55 PM 5:00 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM 5:05 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05 PM 5:10 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10 PM 5:15 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM 5:20 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20 PM 5:25 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25 PM 5:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 PM 5:35 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:35 PM 5:40 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40 PM 5:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 PM 5:50 PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50 PM 5:55 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:55 PM 6:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit B Continued
### AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

**N-S STREET:** MVC SB  
**E-W STREET:** 11800 South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Ped</th>
<th>Total 5' Volumes</th>
<th>Total 15' Volumes</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

**INTERSECTION**: MVC SB and 11800 South

| PK HR VOLUME: | 2,502 |
| PHF: | 0.94 |

**PEAK HOUR HC**

| FROM: TO: | 5:00 PM 6:00 PM |

**COUNT DATE:** August 23, 2017

**Day of the Week:** Wednesday

**NOTES:**

- MVC SB from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

**COUNT TIME:**

- FROM: 4:00 PM
- TO: 6:00 PM

### PM Traffic

| TIME PERIOD | FROM TO | NBL NBT NBR EBL EBT EBR SBL SBT SBR WBL WBT WBR TOTAL 3’ TOTAL 15’ PEDESTRIAN |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|\| | \| | E/W | N/S |
| 4:00 PM     | 4:05 PM | 0 0 0 0 16 4 8 103 5 9 7 0 152 465 0 3 |
| 4:05 PM     | 4:10 PM | 0 0 0 0 18 1 5 81 7 15 27 0 154 507 1 0 |
| 4:10 PM     | 4:15 PM | 0 0 0 0 14 3 18 113 6 14 14 0 179 513 0 0 |
| 4:15 PM     | 4:20 PM | 0 0 0 0 23 4 12 92 3 17 23 0 174 477 0 0 |
| 4:20 PM     | 4:25 PM | 0 0 0 0 10 1 10 106 4 12 17 0 160 509 0 0 |
| 4:25 PM     | 4:30 PM | 0 0 0 0 14 1 8 81 9 11 19 0 143 520 0 0 |
| 4:30 PM     | 4:35 PM | 0 0 0 0 11 2 17 146 5 10 15 0 206 585 0 0 |
| 4:35 PM     | 4:40 PM | 0 0 0 0 17 0 7 110 3 14 20 0 171 533 0 0 |
| 4:40 PM     | 4:45 PM | 0 0 0 0 11 1 18 140 6 16 16 0 208 552 0 1 |
| 4:45 PM     | 4:50 PM | 0 0 0 0 19 3 12 87 4 10 20 0 154 533 0 1 |
| 4:50 PM     | 4:55 PM | 0 0 0 0 8 3 12 134 11 7 15 0 190 579 0 0 |
| 4:55 PM     | 5:00 PM | 0 0 0 0 16 0 15 109 6 14 29 0 189 584 0 1 |
| 5:00 PM     | 5:05 PM | 0 0 0 0 21 3 18 98 7 23 25 0 195 620 0 1 |
| 5:05 PM     | 5:10 PM | 0 0 0 0 4 1 17 140 14 13 17 0 206 655 0 0 |
| 5:10 PM     | 5:15 PM | 0 0 0 0 12 5 11 133 9 18 31 0 219 658 0 1 |
| 5:15 PM     | 5:20 PM | 0 0 0 0 15 0 12 113 9 16 44 0 209 644 0 0 |
| 5:20 PM     | 5:25 PM | 0 0 0 0 16 0 12 157 12 17 21 0 230 666 2 0 |
| 5:25 PM     | 5:30 PM | 0 0 0 0 19 5 19 151 11 14 19 0 227 654 0 0 |
| 5:30 PM     | 5:35 PM | 0 0 0 0 21 3 15 106 6 16 42 0 208 636 1 1 |
| 5:35 PM     | 5:40 PM | 0 0 0 0 9 4 15 141 11 20 19 0 219 612 1 3 |
| 5:40 PM     | 5:45 PM | 0 0 0 0 19 1 5 124 6 24 30 0 209 589 1 1 |
| 5:45 PM     | 5:50 PM | 0 0 0 0 11 1 13 121 6 12 25 0 184 360 0 1 |
| 5:50 PM     | 5:55 PM | 0 0 0 0 15 1 11 101 9 21 38 0 196 196 0 1 |
| 5:55 PM     | 6:00 PM | 0 0 0 0 13 1 11 101 9 21 38 0 196 196 0 1 |

**Exhibit B Continued**
AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

INTERSECTION: Freedom Park Drive and Anthem Park Blvd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>7:00 AM TO 8:00 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK HR VOLUME:</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF:</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK HOUR:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO:</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NORTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>FROM TO NBL</th>
<th>NBT NBR</th>
<th>EBL EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>SBL SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>WBL WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:05 AM</td>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 AM</td>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20 AM</td>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25 AM</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:50 AM</td>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55 AM</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 AM</td>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25 AM</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50 AM</td>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:55 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

- **Exhibit B Continued**
### PM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES

**INTERSECTION**
- Freedom Park Drive
- Anthem Park Blvd

**PK HR VOLUME:** 854
**PHF:** 0.94
**PEAK HOUR:** 5:00 PM - 6:00 PM

**COUNT DATE:** August 23, 2017
**Day of the Week:** Wednesday

**COUNT TIME:**
- **FROM:** 4:00 PM
- **TO:** 6:00 PM

#### PM Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>NORTHBOUND</th>
<th>EASTBOUND</th>
<th>SOUTHBOUND</th>
<th>WESTBOUND</th>
<th>TOTAL 5' VOLUMES</th>
<th>TOTAL 15' VOLUMES</th>
<th>PEDESTRIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>4:05 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 12 13 0 0 5 6 13 1 16 7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>177 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05 PM</td>
<td>4:10 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 14 13 0 0 2 0 12 0 8 1 50 166 0 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10 PM</td>
<td>4:15 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 11 11 0 0 2 0 9 0 20 6 59 175 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM</td>
<td>4:20 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 14 9 0 0 6 0 13 0 15 2 57 163 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20 PM</td>
<td>4:25 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 9 14 0 0 4 0 11 0 14 7 59 163 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25 PM</td>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 9 7 0 0 3 0 10 0 17 1 47 156 0 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>4:35 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 6 8 0 0 4 0 8 0 18 10 57 170 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35 PM</td>
<td>4:40 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 10 10 0 1 0 15 0 14 4 54 170 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40 PM</td>
<td>4:45 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 13 10 0 5 0 11 0 9 11 59 173 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM</td>
<td>4:50 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 13 8 0 3 0 13 0 15 5 57 173 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 PM</td>
<td>4:55 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 8 7 0 14 0 8 0 16 4 57 191 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55 PM</td>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 12 8 0 4 0 9 0 19 9 61 215 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>5:05 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 16 6 0 2 0 15 0 22 10 73 225 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05 PM</td>
<td>5:10 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 14 14 0 8 0 25 0 15 5 81 204 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10 PM</td>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 12 11 0 5 0 15 0 20 8 71 197 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>5:20 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 8 6 0 5 0 14 0 12 7 52 188 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20 PM</td>
<td>5:25 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 4 9 0 4 0 27 0 23 7 74 215 0 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25 PM</td>
<td>5:30 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 10 6 0 6 0 15 0 20 5 62 211 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 PM</td>
<td>5:35 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 12 4 0 4 0 18 0 27 14 79 228 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:35 PM</td>
<td>5:40 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 8 9 0 7 0 18 0 22 6 70 212 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40 PM</td>
<td>5:45 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 16 11 0 6 0 16 0 22 9 79 219 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 PM</td>
<td>5:50 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 8 11 0 3 0 17 0 16 6 63 213 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50 PM</td>
<td>5:55 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 6 14 0 4 0 20 0 24 9 77 150 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:55 PM</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 6 16 0 5 0 21 0 20 3 73 72 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File #</th>
<th>C2018-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Zack Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>5252 W Anthem Peak Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit for a Les Schwab Tire Store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: June 15, 2017

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Bryn McCarty, Assistant City Planner

MEETING: Planning Commission June 21, 2018

REQUEST: Landscape Plan and Materials Board Approval
Applicant: Zach Graham
Address: 5252 W Anthem Peak Lane
Zone: C-2
Acres: 1.31
File Number: C2018-18

Request

The applicant is requesting approval for Les Schwab’s landscape plan and elevations.

Site

The lot is located at approximately 5252 W Anthem Peak Lane and contains 1.31 acres.

Zoning

The site is zoned C-2.

Discussion

The Planning Commission, at their June 7, 2018 meeting, approved the Les Schwab Tire Center with a number of conditions. The three listed below are being brought back to this work meeting for further review by the Commission:

9. A traffic study for the entire development shall be reviewed as part of the engineering approval. Left-turns may be limited as recommended in the traffic study.
20. The landscaping plan is to come back to the Planning Commission for approval of the applicant’s final version, working in conjunction with the JCW’s applicant.
21. Elevations are to come back before the Planning Commission, including a materials board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date of Meeting:</strong></th>
<th><strong>06/21/2018</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File #</strong></td>
<td>S2018-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>Ben Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>5937 W 12900 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td>Plat Amendment for a Lot Line Adjustment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request
The property owner, Ben Johnson, is requesting a subdivision plat amendment to adjust the lot line between two of his parcels.

Site
The lots are located at 5937 W 12900 South and 5917 W 12900 S. The lots are located within the Old Herriman plat.

Notices
Notices are not required because this is a lot line adjustment in which the applicant owns all affected parcels.

Process
A subdivision is an administrative decision. Herriman City ordinance states that a public hearing is not required when the application is to:

“Adjust the lot lines of adjoining lots if the fee owners of each of the adjoining lots join in the application, regardless of whether the lots are located in the same subdivision.”

For this application the applicant is the owner of both affected lots. The Planning Commission will make a decision based on compliance with applicable ordinances.
Discussion
The applicant is requesting to shift the lot line so that the lot containing his home also fully encapsulates his water features. The adjustment will not create any illegal lots or have any detrimental zoning impact.

Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the subdivision plat amendment to adjust the lot line with the following requirements:

1. Compliance with all recommendations received from applicable agencies.
2. Final plat to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.
3. Any utilities or utility boxes that need to be relocated shall be done at the expense of the property owner.

Attachments
A. Application
B. Vicinity Map
C. Amended Plat
Land Use Application

Address or location of site 5937 W 12900 S.

Size of Parcel 1.25

What is Requested (explain in detail)? Lot 6.3 in H. Rex

If applicable, square footage of proposed building(s) or addition (all stories combined).

If the request is residential, how many and what type of units (apartment, condo, etc).

Property Owner’s Name  Ben Johnson

Mailing Address

City  Herriman  State  UT  Zip Code  84096

Telephone  Cell Number

Applicant/Agent  Same

Mailing Address

City  State  Zip Code

Telephone  Cell Number  E-mail

Subject to Purchase or Lease:  or  Present Owner of Property: X

Yes I am the authorized agent or owner of the subject property:

Current Use of Subject Property

Proposed Development Name

For Herriman Use Only

Date of Submittal  5/30/18  Filing Fee  $150  File Number  52018-13

Receipt Number  572975  Accepted by  DRC

Herriman City, 13011 S Pioneer St, Herriman UT 84096  Phone: (801)446-5323  Email: planning@herriman.org
Proposed Lot Line Adjustment
File #s S2018-13
| **Date of Meeting:**  
| **06/21/2018** |
| **File #** | S2018-11 |
| **Applicant** | Evans & Associates Architecture |
| **Address** | 14000 S Autumn Crest Blvd |
| **Request** | One Lot Subdivision for an LDS Seminary |
DATE:       June 13, 2018

TO:         Planning Commission

FROM:       Bryn McCarty, AICP, Assistant City Planner

MEETING:    Planning Commission June 21, 2018

REQUEST:    Preliminary plat for a One Lot Subdivision for an LDS Seminary
            Applicant:  Evans & Associates Architecture
            Address:   14000 S Autumn Crest Blvd
            Zone:     A-1 (Agricultural – 1 acre min.)
            Acres:    1.097
            File Number: S2018-11

Request
The applicant is requesting preliminary plat approval for a one lot subdivision for an LDS Seminary building. The seminary will be built next to the new high school, which is currently under construction.

Site
The lot is located at approximately 14000 S Autumn Crest Blvd and contains 1.097 acres. It is north of the new high school, which is currently under construction.

Development Review Committee (DRC)
Staff sent DRC comments to the applicant on May 22, 2018. The applicant attended a DRC meeting with staff on May 23, 2018. A number of minor departmental comments were received. The plans have been revised to address the concerns.

Discussion
The applicant needs to create one legal lot in order to build the proposed LDS seminary. The property is currently zoned A-1, requiring a minimum lot size of one acre. The proposed lot is 1.097 acres.

Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for one lot with the following requirements:
Requirements

1. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies, including DRC comments.
2. Install park strip, street trees, sidewalk, and street lights along Autumn Crest Blvd. This may be a fee in lieu, depending on the timing of the construction of the road.
3. Modify or replace the existing sewer easement. (See DRC comments)
4. Dedicate property to Herriman City to provide stormwater outfall to Rose Creek (see Attachment A – Development Review Committee Comments).
5. Final plat to be reviewed and approved by the Engineering Department before building permit submittal.

Attachments

A. Development Review Committee Comments
B. Application
C. Vicinity Map
D. Preliminary Plat
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>STATUS/RESULT</th>
<th>ACTION BY</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/5/2018</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Awaiting revised information</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Submitted application for a conditional use for an LDS Seminary; staff advised applicant of missing or incomplete information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Routed for DRC review</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Applicant submitted additional information; including application for a one lot subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/2018</td>
<td>Zoning Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Landscaping: 20 feet of landscaping required behind the property line along the street. Must be a 15 foot landscape buffer adjacent to residential on the north side of the property. Evergreen landscaping anticipated to grow to more than six feet in height shall be provided at distances sufficient to provide a visual and noise reducing barrier. Such landscaping shall consist of at least one tree for every 20 feet of fencing. A minimum of one tree shall be provided for every 500 square feet of landscaped area. Park strips must be landscaped and maintained by the applicant. Trees must be provided every 30 feet in the park strip. Trees must meet the approved City tree list. Fencing: 6 foot precast wall adjacent to Agricultural property (north and west side) Parking: 1 space for each administrator and faculty member Setbacks: front yard – 30 feet, side yard - 20 feet rear yard - 30 feet Elevations: must have an element of brick or stone, as shown on the proposed elevations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Blackett, Eric</td>
<td>The plat needs to provide an address for the lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>Unified Fire Authority</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Devoogd, Dan</td>
<td>UFA has reviewed the plans and has no concerns at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/2018</td>
<td>Building Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Hunting, Boyd</td>
<td>Building will review accessibility with the Engineering review. This needs to include an Accessibility Detail Sheet. The detail sheet should include an accessible route from the accessibility parking in the upper corner of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5/8/2018   | Engineering Review  | Complete     | Thomas, Blake | • Applicant will be required to modify/replace existing easement for sewer (SLCo Recorder Entry#11146533) so that there is not a requirement that the sewer easement be in the right-of-way of the road and that the right-of-way be dedicated to Herriman City.  
• Plans need to show the future elementary school road where it connects to Autumn Crest Blvd.  
  o Provide dimensions on plan showing distance that driveway is offset from Elementary School road connection.  
• Contour map is not stamped by P.E. as required by City Ordinance.  
• Project will require a storm water report to be completed for the site  
  o The project will need to dedicate property to Herriman City in order to provide a storm water outfall to Rose Creek across the property owned by CPB.  
  ▪ The alignment of this channel shall follow the new road along the north side of the proposed elementary school and then parallel the Welby-Jacobs Canal.  
  • Herriman City will construct all portions of the off-site drainage improvements along the Welby-Jacobs Canal once the property is dedicated to the City.  
  ▪ On-site detention will need to be a private system which will require a long-term storm water maintenance agreement and long-term storm water management plan.  

Land Use Application

Address or location of site: Autumn Crest Blvd

Size of Parcel(s): 1.097 acres

What is Requested (explain in detail)?

A new LDS Seminary is proposed and we are submitting for a one-lot subdivision

If applicable, square footage of proposed building(s) or addition (all stories combined): 12,519 sf

If the request is residential, how many and what type of units (apartment, condo, etc.):

Property Owner's Name: Corporation of the Presiding Bishop

Mailing Address: [Redacted]

City: Salt Lake City  State: UT  Zip Code: 84150

Telephone: [Redacted]

Applicant/Agent: Evans & Associates Architecture / Chad Spencer

Mailing Address: [Redacted]

City: Draper  State: UT  Zip Code: 84020

Telephone: [Redacted]

Subject to Purchase or Lease: ______ or Present Owner of Property: X

Yes I am the authorized agent or owner of the subject property: X

Current Use of Subject Property: Vacant

Proposed Development Name: Herriman Sr High Seminary

For Herriman Use Only

Date of Submittal: 5/9/18  Filing Fee: $250  File Number: 05218-025

Receipt Number: _____  Accepted by: CE  DRC

Herriman City • 5355 West Herriman Main St, Herriman UT 84096 • 801.446.5323 • email: planning@herriman.org
Proposed Subdivision & Conditional Use
File#s S2018-11 & C2018-14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date of Meeting:</strong></th>
<th>06/21/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File #</strong></td>
<td>C2018-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>Evans &amp; Associates Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>14000 S Autumn Crest Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit for an LDS Seminary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE:       June 13, 2018

TO:        Planning Commission

FROM:      Bryn McCarty, AICP, Assistant City Planner

MEETING:   Planning Commission June 21, 2018

REQUEST:   Site Plan Review for an LDS Seminary

Applicant:  Evans & Associates Architecture
Address:    14000 S Autumn Crest Blvd
Zone:       A-1 (Agricultural – 1 acre min.)
Acres:      1.097
File Number: C2018-14

Request
The applicant is requesting approval of a site plan for an LDS Seminary.

Site
The lot is located at approximately 14000 S Autumn Crest Blvd and contains 1.097 acres. It is adjacent to the new high school, currently under construction.

Process
A school is a permitted use in every zone. A permitted use requires site plan approval from the Planning Commission (PC). The PC will hold a public meeting and shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application pursuant to the standards in the ordinance. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall work with staff to submit plans which conform to any required corrections or revisions.

Issue 1 – Elevations
The ordinance states All facades, including back and side elevations of a public or quasi-public building generally visible from public view or adjacent to residential areas, shall have an element of rock or stone. The applicant has submitted building elevations which shows a brick building. Rock or stone accents should be added to the building to be in compliance with this requirement.

Issue 2 – Parking
The ordinance requires “1 space for each administrator and faculty member.” The seminary will have 11 faculty and administrators total. The site plan shows 19 available parking spaces, which meets the requirement.
Issue 3 – Landscaping
The ordinance requires 20 feet of landscaping along Autumn Crest Blvd. They are also required to have a 15 foot landscaped buffer adjacent to any current or future residential. The proposed site plan complies with this requirement.

Issue 4 – Subdivision
The property is not currently a legal lot. The applicant has also applied for a preliminary plat for a one lot subdivision. The plat will be required to be recorded prior to a building permit being submitted.

Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the site plan for an LDS Seminary building with the following requirements:

Requirements
1. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies, as noted on the attached Development Review Committee comments.
2. Landscape plan is approved as submitted.
3. Building elevations are approved, with the addition of rock or stone accents to the building.
4. Provide a 6 foot precast wall along the north and west property lines.
5. The Building Department will review accessibility with the Engineering Review. (See DRC comments)
6. All air conditioning units, dumpsters, and outside utilities shall be fenced with masonry enclosures.
7. Parking shall be provided at 1 space for each faculty member and administrator.
8. A subdivision plat shall be recorded prior to applying for a building permit.
9. Modify or replace the existing sewer easement. (See DRC comments)
10. Dedicate property to Herriman City to provide storm water outfall to Rose Creek (see Attachment A – Development Review Committee Comments).

Attachments
A. Development Review Committee Comments
B. Application
C. Vicinity Map
D. Site plan
E. Landscaping plan
F. Building elevations
G. Applicant response to Conditional Use standards
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>STATUS/RESULT</th>
<th>ACTION BY</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/5/2018</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Awaiting revised information</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Submitted application for a conditional use for an LDS Seminary; staff advised applicant of missing or incomplete information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Routed for DRC review</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Applicant submitted additional information; including application for a one lot subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/2018</td>
<td>Zoning Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Landscaping: 20 feet of landscaping required behind the property line along the street. Must be a 15 foot landscape buffer adjacent to residential on the north side of the property. Evergreen landscaping anticipated to grow to more than six feet in height shall be provided at distances sufficient to provide a visual and noise reducing barrier. Such landscaping shall consist of at least one tree for every 20 feet of fencing. A minimum of one tree shall be provided for every 500 square feet of landscaped area. Park strips must be landscaped and maintained by the applicant. Trees must be provided every 30 feet in the park strip. Trees must meet the approved City tree list. Fencing: 6 foot precast wall adjacent to Agricultural property (north and west side) Parking: 1 space for each administrator and faculty member Setbacks: front yard – 30 feet, side yard - 20 feet rear yard - 30 feet Elevations: must have an element of brick or stone, as shown on the proposed elevations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Blackett, Eric</td>
<td>The plat needs to provide an address for the lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>Unified Fire Authority</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Devoogd, Dan</td>
<td>UFA has reviewed the plans and has no concerns at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/2018</td>
<td>Building Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Hunting, Boyd</td>
<td>Building will review accessibility with the Engineering review. This needs to include an Accessibility Detail Sheet. The detail sheet should include an accessible route from the accessibility parking in the upper corner of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Review Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/2018</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Thomas, Blake</td>
<td>• Applicant will be required to modify/replace existing easement for sewer (SLCo Recorder Entry#11146533) so that there is not a requirement that the sewer easement be in the right-of-way of the road and that the right-of-way be dedicated to Herriman City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Plans need to show the future elementary school road where it connects to Autumn Crest Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Provide dimensions on plan showing distance that driveway is offset from Elementary School road connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contour map is not stamped by P.E. as required by City Ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Project will require a storm water report to be completed for the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The project will need to dedicate property to Herriman City in order to provide a storm water outfall to Rose Creek across the property owned by CPB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The alignment of this channel shall follow the new road along the north side of the proposed elementary school and then parallel the Welby-Jacobs Canal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Herriman City will construct all portions of the off-site drainage improvements along the Welby-Jacobs Canal once the property is dedicated to the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- On-site detention will need to be a private system which will require a long-term storm water maintenance agreement and long-term storm water management plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use Application

Address or location of site: Autumn Crest Blvd

Size of Parcel(s): 1.097 acres

What is Requested (explain in detail):

_A new LDS Seminary is proposed_

If applicable, square footage of proposed building(s) or addition (all stories combined): 9,069 sf

If the request is residential, how many and what type of units (apartment, condo, etc.):

Property Owner's Name: Corporation of the Presiding Bishop

Mailing Address: ____________

City: Salt Lake City State: UT Zip Code: 84150

Telephone: ____________

Applicant/Agent: Evans & Associates Architecture / Chad Spencer

Mailing Address: ____________

City: Draper State: UT Zip Code: 84020

Telephone: ____________

Subject to Purchase or Lease: _______ or Present Owner of Property: X

Yes I am the authorized agent or owner of the subject property: X

Current Use of Subject Property: Vacant

Proposed Development Name: Herriman Sr High Seminary

---

For Herriman Use Only

Date of Submittal: 5/9/18 Filing Fee: $872 File Number: C 2018-14

Receipt Number: Accepted by CE DRC

Herriman City • 5355 West Herriman Main St, Herriman UT 84065 • O. 801.446.5323 • Email: planning@herriman.org
Proposed Subdivision & Conditional Use File#s S2018-11 & C2018-14
DATE: March 27, 2018
PROJECT NAME: Herriman UT Mtn View Seminary
US Utah Salt Lake Valley South S&I Area
PROJECT ADDRESS: Autumn Crest Blvd
Herriman, UT

SUBJECT: Conditional Use Permit

To Whom It May Concern:

The following items address the standards provided by Herriman City.

1. The suitability of the specific property for the proposed use:
   a. The project site is near the high school which provides the students easy access to participate in release time activities.

2. The development or lack of development adjacent to the proposed site and the harmony of the proposed use with existing uses in the vicinity:
   a. This property is bounded by the new Herriman High School to the south and future residential lots on the west, north and east.

3. Whether or not the proposed use or facility may be injurious to potential or existing development in the vicinity:
   a. The seminary will not provide any detrimental impacts to the neighboring development.

4. The economic impact of the proposed facility or use on the surrounding area:
   a. The seminary will not provide any negative economic impacts.

5. The aesthetic impact of the proposed facility or use on the surrounding area:
   a. The seminary will be wood framed structure with brick veneer and stone accents. These elements will compliment the schools on either side of the property.

6. The present and future requirements for transportation, traffic, water, sewer, and other utilities for the proposed site and surrounding area:
   a. All required utilities will be stubbed into the site by the developer during the construction of the roads.

7. The safeguards proposed or provided to insure adequate utilities, transportation access, drainage, parking, loading space, lighting, screening, landscaping, open space, fire protection, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation:
   a. All required utilities will be stubbed into the site by the developer and have been sized for the project. The seminary has provided 19 parking stalls which exceeds the city requirements. The site will be lighted by typical light poles around the building. The landscaping will be like other meetinghouses located throughout the city. The building will be fire sprinklered.

8. The safeguards provided or proposed to prevent noxious or offensive omissions such as noise, glare, dust, pollutants and odor from the proposed facility or use:
   a. There will be no additional noise, glare, dust or pollutants generated from the seminary.
9. The safeguards provided or proposed to minimize other adverse effects from the proposed facility or use on persons or property in the area:
   a. It is anticipated no adverse effects will be generated.

10. The impact of the proposed facility or use on the health, safety, and welfare of the city, the area, and persons owning or leasing property in the area.
   a. The seminary will provide an aesthetically pleasing place to meet and worship for the students located in the area.

Paul A. Evans, AIA
Evans & Associates Architecture, LLC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting: 06/21/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File #</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: June 13, 2018

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Bryn McCarty, AICP, Assistant City Planner

MEETING: Planning Commission June 21, 2018

REQUEST: Preliminary plat approval for 116 single family lots in Creek Ridge West

Applicant: Edge Homes
Address: 6400 W Herriman Pkwy
Zone: R-2-10 (Residential – Medium Density)
Acres: 25
File Number: S2018-01

Request
Edge Homes is asking for preliminary plat approval for a subdivision of 116 single family lots. This is part of the Creek Ridge Planned Unit Development (PUD). The applicant has also submitted for final PUD approval for this phase.

Site
The parcel is located at approximately 6400 W Herriman Pkwy and contains 25 acres. It is Phase 5-7 of the Creek Ridge development

Process
A subdivision is an administrative decision. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and make a decision based on compliance with the applicable ordinances.

Development Review Committee (DRC)
Staff has been working with the applicant for several months on revisions to the site plan to comply with the ordinance and Master Development Agreement. Staff sent written DRC comments to the applicant on June 5, 2018. The comments from the DRC are included in this packet. Staff met with the applicant on June 6, 2017 to discuss the comments. Most of the issues addressed the location of the park, and a revised traffic study.

Notices
Staff mailed notices to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property and all owners of lots in Creek Ridge phases 1 though 4. Notices were mailed on June 8, 2018, to 29 property owners. At this time, no responses have been received.


**Discussion**
This is part of the Creek Ridge PUD. The development has a Master Development Agreement for this project. It specifies the density of each “Area”, as well as setbacks and other design criteria.

**Issue 1 – Lot size**
This is part of a PUD, so there is no minimum lot size or lot width. All of the lots are single family, ranging in size from approximately 4,500 square foot lots up to 9,000 square feet. All of the roads are planned to be public roads.

**Issue 2 – Grading and Drainage**
The DRC comments requested a grading and drainage plan be submitted. This is required by the ordinance for final PUD approval. This has not yet been submitted by the applicant.

**Recommendation**
Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for 116 single family lots with the following requirements:

1. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies, including all comments from the Development Review Committee.
2. Install curb, gutter, park strip, street trees, and sidewalk on all public streets.
3. Work with UFA on providing emergency turnarounds as required.
4. All public roads to meet City Standards.
5. Coordinate with other utilities at the time of road improvements in order to minimize future road cuts.
7. Provide detention to meet all City requirements. The detention pond should be landscaped with sod, sprinklers, and trees to meet City standard.
8. Install an 8 foot precast wall along Herriman Blvd, making sure to maintain the clear view at the intersections.
9. Oceanside Street shall be a minimum 60 foot right of way adjacent to the park, to allow for on-street parking.

**Attachments**
A. Development Review Committee Comments
B. Application
C. Vicinity Map
D. Site plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>STATUS/RESULT</th>
<th>ACTION BY</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2018</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Routed for DRC review</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Submitted revised plans for Creek Ridge West; 114 single family lots, part of the SLR MDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/2018</td>
<td>Zoning Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>1. Part of the Creek Ridge MDA and Preliminary PUD. Area B, which includes this property, is approved for 520 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Must meet the Creek Ridge Design Guidelines. The Creek Ridge ARC must submit an approval final to engineering review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Setbacks need to be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 15’ rear yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 5’ side yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10’ corner yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10’ from to living area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20’ front to garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. The PUD approval states “Detailed plans on amenities, including parks, landscaping, and fencing, will be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission when each phase receives final approval.” Provide additional information about the amenities being provided in the “Public Park”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Park/Amenities to be installed by the developer or builder prior to 50% of the building permits being issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Trail connections between lots need to be at least 20 feet wide, with a 10 foot paved trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Construct an 8’ precast wall along Herriman Parkway, excluding the public park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Construct a 6’ precast wall along the south property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Construct a 6’ privacy fence along the west property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. The approved Project Guidelines require all architectural elevations to be submitted to the city for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. The approved Design Guidelines state that Neighborhood parks should be “centrally located within the neighborhood”. Staff recommends that the park be located more centrally within the neighborhood. Specifically, staff recommends that the park be moved south, off of Herriman Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. The Creek Ridge MDA requires “Concurrently with any development application, Master Developer to demonstrate how much density has been allocated to previously approved development applications and how much density is available for future development”. This information should be provided prior to Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2018</td>
<td>Unified Fire Authority</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Devoogd, Dan</td>
<td>Fire does not have any issues with this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2018</td>
<td>Building Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Hunting, Boyd</td>
<td>Building does not have any issues with this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Review Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6/1/2018   | Engineering      | Complete   | Thomas, Blake   | 1. Provide a long-term storm water maintenance agreement for the detention pond.  
|            | Review           |            |                 | 2. Provide a Traffic Study prior to Planning Commission. This should include an analysis of the width of the roads.  
|            |                  |            |                 | 3. Submit grading and drainage plans prior to Planning Commission, as required by the ordinance for final PUD approval.  
|            |                  |            |                 | 4. See redlines on attached plans.                                    |
| 5/24/2018  | Water Review     | Complete   | Edwards, Justun | 1. Fire flow analysis will be required through the engineering review process  
|            |                  |            |                 | 2. Provide water demand analysis for outdoor and indoor uses  
|            |                  |            |                 | 3. See comments on attached redlines.                                  |
| 5/24/2018  | GIS              | Complete   | Blackett, Eric  | The plat needs:  
|            |                  |            |                 | Street names  
|            |                  |            |                 | Intersection coordinates  
|            |                  |            |                 | Lot addresses                                                        |
Land Use Application

Address or location of site 6400 W Herriman Pkwy

Size of Parcel 25

What is Requested (explain in detail)?

Preliminary Plat Approval for Creek Ridge West, 125 lots within the Creek Ridge FUD.

If applicable, square footage of proposed building(s) or addition (all stories combined).

If the request is residential, how many and what type of units (apartment, condo, etc).

Property Owner's Name Suburban land reserve, Inc.

Mailing Address

City Salt Lake State UT Zip Code 84111

Telephone Cell Number E-mail

Applicant/Agent Steve Maddox, Edge homes

Mailing Address

City Draper State UT Zip Code 84020

Cell Number E-mail

Subject to Purchase or Lease: x or Present Owner of Property: _______

Yes I am the authorized agent or owner of the subject property: x

Current Use of Subject Property Vacant/ Farm Land

Proposed Development Name Creek Ridge West

For Herriman Use Only

Date of Submittal 1/4/18 Filing Fee $4,750 File Number 52018-01

Receipt Number Accepted by CE DRC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date of Meeting:</strong></th>
<th><strong>06/21/2018</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File #</strong></td>
<td>C2014-09-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>Edge Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>6400 W Herriman Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td>Final Planned Unit Development Approval for 116 Single Family Lots in Creek Ridge West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: June 13, 2018

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Bryn McCarty, AICP, Assistant City Planner

MEETING: Planning Commission June 21, 2018

REQUEST: Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for 116 single family lots in Creek Ridge West

   Applicant: Edge Homes
   Address: 6400 W Herriman Pkwy
   Zone: R-2-10 (Residential – Medium Density)
   Acres: 25
   File Number: C2014-09-01

Request
Edge Homes is asking for final Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for 116 single family lots. This is a phase of Creek Ridge. All of the lots are single family, ranging in size from approximately 4,500 square foot lots up to 9,000 square feet. All of the roads are planned to be public roads.

Site
The parcel is located at approximately 6400 W Herriman Pkwy and contains 25 acres.

Notices
Notices are not required for conditional use applications.

Process
The subject property is part of the Creek Ridge development, which has Preliminary PUD approval. Each phase must come in for final PUD approval. A PUD is a conditional use, which is an administrative decision. The Planning Commission will hold a public meeting and make a decision based on compliance with the approval standards, the Preliminary PUD approval, and the Development Agreement.

Development Review Committee (DRC)
Staff has been working with the applicant for several months on revisions to the site plan to comply with the ordinance, Preliminary PUD, and Master Development Agreement (MDA). Staff sent written DRC comments to the applicant on June 5, 2018. The comments from the DRC are included in this packet. Staff met with the applicant on June 6, 2018, to discuss the comments. Most of the issues addressed the location of the park, and a revised traffic study.
Issue 1 – Density
This is part of the Creek Ridge PUD. The developer has had a development agreement approved by the City Council to clarify the number of units allowed for each area of the Creek Ridge Development. This subdivision is the first to be located within ‘Area B’ of the approved Creek Ridge map. Area B has been approved for 520 total units. There will be 404 available units remaining if this application is approved.

The MDA requires that with each application, the master developer shall demonstrate how much density has been allocated to previously approved projects and how much density remains for future development. This information has been provided.

Issue 2 – Parks/Open Space
Staff has spent several months working with the applicant on enhancing the open space in this project. The Master Development Agreement requires that each phase attempt to maintain a “pro rata” amount of the required 20 percent open space. Staff determined that the original phase of Creek Ridge, and now this second phase of Creek Ridge, were lacking in the required open space. The developer has added a 1.67 acre park. The Preliminary PUD requires that detailed plan on amenities, including parks, will be reviewed and approved by the PC when each phase receives final approval. The applicant has not yet submitted any details on the park or amenities.

Issue 3 – Building Elevations
Creek Ridge has approved design guidelines that specifies the architectural elements required for the homes. It also outlines landscaping requirements. The applicant has submitted building elevations for PC review. The Creek Ridge Architectural Review Committee must submit an approval which states the proposed elevations are in compliance with the design guidelines. This has not yet been submitted.

Recommendation
Staff recommends final Planned Unit Development approval for 116 single family lots with the following requirements:

1. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies, including the DRC comments. (see attached)
2. Overall number of units approved is 116.
3. Submit detailed plans on park amenities to the Planning Commission for review and approval. The park amenities need to be reviewed and approved by the PC prior to Engineering plans being submitted for review.
4. Park and amenities to be installed by the developer or builder prior to 50 percent of the building permits being issued.
Staff Report

5. Install an 8 foot high precast masonry wall along Herriman Blvd.
6. Install a 6 foot high precast masonry wall along the south property line.
7. Setbacks to be as follows:
   - Living area: 10 feet
   - Garage: 20 feet
   - Rear yard: 15 feet
   - Side yard: 5 feet
   - Corner: 15 feet
8. The trail connections and parks shall be installed by the developer, per City Standard, and dedicated to the City.
9. Work with the City on the landscaping along Herriman Blvd.
10. Install a 6 foot high solid vinyl fence along the west property line.
11. All development within the Master Plan area shall comply with the approved Project Guidelines, administered by the City, and Design Guidelines, administered by the Design Review Committee. The Creek Ridge Architectural Review Committee (ARC) shall submit an approval prior to engineering review.
12. Meet all the requirements of the Creek Ridge Master Development Agreement that apply to this phase.
13. The master developer shall demonstrate how much density has been allocated to previously approved projects and how much density remains for future development.

Attachments
   A. Development Review Committee Comments
   B. Application
   C. Vicinity Map
   D. Site plan
   E. Approved Creek Ridge Preliminary PUD
   F. Building elevations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Status/Result</th>
<th>Action By</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2018</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Routed for DRC review</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Submitted revised plans for Creek Ridge West; 114 single family lots, part of the SLR MDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/2018</td>
<td>Zoning Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>1. Part of the Creek Ridge MDA and Preliminary PUD. Area B, which includes this property, is approved for 520 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Must meet the Creek Ridge Design Guidelines. The Creek Ridge ARC must submit an approval final to engineering review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Setbacks need to be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15’ rear yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5’ side yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10’ corner yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10’ from to living area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20’ front to garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. The PUD approval states “Detailed plans on amenities, including parks, landscaping, and fencing, will be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission when each phase receives final approval.” Provide additional information about the amenities being provided in the “Public Park”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Park/Amenities to be installed by the developer or builder prior to 50% of the building permits being issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Trail connections between lots need to be at least 20 feet wide, with a 10 foot paved trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Construct an 8’ precast wall along Herriman Parkway, excluding the public park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Construct a 6’ precast wall along the south property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Construct a 6’ privacy fence along the west property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. The approved Project Guidelines require all architectural elevations to be submitted to the city for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. The approved Design Guidelines state that Neighborhood parks should be “centrally located within the neighborhood”. Staff recommends that the park be located more centrally within the neighborhood. Specifically, staff recommends that the park be moved south, off of Herriman Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. The Creek Ridge MDA requires “Concurrently with any development application, Master Developer to demonstrate how much density has been allocated to previously approved development applications and how much density is available for future development”. This information should be provided prior to Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2018</td>
<td>Unified Fire Authority</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Devoogd, Dan</td>
<td>Fire does not have any issues with this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2018</td>
<td>Building Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Hunting, Boyd</td>
<td>Building does not have any issues with this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Review Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reviewer Name</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6/1/2018   | Engineering    | Complete     | Thomas, Blake  | 1. Provide a long-term storm water maintenance agreement for the detention pond.  
2. Provide a Traffic Study prior to Planning Commission. This should include an analysis of the width of the roads.  
3. Submit grading and drainage plans prior to Planning Commission, as required by the ordinance for final PUD approval.  
4. See redlines on attached plans. |
| 5/24/2018  | Water Review   | Complete     | Edwards, Justun| 1. Fire flow analysis will be required through the engineering review process  
2. Provide water demand analysis for outdoor and indoor uses  
3. See comments on attached redlines. |
| 5/24/2018  | GIS            | Complete     | Blackett, Eric | The plat needs:  
Street names  
Intersection coordinates  
Lot addresses |

Land Use Application

Address or location of site 6400 W Herriman Parkway

Size of Parcel 25

What is Requested (explain in detail)?

Final PUD approval for Creek Ridge West, consisting of 125 single family lots.

If applicable, square footage of proposed building(s) or addition (all stories combined).

If the request is residential, how many and what type of units (apartment, condo, etc).

Property Owner’s Name Suburban land reserve, Inc.

Mailing Address ______________________________

City Salt Lake State UT Zip Code 84111

Telephone ____________________ Cell Number ____________ E-mail ____________________

Applicant/Agent Steve Maddox, Edge homes

Mailing Address ______________________________

City Draper State UT Zip Code 84020

Telephone ____________________ Cell Number ____________ E-mail ____________________

Subject to Purchase or Lease: x or Present Owner of Property: ______

Yes I am the authorized agent or owner of the subject property: x

Current Use of Subject Property Vacant/ Farm Land

Proposed Development Name Creek Ridge West

For Herriman Use Only

Date of Submittal 1/4/18 Filing Fee $3,750 File Number C2014-09-01

Receipt Number __________________ Accepted by ____________ DRC __________________

Herriman City, 13011 S Pioneer St, Herriman UT 84096 Phone: (801)446-5323 Email: planning@herriman.org
Density Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Land Use Summary</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>138.65</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>71.12</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Sites</td>
<td>(-18)*</td>
<td>(-126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>(-12*)</td>
<td>(-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocated Residential Units</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Residential Units: 1,990
Total Required Open Space: 58.00

**Potential Elementary School Sites** (12 Sites)
**Potential Chapel Sites** (9 Sites)
**Potential Open Space** (137.7 Acre) (Excluded & not to be determined at plat and will include an additional 13.8 Acre)
* Pocket Parks
* Expansive street landscape

**Proposed R-2-10 PUD (99.5 Acre) and C-2 Zoning (7.0 Acre)**

--- Southern Property Limit Boundary for Apartment Development

Master Developer reserves the rights, types, counts and depictions contained on this document. Nevertheless, Master Developer shall have the right to modify, in its sole discretion, any and all of the features, depictions contained on this map, subject to the following limitations:

1. Trails, trails should create continuity and linkages between major communities and open spaces.
2. Apartments shall not be allowed in Areas B & C.

Creek Ridge PUD
Approx. 11800 South & 6400 West, Herriman, Utah
Aspen Pointe Model:
Exterior Options

Floorplan: Hadley
Roof: Barkwood
Lap Siding: Monterey Taupe
Siding Trim: Arctic White
Shake Siding: Arctic White
Board & Batten Siding: Arctic White
Column/Bands: Arctic White
Stone: Mountain Ledge Oquirrh (Discontinued)
Front Door: Stiletto
Soffit: 30 Degree White
Window: White
Railing: White
Deck: Gray

1036 East 600 South Heber, UT 84032
Broadmoor Park Model:
Exterior Options

Floorplan: Lauren
Roof: Weathered Wood
Lap Siding: Iron gray
Siding Trim: Arctic White
Shake Color: Cobblestone
Column/Bands: Arctic White
Stone: Uintah Ledgestone Rocky Cliff
Front Door: Whitest White
Soffit: 30 Degree White
Window: White
Railing: White
Deck: Gray

346 South 630 East Lehi, UT 84043
Maple Highlands Model:
Exterior Options

Floorplan: Hadley-B
Roof: Weathered Wood
Stucco Base Color: Moonstone
Siding Trim Color: Mistaya
Siding Trim: Great White
Shake Color: Timber Bark
Column/Bands: Great White
Stone: Uintah Ledgestone Cape Cod
Front Door: Rocky Creek
Soffit: Pebblestone Clay
Window: White
Railing: White
Deck: Gray

2512 E. Rio Grande Dr. Spanish Fork, UT 84660
Mountain Heights Model: Exterior Options

Floorplan: Morgan
Roof: Weathered Wood
Lap Siding: Timber Bark
Siding Trim: Arctic White
Board & Batten: Arctic White
Column/Bands: Arctic White
Stone: Arcadia Natural Stone
Front Door: Finger Print
Soffit: 30 Degree White
Window: White
Railing: White
Deck: Gray

14454 S. River Chase Rd. Herriman, UT 84096
Mountain Heights Parade Home: Exterior Options

Options

Floorplan: Nora Prairie
Roof: Charcoal
Lap Siding: Cobblestone
Siding Trim: Pearly White
Stucco: Foghorn
Stucco trim: Mistaya
Stone: Antique Pearl w/ Gray Grout
Front Door: Volcanic Rock
Soffit: Linen
Window: White
Deck: Gray

14476 S. River Chase Rd. Herriman, UT 84096
Rosecrest Meadows Model: Exterior Options

Floorplan: Orlando
Roof: Charcoal
Lap Siding: Gray Slate
Siding Trim: Arctic White
Board & Batten: Gray Slate
Column/Bands: Arctic White
Stone: Uintah Ledgestone Rocky Cliff
Front Door: Navy Damask
Soffit: 30 Degree White
Window: White
Railing: White
Stucco Main: Cityscape
Stucco Trim: Mistaya
Deck: Gray

14328 S. Meadow Rose Dr. Herriman, UT 84096
# Agenda

**HERRIMAN CITY**

---

**Date of Meeting:**
06/21/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File #</th>
<th>S2018-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>BHD Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>5661 W 12900 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td>Two Lot Subdivision for an LDS Church/Stake Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: June 13, 2018

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Bryn McCarty, AICP, Assistant City Planner

MEETING: Planning Commission June 21, 2018

REQUEST: Two Lot Subdivision for an LDS Church.
Applicant: BHD Architects
Address: 5661 W 12900 South
Zone: A-1 and A-.50
Acres: 7.3
File Number: S2018-12

Request
The applicant is requesting preliminary plat approval for a two lot subdivision for an LDS Church. They have also submitted a separate application for a conditional use for the church.

Site
The lot is located at approximately 5661 W 12900 South and contains 7.3 acres.

Discussion
The LDS Church has purchased this property to construct a chapel. The property is larger than they need for the chapel, so they are doing a two lot subdivision. Lot 1 will be used for the chapel (See file number C2018-27). Lot 2 will be sold for future development. Lot 2 could be subdivided in the future into half-acre lots if a public road was constructed for access.

Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for a two-lot subdivision with the following requirements:

Requirements
1. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies, including the DRC Comments.
2. Install curb, gutter, park strip, street trees, and sidewalk along 12900 S across both lots.
3. Install curb, gutter, park strip, street trees, and sidewalk along 5600 West.
4. Provide a 6-foot precast wall along the west side of lot 1.
5. Receive final plat approval from the Engineering Department.
6. Lot 2 could be further subdivided in the future, in compliance with applicable ordinances.

Attachments
A. Application
B. DRC Comments
C. Vicinity Map
D. Preliminary Plat
Land Use Application

Address or location of site  Approx. 5661 West 12900 South, Herriman, UT 84096

Size of Parcel  Approx. 7.3 Acres

What is Requested (explain in detail)?
2-lot subdivision approvals for a new LDS Church Stake Center Meetinghouse.

If applicable, square footage of proposed building(s) or addition (all stories combined).  20,602 SF

If the request is residential, how many and what type of units (apartment, condo, etc).  n/a

Property Owner's Name  The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, c/o Jeff Scott, Project Manager

Mailing Address  [Redacted]

City  Salt Lake City  State  Utah  Zip Code  84104

Telephone  [Redacted]

Applicant/Agent  BHD Architects, c/o Lafe Harris and Mike Davey

Mailing Address  [Redacted]

City  Draper  State  Utah  Zip Code  84020

Telephone  [Redacted]

Subject to Purchase or Lease:  or  Present Owner of Property:

Yes I am the authorized agent or owner of the subject property:

Current Use of Subject Property  Vacant

Proposed Development Name  Western Springs Stake Center

For Herriman Use Only

Date of Submittal  5/25/18  Filing Fee  $230  File Number  52018-12

Receipt Number  574227  Accepted by  CE  DRC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>STATUS/RESULT</th>
<th>ACTION BY</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2018</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Routed for DRC review</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Submitted application for a conditional use and 2 lot subdivision for an LDS Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6/5/2018 | Zoning Review         | Complete      | McCarty, Bryn | Use: Church is a conditional use in this zone  
Landscaping: 20 feet of landscaping required behind the property line along the street.  
Must be a 15 foot landscape buffer adjacent to residential on the west side of the property. Evergreen landscaping anticipated to grow to more than six feet in height shall be provided at distances sufficient to provide a visual and noise reducing barrier. Such landscaping shall consist of at least one tree for every 20 feet of fencing. A minimum of one tree shall be provided for every 500 square feet of landscapped area  
Park strips must be landscaped and maintained by the applicant. Trees must be provided every 30 feet in the park strip. Trees must meet the approved City tree list.  
Fencing: 6 foot precast wall adjacent to residential (west side)  
Parking: 1 space per 3.5 seats, if used by 2 congregations (each 20 inches of pew is a seat)  
Setbacks:  
front yard – 40 feet,  
side yard - 20 feet  
rear yard - 40 feet  
Elevations: must have an element of brick or stone, as shown on the proposed elevations |
<p>| 5/26/2018| Unified Fire Authority | Complete      | Devoogd, Dan | UFA has reviewed the plans and has no concerns at this time                                                                                 |
| 6/1/2018 | Building Review       | Complete      | Hunting, Boyd | Building will review accessibility with the Engineering review. This needs to include an Accessibility Detail Sheet. The detail sheet should include an accessible route from the accessibility parking in the upper corner of the plan. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Review Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2018</td>
<td>Engineering Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Thomas, Blake</td>
<td>See redlines on the attached plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2018</td>
<td>GIS Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Blackett, Eric</td>
<td>The lots each need an address 200 North should be 12900 South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>Water Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Edwards, Justun</td>
<td>See redlines on the attached plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Subdivision and Conditional Use
File#s S2018-12 & C2018-27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date of Meeting:</strong></th>
<th><strong>06/21/2018</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File #</strong></td>
<td>C2018-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>BHD Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>5661 W 12900 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit for an LDS Church/Stake Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST: Conditional Use Permit for an LDS Church
Applicant: BHD Architects
Address: 5661 W 12900 South
Zone: A-1 and A-.50
Acres: 7.3
File Number: C2018-27

Request
The applicant is requesting approval for a conditional use permit for an LDS Church. They have also submitted a separate application for a two lot subdivision for the church.

Site
The lot is located at approximately 5661 W 12900 South and contains 7.3 acres.

Process
A conditional use is an administrative decision. The Planning Commission will hold a public meeting and make a decision based on compliance with the approval standards.

Issue 1 – Elevations
The ordinance states “All facades, including back and side elevations of a public or quasi-public building generally visible from public view or adjacent to residential areas, shall have an element of rock or stone.” The applicant has submitted building elevations which shows a brick building with stone accents.

Issue 2 – Parking
The ordinance requires the following parking requirements: “1 space for each 6.5 feet of linear pew, or 3.5 seats in the meeting hall; except when used by two congregations, 1.5 parking spaces shall be provided for each 3.5 seats in the meeting hall.”

Issue 3 – Landscaping
The ordinance requires 20 feet of landscaping along both 12900 South and 5600 West. The proposed site plan complies with this requirement.
The ordinance also requires a 15-foot landscape buffer adjacent to residential on the west side of the property. Evergreen landscaping anticipated to grow to more than six feet in height shall be provided at distances sufficient to provide a visual and noise-reducing barrier. Such landscaping shall consist of at least one tree for every 20 feet of fencing. A minimum of one tree shall be provided for every 500 square feet of landscaped area.

**Approval Standards**

The following standards shall apply for approval of a conditional use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The suitability of the specific property for the proposed use;</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td>A church is a conditional use in the A-1 and A-.50 zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The development or lack of development adjacent to the proposed site and the harmony of the proposed use with existing uses in the vicinity;</td>
<td>Compliant (with conditions)</td>
<td>The church will be located west of an existing townhome project. There are single family homes planned to the west of the church. The general plan shows commercial to the south of the church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Whether or not the proposed use or facility may be injurious to potential or existing development in the vicinity;</td>
<td>Compliant (with conditions)</td>
<td>This church site has no development immediately adjacent to the north, west, or south. The general plan shows commercial to the south, and residential to the north and west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The economic impact of the proposed facility or use on the surrounding area;</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td>The church will not have any economic impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The aesthetic impact of the proposed facility or use on the surrounding area;</td>
<td>Compliant (with conditions)</td>
<td>The church is required to have brick or stone. It will be landscaped and add to the character of the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The present and future requirements for transportation, traffic, water, sewer, and other utilities for the proposed site and surrounding area;</td>
<td>Compliant (with conditions)</td>
<td>There are adequate present and future utilities at this site. The transportation network has capacity for the proposed church.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. The safeguards proposed or provided to insure adequate utilities, transportation access, drainage, parking, loading space, lighting, screening, landscaping, open space, fire protection, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation; Compliant (with conditions) The proposed plans meet all requirements for access, utilities, drainage, parking, lighting, screening, and landscaping. There will be a precast wall on the west side of the property to buffer the planned residential. There will also be 15 feet of a landscaped buffer.

h. The safeguards provided or proposed to prevent noxious or offensive omissions such as noise, glare, dust, pollutants and odor from the proposed facility or use; Compliant (with conditions) The site will be landscaped and maintained. There will be no noxious emissions, such as dust or odor. The photometric plans indicate that the lighting will meet City standard.

i. The safeguards provided or proposed to minimize other adverse effects from the proposed facility or use on persons or property in the area Compliant There will be no other adverse effects.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval of the conditional use for an LDS Church with the following requirements:

**Requirements**

1. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies, including those on the DRC comments.
2. Landscape plan approved as submitted.
3. Building elevations are approved as submitted, including the stone accents as shown
4. Provide a 6-foot precast wall on the west property line.
5. All air conditioning units, dumpsters, and outside utilities shall be fenced with masonry enclosures.
6. Parking shall be provided at 1 space for each 6.5 feet of linear pew, or 3.5 seats in the meeting hall; except when used by two congregations, 1.5 parking spaces shall be provided for each 3.5 seats in the meeting hall.
7. Must be a 15-foot landscape buffer adjacent to residential on the west side of the property. Evergreen landscaping anticipated to grow to more than six feet in height shall be provided at distances sufficient to provide a visual and noise-reducing barrier. Such landscaping shall consist of at least one tree for every 20 feet of fencing. A minimum of
one tree shall be provided for every 500 square feet of landscaped area.

8. Park strips must be landscaped and maintained by the applicant. Trees must be provided every 30 feet in the park strip. Trees must meet the approved City tree list. Trees must maintain the appropriate distance from street lights, signage, and intersections.

9. Please make a note in the plans that the parkstrip landscaping and irrigation is to be installed and maintained by the applicant.

10. Please provide Fire Flow Test Report per the UFA test report requirements.

11. Parking lot lights need to meet the city standard per the street light fee study that was adopted by the city council.

12. Underground detention will require a long-term maintenance agreement, form to be provided by the engineering department.

13. The Building department will review accessibility with the Engineering review. This needs to include an Accessibility Detail Sheet.

**Denial Standards**

If the motion is to deny, the Planning Commission must identify for the record which of the following circumstances cannot be mitigated based on substantial evidence presented:

a. The proposed conditional use is not allowed by the zone where the conditional use will be located or by another provision of this title;

b. The use is not consistent with the general plan, as amended;

c. The proposed use will not comply with regulations and conditions specified in this title for such use;

d. Existing or proposed utility services are not adequate to serve the proposed development or are designed in a manner that will adversely affect adjacent property or land uses;

e. The proposed use will create a need for essential city services which cannot reasonably be met;

f. Streets and other means of access to the proposed development are not adequate to carry anticipated traffic and will substantially degrade the level of service on adjacent streets;

g. The proposed use will cause unreasonable risk to the safety of persons or property because of vehicular traffic, parking, large gatherings of people, or other causes;

h. The proposed use will unreasonably interfere with the lawful use of surrounding property;

i. Fencing, screening, landscaping, and other buffering cannot adequately protect adjacent property from light, noise, and visual impacts associated with the proposed conditional use; and

j. The proposed use will be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity;
Attachments
   A. Application
   B. DRC Comments
   C. Vicinity Map
   D. Site plan
   E. Landscaping plan
   F. Building elevations
   G. Applicant response to Conditional Use standards
Land Use Application

Address or location of site  Approx. 5661 West 12900 South, Herriman, UT 84096

Size of Parcel  Approx. 7.3 Acres

What is Requested (explain in detail)?
 Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan approvals for a new LDS Church Stake Center Meetinghouse.

If applicable, square footage of proposed building(s) or addition (all stories combined).  20,602 SF

If the request is residential, how many and what type of units (apartment, condo, etc).  n/a

Property Owner’s Name  The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, c/o Jeff Scott, Project Manager

Mailing Address  

City  Salt Lake City  State  Utah  Zip Code  84104

Telephone  

Applicant/Agent  BHD Architects, c/o Laffe Harris and Mike Davey

Mailing Address  

City  Draper  State  Utah  Zip Code  84020

Telephone  

Subject to Purchase or Lease:  or  Present Owner of Property:  X

Yes I am the authorized agent or owner of the subject property:  X

Current Use of Subject Property  Vacant

Proposed Development Name  Western Springs Stake Center

For Herriman Use Only

Date of Submittal  5/25/18  Filing Fee  $396  File Number  C2018-27

Receipt Number  S4227  Accepted by  CE  DRC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>STATUS/RESULT</th>
<th>ACTION BY</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2018</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Routed for DRC review</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Submitted application for a conditional use and 2 lot subdivision for an LDS Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2018</td>
<td>Zoning Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>McCarty, Bryn</td>
<td>Use: Church is a conditional use in this zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaping: 20 feet of landscaping required behind the property line along the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must be a 15 foot landscape buffer adjacent to residential on the west side of the property. Evergreen landscaping anticipated to grow to more than six feet in height shall be provided at distances sufficient to provide a visual and noise reducing barrier. Such landscaping shall consist of at least one tree for every 20 feet of fencing. A minimum of one tree shall be provided for every 500 square feet of landscaped area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park strips must be landscaped and maintained by the applicant. Trees must be provided every 30 feet in the park strip. Trees must meet the approved City tree list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fencing: 6 foot precast wall adjacent to residential (west side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking: 1 space per 3.5 seats, if used by 2 congregations (each 20 inches of pew is a seat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setbacks: front yard – 40 feet, side yard - 20 feet, rear yard - 40 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elevations: must have an element of brick or stone, as shown on the proposed elevations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/2018</td>
<td>Unified Fire Authority</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Devoogd, Dan</td>
<td>UFA has reviewed the plans and has no concerns at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2018</td>
<td>Building Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Hunting, Boyd</td>
<td>Building will review accessibility with the Engineering review. This needs to include an Accessibility Detail Sheet. The detail sheet should include an accessible route from the accessibility parking in the upper corner of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Review Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2018</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Thomas, Blake</td>
<td>See redlines on the attached plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2018</td>
<td>GIS Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Blackett, Eric</td>
<td>The lots each need an address 200 North should be 12900 South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/30/2018</td>
<td>Water Review</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Edwards, Justun</td>
<td>See redlines on the attached plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Subdivision and Conditional Use
File#s S2018-12 & C2018-27
Tue, 12 Jun 2018

Herriman City Building Department
5335 Main Street
Herriman, Utah 84096

Re: Conditional Use Standards letter for Herriman Rose 3, Herriman UT Western Springs Stake
Attention: Craig Evans
801.446.5323

Following are the responses to Conditional Use Standards emailed 12 June 2018:

**Conditional Use Standards Letter:**

1. **Comment:** In considering an application for a conditional use permit, the decision-making body or official may analyze any of the following factors and may request information, studies, or data with respect to such factors for the purpose of determining whether a proposed conditional use meets the standards set forth in subsection E-2 of this section.

   a. The suitability of the specific property for the proposed use;

      **Response:** The building will be built in a residential neighborhood for the use of those living in the area.

   b. The development or lack of development adjacent to the proposed site and the harmony of the proposed use with existing uses in the vicinity;

      **Response:** As is common in many areas of the city and surrounding communities, the building will be built in a residential neighborhood for the use of those living in the area. As such, it will be a compatible use with those of the adjacent properties.

   c. Whether or not the proposed use or facility may be injurious to potential or existing development in the vicinity;

      **Response:** The proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity.

   d. The economic impact of the proposed facility or use on the surrounding area;

      **Response:** Because the building serves those who already live in the area and brings in no occupants from outside the immediate vicinity, there should be no significant impact on public services, utilities, schools, or recreation.

   e. The aesthetic impact of the proposed facility or use on the surrounding area;

      **Response:** The design of the building is intended to complement residential communities and adjacent properties.

   f. The present and future requirements for transportation, traffic, water, sewer, and other utilities for the proposed site and surrounding area;

      **Response:** Because the building serves those who already live in the area and brings in no occupants from outside the immediate vicinity, there should be no significant impact on public services, utilities, schools, or recreation. The Church is installing new road improvements along the frontage of the site.

   g. The safeguards proposed or provided to insure adequate utilities, transportation access, drainage, parking, loading space, lighting, screening, landscaping, open space, fire protection, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation;

      **Response:** The parking lot has good circulation. All drives are wide enough for emergency vehicles to access and exit the property. The site design complies with all city ordinances.

   h. The safeguards provided or proposed to prevent noxious or offensive omissions such as noise, glare, dust, pollutants and odor from the proposed facility or use;

      **Response:** No noise, smoke, odor, dust, or excess illumination will be created by the proposed use. The contractor will follow all city ordinances during construction.
i. The safeguards provided or proposed to minimize other adverse effects from the proposed facility or use on persons or property in the area; and
   
   **Response:** The meetinghouse will not have adverse effects on the area.

j. The impact of the proposed facility or use on the health, safety, and welfare of the city, the area, and persons owning or leasing property in the area.
   
   **Response:** The project will not have a detrimental effect on the neighboring landowners.

Thank you for your review of this project. Let me know if any of these items require further clarification.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lafe T Harris, Principal
B H D Architects