PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
Thursday, September 6, 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. Training
2. Review of City Council Decisions
3. 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: July 19, 2018 and August 2, 2018
   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: Review and Approval of Park Amenities for Creek Ridge West
       Applicant: Steve Maddox – Edge Homes
       Address: 6400 W Herriman Parkway
       Zone: R-2-10 (Residential – Medium Density)
       Acres: 1.75
       File Number: C2014-09-01

   2.2 Request: Preliminary Plat Approval for a 2 Lot Commercial Subdivision (Public Hearing)
       Applicant: Matt Watson – Rosecrest
       Address: 4001 W Real Vista Drive
       14568 S Autumn Crest Blvd
       Zone: C-2 (Commercial) and MU-2 (Mixed Use)
       Acres: 45.58
       File Number: S2018-16

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.
3.2 Request: Discussion of a Proposed Text Change to the Land Development Code to Create an Auto Mall Special District
Applicant: Herriman City
File Number: Z2018-13

4. Chair and Commission Comments

5. Future Meetings

5.1 City Council – Wednesday, September 12, 2018 @ 7:00 PM
5.2 Planning Commission Meeting – Thursday, September 20, 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) 446-5323 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/pmep/index.html and on Herriman City’s website www.herriman.org.

Posted and Dated this 30th day of August, 2018

Wendy Thorpe
Deputy Recorder
PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT MINUTES
Thursday, July 19, 2018
Awaiting Formal Approval

The following are the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting held on Thursday, July 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: Adam Jacobson, Andy Powell, Andrea Bradford, Jackson Ferguson, Parry Harrison, Lorin Palmer

Commission Members Excused: Chris Berbert, Brody Rypien

City Staff Present: Assistant City Planner Bryn McCarty, Communication Specialist Jonathan LaFollette, Planner I Craig Evans, City Engineer Blake Thomas, and Deputy Recorder Wendy Thorpe.

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

Chair Jessica Morton called the meeting to order at 6:08 pm.

Newly appointed alternate Commissioner Parry Harrison was introduced. The Commissioners and Staff offered brief introductions.

1. Review of Items for and LDS Seminary
   File Number: C2018-14
   Assistant City Planner McCarty introduced the developer who presented the material and color boards for the Seminary building, which had been previously requested by the Commission.

2. Review of materials for an LDS Church
   File Number: C2018-27
Assistant City Planner McCarty presented the material and color boards for the proposed LDS Church, which had been previously requested by the Commission.

3. Discussion regarding improvements to 13200 South for the Freeman Subdivision
City Engineer Thomas described that the Planning Commission had placed a requirement to install curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements along 13200 South. However, that is located in the curb/gutter exception area. The City Council passed an ordinance, which allowed for that area to have an asphalt road, gradual swell and a six or eight foot asphalt walking path. The perspective buyer asked for further clarification and the City Attorney and City Manager specified that the City Council ordinance would override the Commission requirement. City Engineer Thomas maintained that two driveways along the road would have to be installed to accommodate the swell creating a fee in lieu situation and the development would occur in phases. The trail connection would tie in with the asphalt trail from the cul-de-sac allowing access for school children to the school grounds. The Commissioners inquired as to why the City has allowed such an exception area. It was explained that City Council voted to leave an area with a rural feel, which would include no curb, gutter or sidewalk in the old town area. City Engineer Thomas added that drainage could be an issue due to the lack of outflow in the area. Improvements could affect drainage and cause flooding issues.

4. Discussion of proposed Auto Mall Overlay Zone
   File Number: Z2018-13
Assistant City Planner McCarty reviewed that a zone would be created which would be limited to this specific property. The site plan of commercial areas would not be amended, as the special overlay zone would impact the dealership areas. The City would require 20 feet of landscaping along the street with some allowance in the parking lot. The Commissioners expressed concern regarding the brightness of lights at night as the lighting requirements seemed vague. City ordinance limiting brightness and dimness would be considered. Assistant City Planner McCarty stated the ordinance was a compromise between Economic Development, Planning and the Dealerships. She stated the developer was reviewing the requirements and would forward their comments to the City. Signage was still not determined, but might consist of signs on the premises with a couple larger ones along Mountain View Corridor (MVC). Some signs may be electronic. Assistant City Planner McCarty reminded the Commissioners that this was still a preliminary site plan draft. Two dedicated access points would be on MVC and one from Main Street. Sign renderings and height would be included in the ordinance. The Commissioners expressed the opinion that motion lights would be distracting and pedestal height would need to be limited. Temporary signage would still need to be determined. Assistant City Planner McCarty reminded the Commissioners this was a special district, not an overlay zone and informed them that dealerships have shown interest. This item would be discussed at a future meeting.

5. Review of City Council Decisions
Assistant City Planner McCarty informed the Commission that the City Council appointed Commissioner Harrison as an alternate, and Commissioners Bradford and Ferguson as would fill the full-time positions. Commissioner Jacobson would be up for re-appointment in the near future. The City Council directed staff to conduct a study regarding the carrying capacity, based on infrastructure, and logical density for the Olympia
Hills area. The City would complete it within a couple of months. The Holiday Oil decision which had been appealed, was upheld by David Church which supported the Planning Commission’s recommendation. The Exxon gas station, which was appealed to District Court, will be decided by a Judge in August. That gas station had been proposed in a multi-use zone and nearby residents had concerns with lighting and noise.

6. Review of Agenda Items
Assistant City Planner McCarty discussed the dome house exception regarding single-family design criteria. The existing architectural standards allow the Planning Commission to approve a project if there were enough compensating architectural features. The exception would address the roof pitch not meeting City standards. The Commissioners discussed the dome house look and potential value. Assistant City Planner McCarty stated the applicant had not provided the cost per square foot. The Commissioners discussed they were expensive to build and highly labor intensive. More specific process and standards may be requested regarding materials and brand, comparable properties and possible effect on nearby housing values.

Planner I Evans clarified that the neighbor affected by the lot line adjustment had signed an affidavit and both neighbors would sign the recorded plat.

Assistant City Planner McCarty reviewed the requirements for the Holiday Oil along 15000 South regarding the detention area and precast wall. The Planning Commission required installation of the precast wall prior to issuance of any building permits. She directed the Commission’s attention to a section that borders an area that had not been developed and inquired if construction could begin when the bond for the precast wall and engineering were completed. Responsible parties for the wall construction were discussed.

Planning Commission work meeting adjourned by consensus at 7:03 p.m.

7:00 PM - Regular Planning Commission Meeting

1. Call to Order
Chair Morton called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance

1.1 Invocation/Thought/Reading and Pledge
Mr. James Dosdall led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1.2 Roll call
Full Quorum Present; Commissioners Chris Berbert and Brody Rypien were excused.

1.3 Approval of Minutes for: 06/07/18
Commissioner Powell moved to approve item 1.3 Minutes for: 06/07/18. Commissioner Palmer seconded, and all voted aye. The motion passed unanimously.
1.4 Conflicts of Interest
No conflicts of interest were offered.

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: Subdivision Amendment for a Lot Line Adjustment
   Applicant: Jeffrey Tobler
   Address: 14813 S Cedar Butte Dr & 6644 W Cedar Butte Cir
   Zone: FR-1 (Forestry Recreation – 1 acre min.)
   Acres: .41
   File Number: S2018-14

Assistant City Planner McCarty reviewed the minimal lot line adjustment to where the fence line was located and stated the item was not a public hearing.

Applicant Jeff Tobler stated the fence was installed by the contractor slightly over the lot line, the neighbor affected by the adjustment had signed the application.

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 applicant/property owner.

Commissioner Powell moved to recommend approval of item 2.1 file number S2018-14 for Subdivision Amendment for a Lot Line Adjustment. Commissioner Bradford seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye
Commissioner Andrea Bradford  Aye
Commissioner Andy Powell  Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Lorin Palmer  Aye
Commissioner Parry Harrison  Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

2.2 Request: Exception to the Single Family Design Standards for a Proposed Dome Home
   Applicant: James Dosdall
   Address: 6043 W Herriman View Way
Zone: A-.25 (Agricultural – 10,000 sq. ft.min.)
Acres: .88
File Number: P2018-02

Assistant City Planner McCarty described the location, single design standards and exception allowances. The main exception for this request regarded the roof pitch. The Commission would decide if the architectural design standard of the dome home offered enough compensating design features to justify the exception.

Applicant James Dosdall approached podium and clarified the home did not meet the 5:12 roof pitch for 17 percent of the roof. The pitch is standard for 83 percent of the roof. He further discussed the renderings and unique hazards for the area. He stated the lot backed up to an open range and he would build with material that would not burn and would provide a fire barrier. Mr. Dosdall explained the dome home would contain a reinforced concrete construction foundation set on bedrock, and would withstand a strong earthquake. Mr. Dosdall emphasized the structure matches the curvature of nearby hills and they would landscape with local materials. There were a half dozen nearby vacant lots and he expressed the opinion that the dome home would be an example of a safe, structural home for the area. The dome home meets façade requirements, would have solar electric and heating, geothermal cooling and rainwater capture. He anticipated preliminary review approval before spending more money on architectural drawings. The driveway would wrap around the lot to the back of the house to the parking garage and a large RV sized garage. The front door would be located at the rear of the house with barrier free access. He communicated his opinion that the design was energy efficient, contained low surface area volume, and would be comprised of six inches of foam covered by concrete with Styrofoam insulation that reduced the need for air conditioning. He offered the opinion that the foam would melt but would not burn. Mr. Dosdall presented a photo of a neighborhood from another state that had all burned except for the dome house. He further stated he did not anticipate any cracks or leaks for the reinforced stucco roof. He defined the tallest area of the structure would have flat walls and windows up to the domed roof section. He further described the architectural drawings.

The Commissioners stated more material would be required to deviate from regular housing type, including window type, color boards, structure materials and architectural improvements to compensate for design standard exception. Proof of these would need to be documented by an architect and energy efficiency would need to be presented with more information.

Mr. Dosdall informed the Commission the square footage would be 1700 feet on the main level, 600 feet on the top floor, plus 1700 in the unfinished basement, in addition to the large garages.

The Commissioners expressed a desire for more engineering reports and architectural details, so the Commission could review the full scope of the project, prior to approval to ensure consistency with all exceptions. The Commissioners emphasized the necessity for them to justify the reasons for approval. They further expressed an interest in notifying neighbors and requested the presentation of color and material boards due to the drastic architectural deviation from current design standards.
Mr. Dosdall proposed the addition of a cap to the dome, to make up for the pitch.

The Commissioners discussed the front would still need to contain 40 percent brick or stone and reports regarding efficiency would need to be submitted. The Commissioners offered the possible affect non-traditional homes would have on nearby home values.

Mr. Dosdall stated he anticipated the value of the home would be higher than those nearby.

Assistant City Planner McCarty stated City Staff would be available to analyze the possible effect on nearby home values and seek feedback from the neighbors if the applicant chose to move forward.

Requirements:
The Planning Commission will need to determine whether granting a deviation from item F of the single-family design standards is warranted based on the compensating design features of the proposed home.

Commissioner Jacobson moved to continue without date item 2.2 Exception to the Single Family Design Standards for a Proposed Dome Home with staff requirements, for applicant to bring back architectural plan, analysis of effect nontraditional homes have on nearby property values, notification of neighbors by the City, for applicant to provide information for the compensating design features for geothermal design, for applicant to bring back color board, architectural design, true schematic to ensure it can be achieved, materials boards, and for applicant to provide compensating design features, and additionally bring in historic dome structure regional information and maintenance information and features for comparable homes in Utah. Commissioner Palmer seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Commissioner Adam Jacobson Aye
Commissioner Andrea Bradford Aye
Commissioner Andy Powell Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson Aye
Commissioner Lorin Palmer Aye
Commissioner Parry Harrison Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

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 to Create an Accessory Structures Chapter (Public Hearing)
Applicant: Herriman City
File Number: Z2018-19
Chair Morton reviewed the public hearing guidelines.

Planner I Evans explained the accessory structures chapter was amended to better explain the ordinance, which had been rather fragmented. This text change would consolidate all information regarding accessory structures. No exceptions are included at this time and provisions would need to be added separately. He requested for the Commissioners and public to make the staff aware of any changes they considered necessary.

Chair Morton opened the public hearing.

Resident Zach Bevan stated his lot was unique and he approached the City for guidance to place a garage on his property. Satellite images of his lot were presented. Mr. Bevan was concerned that a detached garage would not be allowed on his property at this time. Exceptions would need to be implemented to allow for placement of an accessory building on his lot.

Chair Morton closed the public hearing.

Assistant City Planner McCarty clarified requirements and setbacks for construction of an accessory building in a front yard. She added that this property would be an example for implementing exceptions regarding setbacks for unique lots. Commissioner Jacobson stipulated that a three-foot setback for rear and side yards were not necessary and one foot would be sufficient for a fenced yard. Assistant City Planner McCarty mentioned fire code requirements would affect placement for some accessory structures and further advised that placement would be too close to the property line would cause water to flow from the roof onto neighboring property. Commissioners discussed placement possibilities for corner lots, and that offsets would limit size for accessory structure on corner lots. Commissioner Jacobson proposed referencing the front of the house in the requirements as a measure for placement in the front yard of a corner lot. Exception possibilities for placing accessory structures in the front yards of some corner lots were recognized. Commissioner Jacobson mentioned that making the standards simpler would reduce the need for many exceptions. Setback distances from the road for placement of accessory structures and easement locations were acknowledged. The guideline of not allowing structures larger than 25 percent of the yards would prevent small yards from being dominated by accessory structures. Assistant City Planner McCarty proposed including diagrams with examples for placement and clarified the current guidelines do not allow structures to take up more than 25 percent of the rear yard and the garage must be smaller than the house footprint. Accessory structures sizes as compared to lot sizes were discussed in detail, including different allowances in agricultural areas. Staff would continue working on the accessory structure chapter with Commissioner’s recommendations.

*Commissioner Jacobson made a motion to continue without date Item 3.1 File Number Z2018-19 Text Change to the Land Development Code to Create an Accessory Buildings Chapter (Public Hearing), Commissioner Powell seconded the motion.*

The vote was recorded as follows:
*Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye*
3.2 Request: Text change to the Land Development Code Chapter 16, Table of Uses (Public Hearing)

Applicant: Herriman City
File Number: Z2018-12

Assistant City Planner McCarty briefed the Commission on the changes to the Table of Uses. She directed their attention to the Family Food Production category that had a broader definition and included more animal types than residential areas zoned for Backyard Chickens. Home occupation was moved from commercial to residential uses. Home daycare was zoned conditional use and not allowed if a residence shared a driveway. A separate Home Occupation Chapter would be provided to the Commission at a later date. Home dance lessons definition still needed to be defined, depending upon the number of classes per day. Assistant City Planner McCarty further explained Heavy Industry was removed, and limitations were placed on Wholesale Warehousing. Assistant City Planner clarified that most home businesses with customers were conditional use and home businesses with no customers were permitted, and the home occupations chapter would be discussed at a later time.

Chair Morton opened the public hearing

No comments were offered.

Chair Morton closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Harrison made a motion to recommend approval to City Council of Item 3.2 File Number Z2018-12 Text Change to the Land Development Code, Chapter 16, Table of Uses (Public Hearing), Commissioner Palmer seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Commissioner Adam Jacobson  Aye
Commissioner Andrea Bradford  Aye
Commissioner Andy Powell  Aye
Commissioner Jackson Ferguson  Aye
Commissioner Lorin Palmer  Aye
Commissioner Party Harrison  Aye
The motion passed unanimously.

4. Chair and Commission Comments
No comments were offered.

5. Future Meetings
   5.1 Planning Commission Meeting – August 2, 2018 @ 7:00 PM
   5.2 City Council Meeting – August 8, 2018 @ 7:00 PM

7. Adjournment
Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Powell, seconded by Commissioner Jacobson all voted aye.
The Meeting was adjourned by consensus at 8:29 p.m.

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

Wendy Thorpe
PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT MINUTES
Thursday, August 2, 2018
Awaiting Formal Approval

The following are the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting held on Thursday, August 2, 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: Jackson Ferguson, Andy Powell, Brody Rypien, Chris Berbert, Parry Harrison, Andrea Bradford

Commission Members Absent: Adam Jacobson, Lorin Palmer

Staff Present: Assistant City Planner Bryn McCarty, Communication Specialist Destiny Skinner, Planning Coordinator Craig Evans, Assistant City Engineer Jonathan Bowers, and Deputy Recorder Wendy Thoupe.

6:00 PM - Work Meeting (For Herriman Conference Room)
Chair Jessica Morton called the meeting to order at 6:09 pm.

1. Training
Assistant City Planner McCarty distributed training handouts, the first of which explained the terminology and process details for the General Plan Amendment. She informed the Commission that the General Plan process must consist, at a minimum, of a newspaper notice and post to the City website 10 days prior to a public hearing and notification of affected entities. The General Plan must contain land use, transportation and moderate income housing elements. She further clarified the entire General Plan amendment process would take about a year and a half.

Assistant City Planner McCarty distributed a training handout and briefly outline the Zoning process. She made the Commissioners aware that land use applications must be submitted and fees must be paid 30 days
prior to the Planning Commission meeting. Property owners within 300 feet must be notified 10 days prior to
the public hearing. Zoning text changes must be noticed in the newspaper and on the City website 10 days
prior to the Public Hearing. The Planning Commission would then recommend approval, with or without
conditions, or recommend denial to the legislative body. The City Council would then adopt or reject the
ordinance, as proposed or after making revisions. Significant changes would be returned to the Planning
Commission for reconsideration.

Commissioner Andrea Bradford arrived at 6:15 p.m.

Assistant City Planner McCarty distributed the how to make a motion handout. She emphasized the
importance of being specific and clearly stating conditions, adjustments and/or additional requirements.

2. Discussion of Proposed Home Occupation Chapter

Assistant City Planner McCarty provided the Commissioners with proposed updates for the Home
Occupation Chapter and informed the Commissioners that the home daycare section was in a different section
of the ordinance. Home instruction was the working title for preschools, dance classes, and circumstances with
multiple customers coming to the house. She discussed limitations of sessions and number of total customers
allowed at a time. The necessity to exclude outside businesses was clarified, due to home business such as
daycares, preschools and swim lessons utilizing fenced yards. Salons, tax preparation and home businesses with
one person at a time would be defined in a different section. She further defined that these would not be
allowed if the applicant has a shared driveway, and explained that no additional parking or drop-off areas could
be created. Assistant City Planner McCarty said the City would continue to work on the home occupation
chapter and bring it back to the Commission at a future date.

3. Review of City Council Decisions

Assistant City Planner McCarty had none to report. She notified the Commissioners that the Herriman City
Safety Enforcement Area (HCSEA) Truth in Taxation meeting had been scheduled for August 16, 2018 at
6:00 p.m. and the Joint City Council / Planning Commission Meeting had been scheduled for August 30, 2018.

4. Review of Agenda Items

Assistant City Planner McCarty briefly discussed the Open Space Master Plan and that the public hearing was
scheduled for the August 16, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

Assistant City Planner McCarty distributed American Planning Association handouts and informed the
Commissioners that the annual conference would be October 4 & 5, 2018.

Director of Parks, Events and Recreation Thomas entered the meeting at 6:42 p.m. to address questions
regarding the Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan. She informed the Commissioners that a Consultant
would present at the Meeting. She stated no additional parking was included for Blackridge Reservoir. The
Commissioners offered the opinion that trails similar to the Provo Canyon paved trails would be an amenity to draw people from further away. Director Thomas stated some connectivity under Mountain View Corridor (MVC) would be incorporated along with a paved asphalt trail to Highway 111. Inclusion of a mountain bike trail in Juniper Canyon would be contingent on development in the area. Director Thomas further explained the City had coordinated with Police and UFA regarding rescue and injury treatment along the proposed trails.

*Planning Commission work meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:49 p.m.*

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

1. **Call to Order**
   Chair Morton called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

   1.1 **Invocation/Thought/Reading and Pledge**
   Commissioner Rypien led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

   1.2 **Roll call**
   Full Quorum Present; Commissioners Adam Jacobson and Lorin Palmer were not present.

   1.3 **Approval of Minutes for: 06/21/18**
   Commissioner Powell moved to approve item 1.3 Minutes for June 21, 2018. Commissioner Rypien seconded the motion and all voted aye.

   1.4 **Conflicts of Interest**
   No conflicts of interest were offered.

2. **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.

   2.1 **Request: Discussion of the Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan (Public Hearing will be held August 16, 2018)**
   Applicant: Herriman City
   File Number: G2018-02

   Director of Parks, Events and Recreation Thomas introduced Consultant Deborah Shepard from Project Engineering Consultants (PEC) to present the Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan Summary. The Public Hearing and further discussion would take place at the next Planning Commission meeting on August 16, 2018. Consultant Shepard provided a brief history of the research and development and survey feedback from residents that led to the plan. A majority of survey respondents expressed the desire for minimal development and showed support for the addition of some trailheads with parking, structured trails, restrooms, trash receptacles, posted rules for the areas and smaller scale amenities. Highest response was from residents that lived near the trail areas and a
majority of respondents expressed a desire for small scale development, such as trails for hiking, mountain biking or trail running. Year round terrain park for biking and snowshoeing was the most desired of the medium scale development options. With regards to large scale development, respondents expressed interest in access to view areas and roadway development for trail/park access. Access to the interior was desired but not lots of amenities. Respondents were about evenly divided regarding the development of a leash free dog park. A majority of respondents were willing to support an increase in City park fees to maintain and improve the area. Most respondents did not want paved trails and expressed a desire for natural multi-use, shared or single use trails. Respondents expressed safety concerns regarding increased traffic, fire risk, crime, parking and noise. Respondent suggestions for the write in comments portion expressed a desire to leave the area as is, addition of a gun range, ATV trails and more trees.

Consultant Shepard provided a brief overview of the Herriman Hills Concept Plan. Central location, fairly flat elevation and close proximity to commercial development along Mountain View Corridor would make Juniper Crest trailhead a desirable location for developments such as a community events center, small amphitheatre, parking lot, picnic area, race location and restrooms. Due to narrow access and steep terrain of Friendship Drive, the addition of a parking was not recommended; however, the addition of restrooms and trash cans were suggested. Graffiti Rock/Wide Hollow Trail already has an access road which could be developed into a minimally improved gravel parking area with trash cans, signage and restrooms. Other locations were dependent on access. Tick Ville Gulch offers a spring water resource and the interesting slope could be useful as downhill mountain biking trails and the shadowed area could allow winter activities such as tubing or sledding.

Consultant Shepard previewed the Trail priority concept segment plans. She offered a brief overview of the area from Juniper Crest to Blackridge Reservoir and from Blackridge Reservoir to Friendship Drive trailhead. Areas between Friendship Drive to the Wide Hollow section would still need to be negotiated with private property owners. She added that Tickville Gulch had fun slope opportunities for mountain biking. She pointed out the already established trails and the back country and Bonneville Shoreline trails.

The Commissioners requested further information regarding the Juniper Crest trailhead reception center. Director Thomas clarified the center would be an enclosed club house with a kitchen, and would hold 100 to 150 people for races, small weddings, or meetings. The amphitheatre would be very small and would accommodate small scouting groups or kids presenting a small play or small preschool graduation. The Commissioners questioned the effect on traffic. Parks Director Thomas clarified a traffic impact study had not been completed and noted multiple access points to the trails would likely mitigate traffic issues. She explained the Sidewinder Trail from Blackridge to Diamond Back had already been cut and was being utilized, and was accessible from Butterfield Park, which should reduce parking at Blackridge Reservoir. Parks Director Thomas expressed appreciation for the hard work of the Trails Committee and GIS department. Parks Director Thomas stated there were no plans for another reservoir at this time. She further stated the trail locations were aligned to connect with other city and County trails. The public hearing would take place in two weeks.
Commissioner Berbert made a motion to continue item 2.1 Discussion of the Herriman Hills Open Space Master Plan (Public Hearing will be held August 16, 2018) file # G2018-02. Commissioner Bradford seconded the motion and all voted aye.

3. Chair and Commission Comments
No comments were offered.

4. Future Meetings
4.1 City Council – Wednesday, August 8, 2018 @ 7:00 PM
4.2 HCSEA Truth in Taxation Hearing – Thursday, August 16, 2018 @ 6:00 PM
4.3 Planning Commission Meeting – August 16, 2018 @ 7:00 PM

5. Adjournment
Motion to adjourn offered by Commissioner Powell at 7:34 p.m., Commissioner Rypien seconded the motion, and all voted aye.

I, Wendy Thorpe, Deputy Recorder for Herriman City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on August 2, 2018. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting.

Wendy Thorpe
| **Date of Meeting:**  
| **09/06/2018** |
| **File #** | C2014-09-01 |
| **Applicant** | Edge Homes |
| **Address** | 6400 W Herriman Pkwy |
| **Request** | Review and Approval of Park Amenities for Creek Ridge West |
DATE: August 30, 2018

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Bryn McCarty, AICP, Assistant City Planner

MEETING: Planning Commission September 6, 2018

REQUEST: Review and Approval of Park Amenities for Creek Ridge West

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

Request
The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission review and approve the proposed amenities for the park to be located in Creek Ridge West.

Site
The park is located at approximately 6400 W Herriman Pkwy and contains 1.75 acres.

Discussion
Creek Ridge West was approved by the Planning Commission during their meeting on June 21, 2018. The applicant was required to bring the park amenities back to the Planning Commission as part of the approval:

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.

The applicant has been working with the Parks Department on the layout of the park and amenities to be provided. Parks has made suggestions and revisions to the plan and finds the proposed layout acceptable.

Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the proposed park and amenities.

Attachments
A. Vicinity Map
B. Site Plan
C. Images of Proposed Amenities
The Mountain Maple is one of our most popular designs. Its classic look fits well in any landscape, park or urban setting. Brand this bench with a custom logo cutting.

**TOP FEATURES**
- Weather Resistant Powder Coating
- Customizable logo cutting
- Durable steel design throughout

**AVAILABLE LENGTHS**
- 4’, 6’, 8’

**COLOR OPTIONS**
- [Color Swatches]
SPRUCE PICNIC TABLE

The Spruce picnic table is perfect for every get together. It features a non-tip, convenient, walk through design, and a powder coated surface for polished longevity. These tables are built to be outdoors and will last for years.

TOP FEATURES
Ada Compliant
Custom Logo Cutting
Multiple Color Options

LENGTHS AVAILABLE
6’, 8’

COLOR OPTIONS
The Oak is the type of receptacle that is meant to be shown off. Keep your landscape looking classy while also promoting cleanliness from your community members.

**TOP FEATURES**
- Logo Laser Cutting Available
- Easy To Use Pivot Lock System
- Weather Proof Powder Coating

**AVAILABLE SIZES**
- 32 gallon, 44 gallon

**COLOR OPTIONS**
| Date of Meeting:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>09/06/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request
The applicant is requesting preliminary plat approval for a two lot subdivision.

Site
The lots are located at 4001 W Real Vista Dr. and 14568 S Autumn Crest Blvd and contains 45.58 acres.

Notices
Staff mailed notices to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. Notices were mailed to 28 property owners on August 27, 2018. At this time, staff has received no comments on the request.

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.

Discussion
The two lots included in the subdivision request are located on either side of Real Vista Drive on the east side of Mountain View Corridor. The majority of the area is zoned C-2, with a small portion zoned MU-2.

The lots will be developed as a commercial project. Site plans for the property will come back to the Planning Commission for approval at a later date. Engineering plans and details will be worked out when the property is developed in the future.
**Recommendation**
Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for two lots with the following requirements:

1. Receive and agree to the recommendations from other agencies.
2. Final plat to be reviewed and approved by the Engineering Department.

**Attachments**
A. Application
B. Vicinity Map
C. Preliminary Plat
Land Use Application

Address or location of site: Real Vista and Autumn Crest Blvd.
Size of Parcel: 45.58

What is Requested (explain in detail)?

It is being requested to create a two lot subdivision.

If applicable, square footage of proposed building(s) or addition (all stories combined): n/a
If the request is residential, how many and what type of units (apartment, condo, etc.): n/a

Property Owner's Name: Rosencost Communities, LLC
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
City: [Redacted] State: [Redacted] Zip Code: [Redacted]
Telephone: [Redacted] Cell Number: [Redacted] E-mail: [Redacted]

Applicant/Agent: Same as above
Mailing Address:
City: [Redacted] State: [Redacted] Zip Code: [Redacted]
Telephone: [Redacted] Cell Number: [Redacted] E-mail: [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 Land
Proposed Development Name: Rosencost Place 35 3 39

For Herriman Use Only

Date of Submittal: [Redacted] Filing Fee: [Redacted] File Number: [Redacted]
Receipt Number: [Redacted] Accepted by: [Redacted] DRC: [Redacted]
Proposed 2 Lot Subdivision
File# S2018-16
ROSECREST COMMUNITIES
Pod 35 & 39 Proposed Plat Amendment (08.09.18)
**Date of Meeting:**  
09/06/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File #</th>
<th>Z2018-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>Herriman City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td>Discussion of a Proposed Text Change to the Land Development Code to Create an Automall Special District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: August 30, 2018

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Bryn McCarty, Assistant City Planner

MEETING: Planning Commission September 6, 2018

REQUEST: Discussion of a proposed text change to the Land Development Code to create an Auto Mall Special District.
Applicant: Herriman City
File Number: Z2018-13

Request
Herriman City is proposing a text change to the Land Development Code to create an Auto Mall Special District. This item is on for discussion only.

Notice
This item is on for discussion only, not a public hearing. Therefore, no additional notice is required.

Process
A text change is a legislative action. The Planning Commission holds a public hearing and makes a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council holds a public meeting to discuss the item and then makes the final decision.

Discussion
The City has been working on assembling property for an Auto Mall. Staff has written a new Auto Mall Special District to promote the development of this property. The new district will establish requirements and guidelines for the development of the Auto Mall. It includes items such as:

1. Type of uses allowed
2. Landscaping
3. Architectural Design and Materials
4. Signage, including exceptions to current requirements
5. Access and Internal Circulation

The special district applies to a specific piece of property. It is not a new zone, which could be applied to other property in the City. The requirements in this district are only meant for this property. A map of the property is included in the ordinance.
**Recommendation**
No action is required at this time. The Planning Commission should provide staff with comments on the draft ordinance.

**Attachments:**

A. Draft Auto Mall Special District
Auto Mall Special District

9-18D-010: PURPOSE:
9-18D-020: PERMITTED USES:
9-18D-030: CONDITIONAL USES:
9-18D-040: LOCATION OF AMSD
9-18D-050: SCHEMATIC DEVELOPMENT PLANS:
9-18D-060: DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:
9-18D-070: LANDSCAPE STANDARDS:
9-18D-080: INTERIM FACILITIES
9-18D-090: SIGNAGE:
9-18D-100: PROCEDURES:
9-18D-110: EXHIBITS:

9-18D-010: PURPOSE:
The Auto Mall Special District (AMSD) is an area approximately 67 acres in size, located north of 12600 South, between Mountain View Corridor (MVC) and Main Street. The Auto Mall Special District (AMSD) is a master planned retail zone designed for an automobile center to include the sale of new and used vehicles, auto repair, and sales of auto related products and services. The project will incorporate the community's design goals for commercial development.

9-18D-020: PERMITTED USES:

Unless otherwise allowed by state law, the following uses are considered permitted uses within the AMSD:

Dealership, new (autos, trucks, and service).

9-18D-030: CONDITIONAL USES:

Unless otherwise allowed by state law, the following uses are considered conditional uses within the AMOZ:

Dealership, new (RV, ATV, boat, sales and service).

Dealership, rental (autos, trucks, RV, ATV, boat, sales and service).

Dealership, used (autos, trucks, RV, ATV, boat, sales and service), as an interim facility, subject to the requirements found in section 9-18D-080

9-18D-040: EXTENT OF AMSD:
The standards outlined in this article shall apply to all properties within the boundaries of the AMSD which are shown in section 9-18D-100, exhibit A, “AMSD Boundaries”, of this article.
9-18D-050: SCHEMATIC DEVELOPMENT PLANS:
Development within the AMSD shall be substantially in accordance with the schematic
development plan shown in section 9-18D-110, exhibit B, "Schematic Site Plan", of this article,
or a similar schematic development plan that reflects the spirit of the plan shown in section 9-18D-110, exhibit B of this article. Development within the AMSD will be in phases.

9-18D-060: DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:

A. Architectural Design And Materials:

1. Building design and materials for New Auto Dealerships:
   a. Materials shall be selected which require low maintenance, such as CMU,
      stone, cultured stone, metal, stucco, engineering wood, or hardboard. Buildings
      should consist of at least three different materials.
   b. The following materials shall be specifically prohibited:
      i) Unpainted, plain concrete walls;
      ii) Metal or tin, unless where used as an accent material.
   c. Tilt-up concrete construction is permitted.
   d. Roofs shall not be exposed unless they are part of the decorative or
      architectural treatment of the building, such as parapets, columns, etc.

2. Building design and materials for all other dealerships shall comply with the
   Commercial Design Criteria found in section 10-12-6(C).

B. Lot Coverage: Lot coverage by buildings and covered or semienclosed outbuildings shall not
   exceed forty percent (40%).

C. Buffers, Fences, And Walls: As part of the site plan approval process, special buffers, fences,
   and/or walls shall be required to provide separations between public/commercial areas, service,
   loading, refuse collection, equipment and/or storage areas.

D. Building Size: Maximum building size shall be one hundred thousand (100,000) square feet.

E. Building Height: Maximum building height shall be fifty five feet (55'). Additional height
   may be permitted as conditional use.

F. Parking/Vehicle Storage: The minimum number of parking spaces required shall be four
   hundred (400) square feet for every four hundred (400) square feet of public showroom display
   area for all auto related uses. Spaces may be used for customer, employee, inventory or service
   bays. All other uses shall provide parking as per current city code.
G. New And Used Car Display: Car displays, arrangement of parking spaces, and circulation shall be at the dealer's option. However, no car displays shall block minimum required clear vision areas at driveway intersections or block lanes for public safety, egress or fire access. These clear vision areas and emergency access lanes shall be noted on the proposed site plan.

H. Security For Display Vehicles: To the extent deemed necessary by individual dealers, curb walls no higher than sixteen inches (16") closely spaced concrete bollards, berms, low security fencing and rails may be used. Design must be compatible with project theme and architectural detailing in other parts of the site.

I. Inventory/Parts Storage Areas: Inventory/parts storage areas shall be provided within buildings or on site behind buildings or in screened areas in accordance with subsection C of this section. To the extent practical, areas for storage should be combined with adjacent dealership properties.

J. Access And Internal Circulation:

1. Driveway Access: Except where otherwise required for compliance with applicable codes and for fire lanes, driveways shall be a minimum of twenty four feet (24') wide and all drives shall have a minimum 12.5 foot radius.

2. Service Area Access: Service areas shall have sufficient stacking lanes on site to stack a minimum of one vehicle per service bay. Stacking lanes shall not block flow of traffic or fire access lanes.

K. Fences, Screens And Walls:

1. Fences, screens and walls shall be compatible and architecturally complementary between two (2) adjoining sites. This may be achieved by use of similar materials and finishes to the building, landscaping materials, or other architectural design features.

2. Location of fences shall be compatible with adjoining property users to permit the common use of gates and accesses.

3. Neither chainlink fencing nor plain concrete block fences are permitted.

4. Ten foot (10') screening walls around auto storage areas shall be permitted.

L. Display Pedestals:

1. The number of display pedestals allowed in the front setback shall be one pedestal per one hundred feet (100') of street frontage. The total number of pedestals allowed on the site may be clustered together to achieve more effective display, sales area, or circulation.

2. Display pedestals shall be no closer than two feet (2') from a property line.
M. Site Lighting: All outdoor lighting, including street lights and parking lot lights, shall be in conformance with the requirements of the Herriman City Engineering Standards.

9-18D-070: LANDSCAPE STANDARDS:

A. Variety: Landscaping shall consist of a variety of trees, shrubs, flowers and other planted material, and shall be primarily comprised of water wise landscaping applications of ground covers, rock and mulch.

B. Water Efficiency: All new landscaping and revisions to existing landscape shall incorporate water efficient landscape materials.

C. Public Rights Of Way Minimum: A minimum of twenty feet (20’) width of landscaping will be required along all public rights of way. A minimum of ten feet (10’) width of landscaping will be required as rear and side yard landscaped areas.

D. Minimum Required Along Mountain View Corridor: A minimum of twenty feet (20’) width of landscaping will be required along parcels abutting the Mountain View Corridor right of way.

E. Number Of Trees Within Landscape Easement: Within the required landscape easement along public and private rights of way, at least one tree shall be planted for every thirty feet (30’) of frontage.

F. Trees Within Parking, Display Areas: Within the internal landscape areas of parking/display areas, a minimum of one tree shall be planted for every one thousand (1,000) square feet of parking/display area. Trees may be clustered around the parking area.

G. Common Areas: Landscaping or other side or rear yard barriers or side yards between adjoining dealership properties may be eliminated if the yard area is used in conjunction with an adjoining property for common driveways, display and/or parking.

9-18D-080: INTERIM FACILITIES:

A. Dealers that intend to use an interim building and facilities shall propose a structure that provides an aesthetically attractive building while meeting the needs of a temporary structure. The building architecture and materials shall be reviewed as part of the conditional use approval of the site. A site with an interim facility shall comply with all other requirements of this code, including landscaping, screening, signage and circulation.

B. For the purpose of this chapter, “interim” shall be defined as a building or facility intended to remain on the site for less than two (2) years.

9-18D-090: SIGNAGE:

Signage is an important component for the success of the AutoMall sales activities. All signs shall comply with the Herriman City sign ordinance with the following exceptions:
A. General Standards:

1. Location of all ground mounted signs shall be located to meet the requirements for traffic safety and visibility and shall be located outside the clear view area.

2. Illuminated signs shall be internally lighted. Exposed neon is also permitted as an accent or decorative sign element.

3. No flat faced box or cabinet type sign with painted copy shall be permitted.

4. If signage is integrated with an architectural feature of the building, such as a backlit element, face or column, or a design element that is cast into architectural materials, only the portion of the sign that is text or corporate logo shall be counted toward the total allowed signage area.

5. Approval of this AMSD shall constitute the approval of the master sign program as shown in section 9-18D-110, exhibits D, "Master Sign Plan", and E, "Sign Theme", of this article.

6. All banner signs, inflatables, flags, balloons, animated signs and temporary signs, as allowed in this text, shall not require an additional sign permit from Herriman City.

B. Permanent Signage:

1. Mountain View Corridor (MVC) Frontage:

   a. Two monolithic signs of maximum fifty feet (50') high by fifteen feet (15') wide; and

   b. Each dealer adjacent to MVC may have a sign that complies with the requirements of a Planned Center sign as found in section 10-27-7.

2. Main Street Frontage:

   a. Each dealer adjacent to Main Street may have a sign that complies with the requirements of a Planned Center sign as found in section 10-27-7.

3. Private Street Frontage:

   a. Each dealer with frontage on a private street shall be allowed to have monument signs as allowed in section 10-27-7.

4. Building Signage:
a. Location: Signs shall be mounted on building facades parallel to and contiguous with the wall upon which the sign is attached. Signs may be attached to screen walls or service buildings facing a street.

b. Quantity: A maximum sign copy area allowance for each facade of a building facing a public right of way shall be ten percent (10%) of the facade. In the case that a building fronts a public way on more than one facade, the maximum sign area allowance shall apply to each facade. A transfer of sign allowance area between facades on the same building shall not exceed one hundred twenty five percent (125%) of the allowed area for any given facade. Allowed signage area on a facade may be comprised of one or more individual signs and need not be contiguous.

c. Construction: Signs shall be internally illuminated, individual pan channel or channel lume construction or construction methods with similar intent. Exposed neon as an accent element, logo or decorative feature is allowed as part of the sign area allowance.

5. On Site Directional/Destination And Information Signs: On site signs shall be located as needed to facilitate internal circulation and destination identification.

C. Temporary Signage:

1. General Standards:

a. Signs shall not be placed in or over a public right of way.

b. Signs shall not flash, blink, spin, rotate, block traffic visibility, constitute a vehicular or pedestrian traffic hazard, or cause a public nuisance of any kind.

c. Signs shall not be attached to telephone poles, trees or security gates.

d. Signs must be firmly secured.

e. Signs within a power line easement shall comply with height conditions of the easement.

f. Prior to December 15 of each calendar year, property owners within the AMSD shall jointly submit to Herriman City a calendar for the coming year of special promotion periods and holiday promotion periods that establishes "fly dates" for temporary signs, balloons, and inflatables. Fly dates shall comply with the provisions for special promotion and holiday promotion periods established in this section.

2. Banners:
a. Flag banners may be placed along frontage streets with a minimum interval spacing of at least thirty feet (30').

b. Pole banners may be attached to poles and supports.

c. Flag banners may be freestanding feather banners with inground supports and spikes.

3. Temporary Sign Devices: The following types of sign devices may be used during the permitted special promotion and holiday promotion periods:

a. Banners attached to the buildings, not exceeding fifteen percent (15%) of the building facade and no more than one banner per facade, but temporary building banners shall not be counted toward maximum allowance for permanent signage;

b. Vehicle decorations, including antenna flags, balloons, windshield paintings and hood displays;

c. Tall balloons designed to attract attention from long distances, including cloud busters (balloons attached in a series with string or pennant flags) and hot air balloons;

d. Carnival tents;

e. Search or spotlights; and

f. Inflatable objects for the purpose of advertising a specific product or to bring attention to a special promotion, such as inflatable mascots, gorillas, bounce houses, and promotional sponsors.

4. Special Promotion Periods:

a. Property owners within the AMSD may implement jointly up to twenty one (21) special promotion periods per calendar year.

b. Each period may not exceed five (5) consecutive days in length.

c. Special promotional periods shall not be combined to run consecutively and must be separated by nine (9) calendar days between each special promotion period.

d. A sign permit for temporary signage is not required, provided the signage meets the requirements of this section.

5. Holiday Promotion Periods:
a. Property owners within the AMSD may implement jointly up to nine (9) holiday promotion periods per calendar year.

b. Unless otherwise noted below, each period may not exceed six (6) consecutive days in length.

c. Holiday promotional periods may be combined to run consecutively with other special promotion periods.

d. The following days shall be considered holiday promotion periods:

(1) New Year's Day (January);
(2) Presidents Day (February);
(3) Tax season (April, 7 days);
(4) Memorial Day (May);
(5) 4th Of July (July);
(6) 24th of July (July);
(7) Labor Day (September);
(8) Thanksgiving (November); and
(9) End of year/Christmas (December 15 - December 31).

9-18D-100: PROCEDURES:

Approval of this Auto Mall Special District article shall constitute conceptual site plan approval for the development as noted in section 9-18D-110, exhibit B of this article. Except as otherwise provided herein, all other procedural requirements, such as applications for subdivision approval, site plan review, conditional use approvals, and any other permits shall be processed in accordance with the Herriman City requirements, ordinances and procedures.

9-18D-110: EXHIBITS:
Add to definitions:

MONOLITHIC SIGN: A high profile, on premises sign where the sign face and supports are within the same cabinet structure, independent of any building or other structure.