

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE WEST JORDAN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD DECEMBER 18, 2012 IN THE WEST JORDAN COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**PRESENT:** Nathan Gedge, Dan Lawes, John Winn, Jesse Valenzuela, and Lesa Bridge. Ellen Smith was excused.

**STAFF:** Tom Burdett, Greg Mikolash, Robert Thorup, Scott Langford, Paul Brockbank and Julie Davis.

**OTHERS:** Warren Crown, Kyle Crown, Spencer White, Jason Harris, and James Scott.

\*\*\*\*\*  
The briefing meeting was called to order by Nathan Gedge.

The agenda was reviewed. A representative from RhinoRock gave a presentation on a proposed lightweight concrete fencing material for the Loneview North project. Greg said that if this is approved for the Loneview Subdivision then it would be expected throughout the village for consistency.

\*\*\*\*\*  
The regular meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

**1. Consent Calendar  
Approve Minutes from December 4, 2012**

**MOTION: John Winn moved to approve the consent Calendar the minutes from December 4, 2012. The motion was seconded by Dan Lawes and passed 5-0 in favor.**

\*\*\*\*\*  
**2. Discussion - Highlands; approximately 7800 South 5600 West; Conceptual Development Plan for approximately 370 acres; MFR, HFR, LFR, SC-2, R-1-10D/E(ZC) Zones; Peterson Development, LC/Justin Peterson (applicant) [#DP20120001]**

Scott Langford stated that nothing had changed on the master plan since the Commission saw it last in May 2012. Peterson Development is in the process of revising some minor components of the master plan, so the Commission could forward comments at this time. The first village within the Highlands is Loneview North. The Highlands master plan is divided into three pods: Highlands West, Highlands East, and Highlands North. Each pod has a minimum of 20% open space and as each village comes in they have to amend the overall master plan and they have to meet the minimum open space. The Commission hadn't officially approved the master plan but they had reviewed and commented in the past.

Tom Burdett said the Highlands area is part of a settlement agreement made with Peterson Development earlier this year. They will be using the WSPA zoning densities established as part of the development agreement settlement.

No one from the audience wished to make comment.

\*\*\*\*\*  
**3. Discussion - Loneview North; 7800 South 6500 West; Conceptual Subdivision Plat (110 lots on 33.43 acres) and Conceptual Development Plan; LFR Zone; The Boyer Company/Spencer Moffat (applicant) [#SDMA20120014, DP20120006]**

Scott Langford said one of the purposes of presenting this as a discussion item is to look at the proposed buy-ups and suggest changes or clarifications. It is located in the Highlands West area.

Spencer White, consultant for Boyer Development, said they wanted to present this as a work session item for comment and they hope to come back in January for a motion. It is the first project in the Highlands master plan and comprises 108 units. He reviewed the Density Buy-up Table from the development plan:

**Trails & Open Space**

<b>Amenity/Improvement</b>	<b>Weighted Value</b>
Installation of enhanced open space/recreational amenities in excess of that required per City standards  • Active Open Space Amenity/Facility - Picnic Area w/covered pavilion, gazebo, tables, benches, etc. -2% • Passive Open Space Amenity/Facility - Common Green -1%	3%
Improvement of trail corridors and installation of trail amenities in excess of that required per City Standards  - Installation of 1 tree every 25 linear feet of trail, and 1 shrub, bush or perennial flower every 2 linear feet of trail (grouping or clustering is permissible and encouraged) -4% - Installation of 1 bench every 1000-feet -1% - Installation of 1 trash receptacle every 1000-feet -1%	6%
Dedication of additional property for trails beyond that required per City standards along creeks/washes  - Dedicate additional property along the creek/wash for the enhancement of a trail corridor, a minimum of 12-feet and a maximum of 25-feet of additional land shall be dedicated beyond the width of the required dedication area of the trail/maintenance corridor (950' along the creek/wash)	9%

**Street Design**

<b>Amenity/Improvement</b>	<b>Weighted Value</b>
Entryway monument or gateway feature to the subdivision/development	10%
Provision of a landscape buffer on major right-of-ways (500' along 7800 South)	2%

**Smart Growth Urban Design**

<b>Amenity/Improvement</b>	<b>Weighted Value</b>
Alternative load garage configuration	18%

**Building Design**

<b>Amenity/Improvement</b>	<b>Weighted Value</b>
Installation of covered porches throughout 50% of the subdivision	14%
Enhanced door and window treatment	12%
<b>Total Buy-up</b>	<b>74%</b>

The WSPA calls for a 2-foot break in the wall every 150 feet, but they are hoping to eliminate that language. The bump-outs in the wall tend to collect trash and weeds. Their proposed wall will have pilasters every 6 feet. They propose that 75% of the homes in the subdivision have the alternative load garage configuration. Enhanced door and window treatments includes either sidelights on either side of the entrance door or a transom window, and some kind of a border (minimum 4") around the windows. Their project only needs 68% buy-up to get the 108 units, and they plan to provide these items whether or not they need them for the buy-up.

Mr. White said the Design Review Committee wanted to see elevations and floor plans as to how they sit on the site, but since Boyer does not necessarily build the homes, they will show very specific examples of what they expect within their development. One way to make sure homes meet the standard is to have them signed off by an Architectural Control Committee before they are submitted to the city for building permit, which he thought the planning staff was comfortable with.

Dan Lawes asked for clarification on the buy-up for recessed garages.

Spencer White said they can either have a semi-recessed garage (6 feet back from either the front porch or front of the house) or a rear yard attached or detached front load garage (where the garage has to be back at least 20 feet from the front of the house).

Lesa Bridge asked for clarification that the open space buy-up would include one gazebo, one picnic table, one park bench, and one garbage can for 108 homes.

Mr. White said that is correct.

Nathan Gedge said they were presented with samples of the proposed RhinoRock wall in the pre-meeting, and the Commission was pretty comfortable with it. Hopefully they will make a recommendation to the Council for some kind of codification.

Spencer White said the traffic study for the intersection of 7800 South and 6400 West and the rest of the project, and a full landscape plan with exact types of plants, trees and irrigation will come prior to the next meeting.

No one from the audience wished to make comment.

Nathan Gedge said he looks forward to formally reviewing the item at the next meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

**4. Discussion - Jordan Meadows Park Subdivision; 7544 South 2200 West; Concept Plan; R-1-10B Zone; MAR Holdings/Jason Harris, Boyd Brown (applicant) [#MISC20120004]**

Scott Langford said a neighborhood meeting was held by the applicant in August, and a summary of the meeting including materials presented to the neighborhood were given to the commission. He gave a brief background of the park that contains a basketball court, play area, tennis court, and storm water detention needs. Staff spoke to some of the neighbors and the general consensus was that the park is a neighborhood gem and is used for ball practices, etc. The neighborhood meeting presented three options, but this proposal only shows two. Part of the park will be needed to achieve the need road width for the subdivision. If one of the concepts is ultimately supported they would have to receive approval for a general plan land use map amendment, a rezoning to R-1-8, and City Council approval to change the designation of public park to road right-of-way.

Jason Harris, applicant, 4423 Country Wood Drive, appreciated the opportunity for a discussion and invited comments and questions from the Commission. He reviewed the different options. The current Option #1 is the only option of the original three that they brought back. A 4<sup>th</sup> option is given in the packet and is listed as option

#2. The current city ordinance leads them to a design that underutilizes this infill property and would create odd-shaped lots and configurations without providing connectivity to the park. He pointed out a large garage on the property that has become a place for questionable activity. There is a private lane option for infill properties in the ordinance, but the city engineer strongly encouraged them not to pursue it, because the city doesn't necessarily like them. He felt their design is cohesive, mimics the zoning of the adjacent properties, and adds value and usability to the park. About 30 people came to the neighborhood meeting and most favored option #2. Currently there is only frontage and access to the park on the north side, but all amenities are sitting back from the access. This plan will bring in access from 2230 West for a full right-of-way to create access to the secluded portions of the park and provide on-street parking on the north side of the street. They also proposed five new homes that front and add visibility to the park.

A remnant parcel was pointed out that could be used for additional parking, a community garden, or a secondary access option. By giving that back to the park there would be no net loss in acreage. The applicant said they were open to suggestions for that piece.

John Winn said parking would be a good idea, and the neighbors might also have suggestions.

Dan Lawes thought the community garden sounded interesting.

Jason Harris reviewed option #1, which takes more of community perspective by making the park more accessible for the community as a whole. He spoke of a resident on 2200 West who wasn't even aware that a park existed in that location. This option would bring access from 2200 West. They could install a parking lot between the playground and gazebo, and they added a two other home lots to recoup funds to cover construction of the bridge over the canal, etc. The comments from the neighbors are that they love 'their' park and they don't want to open it up. This layout would also leave a remnant parcel. Proposed lots would be a minimum of 8,000 square feet, which is consistent with zoning on the west, east, and south sides.

Dan Lawes asked about connecting the new access road to the stub road.

Jason Harris said that was in one of the original proposals, but it takes more of the park. They are trying to leave the park the way it is as much as possible while adding access, parking, and visibility to the secluded portions.

John Winn asked why the applicant supported the option with five lots over the one with eight.

Jason Harris said he sympathizes with the neighbors, so he felt that option #2 is a good design and compromise. Regarding noticing for the meetings, he said the city requires a 300-foot distance for the planning commission meeting and they did 600 feet for the neighborhood meeting. Chris McConnehey from City Council attended as well.

Warren Crown, West Jordan resident, said the park was initially a drainage pond that was developed into a park, with help from the neighborhood. They appreciate the city taking care of the maintenance. He has seen the entire area (even the flat area) flooded. He said one of the residents is a police officer who said that when parking is added where there is only one access to the park there is sometimes additional crime, which would be the concern with option #1 as well as the elimination of some of the area where water gathers. He thought there would be a lot of support from the neighborhood for option #2 with the exception of the few homes on 2230 West. He understood the reasons for taking a little bit of the park property for the road in option #2, because it wouldn't impede park activities in the large grass area. The entire park is well utilized. He thought the neighborhood support for option #1 would be half and half.

James Scott, West Jordan resident, pointed out his home on 2200 West. He said people come over the bridge and to the abandoned warehouse at night, and he is not sure of the activity that takes place. They had a break in

on the north side of his home. There is a walkway along the south park property line that comes from 2200 West but it is overgrown and isn't maintained by the parks department. So the kids walk on the side of the canal and jump the fence to get to the park. He didn't think a community garden space would work on the remnant parcel. It is a gravel driveway and there are 4 very large trees, and it would take a lot of work. He agreed that option #2 would be the best, because it opens up the park but maintains the 'gem'. He also felt that it would provide a safer walking area for kids going to the park.

Kyle Crown, West Jordan resident, said he was one of the kids that would go through the hole in the fence. He felt that option #1 would cut into the irrigation area and the houses may flood. Option #2 is more accessible for the kids, since most of them are coming from West Jordan Middle School across 2200 West. He also thought that option would be more helpful and provide more benefits for the community.

Nathan Gedge said he preferred option #2 that keeps the integrity of the area. The neighbors on 2230 West might not want a new access, but it is a city park and should be for all citizens. He recommended parking for the remnant parcel.

Dan Lawes asked if the fire department had an opinion on the options.

Paul Brockbank said option #1 as shown would have a fatal flaw with a dead end and no turnaround. They could support option #2 because it has a cul-de-sac. If the access were tied into the stub road they could support that too.

Lesa Bridge agreed with option #2.

Nathan Gedge said they like to see infill development, and this would open the park up to the community and eliminate the garage.

\*\*\*\*\*

Tom Burdett gave updates on newly filled planning commission positions and recent City Council actions. Scott Langford briefly explained the changes to the Undergrounding Utilities ordinance.

Regarding preferences for RhinoRock fencing Nathan Gedge felt it was a good design, can be easily cleaned, is a safer installation, and there is a cost savings. Greg Mikolash said it also seems to do better over time with salt than the concrete walls along collector roads. Scott Langford said he compared the concrete sound wall with the RhinoRock along U-111 and there is flaking on the concrete wall but not on the RhinoRock. Staff hadn't done any comparisons regarding sound attenuation.

Nathan Gedge thanked Commissioner Valenzuela for his service for the past three years and wished him luck.

Tom Burdett said the City Council would like to recognize him on January 9th.

**MOTION: Jesse Valenzuela moved to adjourn.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

Chair

ATTEST:

JULIE DAVIS  
Executive Assistant  
Development Department

Approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013