

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
Thursday, November 20, 2008 7:00 p.m.  
Public Safety Building  
3925 W. Cedar Hills Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Cliff Chandler, Chair, Presiding  
Commission Members: Scott Jackman, Donald Steele, Glenn Dodge, Gary Maxwell, Craig Clement  
Greg Robinson, Assistant to the City Manager - Planning  
Eric Richardson, City Council Representative  
Cathy Larsen, Deputy Recorder  
Others: Greg Espanosa, CLS Associates – Representing Chase Bank

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

1. This meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by C. Chandler.
2. Public Comment: (7:02 p.m.)

No comments.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

3. Approval of Minutes from the October 30, 2008, Regular Planning Commission Meeting (7:03 p.m.)

**MOTION: C. Maxwell - To approve the minutes for the October 30, 2008, meeting without comment.**  
Seconded by C. Jackman.

Yes - C. Chandler  
C. Jackman  
C. Steele  
C. Maxwell  
C. Clement Motion passes.

4. Review/Recommendation on Final Site Plan for Chase Bank (7:04 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Greg Robinson stated that Greg Espanosa, with CLS Associates, will be attending the meeting. Mr. Espanosa is making changes and will be bringing colored elevations with the changes that the City Council has asked him to make.

**MOTION: C. Jackman - To move item #4 after item #6.** Seconded by C. Steele.

Yes - C. Chandler  
C. Jackman  
C. Steele  
C. Maxwell  
C. Clement

Motion passes.

5. Review/Recommendation on Check Cashing Businesses and Zoning Regulations (7:05 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Greg Robinson stated that this item needs to be notice for a public hearing. He provided information regarding the definition of a check cashing business that will be added to 10-2-1 in the definitions. The definition has the typical wording that you would find in the other ordinances that were looked at in the previous meetings. The definition also has the distance limitation of 1 mile, as well as the population limitation of 20,000 citizens. This information will also be added Conditional Uses, 10-4G-3, the last item entitled Check Cashing. The only other place it would be added to would be the neighborhood retail, which is the farthest commercial area fronting 4800 West. These businesses couldn't be in the other two areas. The information would be added to the Design Guidelines in the same manner.

Commission Discussion:

- C. Steel feels this is a great definition and appreciates the work that went into it. However, buried in this is also an ordinance. It should include the last two sentences of Definitions, 10-2-1, starting with "No cashing service ...". The info is really important; it is the guts of the ordinance.
- C. Jackman stated that the definition is good, but it should be added to 10-4E to define the distance and population, starting with "No cashing service ....". In the list of Conditional Uses, the list is generally alphabetized. Check Cashing should come after Catering Establishment as opposed to the very bottom of the list.
- C. Clement stated that when you look at 10-2-1 in Definitions, those are just definitions.

**MOTION: C. Maxwell – To continue this item and direct staff to get the noticing done and to make the couple of small changes as noted.** Seconded by C. Jackman.

**AMEND MOTION: C. Maxwell – To continue this item and direct staff to get the noticing done and to make the couple of small changes as noted, and to remove out of the Definitions the last five lines starting with "No cashing service business ....." and should be moved into the actual ordinance, and that Check Cashing in 10-4G-3 be moved up into its alphabetical order, and the design guidelines be updated with the Check Cashing in its proper position, as well.** Seconded by C. Jackman.

Yes - C. Chandler  
C. Jackman  
C. Steele  
C. Maxwell  
C. Clement

Motion passes.

**MOTION: C. Jackman – To address item #4.** Seconded by C. Maxwell.

Yes - C. Chandler

C. Jackman  
C. Steele  
C. Maxwell  
C. Clement

Motion passes.

4. Review/Recommendation on Final Site Plan for Chase Bank – Continued (7:13 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Greg Robinson passed out new and improved Chase Bank plans. The appearance is quite different than what the Planning Commission originally saw. The changes that the City Council approved are on the plans. The changes the Council asked for were to add dormers to the north face of the Chase Bank (bottom picture). The difference between the first and second pages is the area on the roof with the ladder access. They wanted to give a couple of different options for the Planning Commission to see. The landscape plan is also included. They had somebody match the plans with the development across the street.

Rick Espanosa showed samples of the materials to be used in the Chase Bank building. The savannah stone would go on the face, giving a look similar to an older style building. The smooth face would be on the coins on the corners, and there are some accent strips above the windows. The brick color is mountain red from Interstate Brick, and would be the rest of the brick pattern. The saddle soap is the deepest materials for the face shift and the openings would match. The roof is an artificial slate product (the gray color). The trim (the cap) and the roof access would be the metal flashing. The City Council made a comment about the roof access being a different color. Chase Bank could do the roof access in brick instead of stucco. He would like to use a white aluminum store-front for the window frame. The window frames would be about 4 ½ inches deep from outside face to inside face, and would be two inches wide. He didn't have samples of the windows for the color board, but he can have one for the final design. He can bring the recommendations to raise the roof access and bring two sample designs, one with brick and one with a raised brick. The landscape architect looked at the surrounding developments to try to match the bank perimeters. There were a couple of larger trees there that he thought might block the view and took those out to make it more accessible to pedestrian traffic.

Commission Discussion:

- C. Maxwell likes the white much better for the color of the roof access. The employee entrance door is fine. Unless you are pulling up through the drive-thru, you are never going to see the employee entrance door. It might be worth Rick's time to come next time with the two choices he has now, and add the other one. The Planning Commission can still give their recommendation for approval on the design, and then Rick can take it to City Council.
- C. Chandler stated that he also likes the white better for the roof access. He feels this is a beautiful building and design and the employee door looks fine.
- C. Jackman also feels the white for the roof access looks better.
- C. Steele stated that the Commission's job is not to look at esthetics. He feels, however, that the light has more contrast, and is more colonial than what they've been doing. The Commission spent about a year making sure the LDS Church was more in line with the guidelines. Everyone neglected to look at the window frames. It has plastic window frames and distracts from the building. Having said that, it seems the white windows are in keeping with the colonial style and architecture.
- C. Dodge stated that Cappella's has the lights inside the two windows, which seem to work very well. He

- feels the roof needs to be in brick and taller to look more like a chimney.
- C. Clement stated that the employee door looks fine.
- Eric Richardson stated that he wonders if the roof access could be done in brick, and be a little bit higher. This way it looks more like a chimney and it doesn't look like it sticks out so much as it does now.

**MOTION: C. Maxwell – To recommend approval to the City Council for the final site plan for the Chase Bank development, recommending that the developer bring an option for brick on the roof access and another for an extended, higher access to make it look more like a chimney, as an option to the City.**

Seconded by C. Clement.

Yes - C. Chandler  
 C. Jackman  
 C. Steele  
 C. Maxwell  
 C. Clement Motion passes.

6. Review General Plan Transportation Element (7:35 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Greg Robinson stated that he asked for any changes at the last meeting for the transportation element but did not receive any because of problems with e-mail. However, he is still more than willing to answer any questions the Commission may have. There are some updates that need to be made, such as the mileage of the roads and things of that nature. He suggested continuing this item so the Commission can read through it. The Commission needs to look at it as a 30-year plan, and envision what they would like to see in 30 years. He has not received updates from UDOT on the two main roads going through Cedar Hills. He thinks these projects will be delayed, but there will still be a connection to the freeway and completion of 4800 West. American Fork has been buying right-of-way so they can turn 4800 West into a collector. To retain the name Lone Peak Parkway or Lone Peak Drive all along 4800 West will be a decided by the city mayors and representatives from the city staff. Using the same name is important. The bike path along Bayhill Drive and Cottonwood Drive will be extended, and along the collector all the way down to Harvey Boulevard. He would like the Commission to look over the maps.

Commission Discussion:

- C. Steele stated that everything that is not under contract has been pushed back. Those that are under contract will move ahead. The 4800 West project does not include widening, just connecting and will be called Lone Peak Access.
- Eric Richardson stated that the 4800 West project is a MAAG project and not a Utah County project.

**MOTION: C. Clement – To continue this item until the next regular Planning Commission meeting.**

Seconded by C. Jackman.

Yes - C. Chandler  
 C. Jackman  
 C. Steele

C. Maxwell  
C. Clement Motion passes.

7. Review/Action on the 2009 Meeting Schedule (7:41 p.m.)

See handouts.

Planning Commission meetings are on the last or 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of the month. There are a couple of months that it will fall on the 5<sup>th</sup> Thursday of the month.

**MOTION: C. Maxwell – To adopt the Planning Commission 2009 meeting schedule as proposed.** Seconded by C. Clement.

Yes - C. Chandler  
C. Jackman  
C. Steele  
C. Maxwell  
C. Clement Motion passes.

8. Committee Assignments and Reports (7:44 p.m.)

- **C. Clement:** Most of the discussion at the Parks and Trails Committee meeting focused on the Deerfield (Harvey) parcel. The plan as of now for that is a couple of little league fields and one bigger field. They are working on tennis courts now. They have been working on finalizing the Parks and Trails plan. It comes to the Planning Commission when done.

ADJOURNMENT

9. Adjourn

This meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m. on a motion by C. Jackman, seconded by C. Maxwell and unanimously approved.

Approved by Commission:  
January 29, 2009

/s/ Kim E. Holindrake  
Kim E. Holindrake, City Recorder