

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
Thursday, September 26, 2013 7:00 p.m.  
Community Recreation Center  
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Glenn Dodge, Chair, Presiding  
Commission Members: Emily Cox, Jeffrey Dodge, David Driggs, Donald Steele,  
Michael Geddes, Brad Weber, Craig Clement  
Chandler Goodwin, Assistant City Manager  
Courtney Hammond, Transcriptionist  
Others: Gary Gygi, Corey Shupe, Doug Young

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 7:00 p.m. by C. Dodge.
2. Public Comment  
No comments.

**MOTION: C. Geddes—To approve the minutes from the June meeting.** Seconded by C. Clement.

Yes - C. Clement  
C. Cox  
C. Dodge  
C. Driggs  
C. Steele Motion passes.

Chandler Goodwin read a statement from the City Staff, City Council and Mayor stating that it was brought to their attention that the recent edition of the State of the City failed to make mention of the Planning Commission. They publicly thanked the former and current members of the Planning Commission. While their efforts are largely behind the scenes, they are vital to all the success of the city.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

3. Review/Recommendation on Conceptual Plans by Blu Line Designs for a Development in the SC-1 Commercial Zone  
Staff Presentation:  
Chandler Goodwin stated Blu Line Designs is seeking conceptual approval tonight. The Planning Commission can approve with conditions, not approve or table the item. Approval of the concept plan does not mean approval of the subdivision, but rather the general concept. Preliminary approval is when vesting occurs. The north and south buildings have been lowered to four stories in this plan.

Doug Young stated that he met with some of the city officials on the city's adjoining property to discuss options on the city's nine acres. The working name for this project is "The Commons at Cedar Hills." The planned barrier between the project and the residential homes to the south will be a precast 8-foot wall with trees on both sides of the

fence. As soon as they have an arrangement with the city for its nine acres, they will start marketing that portion of the land for retail and restaurants.

Corey Shupe stated that the first step in this project is a senior living facility, with later steps including retail, a movie theater, restaurants and common area. This iteration of the building lowers the north and south buildings, which puts its well within setback requirements and breaks up the roofline. There is some retail in the bottom level of the building. The total number of units in the facility is 305. There will be extensive landscaping throughout with fire pits, gazebos and gathering places. There is between 4,000–5,000 square feet of commercial space in the building. There are 367 parking stalls, 19 reserved for retail. There is some room to the north of the site plan to slide the building that way which would give residents a larger landscape buffer. The phasing of this project depends somewhat on making arrangements with the city for the adjoining property. The senior living facility is the first step because it will generate demand for the rest of the development, including retail.

Ryan Button stated that the rooflines of the buildings are 47 feet to mid slope on the four story wings, and 57 on the five story portion. Utah Transit Authority (UTA) senior buses are smaller and function fine in parking lot areas. The majority of residents in these type of facilities are widows or widowers. The breakdown of types of units are 70% one-bedroom units, 30% two-bedroom units. He would anticipate 350 residents for this facility. There are several gathering areas throughout the facility. There are many access points to the building with one main access on the west, four on the east and a fire corridor that travels through the entire corridor system and another main access on the south. The parking analysis suggested a parking ratio of one stall per unit. This plan includes a heavier number because of retail and commercial space. The demand for a senior living facility is high. There are few options in between independent living and assisted living. He looked at several similar facilities both in Utah and outside the state. Occupancy rates were 90% or higher, with 98% along the Wasatch Front. The model includes a base lease fee plus a la carte options for medications, meals, etc. There will be some covered parking. The age target is 55 and older. Because of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines, they can only mandate that 80% of the units be occupied by 55 and older. The other 20% can be occupied by younger residents.

Commission Discussion:

C. Cox stated that she would like to see more brick on the building.

C. Geddes has spent some time looking at these types of buildings and asked them to be careful about elevations, materials, etc. He would like to see UTA service direct to the building which might require making plans for turnouts, etc.

C. Glenn Dodge stated that he would like to see some regular bus routes to get people to Frontrunner.

C. Clement stated that one issue with this piece of land is that the only good retail space is along Cedar Hills Drive. The back corner is far from the road and not ideal for retail. The only interest in this space is mixed use.

C. Driggs stated that he is concerned that there may not be enough parking overall, but is also concerned about parking stalls on the south side because the biggest noise issue for the residents would be car alarms. He likes the height changes that were made to the plan. His enthusiasm for the building comes from the commercial part of the plan. He would like more clarity on the commercial portion of the plan, perhaps with a requirement to build out a portion of the retail area.

C. Steele asked the developers to consider rules for commercial deliveries to avoid disrupting residents.

C. Jeff Dodge stated that he really likes the changes made to the heights and scale. He likes the materials and three color zones, but would like to see a little more masonry. His biggest concern is the south property line. He likes the idea of moving the facility to the north. If the parking and traffic studies show sufficient parking spaces, they may want to look at eliminating the parking spaces facing the buffer wall to the south. He also wants to look at any heavy traffic along the south property line, such as garbage pickup. The city will need to look into the impact demands to the utility lines of adding an additional 300 spaces. The city may want to look at the cross walks and access to the Walmart, because until the retail area is developed, the walking traffic will be across the street.

C. Weber stated that his concern is that the entire vision with retail and common space be fully realized.

Public Comments:

John Dredge: Mr. Dredge lives to the south of this proposed development. There is an irrigation pipe just inside the property line, so trees cannot be put on the resident side of the fence. The angle of view from four stories down into their backyards will be an issue until the trees are 40–50 feet tall. He estimates he is looking at a 25% property value loss. He wondered why the large buffer is on the east side. He would like to see the building rotated 90 degrees clockwise to give the courtyards a south face. It would give residents a bigger buffer and the courtyard more sunshine.

Cato Jones: Mr. Jones stated that he appreciates the care taken to blend commercial needs with resident needs. Everyone that bought in that area knew that commercial would come. He likes the concept, drawing, landscaping and architecture. The height is his concern. Everything else in the area is two stories tall. He feels that the building is too large for the size of the area and for the community. He would rather see this facility two stories tall and spread out over a larger area.

Steve Speir: Mr. Speir stated that he lives directly behind where the theater would be. Some people are excited by the prospect of a theater, he is not. He challenges the notion that the theater is commercially viable or necessary to draw in other retail. There are very few theaters that back up to residential. He doesn't want to see trash, etc behind the theaters, which would back up to residential. He also doesn't like the idea of midnight movies right behind his house. He would prefer to see a Whole Foods market and restaurants. He likes the model east of South Towne with fast foods, restaurants and a Nordstrom Rack.

Dan Crawley: Mr. Crawley backs up to this senior living development. He is a real estate agent. When Wal-Mart went in, some neighbors moved and possibly lost 25% in home values. He is more worried about the city as a whole. Demographics are important. If the majority of the units are one bedroom apartments, he worries that the value will be less and will become run down.

**MOTION: C. Geddes—To give conceptual approval to this project.** Seconded by C. Clement.

Further Discussion:

C. Clement recommended amending the motion to include looking at rotating the building to alleviate concerns.

C. Geddes stated that he sees problems with rotating the building. He feels there are better solutions such as moving the building slightly to the north or even stepping down the southern building one more story.

C. Jeff Dodge stated that he is intrigued by the idea of rotating the building. It should at the very least be looked at.

C. Driggs stated that he would like to see some element of commercial added to this concept plan, beyond that found in the lower level.

**AMEND MOTION: C. Geddes—to add looking at the option of rotating the building 90 degrees.** Seconded by C. Clement.

Yes	-	C. Clement	
		C. Cox	
		C. Dodge	
		C. Steele	
No	-	C. Driggs	Motion passes.

Break at 8:44 p.m.

Reconvened at 8:54 p.m.

4. Discussion on Accessory Apartments

Staff Presentation:

Chandler Goodwin stated that this item revolves around the city's definition of a family. There are concerns about multiple family housing units in homes that were designed as a single family residence. There are particular problems with accessory apartments and non-owner occupied units. For instance there are two families renting a single family home in Canyon Heights. Staff would like to see a change of "designee" in 10-2-1(b) to "head of household." Currently accessory apartments are conditional uses, but no one has ever come for a conditional use permit for an accessory apartment. The requirements for an accessory apartment are that there are a maximum of 2 bedrooms and 2 people per bedroom. Off street parking is also required. He feels that is insufficient. Some things to look at: no more than one accessory apartment per single family residence, off street parking provided for every car in the residence, no shared facilities, must be owner

occupied. Affordable housing is a required element of the general plan. Cedar Hills has almost zero affordable housing. Accessory apartments count for affordable housing.

Commission Discussion:

C. Driggs suggested striking out the family definition that includes four unrelated people. He would also suggest the city not permit accessory apartments. The federal register defines a family as any individuals related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is like that of a family.

C. Clement stated that enforcing the nuisance ordinance would take care of the problem.

C. Weber recommended allowing a maximum of two unrelated people in the definition of family.

**MOTION: C. Weber—To put remaining items on hold.** Seconded by C. Driggs.

Yes - C. Clement  
C. Cox  
C. Dodge  
C. Driggs  
C. Steele Motion passes.

C. Driggs stated that he would like to discuss methods for public noticing for building permits, zoning, etc. on a future agenda.

Chandler Goodwin stated that the city's nine acres in the commercial area will be put up for sale by October 15. Development agreements can be put in place to require commercial/retail development.

- 5. Discussion on Structures in Setbacks
- 6. Discussion on Portable Utility Sheds
- 7. Committee Assignments and Reports

ADJOURNMENT

- 8. This meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m. on a motion by C. Weber, seconded by C. Steele, and unanimously approved.

Approved: October 24, 2013

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey  
Colleen A. Mulvey, CMC  
City Recorder