CALL TO ORDER: Chris Kemp, Chair
- Attendance – Chris Kemp, Chair
- Invocation – Commissioner Jerry Abbott
- Pledge of Allegiance – Commissioner Ron Campbell

APPEARANCES:

Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments on non-agenda items. Speakers will be limited to three (3) minutes.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

1. **SP-19-02 & CU-19-02** Highland Hideaway Storage is requesting approval of a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for a flex office use building located approximately at 11251 N. Sunset Drive. **Administrative**

2. **TA-19-02** Highland City is requesting to amend Section 3-510 of the Development Code pertaining to total acreage requirement in the Planned Development (PD) District. **Legislative**

3. **PD-19-01** Andrew Simonsen is requesting rezoning to allow residential and non-residential mixed use development under the Planned Development (PD) District. The plan includes retail and 10 single-family units. The property is approximately 2.85 acres and is located east of 10272 N 4800 W. **Legislative**

4. **PD-19-02** The Boyer Group is requesting approval of a Planned Development (PD) District of approximately 111.71 acres named Ridgeview. The property is located approximately at 9900 N on North County Boulevard. The planned development will include retail and a maximum of 699 residential units. **Legislative**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- Approval of the March 26, 2019 meeting minutes.
ADJOURNMENT:

NEXT MEETING: **May 28, 2019** at 7:00 pm City Council Chambers

*Legislative:* An action of a legislative body to adopt laws or polices. 
*Administrative:* An action reviewing an application for compliance with adopted laws and policies.

FOR SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS

Any individual with a qualified disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the City Recorder at (801) 772-4506 at least 48 hours prior to the Commission meeting.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The undersigned does hereby certify that the above agenda notice was posted in three public places within Highland City limits on this 25th day of April, 2019. These public places being bulletin boards located inside the City offices and located in the Highland Justice Center, 5400 W. Civic Center Drive, Highland, UT; and the bulletin board located inside Lone Peak Fire Station, Highland, UT. On this 25th day of April, 2019 the above agenda notice was posted on the Highland City website at [www.highlandcity.org](http://www.highlandcity.org).

Tara Tannahill, Planning Coordinator
DATE: April 30, 2019
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Tara Tannahill
Planner & GIS Analyst
SUBJECT: Public Hearing and Action – A request by Highland Hideaway Storage for a Site Plan approval and Conditional Use permit of flex office buildings located in the Professional Office Zone south of 11251 N. Sunset Drive (SP-19-02 and CU-19-02) Administrative

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission should hold a public meeting and:

1) Recommend approval of the conditional use permit with appropriate stipulations. Staff has prepared draft stipulations that could be used. Additional stipulations may also be needed. The Commission may include any conditions which are deemed necessary to mitigate potential impacts and insure compatibility of the use with surrounding development, insure compliance with this ordinance, and which are required to preserve the public health, safety, and general welfare; or

2) Recommend denial the conditional use permit. If the Commission recommends denial the conditional use permit, appropriate and specific findings will need to be drafted; or

3) Continue the conditional use permit to allow the applicant to address the issues outlined by the Commission in accordance with Section 3-4902.

PRIOR REVIEW:
On January 26, 2019 Planning Commission voted 6 to 0 to continue the request in order to have the applicant change the architecture elevations of the building to appear more residential. The elevations have been revised and are shown on Attachment 7.

BACKGROUND:
Professional Office District:
The PO District was approved in 2003. The zone was drafted to accommodate the storage facility and a number of professional office buildings along Highland Boulevard. A Development Agreement was also approved in 2003. A specific site plan was included as part of the approval. There have been a few amendments to the PO District since the original approval. These amendments related to assisted living facilities and changes to
the site plan.

Section 3-4902.7 Conditional Uses states:
7) Any other conditional or other types of professional services which the Planning Commission and City Council determine to be compatible with the intent of the zone.

Section 3-4903.1 Prohibited Uses States:
1) Determination of Use – Whenever a use has not specifically been identified in the foregoing classification, it shall be the duty of the City Planning Commission to determine if said use:
   (a) Is consistent with the intended use of the PO Zone; and
   (b) Is compatible with the other listed uses; and
   (c) Is compatible with the uses of adjacent properties.

In the Professional Office (P.O Zone) District the City Council is the approval body for a site plan and conditional use permit, after receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is the approval body for the architectural review.

Conditional Uses:
Conditional uses are uses that are meant to give limited flexibility in the review of an application. In Highland, the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council. A conditional use is regulated by the following standards:

(1) A land use ordinance may include conditional uses and provisions for conditional uses that require compliance with standards set forth in an applicable ordinance.
(2) (a) A conditional use shall be approved if reasonable conditions are proposed, or can be imposed, to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards.
   (b) If the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of a proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated by the proposal or the imposition of reasonable conditions to achieve compliance with applicable standards, the conditional use may be denied.

If a use is allowed as a conditional use it is assumed that the use is desirable but that it may require an extra level of review. Denial must be based on some factor unique to the proposed location that renders the potential negative effects of the proposed use beyond mitigation. Mitigation means to temper or reduce the negative aspects, not eliminate them.

The action taken in response to an application must be supported by substantial evidence in the record. Substantial evidence is evidence that is relevant and credible. To be
relevant, it must relate to the standards in the ordinance. To be credible it must be objective and independent.

**SUMMARY OF THE REQUEST:**

1. The applicant is requesting site plan, architectural plan, and conditional use permit approval for a 20,064 square foot office warehouse building. The property is located approximately at 11251 North Sunset Drive and is 2.13 acres. The petitioner does not have any tenants at this time.

2. Vehicular access will be provided from sunset drive and a shared road with church of Jesus Christ of LDS and an undeveloped lot by Meadowbrook Land, LLC on the east. The site will also provide cross access to the storage facility to the north. Access to the storage facility is also available through Highland Hideaway Storage’s main entrance.

3. The loading will be in the back of the facility are ground level, intended to allow FedEx or other deliver trucks.

4. Access to the property is from sunset drive and a shared driveway with the property owners to the east.

5. There are 46 parking stalls provided with two designated handicap parking stalls.

6. Hours of operation will be 8:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Saturday. Number of employees is unknown at this time.

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:**

The meeting notification sign was posted on the property December 28, 2019 and the neighborhood meeting was held on January 8, 2019. One resident attended the meeting and seventeen written correspondences have been received not in favor of the project.

Notice of the Planning Commission meeting was published in the Daily Herald on January 13, 2019 and posted on the state website January 10, 2019. Notification of the public hearing associated with this meeting was mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the proposed site on January 15, 2019. Staff has received 29 emails in opposition of the project (Attachment 3).

**REQUIRED FINDINGS:**

The Planning Commission must determine that the proposed use meets three findings prior to granting a Conditional Use Permit. The burden of proof rests with the applicant. Each finding is presented below along with staff's analysis.

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

The property to the north and west is zoned PO and is the existing storage facility. The property to the south is also zoned PO and is vacant. The property has been approved for non-residential uses. The property on the east side of Highland Boulevard is zoned R-1-40 and has been developed as single family homes. The proposed use will be a minimum of 125 feet from an existing residential homes. The proposed use is compatible with the surrounding land uses.

2. The use complies with all applicable regulations in the Development Code.

The Development Code allows uses in the PO District that are not specifically listed if it is determined that the proposed use is compatible with the intent of the zone.

The site plan provides adequate access and onsite circulation for the proposed use. There are 46 parking stalls provided. The Development Code requires 20.

A landscape plan has been submitted showing a minimum of 35% landscaping. No landscaping was demonstrated on the median on Highland Blvd. A stipulation has been included to address this issue.

The proposed architecture includes the elements required in Section 3-4922 of the Development Code. Materials include split face block, stone veneer, and wood pitched accents. The original submissions materials included split face block, smooth face block, and metal accents.

All lighting meets the requirements of Section 3-4915 of the Development Code.

All utility and mechanical is required to be screened from view. A stipulation has been included to address this issue.

The building height is a maximum of 30 feet. Due to the topography of the site the height will be lower if measured from Highland Boulevard.

There is an existing 40-foot water line easement that runs through the property from north to south. This limits the types of improvements that can be constructed.

The site plan is being reviewed by the Fire Marshall. The Fire Marshall is requesting that the northern driveway be extended to allow full turning movements for emergency vehicles. A stipulation has been included to address compliance with any issues.
3. **Conditions are imposed to mitigate any detrimental effects.**

Draft stipulations have been included to ensure compliance with the Development Code.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
The Planning Commission should hold a public meeting and:

1) Recommend approval of the conditional use permit with appropriate stipulations. Staff has prepared draft stipulations that could be used. Additional stipulations may also be needed. The Commission may include any conditions which are deemed necessary to mitigate potential impacts and insure compatibility of the use with surrounding development, insure compliance with this ordinance, and which are required to preserve the public health, safety, and general welfare; or

2) Recommend denial the conditional use permit. If the Commission recommends denial the conditional use permit, appropriate and specific findings will need to be drafted; or

3) Continue the conditional use permit to allow the applicant to address the issues outlined by the Commission in accordance with Section 3-4902.

**DRAFT STIPULATIONS:**
The following are draft stipulations.

1. Development of the site shall comply with the site plan January 23, 2019 and building elevations dated April 24, 2019 except as modified by these stipulations.

2. All signage shall require a separate permit and comply with the Development Code requirements.

3. Final civil engineering plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The site shall meet all requirements of the City Engineer.

4. Final civil engineering plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshall.

5. Prior to council consideration an updated landscape plan will be provided demonstrating the improvements to Highland Blvd median.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
This action will not have a financial impact on this fiscal year’s budget expenditures.
ATTACHMENTS:
1. Vicinity Map
2. Project narrative
3. Letters from citizens
4. 2003 Development Agreement Site Plan
5. Proposed site plan and updated elevations dated February 14, 2019
6. January 9, 2019 Architecture Elevation
7. April 24, 2019 Architecture Elevation
Project Narrative

To: Highland City
From: Ken Berg, P.E., Berg Civil Engineering
Subject: Highland Office and Warehouse Park

Proposed Use
Highland Office and Warehouse Park is project is comprised of several adjacent office warehouses. These office warehouses can be used for a variety of companies. Some uses include but are not limited to the following: Dance studio, Daycare Center, Mom and Pop shop and other small businesses. The exact use of each office warehouse may vary slightly from the next but will be consistent with the General Plan and compliant with the Development Code and other city codes and regulations.

Consistency with the General Plan
The general plan currently shows this area to be Professional Office. The proposed use meets this requirement.

Development Code Compliance
Based upon Article 4.9 Professional Office ("P.O.") Zone, allows for the following:

1. Professional offices and services including but not limited to: architects, engineers, contractors, real estate offices, property managers, and mortgage and title offices.
2. Financial or legal offices consisting of but not limited to: banks, insurance offices, and law or accounting offices.
3. Medically related offices/services consisting of but not limited to: doctor's office, dentist's office, pharmacy, physical therapy, optometrists, chiropractors, counselors, and psychiatrists.
4. Other types of Professional Services including but not limited to: information technology services, marketing, travel and employment agencies, journalists, collection agencies, educational services, music studios, photography studios, churches, colleges & schools (academic, pre-schools, special education, indoor instruction only).
5. Art and craft galleries, and studios for the teaching of arts and crafts.
6. Any other conditional uses or other types of professional services which the Planning Commission and City Council determine to be compatible with the intent of the Zone.

Based upon Article 3-4905 allows for the following:

Coverage of a site by a building shall not exceed thirty (30) percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total project size</td>
<td>23 ac</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage &amp; Office Buildings</td>
<td>6.90 ac</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All site plan configurations, landscaping and/or natural open space shall occupy no less than thirty-five percent (35%)

As per the Open Space Table in the attached Overall Master Plan for the overall project the total project as able to maintain the required 35% open space required by the zone.
General Compatibility of proposed use with adjacent property
The proposed addition is located centrally in the existing Professional Office (PO) Zone. This addition will be surrounded on the West and North by existing storage sheds, and by the East and South by future professional office buildings. The proposed use is compatible with its surroundings.

Site the building design with exterior lighting
The proposed buildings will be similar to the existing buildings as shown in the attached colored elevations. The exterior lighting will be minimized with downward directed lighting.

Ingress and Egress
The proposed addition will be accessed from Sunset Drive and a new driveway to the East. No additional roadway access points along Highland Blvd are proposed. The site has been designed to allow for emergency vehicles to turn within the site as shown on the site plan.

Pedestrian and alternative vehicles
No pedestrian or alternative vehicle improvements are proposed for this storage shed site.

Volume and character of traffic
Using the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 10th Edition, the land use code of 130 – Industrial Park was used to identify the Peak PM trips associated with this land use (20,000 sf of Flex Warehouse) = 8 PM Peak Hour Trips.

Impact of public services
Water & sewer connections for each unit are proposed for the site. A common landscape connection is proposed for the common landscaping. There will be no impacts to surrounding schools or recreation facilities.

Screening and buffering
A 21 foot landscaping buffer along Highland Blvd is required and is shown on the site plan.

Proposed outdoor activities or storage
No outdoor storage activities allowed.

Hours of operation
Office Hours
Sunday Closed
Monday - Saturday 8:00 AM - 6:00 PM

Number of employees
Number of employees is unknown at this time. The number of parking spaces is based upon typical office requirements.

Noise, smoke, odor, dust, vibration, or illumination created by the proposed use.
After construction, there will be low to no impacts of noise, smoke, odor, dust, vibration or illumination created by the storage sheds.

Regards,

Ken R. Berg, PE
Attachment 3:
Date: January 28, 2019
Subject: Email Correspondence

Email from Melinda Ashton dated January 23, 2019:

My name is Melinda Ashton and I live in the Country French Development. I agree with the following letter written by Jamie Frischknecht.

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.
Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank you,

Jamie Frischknecht
801-427-3084

Email from Amber Gueck dated January 15, 2019:

To whom it may concern,

I live in Highland in an Ivory homes neighborhood off of Highland Blvd. and I’m concerned about the news that Patterson Construction is considering building an office warehouse near the storage units off of Highland Blvd. We chose to move to Highland (from CA) about 4 years ago because we liked the scenery, open space, and the neighborhoods with large lots. We drive past the storage units on Highland Blvd very often and they’re not very noticeable, the new church getting built in that area is noticeable, but attractive, and when I picture an office warehouse being built in that same area, I can’t imagine that to be attractive, or add to the “welcoming” neighborhood feel. I don’t know anything about Patterson Const., but I keep hearing about them in Highland neighborhood/community conversations or emails and I always come away from the dialogue with the impression that Patterson Construction doesn’t care what the people LIVING IN the community desire. I hope that the planning commission will take into consideration how an office warehouse being built on land that is the main entrance to our neighborhood will affect the ambiance of our neighborhood in an unattractive way. This would’ve had an affect on our decision to move here if we had known about it. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Best regards,

Amber Gueck

Email from Anne Hansen dated January 14, 2019:

Planning Commission:

RE: 11251 N. Sunset Dr / Highland / Highland Hideaway Storage

I do not support the proposal for a Conditional Use Permit for 2.13 acres by Andrew Patterson. This property is at the entrances of Bull River HOA and Country French Estates as well as the entrance to our city. Highland City is predominantly a bedroom community. Placing warehouses adjacent to high end properties will only bring property values down; bring in more truck traffic; excessive congestion to an already congested intersection (entrance to the commuters lane) and potential work activities at night. Please deny this permit.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anne Sward Hansen

11349 N. Tamarack Dr.
Email from Cynthia Shaw dated January 16, 2019:

To who it may concern,

My husband and I moved to Highland 2 1/2 years ago after 31 years in Las Vegas. While in Las Vegas, we enjoyed living in Summerlin, a beautifully master-planned community. When we moved to Highland, we were attracted to the city because it had a feeling of being a master-planned community. It appeared family friendly, classy, harmonious and spacious, with lovely architecture. I have just learned that Patterson, the company who developed my subdivision, wants to build an industrial warehouse on the corner of Highland Blvd and Timpanogus Highway. I am vehemently opposed to an industrial-looking building at the entrance of our pleasant little community. To build something like that would be akin to destroying the curb appeal of a house. And I know for a fact that my neighbors object to the project as I do. Please review this plan in light of all of us who would be negatively affect by this unattractive warehouse in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Shaw

11272 N. Calais Circle,
Highland, UT 84003

Email from Danielle Bailey dated January 16, 2019:

Hi, my name is Danielle Bailey and I am resident of the country French neighborhood in Highland across from the storage unit facility. We have lived there for 10 years.

I have heard about the proposed plan from Patterson to build warehouses north of the storage units and want to share my opinion as a homeowner.

I am highly against this development. When we moved here, we were assured by several people including realtors, that Highland was a bedroom community and was very particular and protective of that title. To me, that means there would be no industrial or office buildings near our neighborhood.

I am frankly disappointed in the unfinished islands and sidewalks on Highland Blvd west of our neighborhood. I thought the Developer was responsible for beautifying that and they have done nothing. To me that is something simple that can be done and makes a big difference.

I am from Southern California with a mother that has served on city council and as mayor of Whittier for several years. She said she is shocked at what some of our streets look like in comparison to the type of neighborhoods they border.

I feel like Patterson seems to do what they feel like doing, and these warehouses would be an extension of that. I’ve also been told that none of the main guys from Patterson even live in Highland. I feel with multi million dollar homes just a few feet away, the worst thing for property values and beautification,
which would also affect the city would be to build these warehouses. My suggestion would be another
development of homes.

I would never move to a neighborhood with existing buildings and I think building the warehouses would
discourage people from moving to the surrounding area, which hurts Highland in the long run.

There is plenty of opportunity to build these warehouses elsewhere. Building homes instead I know
would not bring in the same revenue, but it would keep the property values higher in the surrounding
areas, which would be beneficial for long term tax revenue.

Please do not let this happen. Keep our community beautiful and accurate to what Highland advertises.

Thank you for your consideration, Danielle Bailey

Email from Emily Norton dated January 14, 2019:

To whom it may concern:

We are from the View Pointe neighborhood and we started the process about a year ago to purchase
the open space land behind our homes. There are about 30 homes we have been coordinating with that
wish to purchase land. Another street in our neighborhood was able to purchase their land after a few
years of working towards it. We had already gotten all of our signatures and application filed and were
well on our way to completing the process when we found out about the price change per square foot.
This completely blindsided us and we were not properly informed in advance of this change coming
down the pike. If we had known, we most assuredly would have sped up our process to make sure we
could secure the land at the lower price. The fact is, if we cannot purchase the land at the original $1.40
per square foot we were originally told, all of our homes will withdraw, which could potentially be tens
of thousands of dollars. We wanted to inform you that we would like to come speak to you on Monday
about the potential of letting us be grandfathered into the previous rate of $1.40, since we were already
very close to completing the process. Thank you for your time and we look forward to meeting with you.

Amy Peachey, Emily Norton and

View Pointe Neighbors

Email from Ken & Gloria Williams dated January 16, 2019:

Hello,

In regards to the proposed Patterson Warehouse planned to go in adjacent to the storage units on
Highland Blvd, my husband and I are very much opposed to the idea as it will detract significantly from
the residents view across Highland Blvd, in addition to detracting from and lessening the value of
surrounding homes and neighborhoods. Unless there's the possibility of making it look like the Patterson
offices that look like homes on the corner of Highland Blvd and SR92.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

Ken and Gloria Williams

Email from Ivy Tornow dated January 15, 2019:

My family lives in the Country French Estates off of Highland Boulevard. We have been informed that Andrew Patterson has requested a Conditional Use Permit so that he can build a warehouse on Highland Boulevard. We moved to Highland a year and a half ago to be in a beautiful residential neighborhood surrounded by an aesthetically pleasing community. When we purchased there were two commercial buildings on Highland Boulevard; Hideaway Storage Units and the office building on the corner of SR 92 and Highland Blvd. We do not need any warehouses in the area. It will decrease the value of our beautiful residential area if people have to drive through a warehouse district on their way to our homes. I ask that Patterson be denied a Conditional Use Permit for this project because it means that it is an exception to the current zone. Please force them to keep Highland aesthetically pleasing as it currently is. If we allow one warehouse to be built then it sets a standard for others to be built and devalue our neighborhood.

Highland is a fabulous community and we want to keep it a special place to live and raise our families. Thank you for holding fast on the current zoning to keep it that way.

Sincerely,

Ivy Tornow

505-947-5252

Email from Janet Eyring dated January 10, 2019:

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a concerned resident at 6727 W. Spring Hollow Lane, Highland who is opposed to the Pattersons' building an office warehouse on Highland Blvd. next to the Hideaway Storage Units. There are several concerns I have about this project. First the height of the buildings and the commercial look of the buildings do not fit into the “look and feel” of the surrounding neighborhoods. If the plans could be altered to sink the building and surround it with trees, this would greatly improve the appearance of the structure and help reduce noise and tone down lighting. Highland Blvd. is the entrance to 3 communities: Bull River, Country French, and Dry Creek, all of which are trying to maintain a residential versus commercial feel. I hope new plans can be drawn up which address some of these issues I have mentioned. I plan to attend the meeting on January 29 to further voice my opinion on this issue.

Sincerely,

Dr. Janet Eyring
Email from Jenelle Cox dated January 9, 2019:

To whom it may concern,

We as residents of Highland are concerned about the proposed building on Highland Blvd. next to the storage units. We moved here and built high-end homes in a bedroom community for peace and beauty. Everywhere we turn building is going on. It is unfortunate that the developers cannot see the value of having beautiful neighborhoods kept away from industry and commercial buildings. Isn’t there enough office warehouses being built all along the freeway? It is overdone and becoming an eyesore. Please do not bring that this far into our city and ruin our neighborhoods. It isn’t all about money. It is also about lifestyle and raising families in areas untainted by commercialism.

Please care.

Jenelle Cox

Email from Jill Tew dated January 9, 2019:

We’ve been told Patterson is wanting to build some warehouses on the southwest corner of Highland Blvd near SR-92. PLEASE do not let them do this! We moved to Highland to get away from the ugly industrial buildings. PLEASE keep our community looking nice. IF commercial buildings have to be built, PLEASE keep them to one level so they don’t block the view of the mountains. We do not want to look at ugly buildings every time we leave our homes.

Thank you for preserving our community!

Jill Tew

Email from Johanna Warr dated January 9, 2019:

Hi,

I’m writing to express my concern about the commercial building development that is proposed to happen across the street from my Country French neighborhood. What can I do to voice my opinion and help put a stop to having a 2 story commercial office building go up right there?

Sincerely,

Johanna Warr

801-995-0925

Email from Laura Mustard dated January 11, 2019:

Thank you for your quick response, Mr. Mayor.
And thank you, Manuel, for your efforts and willingness to speak on behalf of our community in the interest of keeping it beautiful.

Mr. Mayor, while you may not have the regular opportunity to hear directly from members of the community, please know that all of our neighbors at Country French care very deeply about Highland and preserving its beauty. Matters like these are discussed frequently and there are strong feelings about some of the administrative decisions made on our behalf.

Particularly in the case of Patterson development, and please forgive me putting this in easy terms, there is a general feeling that the company is permitted to do whatever it wants. Sometimes to the benefit, other times to the detriment of the larger community aesthetic.

As it relates to this case, Mr. Bueno has raised our collective concerns over use of the land directly outside the entrance to the Country French neighborhood. However, it’s more important than that.

We feel this particular space serves as a beautiful welcome to Highland itself, as many people travel up Highland Blvd to the many other well maintained communities up the road. While there has already been development of offices and storage space at the very start of Highland Blvd, it’s our hope that a great deal more consideration will be given to preserving some of the beauty that exists. We should all be invested in presenting Highland as the unique and beautiful community it is, placing more importance on Highland Blvd to showcase that beauty.

I’ve attached Mr. Bueno’s previous note that reinforces these points and also offers several ideas on how to address.

Now that the issue has been made visible and appropriately brought to the attention of homeowners, I’d expect you’ll hear from more of them - within Country French and beyond.

Perhaps it’s worth a larger discussion?

Thanks for your time.

Email from Manuel Bueno dated January 10, 2019:

Hello Mayor, Council and Planning Committee. I recently received a letter from Patterson Homes about the proposed Highland Business Park because I live within 500 feet of the property. I attended the Neighborhood Notification Meeting on Tuesday at 6:15 pm. I was the only resident who attended. Wayne and Andrew Patterson presented the information. I am not aware why I was the only resident there. Perhaps this letter was not mailed out to very many people? Perhaps it was the time of day, being just after 6:15 pm?

I appreciate the opportunity to first hear about this project. I did feel like Patterson was wanting to hear concerns. My two initial concerns was the height of the project and the look of it. However, after having time to think about the information I do have more concerns than this.

1) I do not support warehouse space anywhere in Highland and let alone across the street from my home. This gives rise to all types of industrial businesses and large truck traffic which I don’t think is conducive to Highland City. My preference would be to add more residential lots and homes there. It
seemed like when I first moved into my home, this subject piece of land was part of a larger piece that was zoned residential. Perhaps when Patterson donated some of the land to the Church they were able to get the remaining parcels zone commercial office? I am not sure but you would likely know the history. If residential cannot be done then something similar such as assisted living or a funeral home would be better. And if that is not possible just plane office would be the last possible resort. No warehouses.

2) For this particular lot I would only do a one story on the street frontage side because that part of the parcel is built up with a large natural dirt berm. If they want something taller such as 20 to 22 feet or two story, you can do that on the back side and have it be walk out, similar to a walk out basement where the front only shows one story but the back shows two. What I am saying here is if you want two stories, you can do that with a basement as story one that has a walkout on the west or back side. This way only the top story sits on top of an already elevated lot for this area.

3) If office or any commercial is done, it should look like residential. If you look at the buildings that Patterson owns such as the office building of the adjacent storage units and the office building(s) on the corner of SR 92 and Highland Blvd, these buildings look more residential. Any additional office building should also have a residential and not a commercial, linear look.

As a side note, Andrew said they would finish the medians in the area while working on this project. I would hope the medians look nice and match the other up the street that have landscaping and not just concrete. You can have good landscaping that uses low water.

To recap: I would propose this property be developed as residential but if not then having it be assisted living or something of that nature be better. Of last resort would be a one story office building on the frontage which has a residential looking facade. And actually, whatever structure appears, having it look residential is best. No warehouses please. No warehouses.

Sincerely, Manuel Bueno, resident.

---

Email from Michael Tornow dated January 15, 2019:

To whom it may concern:

I know that it’s not always easy to deny someone the ability to use their property for commercial use. However, when someone purchases a property in a residential area, they consider the neighborhood before purchasing.

The zoning is done for a certain reason. We have many homes in Highland that are what I would consider “high end.” These homes bring in a very nice tax revenue to the city. A warehouse area compared to a residential area is not what should be in this area. Patterson should build their warehouses in an industrial part of town, away from residential. Please consider this when evaluating land use and the esthetic nature of the area. All local residents should have a voice in their his matter.

Thank you,

Dr. Michael Tornow
Email from Monica Wonnacott dated January 14, 2019:

Dear city planning committee and Mayor,

It has come to my attention that Patterson construction has applied for a conditional permit. The permit would allow them to build a warehouse-like building just off of Highland Blvd. As a resident of the adjacent neighborhood, country French estates, I have serious concerns about this.

1. Decreasing property values. I have invested a lot of money in building a home where I have in Highland. A large warehouse devalues that property. I bought the land and built where I did only after I had investigated who owned the surrounding land and what the zoning regulations were already in place. Allowing an exception at this point, changes the rules. I would not have built where I did, if I had known warehouse buildings were going in there.

2. Safety. The kind of traffic that pulls in and out of a warehouse office building is very different than a neighborhood. I have small children and I’m concerned about the type and increase traffic pattern. More importantly, when they become driving teenagers, I am worried about a constant flow of trucks in and out of there. I moved from our previous home in Lehi due to a similar situation that ended up causing dozens of trucks up and down our neighborhood street on a daily basis.

3. Esthetics. An office warehouse is an eyesore. I chose my neighborhood because the houses are beautiful and different. How tragic to have to look an office warehouse every time I pull in and out of my neighborhood.

4. Changing the rules. When the area was zoned and development started, all the parties involved were made aware. Making exception for one large developer without considering the opinions and how it affects other people is ethically wrong. Patterson’s request is based off the financial best interest of the developer alone. In no way does it benefit the surrounding neighborhoods (ultimately the people who are affected by it).

I urge you to vote NO. Please feel free to contact me if you have further questions.

Thank you,

Monica Wonnacott, MD
Highland resident
(801) 368-9943

Email from Steven Tew dated January 16, 2019:

I am a resident of Highland with my home very near the proposed location of Patterson’s proposed warehouse site. I am in the Dry Creek Highlands area and pass that area multiple times daily. I moved to highland to be away from the congestion and feel of commercial development and to have a warehouse complex put up right next to our neighborhood is totally against the reason we built here. Please do what you can to prevent the unchecked development that will take away from the value of highland. If development needs to happen, please have it be in keeping with the neighboring communities - not warehouses.

Thank you, Steven Tew
Email from Vana Olson dated January 15, 2019:

I am opposed to the rezoning and proposal for the property located near the new church building on Highland Blvd. This property should be in keeping with adjacent residential and in keeping with the vision of the founding fathers which is residential on large lots.

Email from Melanie Westcott dated January 16, 2019:

Mayor, Highland City Council, and Planning Commission,

We live in Country French off of Highland Blvd. We are very concerned about Patterson wanting to build a warehouse across the street from our home development. Considering Highland's current status as a quiet bedroom community, I do not see how a warehouse should be allowed in Highland right at the entrance to several beautiful home developments including Country French and several nice communities along Highland Blvd.

Zoned office space should be similar to the office space Patterson has already built on the East side of the entrance to Highland Blvd. These offices look more like homes and enhance the entrance to Highland and Highland Blvd. Truly, I am sad that this space across the street from our development is zoned for offices and not for single family homes. I wish I had known when that zoning took place.

But worse than offices is warehouses!! Warehouses belong on streets like the industrial Geneva road, not Highland Blvd. It is already very frustrating that a storage unit (also better suited to Geneva Road or roads adjacent to the freeway) is on Highland Blvd. Furthermore, having large trucks coming and going to a warehouse on Highland Blvd. would further burden the roads, make them less safe, and add to the eyesore of a warehouse. Additionally, a large warehouse could draw activity that Highland is not accustomed to. As I look at Utah County crime maps, Highland is virtually free of daily crime. The safety of Highland is a major factor contributing to Highland's excellent property values and people's desire to move here with their families. A large warehouse invites opportunities for people with mal-intent to have a silent, remote place for illicit activity where much is unseen and no one is around to notice or hear. Highland does not need to create spaces where more police work will be required--especially not directly across the street from some of Highland's nicest neighborhoods.

Our new church building will also be adjacent to this property. Several teens and children will walk alone to their church to attend weekly activities. A large warehouse adjacent to the church only heightens the worry parents will face as they send their children in the church for these activities on dark weeknights. A warehouse is a great place to watch and hide out for those who could pose a danger to our children, teens, and women.

I implore the mayor, council, and planning committee to keep Highland an inviting, safe, beautiful bedroom community in all your future decisions as you plan Highland's development. Keeping Highland safe and beautiful will keep our property values up which inevitably will leave you, as officials serving our community, with the greatest legacy. Please consider what is best for the future of Highland's residents (those who voted you into office) and not what is most pressing, convenient, and lucrative for developers who constantly come appealingly and incessantly to your inboxes, phones, and meetings.

Thank you for your time,

Lincoln and Melanie Westcott
Email from Jamie Frischknecht dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank you,

Jamie Frischknecht

801-427-3084
Email from Jen Brown dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

   (a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

   (b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

   (c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

   (d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;  

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank you,

Jen Brown

801-949-4641
Email from Kayla Springer dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

   (a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

   (b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

   (c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

   (d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Best,

Kayla G Springer

801.889.5269
Email from Charisse Chambersv dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank You,

Charisse Chambers
Email from Jan Story dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumably accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank You,

Jan Story

801-376-9803
Email from Myrna Dewitt dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Planning Commission Directives,

My husband Scott DeWitt and I, Myrna DeWitt residents of Highland City, fully support Jaime Frischknech’s letter below and too oppose to de build out of warehouses on the west side of Highland Boulevard. We would greatly appreciate it if you could please consider our concerns and hear our voices as residents of this beautiful city we all live on before approving anything.

Best Regards,

Myrna DeWitt

Email from Lexi Fenton dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.
We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thanks,

Lexi Fenton

801-694-9655

(Maple Hollow Ct. Resident)

Email from Olwen Jewson dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.
We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thanks,

Olwen & Keith Jewson

Email from Anita Fowler dated January 18, 2019:

Dear Councilmen/women,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.
Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thanks,

Anita Fowler

801-903-8264

Email from Brooke Sweeney dated January 18, 2019:

Dear Councilmen,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.
In speaking with other concerned neighbors they have all shared the concern that the council is too focused on the list of requirements for “conditional use.” This seems to be a common theme in your responses to our concerns.

We realize that this area is zoned for professional offices and the development code ultimately gives the city council and planning commissions flexibility on what they decide is “conditional use.”

While I think it is good for our community to discourage the approval of a warehouse in this area, if the council chooses to allow Patterson’s proposal to fit under the “conditional use” category, you still need to have Patterson comply with the primary use guidelines that are built in Highland’s city code.

This means whatever Patterson’s builds will need to have “architecture with residential flavor” and not an “industrial or pre-fabricated appearance.” The city council and planning commission must enforce that they follow a residential look for these buildings similar to the appearance that was used for the current Patterson building and Highland Hideaway Storage. You can also regulate other factors like height restrictions and curb appeal.

In Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901 it states,

1. The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:
   a. Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;
   b. Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;
   c. Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;
   d. Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

Thanks,
Brooke Sweeney
425-408-2925
11322 north normandy way Highland❤
This is very upsetting to me, this is a warehouse building and looks like the side of I15. I was born in Highland and it has always been a city that retains a quality standard above. They built the storage units in a way that is below sight lines with the entrance more like a home. The offices Patterson built down the road are what is expected.

We put more than 1.5 million into a home that will be destroyed by warehouse space across the street. Country French, developed by Patterson, is one of the highest quality neighborhoods in Highland and was sold to buyers as such. Deeply disappointed that anything short of quality residential looking professional buildings would be even considered let alone built. Expectations are easy as they built professional buildings of high quality right down Highland Blvd.

Really nice city’s such as Park City Utah do not ever lower standards for very wealthy developers attempting to minimize costs and achieve high rent. I assure you Patterson can afford to build quality residential professional buildings as they did before and already set expectations for all of us.

We already have people flying up and down Highland Blvd at over 60mph in 25mph putting children at risk, warehouse space will make this feel industrial not like a neighborhood.

Thanks for keeping me informed Tara. I will attend meetings if I am in town. I will do whatever I can legally, politically, through media and anything else I can think of to prevent this abomination to our very beautiful neighborhood.

Regards,

Jeff and Kay Taylor
EX DETENTION AREA
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1. CONCRETE MASONRY UNIT GARBAGE ENCLOSURE.
2. SITE LIGHT POLE. SEE ELECTRICAL.
3. WALL MOUNTED LIGHT FIXTURE. MOUNT ON BACK OF STORAGE UNIT WALL WITH SURFACE MOUNTED CONDUIT. BID AS OPTION. SEE ELECTRICAL.
4. NEW ADA COMPLIANT SIDEWALK CURB RAMP. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS.
5. ADA VAN PARKING SIGN.
6. PAINTED ADA PARKING SYMBOL.
### Lighting Calculation Schedules

**Abbreviations**

- **D** - Daylight
- **B** - Ballast
- **A** - Accuracy

**1. Verify the proper mounting kits or accessories to facilitate installation as shown at each location on the drawings.**

**2. Comply with the “Exterior Lighting” section of the specifications.**

**3. Refer to specifications for important technical requirements for lighting fixtures, ballast, and lamps.**

**4. All fixtures shall be approved by A or another acceptable testing lab for the proper service and with the lamp and ballast provided.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>Mounting</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Ballast</th>
<th>Lens</th>
<th>Accessory</th>
<th>Reflector and Distribution</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Pol</th>
<th>Cap</th>
<th>Ctrl</th>
<th>Lamps</th>
<th>Acct</th>
<th>Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Understanding the Information**

- **Engineering:** Curtis Miner Architecture, LLC
- **Date:** 10 January 2019
- **Project:** Highland Office Park, Highland, UT 84003
- **Phone:** (801) 769-3000
- **Email:** cma@cmautah.com

© 2019 Curtis Miner Architecture, LLC

**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**
NOTE TO ENGINEER:

FOR SQUARE POLES LESS THAN 31' OR ROUND POLES LESS THAN 26', USE TAPERED. FOR ARM MOUNT FIXTURES, USE STRAIGHT POLES, OR WATCH SIZE AT TOP OF POLE (MUST BE COMPATIBLE WITH ARM SIZE). TRY TO MATCH FIXTURE SHAPE. DON'T USE ALUMINUM POLES GREATER THAN 14'.

FOR POLES TALLER THAN 30', OR FOR MORE THAN A DOUBLE-HEAD, HAVE A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER PROVIDE CALCULATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS TO THIS STANDARD DETAIL FOR THE PARTICULAR PROJECT CONDITIONS.

3'-0" CLR

6'-0" CLR

2" CLR

12'-0"

RUST INHIBITIVE PRIMER

PROVIDE IN-LINE FUSE WITH INSULATED FUSE HOLDER HERE

HAND HOLE COVER

ROUND STEEL POLE?

SQUARE STEEL POLE?

ROUND ALUMINUM POLE?

SQUARE ALUMINUM POLE?

PAINTED TO MATCH FIXTURE

SEE FIXTURE SCHEDULE FOR FIXTURE HEAD REQUIREMENTS

.75" CHAMFER ALL EXPOSED EDGES

2 SETS #4 TIES IN TOP 5" OF BASE

4 SETS #4 TIES AT 12" OC

#6 .75" CONDUIT

CONDUIT WITH J-BOX (TYPICAL)

8 #6 BARS VERTICAL WITH 3 SETS #4 TIES AT 18" OC

EXCEPT AS NOTED ABOVE

24"Ø CONCRETE BASE

8' X .75" COPPER WELD GROUND ROD

© 2019 CURTIS MINER ARCHITECTURE, LLC

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
ATTACHMENT 6:

SOUTH ELEVATION

NORTH ELEVATION

EAST ELEVATION

WEST ELEVATION

SHEET NOTES
1. CORRUGATED METAL SIDING.
2. LIGHT FIXTURE.
3. CONCRETE BLOCK.
4. POTENTIAL BONNET LOCATIONS (BY SEPARATE PERMIT).
5. ALUMINUM STOREFRONT WINDOWS AND DOORS.
6. FINISHED CONCRETE.
7. STEEL CANOPY.
8. OVERHEAD SECTIONAL GARAGE DOORS.
9. EAM SITTING DOWNSPOUT.

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"
1. STONE VENEER.
2. EXTERIOR WALL LIGHT. COLOR - DARK BRONZE.
3. ROOF MOUNTED MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AS APPLICABLE.
4. POTENTIAL SIGNAGE LOCATIONS TYPICAL (BY SEPARATE PERMIT).
5. ALUMINUM STATIONARY WINDOWS AND DOORS - DARK BRONZE.
6. FINISHED CONCRETE.
7. CANOPY: STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING - DARK BRONZE.
8. DONER DOORS - DARK BRONZE.
9. CMU WALL COLOR - ???, TEXTURE SMOOTH FACE.
10. HEAVY TIMBER CANOPY WITH STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING - DARK BRONZE.
11. OVERHEAD SECTIONAL GARAGE DOORS - DARK BRONZE.
12. RAIN GUTTER DOWNSPOUT.
13. ALUMINUM STOREFRONT WINDOWS AND DOORS - DARK BRONZE.
14. TYPICAL CANOPY WITH STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING - DARK BRONZE.
DATE: April 30, 2019  
TO: Planning Commission  
FROM: Tara Tannahill  
Planner and GIS Analyst  
SUBJECT: **PUBLIC HEARING AND ORDINANCE** – A request by Highland City to amend Section 3-510 of the Development Code relating to the total acreage requirement in the Planned Development (PD) District. (TA-19-02). *Legislative*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**  
The Planning Commission should conduct a public hearing, draft findings and make a recommendation to the City Council.

**BACKGROUND:**  
A development code amendment is a legislative process.

**SUMMARY OF THE REQUEST:**  
1. The proposed amendment clarifies that the City Council can approve a PD District of less than ten acres:

   New Section 3.510  
   **General Provisions**
   a. A PD District may only be applied to a parcel or a combination of parcels totaling at least ten (10) acres.
   b. City Council may approve a PD less than ten (10) acres when the property is designated as mixed use land under the General Plan Land Use Designation and is also less than ten (10) acres.

   ...

**ANALYSIS:**  
- Currently, the development code only allows Planned Development (PD) Districts for areas that have a combination of parcels that equals 10 acres. It also allows the Council to approved modifications to standards within the Development Code. As a result, the City Attorney has asked staff to amend the code to clarify that the Council may approve PD Districts less than ten acres.

- Section 3.510 B also requires the land to be mixed use designation under the
General Plan Land Use Designation and there are currently properties in the city that are under 10 acres with this designation. This would allow these properties to develop under the PD District.

- There are currently properties with mixed use designation on North County Boulevard that are less than ten acres. With the increased traffic on North County Boulevard, standard R-1-40 designation isn’t the best fit for the area.

- The proposed amendment is needed to clarify the Development Code as requested by the City Attorney.

**FINDINGS:**
The proposed action meets the following findings:
- There are properties with mixed use designation in the city that are less than ten acres.
- Some of the areas in the city are on busy roads so standard residential zoning isn’t the best fit for the area.
- The proposed amendment is needed to clarify the Highland City Development Code.

**RECOMMENDATION AND PROPOSED MOTION:**
The Planning Commission should conduct a public hearing, draft findings and make a recommendation to the City Council.

I move that the Planning Commission accept the findings and recommend APPROVAL of the proposed amendment.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
This action will not have a financial impact on this fiscal year’s budget expenditures.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Ordinance
ORDINANCE NO. 2019-**

AN ORDINANCE OF THE HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL AMENDING HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE SECTION 3-705 AS SHOWN IN FILENAME TA-19-02.

WHEREAS, all due and proper notices of public hearings and public meetings on this Ordinance held before the Highland City Planning Commission (the “Commission”) and the Highland City Council (the “City Council”) were given in the time, form, substance and manner provided by Utah Code Section 10-9a-205; and

WHEREAS, the Commission held a public hearing on this Ordinance on April 28, 2019 and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a public hearing on this Ordinance on May 21, 2019.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE Highland City Council as follows:

SECTION 1. That Section 3-510 Establishment of A PD District of the Highland City Development Code, is hereby amended as follows:

New Section 3.510

General Provisions

A. A PD District may only be applied to a parcel or a combination of parcels totaling at least ten (10) acres.

B. City Council may approve less than ten (10) acres when the property is designated as mixed use land under the General Plan Land Use Designation and is also less than ten (10) acres.

SECTION 2. That the Mayor, the City Administrator, the City Recorder and the City Attorney are hereby authorized and directed to execute all documents and take all steps necessary to carry out the purpose of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its first posting or publication.

SECTION 4. If any provision of this Ordinance is for any reason held by any court of competent jurisdiction to be unenforceable, such provision or portion hereof shall be deemed separate, distinct, and independent of all other provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Highland City Council, May 21, 2019

HIGHLAND CITY, UTAH
ATTEST:

__________________________
Cindy Quick, City Recorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCILMEMBER</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Braithwaite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Irwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Ostler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
REPORT ITEM #3

DATE: April 30, 2019
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Tara Tannahill
Planner and GIS Analyst

SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION – Andrew Simonsen is requesting rezoning to allow residential and non-residential mixed use development under the Planned Development (PD) District. The property is approximately 2.85 acres and is located east of 10272 N 4800 W.

Legislative

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission should hold a public hearing, accept the findings and recommend approval subject to the three recommendations of staff.

PRIOR REVIEW:
The Planning Commission held a public hearing on March 26, 2019. A number of residents spoke in opposition to the request. The Commission expressed the following concerns:
1. Concerned about the type of housing and the number of units per acre.
2. Concerned about the number of residents that would be accessing the single access road.

The Commission continued the item to allow the applicant time to address the concerns. This report has been revised to reflect the revised proposal. The major revisions include:
1. The residential district no longer includes townhomes and instead includes ten (10) single-family detached homes.
2. Instead of one community park, the updated narrative includes two community pocket parks.
3. The crash gate for fire access has been removed because the updated plan doesn’t have more than thirty homes on a single access road.

BACKGROUND:
The property is approximately 2.85 acres and located east of 10272 N 4800 W. The applicant is creating a mixed use development with single-family units in the back of the property and commercial in the front.

The property is designated as mixed use development on the General Plan Land Use Map.
The current zoning is R-1-40.

PD Districts are allowed under Article 5 of the Development Code. PD Districts follow the rezone approval process.

On March 26, 2019 Planning Commission voted 7 to 0 to continue the request in order to have the applicant address the density concern for the residential district.

The adoption of a Planned Development (PD) District is a legislative process.

**SUMMARY OF THE REQUEST:**

1. The applicant is requesting approval of rezoning to allow a mixed use development under the Planned Development (PD) District.

2. The request is to zone approximately 2.85 acres to a PD District to allow .85-acre commercial development and 2.00 acres for 10 single-family units. The applicant has submitted a PD plan and narrative.

**Commercial District:**

3. The commercial district will have a maximum 9,500 square foot retail commercial building. The building will have a maximum of 5 businesses available.

4. Generally, the proposed commercial uses are similar to the C-1 Zone. No tenants have been selected for the commercial zone. The proposed uses include:
   a. Accessory uses which are customary and incidental to the principal use of the property.
   b. Apparel, new and used
   c. Antiques, crafts, and collectible sales
   d. Art galleries and art studios
   e. Bakeries, retail only
   f. Education learning centers (i.e. Sullivan Learning Center)
   g. Financial institutions, excluding non-charted financial institutions
   h. Fitness center
   i. Indoor recreational facilities
   j. Laundry, cleaning, and dry cleaning establishments
   k. Personal services such as barber, beauty shops, copy shops, mail shops, tanning salons, shoe repair, and tailor shops
   l. Professional, administrative, business, and medical offices
   m. Restaurants, excluding drive thru
   n. Retail sales of new merchandise
   o. Repair services for small appliances, bicycles, watches, musical instruments, and similar items.
   p. Sporting goods equipment rental, sales, and service

5. Access to the retail center will be from 4800 West.
6. Parking is shown in the front and rear of the building on the conceptual plan. The current proposal demonstrates 4.20 parking stalls per 1,000 square feet of useable commercial space. Currently, 39 parking stalls have been provided on the conceptual plan.

7. Landscaping has been demonstrated on the conceptual plan around the perimeter of the commercial district.

8. Recreational area has been provided on the conceptual plan in the rear of the property. The recreational area will include a pocket park with seating provided under a pergola. The total size of the commercial recreational area will be .11 acres which is approximately 13.2% which meets the 10% open space requirement for the PD District for the commercial zone.

9. Utilities will connect to the utilities on the north side of the property that run underneath the city trail. There is capacity in the existing system to serve the development.

**Residential District:**

1. The residential district will have 10 single-family detached residential units in the rear of the property.

2. The maximum density permitted is 5.0 dwelling units per acre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Density (Units/Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The minimum buildable area for all residential lots is 2,000 square feet. The minimum dwelling area per unit will be 2,000 square feet of habitable space above grade.

4. Each home will have a two car garage. Two additional parking stalls are located in the driveway of each unit. Guest parking is provided on the street with two designated guest parking stalls at the end of the hammerhead on the private road and approximately eleven parallel parking can be accommodated on the street.

5. Setbacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Side Setback</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side setback between buildings</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The majority of the greenspace around the homes is community Common Area. There are two pocket parks in the middle of the district. The recreation area is 0.86 acres which represents 42.7% which is above the 20% of the net development area requirement for the PD District recreational requirement for the residential zones.
7. Fencing will only be allowed on the perimeter of the residential district and a 4’ tall fence is allowed on the properties that abut the pocket parks.

8. Access to the residential district will be from 4730 West.

9. An HOA will be established to maintain the landscaping and non-city roads in the district.

10. Utilities will connect to the utilities on the north side of the property that run underneath the city trail. There is capacity in the existing system to serve the development.

11. The applicant is proposing a public road that is 56 feet in width and a private road that is 26 feet.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:
The applicant held a neighborhood meeting on February 9, 2019 and no residents attended the meeting.

Notice of the Planning Commission meeting was published in the Daily Herald on March 10, 2019 and posted on the state website March 7, 2019. Notification of the public hearing associated with this meeting was mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the proposed site on March 11, 2019. No written communication has been received.

ANALYSIS:

Surrounding Uses
- The General Plan designation for this property is mixed use development. The property to the north of the commercial district is zoned Professional Office (P.O), to the north of the residential district is zoned R-1-40, to the east of the property is Cedar Hills, and to the south of the property is zoned R-1-40. Lone Peak High school is to the west of the property across North County Blvd. The proposed development is in conformance with the General Plan and compatible with the surrounding uses.

Site Access
- Access to the commercial district will be from 4800 West and access to the residential district will be from 4730 West.

Open space
- The proposed development meets the recreational area requirements for the PD District for both the commercial and residential district.

Architectural Design and Theme
- Each project shall include an architectural theme and standards. The proposed PD narrative provided architectural standards.

Utilities
• Utilities will connect to the utilities on the north side of the property that run underneath the city trail. There is capacity in the existing system to serve the development.

Parking and Circulation
• The state fire code requires a second access once a single access has over 30 homes. Between Wildrose Subdivision and the proposed development the number of homes serviced by the single access road is 25.

• The applicant is proposing two additional parking stalls in the driveways of each home, two designated visitor parking at the end of the hammerhead on the private road, and approximately eleven parallel parking can be provided on the street in the residential district.

• The concept plan is demonstrating 39 parking stalls for the commercial district.

Landscaping
• The narrative includes a description of the enhanced landscaping on both the residential and commercial district.

• The concept plan demonstrates a 30-foot parkway detail on 4800 West.

REQUIRED FINDINGS:
The following findings are required for a PD District to be approved:

1. The proposed PD is consistent with the General Plan;
2. That there are or will be adequate public facilities, including but not limited to: transportation, water, wastewater, and public safety facilities, etc.
3. The proposed PD will result in compatible land use relationships and acceptable land use with existing and planned land use in the area; and;
4. The development standards of the proposed PD are consistent with or exceed the desired quality of development for the area.

RECOMMENDATION AND PROPOSED MOTION:
The Planning Commission should hold a public hearing, accept the findings, and recommend APPROVAL of the proposed Planned Development (PD) District with the following stipulations:

1. Development shall comply with the Fairfield Cove Project Plan and Narrative date stamped April 11, 2019 expect as modified by these stipulations:
2. All public improvements shall be installed as required by the City Engineer.
3. The civil construction plans shall meet all requirements as determined by the City Engineer.
I move that the Planning Commission accept the findings and recommend approval of the Planned Developed (PD) District subject to the three (3) stipulations recommended by staff.

**ALTERNATIVE MOTION:**  
The Planning Commission should hold a public hearing, accept the findings, and recommend **DENIAL** of the proposed Planned Development (PD) District with the following stipulations:

(The Commission should draft stipulation)

**FISCAL IMPACT:**  
This action will not have a financial impact on this fiscal year's budget expenditure.

**ATTACHMENTS:**  
1. Vicinity Map  
2. PD Narrative
ATTACHMENT 1:

LDS Seminary

14:003:0368
BERRY GAGON, TORI KAY...
10272 N 4800 WEST - HIGHLAND
Value: $627,200 -- 2.85 acres
Entry# 62653-2002

14:003:0364
REBECCA JEANETTE HOGGARD TRUST...
10242 N 4800 WEST - HIGHLAND
Value: $705,600 -- 2.86 acres
Entry# 23665-2018

14:003:0376
RABR PROPERTIES LC...
Value: $590,900 -- 1.91 acres
Entry# 130671-2005

This cadastral map is generated from Utah County Recorder data. It is for reference only and no liability is assumed for any inaccuracies, incorrect data or variations with an actual survey.
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Introduction and Opening Statement

Context & Description
The Fairfield Cove Planned Development describes a mixed-use community consisting of 2.85 Acres. This Planned Development community is broken out into two (2) sub-districts: 1) Commercial District; and 2) Residential District; 0.85 acre commercial parcel and 10 single-family detached units.

The property was previously used for agriculture purposes and has one existing single-family detached structure and a barn. The property is located at 10272 North 4800 West. The property can be found across the street from Lone Peak High School and 0.15 miles from the Walmart off Cedar Hills Dr. The adjacent land uses consist of big box retail, institutional, single-family residential, agriculture and a senior living facility.

Fairfield Cove also includes opportunities to attract food establishments, professional services, and other businesses which can provide residents, employees, commuters, and students with convenient access to goods and services.

Land Use Designation Description
The proposed Fairfield Cove parcel is currently zoned R-1-40 with a Future Land Use Designation (per the General Plan Land Use Map) of Mixed Use. This PD development will be broken up into two Districts. One District will be the commercial component of this mixed-use development, the other will be a residential neighborhood.

Development Code
The requirements of the Highland City Development Code, as amended, shall apply except where explicitly states otherwise herein by this PD. The Highland City Staff shall determine the applicable development standard to apply.
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Project Location Page

Utah County Parcel Map
Land located in Utah County, State of Utah, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing South 746.30 feet and East 33.59 feet from the Northwest corner of Section 6, Township 5 South, Range 2 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence South 89°52'41" East 779.98 feet; thence South 0°03'15" West 160 feet; thence North 89°52'41" West 779.71 feet; thence North 0°02'30" West 160 feet to beginning. LESS AND EXCEPTING the following; Commencing at a point located 746.30 feet South and 33.59 feet East from the Northwest corner of Section 6, Township 5 South, Range 2 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence South 89°52'41" East 4.77 feet; thence along a portion of the North line of parcel with Serial Number 14:003:0015 as recorded at the Utah County Recorders office; thence South 00°02’42” East along the East Right-of-Way line of 4800 West Highland, 160 feet; thence North 89°52'41" West 4.78 feet along a portion of the South line of said parcel; thence North 00°02’30” West 160 feet along the West line of said parcel to the point of beginning.

Tax Parcel No.: 14:003:0368
Development Overview
The Fairfield Cove Planned Development will complement and build upon the existing 4800 West Commercial Corridor and the strong residential base of Highland City.

The Fairfield Cove Commercial District consists of approximately 0.85 acres and would be developed into a commercial/retail center. This commercial component will provide opportunities to attract a mixture of end users that can serve the adjacent schools, employment centers and the residential base of Highland City. The maximum commercial square footage that will be constructed is 9,500 square feet.

The remaining 2.00 acres of the property is the Fairfield Cove Residential District. This residential community will be a highly landscaped community that will cater to young professionals, new families, and empty nesters who are aiming to downsize their homes.

The architecture style will integrate seamlessly with the surrounding neighborhoods. The cottage configuration will act as a transition between the existing single family residential neighborhood and the new commercial frontage, while also providing a single family detached housing opportunity. The community will consist of ten (10) single-family detached homes.

General Development Goals
1. Build a neighborhood which is compatible with the surrounding single-family detached communities.
2. Encourage community interaction through strong pedestrian connections, interconnected green spaces, and welcoming community layout and design.
3. Create a sense of community through consistent or complimentary community space design, materiality, vegetation, and street furnishings that are used in both Fairfield Cove Districts.
4. Provide housing options for recently married couples, college educated young professionals, and empty nesters looking to downsize.
5. Contribute to Highland City’s sales tax base with high quality commercial businesses.

Ingress & Egress
There is an existing stub road (4730 West) which dead ends into the proposed Fairfield Cove site. This stub road will be connected to and incorporated into the Fairfield Cove Residential District road network. To facilitate a future road connection, 4730 West will continue through Fairfield Cove and will stub into the vacant property to the south.

There is also an existing Main City Trail connection to the north of the property. A connection to this trail will be incorporated into the open space design and pedestrian network of the Residential District. See the Pedestrian Connectivity Exhibit found on the following page.
The ingress and egress for the Commercial District will come off of 4800 West. The curb cut width will comply with the Highland City Development Code and Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) requirements. Since no roadway connections to adjacent commercial complexes or neighborhoods, traffic within the Fairfield Cove Commercial District will consist of only patrons and employees of the businesses on-site.

Utilities
Because this is a smaller development, the impact on public services will be very minimal. It will have an extremely minimal impact on water usage, sewer, power, police and fire services, etc. The Residential District will have minimal impact on the public infrastructure and utilities due to the small scale, and low-density nature of the development.

Phasing
The Fairfield Cove Planned Development will be developed in two (2) phases. The first phase will be the Residential District and the second phase will be the Commercial District.
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Fairfield Cove Residential District Requirements

**Description**
The purpose of the Fairfield Cove Residential District will be developed with a cottage configuration, providing a transition between the existing single family residential neighborhood and the new commercial frontage, while also providing a single family detached housing opportunity.

**Permitted Uses**
The only Permitted Uses allowed in the Fairfield Cove Residential District of the Fairfield Cove Planned Development are as follows:
- Model homes used for the sale of homes/lots within a subdivision in Highland, provided that the model home conforms to the requirements of Section 3-4108(11) of the Development Code.
- Construction Trailer & Sales Trailer
- Detached Single-Family Residential Units
- All permitted uses allowed in the Highland City R-1-40 Zone, adopted as part of the Highland City Development Code excluding the “Keeping of Animals” sub-section (7).
- Trails & Recreation Spaces

**Permitted Uses with Conditions**
All uses not specifically provided for herein are prohibited.

**Overall Residential Density**
The Fairfield Cove Residential District will include ten (10) detached single-family units. The proposed density is 5.00 dwelling units per acre which is significantly lower than what would be permitted per the “Mixed-Use” Future Land Use Designation found in the Highland City General Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Density (Units/Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Width Requirements**
The minimum width at the front of the building pad for all lots is 40 feet.

**Minimum Buildable Area**
Minimum buildable area for all residential lots will be 2,000 SF.

**Dwelling Size**
The minimum dwelling area per unit will be 2,000 SF of habitable space above grade.

**Dwelling Height**
To create visual diversity within the community, the home heights will range with the tallest
home permitted being 30 feet tall. The maximum height of any building shall not exceed thirty (30) feet measured from finished grade. The height is measured from one location along any elevation where the “Grade of the Building” to the highest part of the building is at its greatest vertical distance. On sloped lots where the grade difference is four feet or greater in elevation the averaged maximum “Height of Building” (as defined in 10-102 of the Development Code) shall not exceed an average height of thirty (30) feet above grade.

Foundations
No foundation may be exposed for more than ten inches (10”) above the final grade. Foundations that extend above that height must be covered with a material which compliments and blends with the architectural materials used on the rest of the home.

Garage & Parking
Each home shall have a minimum of a 2-car garage. Two (2) additional parking stalls are located in the driveway of each unit. The parking ratio for the Fairfield Cove Residential District is 4.00 stalls per residential unit. Four (4)-Two (2) guest parking stalls have been accommodated at the end of the hammerhead on the Private Road. Approximately eleven (11) parallel parking can be accommodated on-street. Both sides of the Public Road may be parked on and one side of the Private Road may be parked on.

Landscaping
Landscaping shall be installed at the time of community construction, or as such time as weather permits. All landscaping will be managed and maintained by the residential community’s homeowners association. The following landscape standards shall be followed:
- Each home shall have a minimum of one (1) shade tree planted in the front yard setback.
- Trees shall be planted along the perimeter of the property to provide buffers between homes and adjacent properties.
- Park Strips along public streets shall have a tree planted every 30 feet on-center.
- An attractive mix of turf and waterwise plant materials will be used throughout the Fairfield Cove Planned Development.
- Landscape designs will aim to limit turf to only those areas where people gather.
- A diverse palette of plant material will be used to create interest throughout the seasons.
- Entrances into homes shall be highlighted and enhance by attractive plant materials.

Fencing
Privacy fencing may be located along the perimeter of the Residential District but is prohibited in all other areas except that. Light colored picket, or three rail fencing is permitted along the perimeter of Limited Common Areas which back up onto the central pocket parks and may only be 4’ tall. The intent behind this restriction is to maintain an open welcoming feel within the community and encourages community interaction.
Roof
All roofs shall overhang exterior walls by a minimum of twelve inches (12”).

Accessory Buildings/ Athletic Courts
Shall follow the guidelines as outlined in the R-1-40 section of the Highland City Development Code.

Location & Setback
All main dwellings and other main structures shall be located as follows:
• Since the area around the residential units consist of Common Area/Limited Common Area, **interior** side setbacks **between buildings** are measured from building pad to building pad. Interior Side setbacks shall be a minimum of 10 feet.
• Perimeter Side Setbacks are measured from the building pad to the abutting property line. Perimeter Side Setbacks shall be a minimum of 10 feet.
• Front Setbacks shall be a minimum of 20 feet. Front porches may extend an additional two (2) feet into the front setback.
• Rear Setbacks shall be a minimum of 25 feet measured from the home to the abutting property line. If the home is backing up to a community common area the rear setback shall reflect a minimum of 50’ between structures. Each home which backs onto the community pocket parks shall have a Limited Common Area with a minimum depth of 15’. Rear Porches may extend an additional two (2) feet into the rear setback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Minimum Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Side Setback</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior</strong> Side Setback <strong>Between Buildings</strong></td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recreation Areas
Within the Fairfield Cove Residential District the majority of the greenspace around the homes is community Common Area. This Common Area provides residents with an interconnected network of open space. There are two pocket parks acting as key nodes within the open space network. These pocket parks can be found at the heart of the Residential District and can be used for community gatherings, or quiet enjoyment of the residents. There will also be a linear park which connects to the Main City Trail to the North. The linear park will create a strong pedestrian corridor and amenity for the residents of this community. The proposed recreation open space nodes and corridors will be enhanced by implementing a high-quality landscape design which provides shade and comfortable places to sit.

Recreation Area Size: 0.86 Acres of the Residential District is Community Open Space. This represents 42.7% of the total Residential District Development Area

Recreation Area Designation: Private recreation area dedicated to, and maintained by, the homeowners association. Recreation areas will include a linear park which connects to the Main City Trail network, and central pock parks located at the heart of the Residential District.
Residential Recreation Area Precedent Images
Residential Architectural Example Product Renderings
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Fairfield Cove Commercial District Requirements

Description
The Fairfield Cove Commercial District will consist of a maximum 9,500 square foot retail commercial building that will provide the opportunity to house approximately 3-5 business. This District will add to the existing commercial presence of the Wal-Mart and contribute to the commercial growth in southern Highland City. With the adjacent employment centers, schools, and Highland City residents, the need for access to goods and services is in high demand and is continually growing. The Fairfield Cove Commercial District will improve the surrounding resident’s quality of life through convenient access to a variety of food establishments and retail providers.

Permitted Uses
The only Permitted Uses allowed in the Commercial District of the Fairfield Cove Planned Development are as follows:
- Accessory uses - which are customary and incidental to the principal use of the property
- Apparel, new and used
- Antiques, crafts, and collectible sales
- Art galleries and art studios
- Bakeries, retail only
- Education learning centers (i.e. Sullivan Learning Center)
- Financial institutions, excluding non-charted financial institutions
- Fitness center
- Indoor recreational facilities
- Laundry, cleaning, and dry-cleaning establishments
- Personal services such as barber, beauty shops, copy shops, mail shops, tanning salons, shoe repair, and tailor shops
- Professional, administrative, business, and medical offices
- Restaurants, excluding drive thru
- Retail sales of new merchandise
- Repair services for small appliances, bicycles, watches, musical instruments, and similar items.
- Sporting goods equipment rental, sales, and service.

Permitted Uses with Conditions
All uses not specifically provided for herein are prohibited.

Width Requirements
The minimum roadway frontage width required for all commercial lots is 100 feet.

Building Height
The maximum height of any building shall not exceed thirty (30) feet. The height is
measured from one location along any elevation where the “Grade of the Building” to the highest part of the building is at its greatest vertical distance.

**Roof**
The following roofing materials shall not be applied to any roof structure or design in the Fairfield Cove Planned Development and are prohibited, either because of their appearance, or because they are not likely to perform satisfactorily in the climate of Highland City:
- Untreated aluminum or metal (except that copper may be used)
- Reflective materials
- Brightly colored roofing materials such as bright red, blue, yellow, neon colors, or similar colors that are highly visible

**Location & Setback**
All commercial structures shall be located as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Minimum Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>5 10 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architectural Guidelines**
All commercial structures in the Fairfield Cove Planned Development shall comply with the C-1 Zone architectural design requirements found in the Highland City Development Code.

**Commercial Signage**
All commercial signage shall comply with those requirements outlined in the Highland City Development Code.

**Equipment Screening**
The following standards shall relate to the installment, location and screening of utilities and other exterior equipment:
- All utilities, including drainage systems, sewer, gas and water lines, electrical, telephone and communications wires, and related equipment, irrigation ditches and/or pipes, shall, where possible, be installed and maintained underground.
- No mechanical equipment (including, but not limited to, components of plumbing, processing, heating, cooling, and ventilating systems) shall be visible on site or from adjacent property.
- No exterior components of such mechanical equipment (e.g. piping, stacks and duct work, fans and compressors) shall be mounted on any building wall unless they are an integrated architectural design feature. Any such components shall only be permitted with the written approval of the City Planning Commission.
- Roof mounted mechanical equipment shall be hidden from view by building parapets of equal height.
- If building parapets do not provide adequate screening of mechanical equipment from the upper floors, screening shall be installed as an integral part of the overall architectural design and painted such a color as to allow its blending with its visual background.
- Equipment and mechanical devices shall not be located in any required front setbacks.
• Electric transformers, utility pads, cable TV and telephone boxes shall be located out of public rights-of-way and under grounded or screened with walls, fences or vegetation or otherwise enclosed in a manner harmonious with the overall architectural theme.

Parking
The Fairfield Cove commercial development proposal shows 39 parking stalls provided for the business patrons and employees. Since the commercial tenants have yet to be identified the exact parking requirement cannot be determined. The current proposal consists of a 9,250 SF commercial building which totals to approximately 4.20 parking stalls per 1,000 square feet of usable commercial space.

To ensure there sufficient parking, the commercial building Owner will review with Highland City Staff the proposed tenant, desired square footage of lease space, any shared parking agreements, and the tenants currently leasing in the building to make a determination on whether the site can support the proposed tenant.

Landscaping
Since the Commercial District has frontage along 4800 West, a 29 foot landscape buffer is required. The design and layout of the landscape buffer shall comply with the Parkway Detail found on page 27 of the Highland City Town Center Overlay Zone Design Standards.

Landscaping will be completed at the time the commercial building is being constructed, or as such time as weather permits. The following landscape standards shall be applied to all commercial development sites within the Fairfield Cove Planned Development.
• Trees shall be planted along the perimeter of the property to provide buffers between the commercial businesses and adjacent properties.
• Park Strips shall have a tree planted every 30 feet on-center.
• An enhanced landscape design will be installed along 4800 South to create an attractive presence along the street and to contribute to the Highland City image.
• Tree plantings will be placed along the edges of the parking lot and in parking lot islands to provide shade and reduce the heat island effect created by the parking lot asphalt.
• An attractive mix of turf and waterwise plant materials will be used throughout the Fairfield Cove Planned Development.
• Landscape designs will aim to limit turf to only those areas where people gather.
• A diverse palette of plant material will be used to create interest throughout the seasons.
• Entrances into businesses, trails, and parks shall be highlighted and enhance by attractive plant materials.
• There shall be deciduous trees planted to provide shade for outdoor seating areas.
• Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles shall be followed by all homeowners and throughout the trail and park design.

Fencing
Privacy fencing shall be located between the Commercial District and the Residential District to delineate the separate Districts and to provide additional privacy to the adjacent residents. The privacy fencing shall be installed at the same time as the construction of the Commercial District. Fence material shall be a white vinyl material or something of equal or higher quality. The Fairfield Cove Residential District’s Home Owners Association shall approve the material selected for the fencing prior to installation.
Recreation Area
A highly landscaped multi-use trail connection will be incorporated into the Fairfield Cove Commercial District. This trail connection will encourage surrounding Highland City residents to walk to the Commercial District. It will also provide patrons the opportunity to sit outside and eat their recently purchased food, or employees a comfortable space to sit during lunch.

The Commercial Recreation Area provided in this District will be a linear park with a multi-use trail, comfortable seating, a pergola, and an overhead canopy of shade trees. The total size of the Commercial Recreation Area is 0.11 acres which is 13.2% open space of the Commercial District development area.

Commercial Recreation Area Exhibits & Precedent Images
Commercial Architectural Exhibits & Precedent Images
DATE: April 30, 2019
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Tara Tannahill
Planner and GIS Analyst
SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION – The Boyer Group is requesting rezoning to allow residential and non-residential mixed use development under the Planned Development (PD) District. The property is approximately 115 acres and is located approximately at 9900 N on North County Boulevard. Legislative

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission should hold a public hearing, accept the findings and recommend approval subject to the three recommendations of staff.

BACKGROUND:
The Board governing the Utah State Development Center (USDC) decided to sell the land to the Boyer Company to develop the site in 2018. The proceeds from the sell would be utilized to fund the Developmental Center long term. The property is approximately 115 acres and located approximately at 9900 N on North County Boulevard.

The applicant is creating a mixed use development with single-family residential units and commercial buildings through the Planned Development (PD) District. The property is designated as mixed use development on the General Plan Land Use Map. The current zoning is R-1-40.

PD Districts are allowed under Article 5 of the Development Code. PD Districts follow the rezone approval process.

The adoption of a Planned Development (PD) District is a legislative process.

SUMMARY OF THE REQUEST:
1. The applicant is requesting approval of rezoning to allow a mixed use development under the Planned Development (PD) District.

2. The request is to zone approximately 115 acres to a PD District to allow 7.4-acre commercial development and 107.6 acres for 699 single-family units. The applicant has submitted a PD District plan and narrative.
3. Access to the site will be from Canal Boulevard, 4800 West (North County Blvd), 10100 North, and Knight Avenue.

4. There will be three entry monument signs on the property. Two of the primary entry monument signs will be on 4800 West and the secondary entry monument sign will be on 10100 North.

5. Utilities will connect to the utilities on the perimeter of the site. Culinary Water and Pressurized Irrigation have capacity to sustain the site. Sanitary Sewer will be upgraded outside of the site and the upgraded piping will have capacity to sustain the site.

6. The applicant provided an approval process after the zoning is approved. The preliminary plat approval shall be granted by both the Planning Commission and City Council. Final plat approval shall be granted by City Council. Site plan for the non-residential units shall be approved administratively.

7. Pod boundaries may be adjusted to accommodate different lot layout. However, the overall area of each pod designated shall not increase by more than 15% from what the narrative shows and the Estate lot pod area cannot be reduced by more than 5%.

**Commercial Flex Pod:**

1. The commercial district will be on 7.4 acres and located on the south-eastern portion of the property.

2. Any property within the Commercial Flex pod that is undeveloped or vacant for eight years from the approval date of City Council may be transitioned to Residential Flex, with a maximum density of 12 units per acre.

3. Access to the site will be from 4800 West and Canal Boulevard.

4. Generally, the proposed commercial uses are similar to the C-1 Zone. No tenants have been selected for the commercial flex pod as of yet. The proposed permitted uses include:
   a. Accessory uses which are customary and incidental to the principal use of the property.
   b. Apparel, new and used
   c. Antiques, crafts, and collectible sales
   d. Art galleries and art studios
   e. Bakeries, retail only
   f. Education learning centers (i.e. Sullivan Learning Center)
   g. Financial institutions, excluding non-charted financial institutions
   h. Fitness center
   i. Indoor recreational facilities
   j. Laundry, cleaning, and dry cleaning establishments
   k. Personal services such as barber, beauty shops, copy shops, mail shops, tanning salons, shoe repair, and tailor shops
1. Professional, administrative, business, and medical offices
2. Restaurants, excluding drive thru
3. Retail sales of new merchandise
4. Repair services for small appliances, bicycles, watches, musical instruments, and similar items.
5. Sporting goods equipment rental, sales, and service

The proposed conditional uses include:
6. Gas station and convenience stores
7. Minor auto repair including lubrication, tire sales, engine tune-up, washing and polishing, brakes, muffler and maintenance of other similar accessories.
   This use does not include automotive painting and body repair, or transmission repair. All repair areas must be within an enclosed building. Service bays shall be screened with rollup doors from view from public streets.

The following uses shall be prohibited in the commercial zone:
8. Thrift stores
9. Pawn Shops
10. Sexually oriented businesses
11. Any use not expressly permitted above, unless approved by the City Council.

5. The development of the commercial flex pod is anticipated on being the final phase of the site.

6. Building Setbacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback Type</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>No minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>As allowed by the IBC and must recognize any easements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>As allowed by the IBC and must recognize any easements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Side Setback</td>
<td>No minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IBC= International Building Code

7. Maximum building height is 45 feet. City Council also has the ability to approve a building in excess of 45 feet.

8. Parking Requirement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Parking Stalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail, personal service, and repair businesses</td>
<td>5.0 per 1,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and dental office and clinics</td>
<td>4.0 per 1,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional and business offices, including financial</td>
<td>4.0 per 1,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Landscaping has been demonstrated on the conceptual plan around the perimeter of the commercial district.

10. The PD District requires 10% of the net developable area or approximately 1.48 acres to have an open space recreation area for the commercial district. For the
Ridgeview development commercial district open space may include landscaping around the perimeter of the buildings, parking islands, and along adjacent street buffers outside of the public or private right-of-way.

11. Architecture standards have been established for the commercial flex pods.

**Residential Pods:**

1. The residential district will have four distinct housing types. The goal of offering different housing types is to provide residents of the community with various options for housing sizes, style, and price.

2. The maximum number of residential units for the whole development is 699 single-family units.

3. The front yards of the residential landscaping shall be installed within 6 months of occupancy and rear landscaping shall be installed within one year of occupancy. All residential landscaping shall include street trees as per the street tree concept plan.

4. The PD District requires 20% of the net developable area or approximately 21.5 acres to have a recreation area for the residential district. Currently, they are only demonstrating the 29-foot parkway detail and the 4-acre park. They have put a stipulation in the narrative that the residential district will need to meet the 20% requirement.

5. Open space in the Ridgeview development may include:
   a. Parks
   b. Tot lots
   c. Contiguous grass areas over 5,000 square feet
   d. Trail corridors
   e. The 29-foot parkway detail on North County Boulevard (4800 West)
   f. Swimming pools
   g. Club House outdoor areas
   h. Tennis & Pickleball courts
   i. Basketball courts
   j. Front yard corridors in the carriage and townhome pods

6. Pod 8 will contain a community park and is located in the center of the development. The community park will be approximately 4 acres and be built in phase 2. The community park will have a trail that connects to the Murdock Canal Trail system, playground, pergola/pavilion, four benches, a basketball court, and two pickleball courts.

7. A walkway will be installed on the adjacent lots leading to Highland Glen Park on the west side of the community so that residents will have easy access to the park.

8. A Homeowners Association (HOA) will be established to maintain the landscaping in the park and open space areas. The cluster or townhome housing pods may have a sub-HOA which will have additional dues besides the base HOA dues. The sub-
HOA will provide services to maintain open space or other amenities benefitting the cluster or townhome pods.

9. Parking Requirement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Parking</td>
<td>Two stalls for each multi-family unit. (Garage, driveways, or private designated parking stalls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Driveway Guest Parking</td>
<td>Two stalls for each multi-family unit. If the driveway is not being utilized for private parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Guest Parking</td>
<td>One stall per four multi-family units. If the driveway is not being utilized for guest parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Architecture standards have been established and pertain to each pod in the residential district. Residential stylebooks have also been established for the residential district. Architecture Standards include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exterior Materials</th>
<th>Stone, brick, masonry or fiber cement composite siding or approved similar by the ARC, Stucco, metal (accent material only), and concrete (accent material only).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Material</td>
<td>No more than 40% of homes in each pod can be single material. Remaining 60% of homes in the pod shall consist of a combination of at least two of the exterior materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Treatment</td>
<td>Framed-in wood, composite board, brick, stone or stucco trim that is a minimum four inches width.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colors</td>
<td>Natural earth tones. With accent colors as approved by the ARC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition Townhomes</td>
<td>No set of attached townhomes shall be placed next to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition Carriage</td>
<td>No identical elevation within four lots on either side of the home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition Estate &amp; Cottages</td>
<td>No identical elevations within two lots on either side of the home, or the three lots directly across the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Style</td>
<td>Each home shall identify a style from the residential stylebook and shall incorporate at least 50% of the key characteristics outlines for that chosen style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Stylebook</td>
<td>Colonial, Contemporary/Modern, Cottage, Craftsman, Farmhouse/Country, and Prairie.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. An Architecture Review Committee (ARC) will be established to review the plans, elevations, materials, and colors for homes to be constructed.

Estate Homes:

1. The estate homes are the larger available lots in the development. The lots are for single-family detached homes and are a minimum 7,000 square feet.
2. The estate homes are in pods 13 and 14. The lots back up to Highland Glen park and the Murdock Canal Trail on the west side of the development.

3. The maximum density permitted in the estate lots is 4 dwelling units per acre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Density (Units/Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The maximum lot coverage is 50%.

5. Setbacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback Type</th>
<th>Setback Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Rear Setback</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Rear Setback</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet (7 feet on one side and 8 Feet on the other side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Side Setback</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The maximum height of the building is 35 feet.

7. The estate lots are anticipated on being built in phase 3.

Cottages Homes:

1. The lots are detached single-family homes with a minimum lot size of 3,500 square feet and a minimum lot width of 35 feet.

2. The cottage homes are located in pods 7, 11, and 12. The cottage lots are anticipated to be in phase 2 and 3.

3. The maximum density permitted in the cottage lots is 10 dwelling units per acre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Density (Units/Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The maximum lot coverage is 65%.

5. Setbacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback Type</th>
<th>Setback Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet to home / 18 Feet to garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Rear Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Rear Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Setback</td>
<td>5 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Side Setback</td>
<td>15 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The building height maximum is 40 Feet.
Townhomes/Flex Residential:
1. Townhome lots are linear groupings from two to eight units. The minimum lot size depends on the type of home. Attached, stacked, or clustered units with a shared wall are allowed in these pods.

2. The townhomes/Flex Residential homes are located in pods 2 and 5. The lots are anticipated to be in phase 1 and 2.

3. The front porches will face towards the street and common open space.

4. The maximum density permitted in the townhome lots is 12 dwelling units per acre. The minimum lot size will be controlled by the density.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Density (Units/Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Setbacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setback Type</th>
<th>Minimum Setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>12 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Rear Setback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Rear Setback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Setback</td>
<td>Between residential units 0 feet, total side yards not less than 5 feet, between buildings 5 feet minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Side Setback</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The building height maximum is 40 Feet.

Carriages:
1. Carriage homes includes homes with a shared driveway, twin homes, or single-family homes on lots less than 35 feet wide.

2. The carriage homes are located in pods 1, 6, 9, and 10. The lots are anticipated to be in phase 1, 2, and 5.

3. The front porches will face towards the street and common open space. Carriage home pods shall include clubhouses, common open spaces, and other amenities.

4. The maximum density permitted in the carriage home pods is 12 dwelling units per acre. The minimum lot size will be controlled by the density.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Density (Units/Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The maximum lot coverage for the front and rear load lots is 70%.
6. Single-family or Active adult attached units will be allowed in the carriage pods. The maximum of building units is four units.

7. Setbacks:

Cluster / Age Targeted
Front Setback | 12 feet to any public Row, 5 feet to adjacent homes, 2 feet to adjacent shared driveways or private ROW's
Interior Rear Setback | 12 feet to any public Row, 5 feet to adjacent homes, 2 feet to adjacent shared driveways or private ROW's
Corner Rear Setback | Same as Rear Setback
Interior Side Setback | Residential uses 0 feet, Total side yards 5 feet, between homes 5 feet
Corner Side Setback | 10 Feet

**Front Load**
Front Setback | 15 Feet
Interior Rear Setback | 10 Feet
Corner Rear Setback | 10 Feet
Interior Side Setback | Residential uses 0 feet, Total side yards 5 feet, between homes 5 feet
Corner Side Setback | 10 Feet

**Rear Load**
Front Setback | 10 Feet
Interior Rear Setback | 5 Feet
Corner Rear Setback | 10 Feet
Interior Side Setback | Residential uses 0 feet, Total side yards 5 feet, between homes 5 feet
Corner Side Setback | 10 Feet

*ROW= Right of Way

8. The building height maximum is 40 Feet.

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:**
The applicant with Highland City held Open Houses on January 30, 2019 and March 27, 2019. Many residents attended both meetings and provided feedback to the Boyer Company to review.

Planning Commission and City Council had a work session on January 15, 2019 to review and discuss the Boyer's initial plans. The Boyer Group presented at City Council the updated plan after feedback from the work session and the open house on February 19, 2019.

Notice of the Planning Commission meeting was published in the Daily Herald on April 14, 2019 and posted on the state website April 11, 2019. Notification of the public hearing associated with this meeting was mailed to all property owners within 500 feet and additional subdivisions near the proposed site on March 15, 2019. No written communication has been received.

**ANALYSIS:**
*Surrounding Uses*
- The General Plan designation for this property is mixed use development. The property to the north is Lone Peak High School, to the west is Highland Glen park
and Pheasant Hollow Subdivision, to the east is Cedar Hills and other commercial businesses, and to the south is State of Utah property. The proposed development is in conformance with the General Plan and compatible with the surrounding uses.

Site Access
- Access to the commercial district will be from 4800 West and Canal Boulevard. Access to the residential district will be from Canal Boulevard, 4800 West, 10100 North, and Knight Avenue.

Open space
- The proposed development meets the recreational area requirements for the PD District for the commercial district and residential district.
- The applicant is proposing a main community park in the center of the development. Maintenance of the park will be determined if this park will be accessible to all residents of Highland or primarily for the community depending on ownership.

Architectural Design and Theme
- Each project shall include an architectural theme and standards. The proposed PD narrative provided architectural standards.
- The proposed project will also have an Architectural Review Committee to make sure these standards are being met.

Utilities
- Utilities will connect to the utilities on the perimeter of the site. Culinary Water and Pressurized Irrigation have capacity to sustain the site. Sanitary Sewer will be upgraded outside of the site and the upgraded piping will have capacity to sustain the site.

Parking and Circulation
- The applicant has parking standards for both the residential district and commercial district. Parking standards also include designated guest parking stalls.
- The traffic study will be sent to the Commission on Monday.

Landscaping
- On North County Boulevard the applicant is proposing a 29-foot parkway detail. The applicant is proposing this count towards the open space requirement.
- A tree landscape concept plan was provided for the whole development. The trees provided in the concept plan are approved trees in Highland Cities Municipal Code 2.36.160. The main community park provided a landscaping concept plan.

General
- 3-612 in the Development Code: For all nonresidential development that abuts a residential district will need to provide a 6-foot theme wall. A fence concept plan
was provided for the development. No theme wall fencing was demonstrated between the commercial flex pod and the surrounding residential pods. A stipulation has been included to address this issue.

- For residential homes in other residential zones in the development code the building height maximum is thirty-five feet. The applicant is proposing 40 feet besides the estate homes being 35 feet.

- The CR zone is the only zone in the development code that allows commercial buildings to be up to 45 feet. The other commercial zones are between 30 and 35 feet for building height maximum. The applicant is proposing 45 feet for building height maximum.

REQUIRED FINDINGS:
The following findings are required for a PD District to be approved:

1. The proposed PD is consistent with the General Plan;
2. That there are or will be adequate public facilities, including but not limited to: transportation, water, wastewater, and public safety facilities, etc.
3. The proposed PD will result in compatible land use relationships and acceptable land use with existing and planned land use in the area; and;
4. The development standards of the proposed PD are consistent with or exceed the desired quality of development for the area.

RECOMMENDATION AND PROPOSED MOTION:
The Planning Commission should hold a public hearing, review the required findings and do one of the following:

1) Make recommendation to the City Council; or
2) Continue the item to allow the applicant to address concerns raised in the staff report and in the public hearing if applicable.

If the Commission chooses to make a recommendation to the City Council, the following stipulations should be included. The Commission may also want to include additional stipulations to address any issues raised at the public hearing.

1. Development shall comply with the Ridgeview Project Plan and Narrative date stamped April 18, 2019 expect as modified by these stipulations:
2. All public improvements shall be installed as required by the City Engineer.
3. Residential Uses in the Commercial Office District shall comply with the Carriage Lots or the Flex Residential areas.
4. A theme wall shall be constructed between the residential and commercial areas.
5. The civil construction plans shall meet all requirements as determined by the City Engineer.
**FISCAL IMPACT:**
This action will not have a financial impact on this fiscal year's budget expenditure.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Vicinity Map
2. PD Narrative
This cadastral map is generated from Utah County Recorder data. It is for reference only and no liability is assumed for any inaccuracies, incorrect data or variations with an actual survey.

Date: 4/24/2019
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Ridgeview: A Highland City Planned Development

The Utah State Development Center (USDC) has long been a staple of the community in north Utah County. Many area residents feel a connection to the center, its mission, and the farmland adjacent to the center. The Boyer Company is honored to be selected by the State of Utah to manage the growth and expansion of housing, and businesses on property in Highland adjacent to the center that is owned by the State. We are sensitive to the special connection residents feel to the property. We hope to enhance, and expand the sense of connection and cohesion within the community with the development of the property.

The project on the USDC site will be called Ridgeview. The simple name is indicative of the property’s unique location on the ridge overlooking Highland Glen Park, and the Utah valley. The views from the property are one of the many unique attributes of the property. The name Ridgeview is simple and timeless.

Ridgeview is not a traditional subdivision, it is a community. Community incorporates shared experiences, and a unified sense of place. Ridgeview will add to the thriving community of Highland by providing opportunities for long time Highland residents to stay Highland, and bringing new residents and businesses to the area to experience, and help grow the wonderful community.

Highland is an active community. Ridgeview will include trails, parks, and connectivity that encourage activity and connection. A prominent feature of the community will be the monumentation and theming. Residents and community members alike will be able to easily identify the community by the monuments, and brand of Ridgeview. Like the name Ridgeview, the monuments will be timeless.

Ridgeview will feature a mix of housing types ranging from town homes, to homes constructed on large traditional lots. The mix of housing provides a diversity of residents that help create community. Housing types consist of town homes, cluster homes, carriage homes, and estate homes. These housing types, along with permissible styles and design, will be outlined in the development plan. It is important to note that the project does not allow for any high density apartment multi-family housing.
Property Overview
Ridgeview consists of approximately 118 acres of property located generally west of North County Boulevard, south of Lone Peak High School, east of Highland Glen Park, and north of the Murdock Canal trail.

Land Use Designation
The Ridgeview property is designated as Mixed use development. The requirements of the Development Code, shall apply, except where explicitly stated otherwise herein by this PD.

Approval Process
Preliminary residential approval shall be granted by both the planning commission and the city council. Final residential approval shall be granted by City Council only. Site plan for non-residential be approved administratively.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION PROPOSED OVERALL LANDUSE
PREPARED FOR THE BOYER COMPANY
HIGHLAND, UTAH
(April 16, 2019)
19-0084

PROPOSED LEGAL DESCRIPTION
Located in the SE1/4 and NE1/4 of Section 1 of Township 5 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian. Comprised of all of Parcels identified by Utah County Tax Id. Numbers 12:003:0034 & 12:004:0017 and a part of Parcel 12:0047:0018, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point N00°06'11"W 561.29 feet along the section line and S89°53'35"W 58.33 feet from the Southeast Corner of Section 1, Township 5 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence N71°57'00"W 1,018.31 feet; thence along the arc of a curve to the left with a radius of 525.00 feet a distance of 89.80 feet through a central angle of 09°48'00" Chord: N76°51'00"W 89.69 feet; thence N81°45'00"W 747.36 feet; thence along the arc of a curve to the right with a radius of 475.00 feet a distance of 242.49 feet through a central angle of 29°15'00" Chord: N67°07'30"W 239.87 feet; thence N52°30'00"W 154.35 feet; thence along the arc of a curve to the left with a radius of 525.00 feet a distance of 8.96 feet through a central angle of 00°58'40" Chord: N52°59'20"W 8.96 feet; thence N10°56'00"E 191.07 feet; thence N18°32'07"E 65.08 feet; thence N14°04'07"E 69.73 feet; thence N10°09'41"E 53.70 feet; thence N02°21'53"W 33.89 feet; thence N26°09'12"W 20.29 feet; thence N42°51'02"W 23.99 feet; thence N44°08'35"W 22.71 feet; thence N29°37'18"W 45.36 feet; thence N26°56'40"W 35.30 feet; thence N12°11'08"W 55.38 feet; thence N24°14'35"W 92.14 feet; thence N07°54'21"W 86.61 feet; thence N06°00'48"E 101.15 feet; thence N12°43'08"E 551.81 feet; thence N10°36'39"E 71.06 feet; thence N00°16'45"E 8.82 feet; thence N00°18'38"E 120.27 feet; thence N15°06'39"E 90.08 feet; thence N21°47'22"E 362.78 feet; thence N26°28'59"E 133.21 feet; thence S89°54'26"E 1,459.71 feet; thence S00°05'34"W 21.13 feet; thence S86°06'29"E 270.95 feet; thence East 65.14 feet; thence S52°50'22"E 39.12 feet; thence S00°20'49"W 598.82 feet; thence S00°00'10"E 1,309.17 feet; thence S01°20'24"E 793.93 feet to the point of beginning.

Contains: 116.95 acres+/-
Ridgeview Conceptual Master Plan
Ridgeview Development Standards

Residential Housing Types
Ridgeview features four distinct housing types. The intent of the different housing types is to provide residents of the community with various options for housing sizes, style, and price. Diversity of housing attracts different buyers, and adds to the overall vibrancy of the community. The maximum number of residential units at Ridgeview will be 699 units.

The featured housing types at Ridgeview are: estate homes, carriage homes, cluster homes, and townhomes. Below is a brief summary of the housing types. The residential bulk and intensity table below provides specific information about the housing types such as setbacks, density, height, etc.

Estate Homes
Estate homes are traditional single family detached homes on lots 7,000 square feet or larger with a minimum lot frontage of 60 feet. These homes feature larger private yards, front or side load garages, and more space between homes. See image below for an example of one possible layout of an Estate pod.

Cottage Homes
Cottage homes are traditional detached single family homes situated on individual lots with a minimum lot size of 3,500 square feet. The cottage homes live like traditional single family homes. See image below for an example of one possible layout of a Cottage pod.

*Single Family lot pods may include the following:*
- 40' wide cottage lots
- 50' wide cottage lots
- 1/4 acre estate lots
- 1/3 acre estate lots
- Single family detached homes
- Varied densities (2-8 DU/AC)

Note: Lot layout is for illustration purposes only. Actual layout is subject to change during the planning, design, and approval process.
Carriage Homes

Carriage homes consist of a mix of housing types. Examples of carriage housing types include homes with a shared driveway, twin homes, or single family homes on lots less than 35 feet wide. A hallmark of carriage homes is small side yard setbacks, and proximity to other homes. In no event shall any two homes be within five feet of each other. Below are two examples of possible layouts for a carriage pod. A carriage pod may include such uses as age targeted housing -- a housing type focused on providing floor plans and amenities attractive to individuals or couples that don’t have any children living with them.

Carriage Lot Pods may include the following:

- Single Family Detached Units
- Front porches facing streets and open spaces
- 16’ to 20’ shared driveways
- Rear and side loaded 2-car garages
- Common open spaces
- Varied densities (6-12 DU/AC)

Example rendering of carriage home pod (right) featuring four pack shared drive cluster housing and private internal roads. Note: Lot layout is for illustration purposes only. Actual layout is subject to change during the planning, design, and approval process.

Example renderings of carriage home pod (left) features rear load single family with a shared drive and private internal roads. Note: Lot layout is for illustration purposes only. Actual layout is subject to change during the planning, design, and approval process.

Carriage home streetscape example featuring rear loaded garages
Town Homes

Town homes consist of multi-family units with shared walls. Town homes can come in linear groupings of anywhere from two units to eight units. Rear and front loaded townhomes shall be allowed in the community. Each unit has its own garage, and front entrance. Below is an example of a possible layout for a townhome pod.

Townhome Pods may include the following:
- Single family attached units
- 2 to 8 unit buildings
- Front porches facing streets and open spaces
- 16’ to 20’ shared and individual driveways
- Rear and Front loaded 1-car and 2-car garages
- Common open spaces
- Varied densities (8-12 DU/AC)

Note: Lot layout is for illustration purposes only. Actual layout is subject to change during the planning, design, and approval process.

Example townhome pod layout

Example townhome streetscape along north/south connector road from high school parking lot to Canal Blvd
**Home Site Examples**

### Estate Lot
- Lot Dimensions: 60’x117’
- Area: 7,020 ft²
- Building Coverage: ±27%

### Cottage Lot
- Lot Dimensions: 40’x100’
- Area: 4,000 ft²
- Building Coverage: ±35%

### Carriage Lot (Rear Load)
- Lot Dimensions: 30’x80’
- Lot Area: 2,400 ft²
- Building Coverage: ±50%

### Carriage Lot (Front Load)
- Lot Dimensions: 30’x80’
- Area: 2,400 ft²
- Building Coverage: ±51%
• Lot Dimensions: 41’x61’
• Lot Area: 2,806 ft²
• Building Coverage: ±58%
Ridgeview will feature a prominent commercial element situated at the corner of Canal Blvd. and North County Boulevard. Commercial at this location is envisioned as neighborhood commercial consisting of in-line or stand alone retail, small to medium office, or a combination of both. The future signalized intersection on North County Blvd will create a “hard corner” with strong visibility. Entrance to the commercial is anticipated to come from Canal Blvd, with the possibility of a right in or right out to North County.
**Land Use Plan**

The land use plan for Ridgeview calls out permitted development types for certain areas, or “pods” within the community. Pods are designated as Estate, Cluster, Carriage, Flex Residential, or Flex Commercial. In addition to a specific use, each pod has a minimum and a maximum number of units that may be developed within the pod. Pod boundaries may be adjusted to accommodate different lot layouts, however the overall area of each pod designation shall not increase by more than 15% from what is shown on the land use plan. In no event shall the Estate Lot pod area be reduced by more than 5%.

**Overall Project Density:** The maximum overall density for the Ridgeview project is 699 units. In no event will any pod be allowed to exceed its maximum allowable density per acre.

- **Estate:** Pods may consist of 2 to 4 units to the acre.
- **Cottage:** Pods may consist of 4 to 10 units to the acre.
- **Carriage:** Pods may consist of 6 to 12 units to the acre.
- **Residential Flex:** Pods may consist of carriage, cluster, or townhome products. In no event shall density exceed 12 units to the acre. No high density apartments shall be permitted in this pod.
- **Commercial Flex:** Pod shall consist of commercial uses per the commercial bulk and intensity table. Commercial pod at Ridgeview will likely feature neighborhood commercial, consisting of a mix of retail, office, or institutional uses.

Should institutional uses such as a church or school be required in the project, they can be incorporated into any of the residential or commercial pods.

The residential bulk and intensity table below specifies density, setbacks, height and other requirements for different housing types.
Actual project density will not exceed 699 dwelling units.

Bubble diagram layout, density calculations, and open space areas are for illustration purposes only. Final master plan is subject to change during the planning, design, and approvals process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Townhomes Pods (Pods 2, 5)</th>
<th>Carriage (Pods 1, 2, 5, 6, 9)</th>
<th>Cottage (Pods 2, 5, 10)</th>
<th>Estate (Pods 11, 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Lot Size</strong></td>
<td>Attached, Stacked, or Clustered Units with Density Controlling Number of Units</td>
<td>Attached, Stacked, or Clustered Units with Density Controlling Number of Units</td>
<td>Attached, Stacked, or Clustered Units with Density Controlling Number of Units</td>
<td>3,500 sq ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max Units/Acre</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Lot Width</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>30’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Front Yard</strong></td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>12’ to any public ROW, 5’ to adjacent homes, 2’ to adjacent shared driveways or private ROWs</td>
<td>15’</td>
<td>10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Rear Yard</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12’ to any public ROW, 5’ to adjacent homes, 2’ to adjacent shared driveways or private ROWs</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Rear Yard</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12’ to any public ROW, 5’ to adjacent homes, 2’ to adjacent shared driveways or private ROWs</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Side Yard</strong></td>
<td>Residential Uses 0 ft. Total Side Yards Not Less than 5’ All buildings to be a minimum of 5 ft between homes</td>
<td>Residential Uses 0 ft. Total Side Yards Not Less than 5’ All buildings to be a minimum of 5 ft between homes</td>
<td>Residential Uses 0 ft. Total Side Yards Not Less than 5’ All buildings to be a minimum of 5 ft between homes</td>
<td>5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Side Yard</strong></td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>Residential Uses 0 ft. Total Side Yards Not Less than 5’ All buildings to be a minimum of 5 ft between homes</td>
<td>Residential Uses 0 ft. Total Side Yards Not Less than 5’ All buildings to be a minimum of 5 ft between homes</td>
<td>15’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td>Shall not exceed 40’</td>
<td>Shall not exceed 40’</td>
<td>Shall not exceed 40’</td>
<td>Shall not exceed 40’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Lot Coverage</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As measured from the highest point on the top back of curb along the lot frontage*
### Commercial Flex Bulk & Intensity Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flex Commercial Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Lot Area</strong></td>
<td>No minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Lot Width/Frontage</strong></td>
<td>No minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Front Yard &amp; Corner Yard</strong></td>
<td>No minimum requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Rear Yard</strong></td>
<td>As allowed by IBC and must recognize any easements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Side Yard</strong></td>
<td>As allowed by IBC and must recognize any easements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Living Area Per Residential Unit</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Building Height Occupied Structure</strong></td>
<td>45’ (City council shall have the ability to approve buildings in excess of 45’ in height)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Building Height of Unoccupied Structure</strong></td>
<td>45’ (City council shall have the ability to approve buildings in excess of 45’ in height)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Dwelling Units per Acre</strong></td>
<td>Refer to Land Use Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Open Space Requirement</strong></td>
<td>10% of net developable area as defined in Open Space section of this document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transition of Use**

Any property within the Commercial Flex pod that is undeveloped, or vacant after eight years from the approval date of the Planned Development Zone by the Highland City Council for Ridgeview may be transitioned at the election of the developer to Residential Flex, with a maximum density of 12 units per acre. Any density in excess of 12 units per acre must be approved by the Highland City Council.
Table of Uses

Ridgeview shall adhere to the following permitted, conditional, and prohibited uses.

Permitted Uses:

- Accessory uses which are customary and incidental to the principal use of the property.
- Apparel, new and used
- Antiques, crafts, and collectible sales
- Art galleries and art studios
- Bakeries - Retail and wholesale and manufacturing not to exceed 50% of gross leasable area
- Education learning centers (i.e. Sylvan Learning Center)
- Financial institutions
- Fitness centers
- Indoor recreational facilities
- Laundry, cleaning, and dry cleaning establishments
- Personal services such as barber, beauty shops, copy shops, mail shops, tanning salons, shoe repair, and tailor shops
- Professional, administrative, business, and medical offices
- Restaurants, including drive through restaurants
- Retail sales of new merchandise
- Repair services such as, but not limited to small appliances, bicycles, watches, musical instruments, and similar items.
- Sporting goods equipment rental, sales, and service.

Conditional Uses:

- Gas station and convenience stores
- Minor auto repair including lubrication, tire sales, engine tune-up, washing and polishing, brakes, muffler and maintenance of other similar accessories. This use does not include automotive painting and body repair, or transmission repair. All repair areas must be within an enclosed building. Service bays shall be screened with rollup doors from view from public streets.

The following uses shall be prohibited in the commercial zone at Ridgeview:

- Thrift stores
- Pawn shops
- Sexually oriented businesses
- Any use not expressly permitted above

All uses not specifically provided for herein are prohibited, unless approved by the City Council.
Phasing Plan

Ridgeview will consist of multiple phases of development, and we anticipate building out the project over several years. Each phase has been broken out into several sub-phases to allow for flexibility in the development of the property. We anticipate starting with Phase 1 and ending with Phase 6, but there may be some deviation in phasing in order to adjust to market demand. We anticipate the commercial will be the last phase of the site to develop, as development of surrounding residential will help facilitate demand for the commercial. This phasing plan is based on a conceptual layout that is subject to change, which would affect the planned phasing.
Ridgeview Design Guidelines

Residential Architectural Design Guidelines

Estate Homes Design Standards

**Housing Type:** Single Family Estate Lots  
**Orientation:** Front load or side load garages
Exterior Materials: Stone, brick, masonry or fiber cement composite siding or approved similar by the Architectural Review Committee (“ARC”), stucco, metal (accent material only), concrete (accent material only).

Single Material: No more than 40% of homes on estate lots can be a single material. Permissible materials for a single-material home are brick, rock, or masonry or fiber cement composite or approved similar. Remaining 60% of homes on estate lots shall have at least three materials on the exterior of the homes. Permissible exterior materials are stone, brick, stucco, or accent material listed above.

Window Treatment: All windows should have framed-in wood, composite board, brick, stone or stucco trim that is a minimum of four (4) inches in width.

Colors: Natural earth tones – greys, tans, browns, soft blue, whites, reds, greens with accent colors as approved by the ARC.

Height: Maximum height of two stories or 35 feet as measured from the top back of curb.

Roof: Roof pitches between 4:12 and 12:12 excluding porches and awnings which can have a minimum pitch of 3:12. The ARC may approve a roof pitch of 1:12 or greater for modern/contemporary homes.

Front Porch: Each home shall have a minimum front porch requirement of 50 square feet with a minimum depth of five feet.

Repetition: No identical elevation within two lots on either side of the home, or the three lots directly across the street. For purposes of clarification, homes with the same floorplan and different exterior elevations are not subject to the repetition requirement so long as the exteriors are noticeably different from each other in design.

Accessory Structures: Accessory structures shall be permitted on lots within Estate Home pods per existing city ordinance for R-1-20 accessory structures with the following changes: An accessory building may not cover more than 10% of total gross lot area, side and rear setback shall be 8 feet.

Swimming Pools: All pools shall be constructed in accordance with existing ordinance for R-1-20. No above ground permanent or semi-permanent pools shall be permitted.

Home Style: Each home shall identify a style from the residential stylebook and incorporate at least 50% of the key characteristics outlined for the chosen style.

Architectural Review: Each home design (plan, elevation, colors, and materials) shall be reviewed by the ARC prior to submittal for building permit to the City.
Cottage Home Design Standards

**Housing Type:** Single Family Cottage Lots  
**Orientation:** Front Load
Exterior Materials: Stone, brick, masonry or fiber cement composite siding or approved similar by the ARC, stucco, metal (accent material only), concrete (accent material only)

Single Material: No more than 40% of homes on estate lots can be a single material. Permissible materials for a single-material home are brick, rock, or masonry or fiber cement composite or approved similar. Remaining 60% of homes on estate lots shall have at least three materials on the exterior of the homes. Permissible exterior materials are stone, brick, stucco, or accent material listed above.

Window Treatment: All windows should have framed-in wood, composite board, brick, stone or stucco trim that is a minimum of four (4) inches in width.

Colors: Natural earth tones – greys, tans, browns, soft blue, whites, reds, greens with accent colors as approved by the ARC.

Height: Maximum height of two stories or 40 feet as measured from the top back of curb.

Roof: Roof pitches between 4:12 and 12:12 excluding porches and awnings which can have a minimum pitch of 3:12. The ARC may approve a roof pitch of 1:12 or greater for modern/contemporary style homes.

Front Porch: Each home shall have a minimum front porch requirement of 50 square feet with a minimum depth of five feet.

Repetition: No identical elevation within two lots on either side of the home, or the three lots directly across the street. For purposes of clarification, homes with the same floorplan and different exterior elevations are not subject to the repetition requirement so long as the exteriors are noticeably different from each other in design.

Swimming Pools: All pools shall be constructed in accordance with existing ordinance for R-1-20. With the exception of the following changes: rear and side yard setback shall be 8’. No above ground permanent or semi-permanent pools shall be permitted.

Home Style: Each home shall identify a style from the residential stylebook and shall incorporate at least 50% of the key characteristics outlined for the chosen style.

Architectural Review: Each home design (plan, elevation, colors, and materials) shall be reviewed by the ARC prior to submittal for building permit to the City.
Carriage Home Design Standards

**Housing Type:** Single Family, Twin Homes, Clustered homes with shared driveway

**Orientation:** Front load, rear load, and clustered

Parking:
**Exterior Materials:** Stone, brick, masonry or fiber cement composite siding or approved similar by the ARC, stucco, metal (accent material only), concrete (accent material only)

**Single Material:** No more than 40% of homes on estate lots can be a single material. Permissible materials for a single-material home are brick, rock, or masonry or fiber cement composite or approved similar. Remaining 60% of homes on estate lots shall have at least three materials on the exterior of the homes. Permissible exterior materials are stone, brick, stucco, or accent material listed above.

**Window Treatment:** All windows should have framed-in wood, composite board, brick, stone or stucco trim that is a minimum of four (4) inches in width.

**Colors:** Natural earth tones – greys, tans, browns, soft blue, whites, reds, greens with accent colors as approved by the ARC.

**Height:** Maximum of two stories or 40 feet as measured from the top back of curb.

**Roof:** Roof pitches between 5:12 and 12:12 excluding porches and awnings which can have a minimum pitch of 3:12. The ARC may approve a roof pitch of 1:12 or greater for modern/contemporary homes.

**Front Porch:** Each home shall have a minimum front porch requirement of 35 square feet with a minimum depth of five feet.

**Repetition:** No identical elevation within four lots on either side of the home. For purposes of clarification, homes with the same floorplan and different exterior elevations are not subject to the repetition requirement so long as the exteriors are noticeably different from each other in design.

**Home Style:** Each home shall select a style from the residential stylebook and shall incorporate at least 50% of the key characteristics outlined for the chosen style.

**Architectural Review:** Each home design (plan, elevation, colors, and materials) shall be reviewed by the ARC to submittal for building permit to the City.
Townhome Design Standards

**Housing Type:** Townhomes  
**Orientation:** Front Load and Rear Load, Cluster  
**Driveway:** Minimum driveway length of 5’. Driveway on front and rear townhomes shall be measured from the back of curb to the garage door.
Exterior Materials: Stone, brick, masonry or fiber cement composite siding or approved similar by the ARC, stucco, metal (accent material only), concrete (accent material only)

Single Material: No more than 40% of townhomes can be a single material. Permissible materials for a single material home are brick, rock, or masonry or fiber cement composite or approved similar. Remaining 60% of townhomes shall consist of a combination of at least two of the specified exterior materials (not including accent materials).

Window Treatment: All windows should have framed-in wood, composite board, brick, stone or stucco trim that is a minimum of four (4) inches in width.

Colors: Natural earth tones – greys, tans, browns, soft blue, whites, reds, greens, with accent colors as approved by the ARC.

Height: 40 feet for all townhomes as measured from the top back of curb.

Roof: Roof pitches between 4:12 and 12:12 excluding porches and awnings which can have a minimum pitch of 3:12. The ARC may approve a roof pitch of 1:12 or greater for modern/contemporary style homes.

Repetition: No identical buildings (set of attached townhomes) shall be placed next to each other.

Home Style: Each home shall select a style from the residential stylebook and shall incorporate at least 50% of the key characteristics outlined for the chosen style.

Architectural Review: Each home design (plan, elevation, colors, and materials) shall be reviewed by the ARC prior to submittal for building permit to the City.
Residential Stylebook

Colonial

Key Characteristics:

- Typically two story.

- Symmetrical front elevation with centered front door.

- Divided light windows centered on both sides of the front door.

- Medium pitched roof running parallel to the street with gables on each end.

- Classically inspired entry portico, decorative pediment, crown molding, or other ornamentation above the door.

- Horizontal siding, straight lines throughout the building.
Contemporary/Modern

Key Characteristics:

- Typically two story.
- Highlighted front door with vertical elements, or roof overhangs.
- Typically includes large windows.
- Low pitched hip, flat, or shed roof.
- Strong sense of entry from the street.
- Horizontal or vertical siding, stucco, brick or cut stone with clean forms.

Blend of classic and modern elements and materials.

Clean forms.
Cottage

Key Characteristics:

- Asymmetrical front elevation.

- Gabled, enclosed entry, Doors and/or entry may be half-rounded or arched.

- Windows are often tall and narrow with small panes.

- Roof is typically steeply pitched, cross-gabled.

- Exterior materials typically include brick, stone, or stucco siding with accents of fiber cement board.
Craftsman

Key Characteristics:

- Decorative beams or braces under gables.
- Windows with divided panes in upper sash and a single pane in lower sash.
- Roof is low pitched, hipped or gabled with wide eave overhangs and exposed rafters.
- Exterior materials typically include horizontal siding, stone, shingles and stucco.
- Medium to large front porches with heavy square or tapered columns that may be full length or resting on a base that is dressed with stone or stucco.

Exposed beams and shingle siding.

Substantial covered porch with dormer above.

Complex roof lines, exposed beams and covered porch.
Farmhouse/Country

Key Characteristics

- Large front porches or wrap-around porch with a decorative porch railing.

- Gable roof with medium to steep roof pitch. Can also be cross-gabled with second floor dormer windows. Main gable runs parallel to the street.

- Symmetrical windows, often with shutters.

- Exterior materials typically include horizontal siding, stone and metal.
Prairie

Key Characteristics:

- Two story homes. Have one-story windows or porches.
- Symmetrical or Asymmetrical front elevation with strong layered, horizontal appearance.
- Exposed rafters and beams.
- Broad eaves and substantial covered porches.
- Ornamental window clusters and clerestory windows are common.
- Stucco, brick, stone and horizontal siding exteriors
- Lines and elements with strong horizontal emphasis.
- Low-pitched roof, usually hipped.
Parking Requirements

Private Parking: Each multi-family unit will require two stalls of private parking. Private parking is allowed in garages, private driveways, or private designated parking stalls.

Private Driveway Guest Parking: If a multi-family unit does not use the driveway for its required two stalls of private parking and, provides the driveway as two guest parking stalls then no additional guest parking is required for said unit of multi-family housing.

Additional Guest Parking: If a multi-family unit does not provide two guest parking stalls in the driveway then additional guest parking stalls are required at a ratio of one stall per four multi-family units.

Note: The minimum allowable stall size is 18’ long and 8’ wide. All driveways less than 18’ long are not allowed to be used for private or guest parking. All driveways less than 16’ wide can only be used as one stall.

Commercial Parking:
Retail, personal service, and repair businesses: 5.0 per 1,000 square feet
Medical and dental office and clinics: 4.0 per 1,000 square feet
Other professional and business offices, including financial: 4.0 per 1,000 square feet

Residential Landscape
Front yard landscaping for residential homes shall be installed within 6 months of occupancy. If occupancy occurs during winter months, landscaping shall be completed as soon as weather allows for installation of landscaping in the spring. Rear yard landscape shall be installed within one year of occupancy. All residential landscaping shall include street trees per the street tree plan.

Homeowners Association
The residential dwellings at Ridgeview will have a Homeowners Association (HOA) responsible for coordination of maintenance of the main park, and open space areas. All homeowners in the project will pay dues to the HOA to cover the costs associated with these amenities. Specific pods of cluster and town home housing may have a sub-HOA, or benefitted parcel, which assesses dues in addition to the base dues mentioned above in order to provide services, and maintain open space or amenities benefitting the specific cluster or town home pod.

Architectural Review Committee
The developer and the HOA management company will work together to form an Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to review the plans, elevations, materials, and colors for homes to be constructed at Ridgeview. The ARC will ensure compliance of plans to the architectural design guidelines. Highland City may also conduct its own review of building plans to ensure architectural compliance. It is preferable for a builder to submit information regarding the various floorplans in a packet consisting of all anticipated floorplans to be built in a specific pod, or neighborhood.
Commercial Architectural Design Guidelines

Theme and Unity
The planning and design character within Ridgeview is for a mixed-use district including a harmonious mix of commercial retail/restaurant, office that ties to the surrounding residential uses. The area shall be organized around compatible architectural building statements in terms of character, materials, texture and color of buildings.

Commercial Retail Buildings
The Commercial Retail building type is allowed in the Ridgeview Commercial Flex pod and is designed for small and moderate scale commercial, office, retail, and restaurants. The building type provides convenient automobile access from the roads. Commercial retail buildings may be freestanding structures intended for use by a single tenant or may be multi-tenant buildings. Commercial retail buildings are typically in a multiple-building development, or on outparcels adjacent to large format retail buildings. The layout, orientation, setbacks, and materials intended for use for commercial retail buildings are regulated above in the Commercial Flex Bulk and Intensity table.

Orientation
New commercial retail buildings will be oriented to enhance pedestrian access and customer experience and connected pedestrian pathways within the development.

Materials
Primary materials shall consist of glass, integral color CMU, metal panel, tile, metal, cementitious fiber board, or materials of similar quality and durability. EIFS may be used up to 75 percent of non-glass areas.

Primary Facades
Primary facades on structures using the commercial retail building form shall incorporate a building canopy, awning, or similar weather protection along the building’s principal public entrance.
Side and Rear Loading and Service Areas

Loading, service, and equipment areas shall be located in a manner that minimizes their visual impact from drive approaches and streets. Loading, service, and equipment areas shall be screened through the use of architectural elements, landscaping, and materials that reduce their visibility.

Drive Through Facilities

Drive through facilities may include a canopy or roof. Any canopy or roof shall be architecturally integrated with the building, and mirror the roof form of the primary structure.

Sign Standards

Signage shall comply with the requirements of the Highland Municipal Code, except as provided for in this section and in the exhibits. Internally illuminated cabinet wall signs are conditionally permitted, except shall be permitted to display a logo or individual alphanumeric characters.

Street Furnishings, Lighting and Fixtures. Ridgeview Commercial Flex pod will include high-quality street furnishings, lighting, and fixtures.

District Parking and Access Standards. Parking and access requirements established in Highland City code, unless indicated otherwise as follows. Pedestrian access within the development shall be provided by pedestrian pathways connecting parking lots, public rights of way, principal public entrances of each building, and adjacent public trails and transit.
Example Commercial Elevations
Ridgeview Open Space & Recreation

Monumentation: Style and location
The monumentation and theming for Ridgeview will be a blend of historic and modern design concepts and materials, which will be used throughout the community for features such as monument signs, wayfinding signage, lighting, site furnishings, raised planters, and site walls. Materials for the monumentation and theming will generally include, but not be limited to brick, concrete, and steel. These proposed materials are durable, historically relevant and readily available, and through a variety of color combinations they will be used to create a cohesive exterior theme throughout the community.

Example of the primary monument feature

Example of secondary monument feature

Primary Entry Monument Location
Secondary Entry Monument Location
**Open Space Narrative**

For the residential developments, 20% open space of the net developable area shall be provided. The net developable area does not include public or private road right-of-way. Open space is defined as public and private open areas that can be used to congregate, play, recreate, or exercise. Open space areas may include but are not exclusive to parks, tot lots, contiguous grass areas over 5,000 square feet in size, trail corridors (including trails along roadways), the 29’ parkway landscape buffer along North County Blvd which shall be measured from the back of curb, swimming pools, club house outdoor areas, tennis and pickleball courts, basketball courts, and front yard corridors in the carriage and townhome pods. The residential 20% open space requirement must be met for the overall residential net area and any open spaces within one pod can count towards meeting the total 20% requirement.

For the commercial developments, 10% open space of the net developable area is required. The net developable area does not include public or private road right-of-way. Commercial open space is defined as any and all landscaped area within the commercial development. This includes landscaping around the perimeter of buildings, parking islands, and along adjacent street buffers outside of the public or private right-of-way.

**Park Layout and Features**

Ridgeview will feature a park in the center of the development that serves as the epicenter for activity within the community. The north side of the park will connect to a widened 8’ trail in the parkstrip that connects back to the Murdock canal trail. We will also provide a breezeway on the adjacent to the Highland Glen Park on the west side of the community so that residents will have easy access to the park.

The centrally located park will feature multiple amenities. The proposed amenities include: Playground, pergola/pavilion, four benches, one half court basketball court, and two pickleball courts.

---

**Note:** Individual carriage pods will feature pod specific landscape and open space areas. These pods may include amenities specific to the pod, such as a tot lot, or a pavilion or gathering area.
**Park Installation**

Construction of the park must be started at such time as 45% of homes in the project have received certificate of occupancy from Highland City. The park must be completed within one year of commencement. The developer shall have the right to commence construction of the park at any point prior to this benchmark if so desired.

**Open Space Maintenance**

The parks at Ridgeview will be privately owned and maintained. If the main park located in the center of the community at Ridgeview is opened to the larger community of Highland, the developer and the City may discuss assignment of the maintenance of the park to the City.
There are four types of walls and fences proposed at Ridgeview, as indicated on the Wall Plan.

**Type 1 Wall**
A private or semi-private, six-foot solid wall that will be constructed along the backs of residential pods that are adjacent to North County Boulevard. This wall type will comply with Highland City’s design standards and may also include materials that are consistent with monumentation and theming elements; such as masonry columns and panels, masonry columns and decorative metal panels, pre-cast concrete columns and panels, or split-face block with pre-cast concrete caps. Pre-cast concrete wall types may include a stamped pattern and decorative colors. At street intersections, the wall height should be lowered from six feet to three feet within twenty five feet of the intersecting street right-of-way line for increased sight distance. This wall type will be constructed as a part of the overall phasing sequence proposed by the master developer. In residential areas along North County Blvd the wall shall be constructed 29’ from the back of curb on the UDOT roadway.
Type 2 Wall
A private or semi-private, six-foot solid wall that will be constructed along the backs of residential lots adjacent to Cedar Hills Drive. This wall type will complement the Type 1 walls and may also include materials that are consistent with monumentation and theming elements; such as masonry columns and panels, masonry columns and decorative metal panels, pre-cast concrete columns and panels, or split-face block with pre-cast concrete caps. Pre-cast concrete wall types may include a stamped pattern and decorative colors. At street intersections, the wall height should be lowered from six feet to three feet within twenty five feet of the intersecting street right-of-way line for increased sight distance. This wall type will be constructed as a part of the overall phasing sequence proposed by the master developer.

Type 3 Fence
A private or semi-private decorative fencing that will be constructed along the backs of residential lots adjacent to Knight Boulevard, and along the backs of residential lots and residential pods adjacent to the Murdock Canal Trails. This fence type will be a six-foot, solid fence with materials selected from an approved list of fencing types. Generally this type of fence will be constructed by home builders as lots and residential units are built along Knight Boulevard and Murdock Canal Trails, therefore Type 3 fencing is not included in the master developer’s phasing sequence. The intent is for the fencing in the location specified above to be consistent, and match.

Type 4 Fence
Suggested to be a split-rail fence with a maximum height of four feet. This fencing is located in the front of homes and due to the fact that it is in the front of homes it shall be optional. If the master developer or builder elects to install this fence, it will be located along the right-of-way lines for the main north/south collector road and Canal Boulevard. Materials for this type of fence will be selected from an approved list of fencing types.
Street Tree Plan

Street trees are vital to community maturity and long term livability at Ridgeview. We prepared guidelines for tree types to be planted on each street within the community. If the alignment of streets changes, it is still anticipated that the streets will feature trees. The trees will be spaced at 30 feet on center and will be at least 1.5 inch caliper trees at planting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECIDUOUS TREES</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>CONTAINER</th>
<th>QTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE CAM</td>
<td>A. campestris ‘Metro Gold’</td>
<td>Metro Gold Hedge Maple</td>
<td>1.5&quot; Cal.</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE GRI</td>
<td>A. griseum Fireburst</td>
<td>Paperbark Maple</td>
<td>1.5&quot; Cal.</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA PEN</td>
<td>F. pennsylvanica ‘Patmore’</td>
<td>‘Patmore’ Ash</td>
<td>1.5&quot; Cal.</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOE PAN</td>
<td>K. paniculata</td>
<td>Golden Rain Tree</td>
<td>1.5&quot; Cal.</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU BLI</td>
<td>P. x Israeliana</td>
<td>Pink Flowering Plum</td>
<td>1.5&quot; Cal.</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example rendering looking east at typical park strip on the east side of the connector road from Lone Peak high school to Canal Blvd. Townhome product shown in the background.

Example rendering looking west at oversized park strip and trail on the west side of connector road from Lone Peak High School to Canal Blvd. Carriage product featured in the background.
Ridgeview Utilities and Infrastructure

Introduction

Sanitary Sewer: Sanitary sewer service for this development comes from an existing 8” sewer main that runs along the north and west boundaries of the development. The Sanitary Sewer exhibits show the anticipated connection location to the existing sewer and the proposed 8” sewer line that will run along the southern boundary of the development. We anticipate all sewer for the development to connect to this proposed line. Off-site sewer improvements needed for this project (see Sanitary Sewer exhibits pgs. 53-54) will be designed and constructed by Highland City and reimbursed through the impact fees collected with this development.

Storm Drain: Because there is no storm drain outfall for this development, the use of inlet sumps for storm water collection is being proposed. Stormwater design will be required to follow the Highland City standards for design and construction (see Storm Drain exhibit pg. 55).

Culinary Water: There are two existing 8” water lines that can provide water service to the development. There is also an off-site 12” waterline that will be required after a certain number of building permits are allowed. This number of building permits will be determined by an overall water model for the development. All of the internal waterline sizes will be sized based on this internal water model that will be required with the preliminary plan submittal. Offsite water improvements needed for this project will be designed and constructed by Highland City or the developer and reimbursed through the impact fees collected with this development (see Culinary Water exhibits pgs. 56-57).

Pressurized Irrigation: The pressurized irrigation design will require to connect the existing 8” line to the 24” C.U.P. line with a proposed 12” line along with the installation of a master meter. The development will connect to the proposed 12” pressurized irrigation line to provide service for the development. A model will be required with preliminary design to determine pipe sizes for the pressurized irrigation lines within the development. Offsite irrigation improvements needed for this project will be designed and constructed by Highland City and reimbursed through the impact fees collected with the development (see Pressurized Irrigation exhibit pg. 58).

Note: All proposed roadway and utility lines as shown in the exhibits are conceptual. Final alignments will be determined at final design.
Street Plan: Master-planned Roads
Street Cross Sections

Notes:
1. Private roadways and shared driveways may use asphalt or concrete and are not required to have curb and gutter. These sections show minimum total widths of hard surface, but the hard surfaces may vary.
2. The 20' Private Dead-End Street section is not designed for emergency vehicle access and has a maximum length of 150'.
3. Developer will not be required to reimburse cost for 34' of existing asphalt on Cedar Hills Drive.
Sanitary Sewer

LEGEND

EXISTING SEWER

PROPOSED SEWER

PROPOSED 8” SEWER. SEWER SERVICE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT WILL COME FROM THIS PROPOSED SEWER MAIN. EXACT ALIGNMENT TO BE DETERMINED AT FINAL DESIGN.
Offsite Sanitary Sewer
Storm Drain
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Offsite Culinary Water
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The regular meeting of the Highland City Planning Commission was called to order by Planning Commission Chair Christopher Kemp at 7:00 PM on March 26, 2019. An invocation was offered by Commissioner Jones and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Commissioner Abbott.

**PRESENT:**
- Commissioner: Chairman Christopher Kemp
- Commissioner: Jerry Abbott
- Commissioner: Tim Ball
- Commissioner: Brittney Bills
- Commissioner: Ron Campbell
- Commissioner: Claude Jones
- Commissioner: Audrey Wright

**EXCUSED:**
- Commissioner: Sherry Carruth

**STAFF PRESENT:**
- Mayor: Rod Mann
- Community Development Director: Nathan Crane
- Planner: Tara Tannahill
- Planning Coordinator: JoAnn Scott
- Planning Commission Secretary: Heather White

**OTHERS:**
- See attached attendance list

**PUBLIC APPEARANCES**

Commissioner Kemp asked for public comment. None were offered.

**CONTINUANCIES AND WITHDRAWALS**

1. **SP-19-02 & CU-19-02**

   Highland Hideaway Storage is requesting approval of a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for a flex office use building located approximately at 11251 N. Sunset Drive.

   **MOTION:** Commissioner Campbell moved to continue items SP-19-02 and CU-19-02 to the April 30th meeting. Commissioner Ball seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.
PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

2. PP-19-01

Millhaven Development is requesting approval of a Preliminary Plat for a 10-lot subdivision known as Spring Creek Subdivision. The property is located approximately at 10029 N 6300 W.

Commissioner Kemp opened the public hearing at 7:04 PM.

Ms. Tannahill reviewed the history of the property and details of the application. She mentioned that the city originally owned the property and intended to develop it as a park. In November 2018 it was decided to surplus the property for residential development. The property was sold to Millhaven Development in January 2019 for $1,915,000, and the proceeds generated from the sell will be utilized for development of the Mountain Ridge Park property and for major park construction repair projects. Ms. Tannahill explained that the proposed development included 10 single-family residential building lots.

Commissioner Kemp asked for public comment.

Resident Katherine Shram wondered what would be done with the irrigation ditch on the north side of the development and why the park was on the south rather than the north. Mr. Crane said the city’s plan was to pipe the ditch. He explained that there was a small chance the ditch could be abandoned if no one downstream used it. Mr. Crane explained that the park naturally moved to the south when the city first worked with surrounding neighborhoods and tried to meet requests to line up roads and not impact existing houses. Ms. Shram thought the ditch needed to be piped, but not destroyed because it was an important part of drainage to the southwest. She explained that there was a permanent easement on the south side of the irrigation ditch which provided access to private property. She wondered if it would be changed. Mr. Crane mentioned that staff needed to investigate the matter, but it would be maintained if it was existing. Ms. Shram wondered if there would be a parking lot and if competitive sports would be played at the park. Ms. Crane mentioned that it was a neighborhood park and would not have a parking lot. He said no competitive sports were planned for this location.

Mr. Kelly Sobotka voiced appreciation to the city for working with neighbors. He was concerned with the length of the park. He wondered if fencing was part of the plan. Ms. Tannahill explained that the developer would provide a 6-foot masonry fence along the rear property line and that it was permitted because it was over 40 feet. Mr. Sobotka had concerns with a 6-foot cement wall on three sides of the park.

Mr. Tyrell Grey, Millhaven Development, mentioned that they would do a concrete wall in the back at the city’s request. He said they had four different fencing designs for the city to choose from. He pointed out that the developer wanted to make the park very nice and make it look aesthetically pleasing as much as they could. He said they wanted the whole development to have access to the park so there was a meandering trail planned between two homes with landscaping on both sides and an open railing to separate it from the homes. He explained that
most Highland residents preferred having a nice stamped concrete wall. Mr. Crane explained that
the city preferred solid fencing. He said open fencing had created issues in other locations.

Ms. Shram mentioned that she and her neighbors had animal rights. She wondered if the new lots
would also have animal rights. She was concerned about new neighbors complaining.
Commissioner Kemp said she would not be made to give up animal rights because she was there
first. He asked the developer to communicate with buyers that the surrounding neighborhood had
animal rights. Mr. Grey mentioned that two buyers interested in the larger lots both want
animals. He said it would be part of the CC&Rs and written on the plat.

Commissioner Kemp asked for additional comments or questions. Hearing none, he called for a
motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Abbott moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval for
the Spring Creek Subdivision Preliminary Plat with the following four stipulations recommended
by staff and one additional stipulation:

1. The final plat shall be in substantial conformance with the preliminary plat received
   March 14, 2019.
2. All signage shall require a separate permit and comply with the development code.
3. Final civil engineering plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The
   site shall meet all requirements of the City Engineer.
4. Prior to council consideration, reports and plans shall be reviewed by staff.
5. Animal rights on neighboring lots should be stated on the plat.

Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried
unanimously.

3. CU-19-04
The City of Highland is requesting a conditional use permit for 2.32 acres of park known
as Spring Creek Park located at approximately at 10029 N 6300 W.

Ms. Tannahill reviewed the details of the proposed park. She explained that a masonry fence
would be along properties that abut the park. She said access would be from Mountain View
Drive and that a walking path would be between lots 7 and 8. She explained that a concept plan
for the park proposed two pavilions, two swing sets, four park benches, one playground, a grass
field, and a walking path. Ms. Tannahill mentioned that the city was paying for the park, would
provide culinary and pressurized irrigation water shares, and was responsible to maintain
landscaping.

Commissioner Kemp opened the public hearing at 7:26 PM and asked for public comment.

Resident Michael Burns asked a question about the cost of the park. Mr. Crane explained that the
city already owned the park property.
Commissioner Kemp closed the public hearing at 7:27 PM and called for a motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Campbell moved that the Planning Commissioner accept the findings and recommend approval of the conditional use permit for the Spring Creek Park subject to the following four stipulations recommended by staff.

1. The final plat shall be in substantial conformance with the concept plan and plat received March 14, 2019.
2. All signage shall require a separate permit and comply with the development code.
3. Final civil engineering plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The site shall meet all requirements of the city Engineer.
4. Prior to council consideration, reports and plans shall be received by staff.

Commissioner Abbott seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

4. PD-19-01

Andrew Simonsen is requesting rezoning to allow residential and nonresidential mixed-use development under the Planned Development (PD) District. The property is approximately 2.85 acres and is located east of 10272 N 4800 W.

Commissioner Kemp opened the public hearing at 7:28 PM.

Ms. Tannahill explained that the current zoning was R-1-40 but Highland’s General Land Use map showed mixed use development. She said 10 acres was required for a PD district, but it was mixed use in the General plan and staff determined that it was an appropriate zone for the property. She said an original concept plan was received on March 18, 2019 with 9.27 units per acre. A new concept plan was received today with changes based on staff and fire marshal comments.

Michael Brodsky with Hamlet Development said they built similar developments over the last 25 years. He reviewed demographics of customers in similar developments. He said the newly submitted concept plan was in full compliance with the PD zone. He reviewed architecture and said two different floor plans were proposed. An HOA would be responsible for private streets, improvements, maintenance of common areas, landscaping front and rear, and snow removal.

Developer Greg Zenger explained that he would build the commercial part of the development on 4800 West. He thought the location was advantageous for high school students because they anticipated 2 or 3 different sandwich shops/fast food. He talked about possibly having a hair shop, tanning, and nail salon to fill in the other spaces.

Resident Rebecca Kaylor said she lived directly behind the 2-story assisted living center and saw first hand how development impacted residential area. She talked about the Allerton’s and the impact on equity to homes. She said they had many windows from the center and lights in their windows. She talked about remodeling their home and changing the bedroom to have privacy. She urged the Planning Commissioners to consider unintended consequences. She talked about...
the development code and minimizing impact on existing development. She thought the city
would more than double the impact on the existing homes. She talked about traffic and the
difficulty of getting in and out of the neighborhood. Ms. Kaylor mentioned that school buses
were not allowed to go into their neighborhood. She said elementary school and junior high kids
had to walk along driveways and travel through two neighborhoods to catch a bus. She thought
excess parking in the neighborhood would be an issue. She also voiced concern with lighting and
safety on the path for high school students to get to the only lighted school crosswalk. She was
concerned that the code required 10 acres for a PD zone, increased traffic with a strip mall,
safety of children, trash, and roaming children without adult supervision. She was concerned
about piecemealing the development of the area and suggested developing the area as a whole.
Ms. Kaylor didn’t think the high density residential should be accessed through the existing
residential neighborhood.

Resident Brett Burns was concerned with traffic, consistency in development, property values,
and safety for kids walking to school. He acknowledged that the property would be developed
someday but hoped the city would consider something similar to the existing neighborhood. He
said referred to the development code and talked about creating something relative to the design
and scale of the surrounding area. He thought the proposed development did not meet the
criteria. Mr. Burns read a letter submitted by David Royster who was out of town and could not
attend the meeting. Mr. Royster’s concerns were regarding safety, traffic, and high school kids
walking to school.

Resident Sandra Hadlock said she was at the meeting on behalf of her husband who sent a letter
and could not attend the meeting. She said his biggest concern was the 10 acres required in the
PD zone and asked for clarification. Other concerns were safety, increase in traffic and parking,
snow and garbage removal, and the HOA. She wondered if enough fees would be collected to
keep the HOA functioning. Mr. Crane explained the difference between general plan and zoning.
He said the General Plan was changed because the council at the time thought the location
wasn’t good for an R-1-40 zone due to traffic and what was being developed around it. He said
the PD district allowed for deviations with justification that allowed the council to approve one
smaller than 10 acres. Ms. Hadlock wanted to see development more congruent with existing
development.

Resident Laurie Wright said they loved the family feel of Highland. She acknowledged that
development was coming but wanted it to be consistent as well as safe. She voiced concern with
the short-term safety regarding construction trucks driving through the neighborhood. She
questioned the demographic statistics given by the developer and wondered if most retired
residents would want 3-story condos. She mentioned that the developer’s plan was to phase out
visitor parking and pointed out that visitors would have to park on neighborhood roads.
Commissioner Kemp wondered where park patrons currently parked. Ms. Wright explained that
they parked on the street in front of houses. She urged the commissioners to consider congruent
development with a separate roadway.

Resident Bryce Hayes pointed out that there was an almost universal response from the
neighborhood that the development didn’t feel right. He thought the proposed development
didn’t fit and that the “soul” of the neighborhood would be changed. He talked about watching
two cars being rear-ended in the snow at the corner. He said it would not be feasible to add 25-30
more cars. He said the development felt completely wrong.

Resident Shaunna Godwin was concerned with safety and that school buses were already not
permitted in the neighborhood. She said a left turn out of the neighborhood was not possible
when the high school let out because of traffic. She said many students turned south and did a U-
turn at the end of the subdivision. She said the traffic was scary and there had been close calls
with neighborhood kids. She talked about how empty nesters did not want 3-story houses. Ms.
Godwin seconded the concerns already mentioned.

Resident Jared Wright thought the proposal was significantly delinquent in proving beneficial
value to residents and safety to children. He thought the development would turn 4718 West into
a “twin 3800 West thoroughfare” that posed higher risk of traffic accidents, increased risk, and
unreasonable load on the street. He said inadequate parking would inevitably result in overflow
parking in a neighborhood that was already dealing with safety issues. He was also concerned
about the lack of common sense and respect implied by the proposal. He spoke about the
Allerton’s home backing up against the memory center and how they lost about $50,000 in
property value and took over 1 year to sell their home. He was not a proponent of fast food or
tanning places. He thought more egress was needed and said the force fit of the development
gave the impression of greed.

Resident Susanne Brough said she lived in a PUD for 17 years and moved because of the
financial burden of the HOA. She said her current property value dropped because of the assisted
living center. She said she would be interested in moving to a place like the proposed
development but would not buy this plan because she preferred a twin home with master bed on
the main floor. She was concerned about parking and the thoroughfare in front of her home. She
would welcome a nice residential area with less density.

Resident Sharlene Richards said they currently used the water in the ditch in the back of the
property and had no plans to sell their property in the near future. She wondered if the city would
declare emanate domain and put a road on her property because the developer showed there was
another way out of his development. She said the General Plan was changed to commercial in
2011 and wondered if her property now had to change to mixed use. Commissioner Kemp
assured her that the ditch would be piped and that her water would not be cut off. He said they
would not be forced to sell. He explained that her property could still be commercial. Ms.
Richards was concerned that anticipating the location of a road would bring down the value of
her property. She voiced concern with the density and how close the development was to existing
homes.

Cedar Hills Resident Kristi Rogers voiced concern with property values. She explained that the
proposed apartments would look right down into her back yard and create no privacy for them.
She pointed out that the development did not come close to matching the design or scale of
neighboring developments. She said she did not understand why the development would be
approved without being at least 10 acres.
Cedar Hills Resident Bob McFadden anticipated development, but not something so different than the surrounding area. He asked the commissioners to imagine what it might look like from his house and seeing a wall out his windows. He said it would drive his property values down as well as his mood and good will. He preferred single family dwellings and hoped the developer could come back with a different plan.

Resident Judy Telfer said it was difficult to drive onto North County Boulevard because of school and businesses in either direction. She said the elderly people from the Ashford Center used their road to go to the park and was concerned about safety. She was concerned that renters would move into the proposed development.

Resident Timo Hoggard said he had no intention of selling his property south of the proposed development. He was not necessarily against the development but wanted a fence between his property and the development. He said he had animals and, in the past, had a neighbor complain about animals. This neighbor complained about the fence and threw grass clippings on his property that could kill the horses. He asked that a nice fence be installed and mentioned that he had no trouble with his new neighbor. He wasn’t thrilled about the strip mall and fast food aspect of the development, but thought it made good business sense because of the high schoolers. He voiced concern with parking and wished the city would enforce the no parking zone. He thought the density seemed high and suggested having an access road from 4800 West.

Resident Bob Valentine talked about moving back to Utah and buying the model home in the Wild Rose development. He said he was a mostly retired realtor and talked about the higher density products currently being built by the lake. He said they were low quality and did not want them in Highland. He talked about traffic issues coming out of the development and thought 17 additional townhomes was “madness”.

Commissioner Campbell read a letter from Resident Gary Wright who was opposed to any multifamily zone next to Wild Rose neighborhood if it connected to Wild Rose. Mr. Wright approved the commercial element on 4800 West. The letter voiced concern with reducing property values, increased traffic, and multifamily units turning into rental properties. He suggested approving commercial for the front 1-acre along 4800 West and keeping the back portion of the property as single family dwellings. Mr. Wright thought any development using Wild Rose roads for access should be bound by the same covenants as the Wild Rose development.

A Highland resident thought the 3-story building did not fit the warmth and closeness of the city. She thought older residents would not stay in the development very long.

Cedar Hills Resident Lisa McFadden said they did not want to look at the back of the development. She mentioned that Cedar Hills had an entrance into the park and there were 100’s of kids from her neighborhood that used the trail to go to school.
Commissioner Kemp asked for additional comments. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 8:47 PM and asked for Planning Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Jones said he needed additional time to review the proposed development and did not feel he could decide at this meeting.

Commissioner Ball did not think the proposed development was consistent with the General Plan. He thought it put an undue burden on existing neighbors and neighborhoods. Additionally, he did not think it was consistent with the existing quality of the area.

Commissioner Abbott was in favor of the commercial element off 4800 West but thought 6-8 units should be on the remaining property. He mentioned that higher density usually had some kind off buffer. He did not think it was fair for existing residents to have high density in the area. He said high density did not fit the area.

Commissioner Bills agreed with commercial along 4800 West. She was not completely opposed to duplexes but concerned with 3-story buildings. She was not too worried about traffic because it mostly came from the high school and Walmart.

Commissioner Wright preferred more time and more conversation with the commissioners regarding the proposed development. She voiced concern about traffic and mentioned that there were many accidents near the high school. She talked about the change in the high school lunch schedule which would result in students leaving earlier for the day. She thought maybe school administrators were trying to alleviate some of the traffic issues. Ms. Wright liked the idea of commercial use on 4800 West and the buffer it created for residential use. She thought it was a logistical problem to have more traffic on a smaller road, especially during a heavy snow year.

Commissioner Campbell said he also needed more time to consider the new concept. He thought there were many issues with the concept plan. He said 2-story homes might be problematic for neighbors and 3-story homes were ridiculous. Mr. Campbell thought there was little difference between this plan and the care center and pointed out that property values dropped when the center was built. He thought having 17 new residents drive through existing roads was problematic. He said 6-8 units might be reasonable. He thought enough damage was done to the Wild Rose community and said the neighbors in Cedar Hills should also be considered.

Commissioner Kemp was in favor of commercial along 4800 West. He thought allowing the assisted living center to be built was a huge mistake and hurt property values. He said he voted against it and felt bad that it was approved. He thought there were too many compatibility issues with the proposed concept. Commissioner Kemp thought Highland had a responsibility to also consider the neighborhood that was in Cedar Hills. He said the traffic on 4800 West was crazy and that teenagers were not experienced enough to know how to drive well. He thought it was extremely dangerous. He agreed with suggestions made by Commissioner Abbott and having fewer lots. He understood that developers needed to make a profit but said the city’s business was to ensure that there was good product design that fit with the city. He thought the current concept was not compatible.
Mr. Brodsky explained that the townhouses would be two stories above ground in the front and back instead of three as was shown in his presentation. He said they would be the same height as houses in surrounding neighborhoods. He clarified that showing a stub road on the concept plan would not result in eminent domain and that no one would be forced to connect to the road. He explained that the crash gate was because the fire department said an emergency exit was needed. He pointed out that the General Plan indicated mixed use and that 17 units was low density. Mr. Brodsky explained that roads in the development would be built large enough for emergency vehicles. He said they would provide fencing between adjacent properties. He thought a buffer was created by the open space in the concept plan. He was sure their product would remain owner occupied because of the price point and not turn into rental properties. He acknowledged that 17 units was a small HOA and explained that a professional management company would be managing the community.

Commissioner Kemp thanked Mr. Brodsky for his comments and asked if they wanted a chance at the next meeting to address comments made by the commission. Mr. Brodsky said they wanted the opportunity to come back to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Kemp called for a motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Campbell moved to continue PD-19-01 to the April 30, 2019 meeting and recommended that the applicant seriously consider, and address comments and issues discussed by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion. Commissioner Jones, Commissioner Ball, Commissioner Abbott, Commissioner Bills, Commissioner Wright, and Commissioner Campbell were in favor. Commissioner Kemp was opposed. The motion carried.

Commissioner Kemp explained that he did not see the point of continuing the application. In his opinion there were so many changes that needed to be made that the applicant needed to start over with the concept design.

Commissioner Abbott asked that the applicant was aware of and considered comments made about the multi-family element of their plan.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Campbell moved to approve the February 26, 2019 meeting. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

PLANNING STAFF REPORT

Mr. Crane mentioned that an open house would be held tomorrow night for the USDC property from 5:30 to 7:00 at city hall. He said the units dropped from 1100 + to 699. He said it was
tentatively planned for the commission to review the USDC Planned development District at the
next meeting.

COMMISSION COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Commissioner Bills wondered when it was appropriate to ask a developer to make changes to his
design. Mr. Crane explained that part of due process included working with the developer and
asking if they were willing to make changes or if they preferred to have a decision so the
application could move forward to the council. He said some developers were willing to make
changes and others just wanted to have the application addressed by the council. Regarding PD-
19-01, a resident talked about notices that were or were not received. She wondered if emails
could be sent out to residents. Mayor Mann mentioned that there was a way to sign up on the city
website requesting agendas for the planning commission and council. The resident did not want
to receive all agendas. Mr. Crane explained that the city did not have a way to have everyone’s
email address who might be affected by a potential project. Commissioner Wright mentioned
that other neighborhoods selected representatives to attend city meetings and then communicated
with the rest of their group. She suggested working together as a neighborhood. Mr. Kemp
explained the purpose of neighborhood meetings held by developers. Mr. Crane suggested that
he talk to residents in more detail after the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Abbott
seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:17 PM.