

APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
OCTOBER 6, 2021

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on October 6, 2021, at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 pm.

Present: Vice-Chair Christine Anderson
Bruce Frandsen
Rod Brocious
Jenny Peay

Absent: Chairman John Woffinden
Harold Dudley
Chris Christiansen

Staff Present: David Bunker, City Administrator
Camden Bird, Assistant City Administrator
Scott Sensanbaugher, Public Works Director
Ben Hunter, Engineer
Wendelin Knobloch, Planner
Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant

Others Present: Mr. & Mrs. Trevor Pyne

Vice-Chair Anderson led the “Pledge of Allegiance.” She then stated that items 1 and 2 would be withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

1. Hearing, review and action on a land use map amendment for property located in the area of 1100 South and the Utah Lake Shoreline east and west of 100 West from the Resort, Very-Low-Density Residential, General Commercial and Shoreline Protection designations to the Design Industrial designation
2. Hearing, review and action on a zone map amendment from the M-1 Marina, SP Shoreline Preservation, PR-2.0 Planned Residential, and R-1-12,000 Residential zones to the PI-1 Planned Industrial zone, located in the area of 1100 South and the Utah Lake Shoreline east and west of 100 West

APPROVED MINUTES

1
2 3. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 17.5.133 of the American Fork
3 City Municipal Code entitled “Off-Street Parking Standards”
4
5

6 Mr. Knobloch explained that this item was discussed in a joint work session with the city council
7 recently. As part of the session, a couple of options dealing with off-street parking were fleshed
8 out. This is largely a result of the applicant requesting a sizable reduction in required parking. At
9 the end of the session a request was made to present two options that would reduce the required
10 numbers of parking stalls.

11
12 The first option is to add something to the ordinance to allow the applicant to get parking stall
13 credit for items intended to reduce the need for a vehicle, i.e. a bike room, nearby grocery store,
14 etc. The numbers of required visitor parking will not be affected. This option has a provision that
15 involves the city council by giving it the authority to decrease the required parking numbers. The
16 planning commission also has a say because a positive recommendation from the commission is
17 required before it can go to the city council.

18
19 The second approach is simpler as it bases parking requirements upon the size of the unit.
20 Everything larger than 600 square feet will be subject to the normal parking requirements.
21 The second option does not require anything from city council, it is clear to the developer what
22 the size requirements are. This option is easily enforceable and clear.
23

24 Ms. Anderson asked what the role of the commission is regarding this item – may the
25 commission make changes or just approve/deny what is before us?
26

27 Mr. Knobloch replied that he believes the commission may make changes, since the discussion
28 is regarding something that is city-initiated and not a private developer’s proposal.
29

30 Mr. Frandsen asked what would happen to a proposal for reduced parking under the first option
31 if the planning commission does not give a positive recommendation.
32

33 Mr. Knobloch believes that the city council would not be able to consider the matter, but he’s not
34 100 percent sure.
35

36 Ms. Peay said that in her opinion, option 2 is one-size-fits-all, she thinks the first option might fit
37 different situations differently and give more flexibility. She is open to the possibility of even
38 bringing the requirement down to 1.5 or 1.6 stalls per unit.
39

40 Mr. Knobloch added that in the work session the car-share discussion seemed to conclude that
41 it’s hard for the city to have follow-thru if the car-share service were to go away. It will be very
42 hard to enforce.
43

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Ms. Anderson felt that if she was understanding it correctly, the first option was more limited to
2 the site. It seemed more cut and dry, and won't be going away. Mr. Knobloch concurred.

3 Ms. Peay asked how senior housing units would be affected by these proposals.
4

5 Mr. Knobloch answered that they would probably fall under the Public Agency/HUD item that
6 would qualify for reduced parking. Senior housing is usually run by the Housing Authority of
7 Utah county. If it is run by another entity, that entity usually enforces the requirements.
8

9 Mr. Brocious said that he liked option 2 as it is more enforceable and fits multiple zoning and
10 density situations. He asked how staff came up with the numbers in this option.
11

12 Mr. Knobloch replied that the numbers are based on a memo from Hales Engineering. They are
13 not specific to American Fork but give an idea of what some of the numbers might be.
14

15 Ms. Anderson pointed out that in the Hale study they called some areas "transit-adjacent." She
16 likes the ultimate goal of decreasing parking but feels that it is a little premature to do it right
17 now since we are still a little too car-dependent. She can see the benefit to both options and can
18 see why a developer would like one or the other. She wondered if there has to be a choice or can
19 we offer both. The first option incentivizes a lot of good things we would want to encourage
20 anyway while the second is more cut and dry. Different developments will have different goals.
21 If it makes it so a developer can be more creative and free to reach the goals in their own way,
22 she thinks it is a good idea to offer both. The developer would choose which option they wanted.
23

24 Mr. Knobloch said that a developer might like option 2 if they have fewer units as it would
25 achieve the smaller ratio with less trouble.
26

27 Ms. Anderson can see that in certain areas of town, option 1 would be difficult to attain. If she
28 was a developer she would want another way to decrease parking.
29

30 Mr. Frandsen agreed that offering both is the way to go. This would meet the needs of diverse
31 circumstances. Option 1 offers multiple positive improvements that promote progress, while
32 option 2 is clear and easily understood.
33

34 35 **Public Hearing Opened**

36 No comments received.

37 **Public Hearing Closed**

38
39 **Mr. Frandsen moved to recommend approval of the following proposed amendments:**

40 **(1) Which adds eligibility criteria for parking reductions**

41 **And**

APPROVED MINUTES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

5. Other Business

Mr. Knobloch stated that this is his last meeting. He has worked for the city for 17 years and has many good memories.

Mr. David Bunker said that Mr. Knobloch has done a fantastic job and we thank him and wish him the best of luck. Midvale is lucky and getting some great people.

Ms. Anderson relayed her personal experience with Mr. Knobloch and Mr. Olsen. She said that she didn't know anything about the planning commission years ago, but the planners talked to her for hours and explained everything to her, when she was just a resident. It was so valuable to her to have their introduction to the world of ethics and planning. She can't say thank you enough for the foundation they gave her. This is also a way that she can contribute to the community.

Mr. Camden Bird presented Mr. Knobloch a gift from the city.

6. Site Plan Committee Report

Mr. Knobloch said that several projects are coming up in the next meeting. There will be mostly subdivisions and a couple of site plans.

7. Review and action on the minutes of the September 22, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Session

Mr. Frandsen moved to recommend approval of the minutes of the September 22, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Session.

Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Vice-Chair Anderson	Aye
Bruce Frandsen	Aye
Rod Brocious	Aye
Jenny Peay	Aye

The motion passed.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 8. Adjournment

2

3 **Mr. Brocious motioned to adjourn.**

4 **Ms. Peay seconded the motion. All voted in favor.**

5

6

7 Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

8

9

10

11



12

Lisa Halversen

13

Administrative Assistant