

AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
SEPTEMBER 7, 2021
JOINT WORK SESSION AGENDA

Members Present:

Staci Carroll	Council Member
Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Rob Shelton	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member

Members Absent:

Kevin Barnes	Council Member (excused)
--------------	--------------------------

Staff Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Community Services Director
Wendelin Knobloch	Associate Planner
Stephanie Finau	Deputy Recorder
Cherylyn Egnor	Legal Counsel
Scott Sensanbaugher	Public Works Director

Also present: John Woffinden, Bruce Francis, Chris Christiansen, Christine Anderson, Jenny Peay, Steve Cornell, Steve Goodwin, Peter Jacobsen (Dwell Design Studio), McKay Quinn (Crescent Communities)

JOINT WORK SESSION W/PLANNING COMMISSION

The purpose of City Work Sessions is to prepare the City Council for upcoming agenda items on future City Council Meetings. The Work Session is not an action item meeting. No one attending the meeting should rely on any discussion or any perceived consensus as action or authorization. These come only from the City Council Meeting.

The American Fork City Council will meet in a work session on Tuesday, September 7, 2021 in City Hall Building, located at 31 North Church Street, commencing at 4:00 p.m. The agenda shall be as follows:

1. CC-1 zone parking requirements

David Bunker, City Administrator, shared some information that he thought was relevant to the Planning Commission and City Council. He said parking needs were based on a lot of distinct factors. Every project would have different project needs and the supply and demand for each of them would be different. He added that apartment size for high density and multi-family units also impacts parking needs. Bigger factors than the size of an apartment was its proximity to services, transit and how walkable/bikeable the area was. It also mattered if there was shared parking within the area of the project. Lastly, the type of housing—low income, HUD, high rent—changed the parking needs. He said there were parking structures in Salt Lake that not only had one stall per unit, but had an extra stall for the fancy car.

Mr. Bunker stated that they were in a very suburban area in American Fork. There was a slight movement towards becoming more urban with higher densities and trying to concentrate services. Despite this, American Fork's walkability score was thirty-four which meant that it is a car dependent category. The City's bike score was forty-five which meant the City was bikeable. This score did not even indicate that American Fork had significant bike infrastructure. In regard to a transit score, the City was at 19, indicating that they do not have a lot of developments near transit stations. Salt Lake City scored twenty-five points higher in the walkability and bikeability scores and twenty-eight points higher in the transit score. Salt Lake scores in comparison to other urban areas were middle of the road.

He continued that he had some conversations with Hales Engineering who did the peer review on Lake City Flats' traffic study. He said that it was the most comprehensive traffic study that had been done. A lot of the projects were referenced in other parking studies. Most of the projects reviewed were in Salt Lake County with a few in Utah County. The average parking demand for the projects was 1.59. However, the Mission Meadow project, a lower income project where people don't usually own vehicles, the parking demand was lower. If that project were removed, the average parking need in an area like Salt Lake that had more walking, biking, and transit options was 1.67.

Council Member Carroll asked how these projects compared in size and number of bedrooms to each other.

Mr. Bunker said they varied. There were projects included that were studio and single-room apartments with some with as many as two to three bedrooms. The transit adjacent projects, with a quarter mile or less of transit, only required 1.49 spaces. He continued that in the same report, Hales Engineering outlined different criteria cities could consider to reduce parking requirements. These included:

- A car share program (0.05)
- Unbundled Parking where each stall isn't tied to a specific unit, but that the development charges a fee for that parking stall (0.10)
- Accessibility of bike share programs and usable bike locks and storage. (0.10)
- A Development supplied transit pass included with a tenant's rent
- Senior housing (0.20)
- Student housing
- Shared or Public parking within a quarter mile
- Programmed shuttle services that runs at certain times
- Other amenities

He explained that cities who look at these take their standard parking requirement provided and for each amenity that is provided they would subtract a certain stall per unit from the standard parking. For example, if American Fork's parking standard was 2.25 and there was a reduction of certain amenities provided, then you would get 20%-30% off the parking requirements. He said that this method makes sense because when these amenities are provided people really don't need their vehicles as much.

Staff would like to look at a comprehensive parking policy that establishes how the City got from its standard to anything less. If those parking reductions were identified they needed to be added to the City's code so that every developer in the CC-1 Zone knew them. He was certain that there

would be other projects coming forward with requests for parking reductions. He said that any projects that provide amenities related to walkability, bike-ability, and access to transit should be considered for parking reductions. He also noted that the parking data that was collected in American Fork were counts made between midnight and 4:00 a.m.

Council Member Carroll said that was very atypical. Someone would have to sit outside and count parked cars. Mr. Bunker said that Hales Engineering hires employees to count available stalls and the demand during the time period because that's when everyone was back in the apartment. He continued that it was staff's recommendations that if a parking reduction was approved it should be as a conditional use that was based on a finding of fact that these parking reduction amenities actually reduced the needed parking stalls. At that point, the proposal would go to the Planning Commission for recommendation and then to the City Council for approval.

Bruce Francis, Planning Commission Member, asked what sort of assurance there would be that a development would continue to offer the amenities that contributed to their parking reduction. Mr. Bunker said that was a great question and noted that the one project that said they would have a shuttle service did not actually have one. Because of this, the parking reduction would have to be tied to a development agreement with the ramifications for not complying outlined in the agreement.

Council Member Shelton also asked what would happen if a project went out of business and the development goes up for sale. He could see how a new buyer would say that the previous agreement was not their obligation. This raised questions about if an agreement was tied to the land, the developer or the entity that signed the agreement.

Mr. Bunker said one way the City could address this would be to say that a new buyer purchased a certain number of units and occupants. They could tell the buyer that if they did not meet the necessary parking amenities then they would reduce the occupancy allowed in the project until the base parking requirement was met. He recognized that there would be a financial component for every development.

Council Member Taylor said that the legality of enforcement was separate to their current enforcement challenge which was that the City did not have enough staff to do its current code enforcement. Mr. Bunker said that right now most code enforcement happens based on complaints. He said that all of these projects would be required to have a business license.

Council Member Shelton noted that a recent report found that there were fifty complaints a week for everyone police officer. He felt it was important to consider what sorts of complaints police officers should be responding to. He also talked about how parking needs would change over time and mentioned how Utah Valley University had changed the character of neighborhoods. He said he felt they needed to legislate to the lowest common denominator and that was why 2.25 had always been the number. He saw how looking at the number of bedrooms could limit the number of parking spaces needed.

Mr. Bunker said they could legislate to an inflexible standard. No matter what, though, a developer would come in and claim to be different because they were really close to the grocery store or had really small units. Developers might feel like it was unfair that the Planning Commission and Council were not willing to be flexible, but they could decide to go that route.

Council Member Shelton said there was a give and take. If they took that approach they might have to pass up on a creative project that was out of the box that might benefit the City. However, he said he would hate to change the Planning Commission and City Council into traffic experts by asking them to sit and go through the data and try to refute one study.

Council Member Hunter asked who produced the car to dependency scores. Mr. Bunker replied it was a national group. Council Member Hunter wondered if parking stall requirements could be tied to those numbers.

Council Member Taylor suggested that they create criteria similar to what they did with water rates. He felt that the criteria always needed to be tied to the project and not the owner. Having the criteria for parking reduction in the code would allow developers/project owners to customize their projects to meet those reductions if they wanted.

Mr. Bunker reminded that a developer and project owner was always welcomed to comply with the standard 2.25 stalls per unit. John Woffinden, Planning Commission Chairman, said that one of the challenges was that some projects, like the micro apartments, were so new that they were hard to evaluate against the standard. He said that was part of the reason the Planning Commission was so skeptical of it being so far away from the standard; it was the first project like it that they had seen.

Mr. Bunker said that the composition of the City would change. The reason the Planning Commission had not seen a micro apartment project was because they were not yet an urban area where micro apartments were typically found. Micro apartments are successful but in places like Seattle, or L.A., or other cities that have a higher walkability or bike-ability score.

Council Member Carroll said that she did not know if the size of the apartment was necessarily linked to the mode of transportation. You could have micro apartments where people use cars. She did not think that micro apartments only had to be in areas where everyone commuted by transit. She said that micro apartments allowed people who wanted to live alone to do so affordably. She then stated that she did not know when she needed to declare a conflict. She said that in this particular case she wanted to be able to participate in the general discussion about parking. She did not feel like she was speaking specifically to the project her husband was involved with. She continued that when she looked at the numbers of the average provided by the Hales Engineering parking study, their average of 1.6 compared to American Fork's requirement of 2.25 seemed like a pretty big gap. She wondered if they should reduce the baseline requirement in American Fork. She also noted that the flexibility model was already built into American Fork's code to look at things on a project by project basis, but that had brought them to the current discussion. She felt some parameters and clarification would be helpful such as having parking requirements be based on the number of bedrooms or square footage. She knew that other parameters such as proximity to transit mattered, but unless someone was in the TOD, those parameters didn't feel especially applicable to American Fork.

Mayor Frost said that might matter more if the central corridor ended up coming through American Fork along the railroad line.

Council Member Shelton noted that when they established the CC-1 zone they defined density two parking. If they allowed parking reductions they were allowing higher densities. He said that

if they were going to change the parking requirements they needed to decouple density and parking approvals.

Jenny Peay, Planning Commission Member, asked if it was possible to tie the approval of a business license to meet the parking reduction requirements so that they were addressed on a yearly basis. If they did not have the parking amenities to reduce the number of spaces needed they would have to reduce the number of apartments they rented out in order for their business license to be approved.

Chris Christianson, Planning Commission Member, asked what would happen if there were already renters in the apartments at a time when a business was found to not have met the parking reduction requirements and thus need to reduce their tenants. Would renters have to evacuate and pay the price.

Mr. Bunker said it was a good point. If a complex was full and was found you be out of compliance with the parking reduction requirements, they wouldn't want to kick people out. Mr. Francis said they could simply say that the complex was not allowed to fill the next ten vacancies. He felt that they should figure out a way to put the responsibility on the developer as opposed to on City enforcement.

Council Member Shelton mentioned the concern of when apartment complexes become condominiums with multiple individual owners. That would make parking enforcement even harder.

Christine Anderson, Planning Commission Member, asked if parking reduction criteria could be based on amenities that cannot change. A shuttle service could be started, but easily go away; where there things on the list that wouldn't change over time. She said that shared public parking would be one.

Council Member Carroll said that was why she wanted to consider bedroom number or square footage. It didn't change and gave particular parameters instead of something arbitrary. She said that those parameters did not build in a lot of flexibility. However, she felt like the current code which was written to provide that flexibility did not give the City enough parameters to make fair judgements.

Council Member Shelton added that the micro apartment project was not the first time that someone had come forward about that provision of the code and asked for an exception. He said that in the ten years that he had been on the Council they have always stuck to the 2.25. He thought there was one project they went down to 1.7 spaces per unit.

Mr. Bunker interjected that it was 1.8 on the Vest project that was a shared parking agreement. Ms. Anderson said she felt that if these reductions were codified they wouldn't have to worry about reductions as precedent. Instead the City could point to the amenities they had such as shared parking, one bedroom units, etc. Mr. Bunker said there could be other things on the list, one of which could be unit size. Ms. Anderson replied that a studio compared to a one bedroom was different. Mr. Bunker suggested that there might be a threshold, such as a unit being over two bedrooms, where the 2.25 stall per unit requirement could not be reduced.

Council Member Shelton said he liked the bedroom and square footage because it was easy to calculate. If folks had new data to show why the code did not match industry best practices they could certainly apply to change the code through the legislative process.

Ms. Anderson said shared parking could also be considered a permanent amenity. Mayor Frost said the City has shared parking at the Meadows and at the Vests. Ms. Anderson continued and said she saw access to transit, even a bus, or a bus stop or access to other amenities like access to the grocery store being fairly permanent and lower the parking needs.

Council Member Taylor asked if the shared parking in the Meadows residential parking to the west of the development was. Mayor Frost said they wanted to go across Pacific Drive, but the City prohibited this because of the flyover. They share parking to the west of the development by the movie theaters. Mr. Woffinden said they were afraid of the traffic increase when the flyover was completed. Council Member Shelton noted there were also some partial parking agreements with Woodbury and Cal Ranch.

Ms. Peay asked if a calculation or requirement could be included where one stall was assigned to a particular unit and the leftover requirement could be fulfilled through shared parking within the site itself. Mr. Bunker stated it would be in the calculation of how many total stalls. Shared parking is more off-site parking.

Council Member Shelton mentioned a project in downtown Provo that had zero parking of CRAs between Wells Fargo, Zions Bank and Central Bank. Through their three parking structures it was determined that there was enough public parking to allow higher density housing. He said that when they did address downtown it would be worth looking into a CRA. He worried about bringing density into downtown when they already had a parking problem. He recognized it was outside of the CC-1 zone, but the City had already been involved in a litigation issue with a business owner who did not want anyone to park in his lot and ended up fencing everything off and established that a parking pass was needed or vehicles would get towed or booted. For him it was hard to look at reducing parking requirements because of challenging past experiences. He could see the wisdom behind bedrooms and units.

Ms. Anderson said she thought that everyone wanted to reduce dependency on cars. For her the permanent things that could be tied to parking reductions included: shared parking, access to transit, access to groceries, square footage, number of bedrooms, and indoor bike storage. Those six things should stick with the unit that could contribute to a lower parking requirement. allow lower parking requirements.

Council Member Carroll clarified that what Ms. Anderson proposed an exception-based on size. She explained that she pictured a tiered approach like what Council Member Shelton was saying that outlined if units were of x square footage then x number of spaces were required so that there was not so much of a guessing game. This would align with how most of the code is currently written so that the developer knows ahead of time what to build or plan for.

Ms. Anderson said that each of these criteria could count for a certain amount of reduction. They might have different weights, but could be added up for a developer to calculate what their parking requirement would be.

Council Member Shelton said he also had a lot of negative history in regard to access to transit. He said he had tried to go to Salt Lake a lot of times via transit and it never went very well. He didn't feel like there was enough transit in Utah County even with the FrontRunner to feel like that was a substantial claim for parking reduction.

Mr. Bunker asked Ms. Anderson to repeat the six potential reductions again. She did so and continued that some of the items on the list originally presented by Mr. Bunker should not be used because they were more likely to be impermanent like the shuttle service or car share programs.

Council Member Shelton questioned if shared parking would stay permanent. Ms. Anderson clarified that Council Member Shelton wanted a model that said straight across that if a unit had one bedroom x stalls were required, two bedrooms x stalls, etc. and then these things could be subtracted in addition to a tiered baseline parking requirement.

Council Member Shelton said that he did not want to include access to transit because he didn't feel as though that existed downtown. Mr. Francis added there could be more specific criteria about what access to transit meant. Details like being a quarter of a mile from the bus stop, or half a mile from a front runner, etc. There was more general discussion about transit and walkability.

Ms. Peay asked what the distance was between a residence and an amenity to be considered walkable. Mr. Bunker replied that an amenity that was beyond a ½ or ⅓ mile was not considered walkable. He said that in the TOD and American Fork's core transit areas things were walkable if they were within a ¼ mile of the platform.

Mayor Frost asked what their next steps needed to be. He felt there had been some innovative ideas during the meeting.

Mr. Bunker said how much of a reduction the Council was willing to consider needed to be discussed. Was there a maximum reduction from the 2.25 required stalls? Was there unlimited reduction?

Council Member Shelton suggested that staff produce a system the Council likes and bring back numbers within that framework. At that point, the Council could allow for open comment from developers to respond to the new structure.

Mayor Frost said when he was out of town his kids Uber all around. He wondered if that was a factor to continue. He shared a story about being down in Provo for business and coming across a new development right near the FrontRunner. He encountered a kid outside in his car and knocked on his window to ask him some questions. He asked if he lived there and how many bedrooms were in his apartment. The kid said there were two bedrooms and five of them lived in the unit. He then asked how many of those kids had cars.

Council Member Shelton said he had heard a lot of good comments about Uber. He said when he went to Florida his family ordered from Amazon Fresh to bring groceries to them. His wife shops from Costco and it's delivered to them. He recognized that some of those evolving edges needed to be considered and that was why code needed to be a living document that could be

changed. He was in support of a tiered structure with a limited list of criteria that could qualify for parking reductions.

Council Member Taylor said he recognized he had strong opinions about parking. He felt that in the ten years he had been on the Council none of the parking problems downtown had changed. He was trying to be open minded and appreciated arguments made by the developer and the studies they provided to support their request for the parking reduction. However, he still struggled with the disconnect between study's findings and their practical application. He felt like they did not usually workout in practice.

Council Member Shelton wanted to hear from the Planning Commission. Ms. Anderson asked if the Council wanted the tired parking structure to be based on the number of bedrooms or the square footage of a unit. Council Member Shelton said it could be either. He would leave it up to staff to see what worked better.

Council Member Carroll said it was usually one or the other. She had never seen it combined, but American Fork could try. Council Member Taylor said he felt they were inventing the wheel. Council Member Carroll said they did not need to. Other cities already had parking requirements like this. Mayor Frost said not in Utah County.

Council Member Shelton said that was why this should be a task for staff to do more research and come back to the Planning Commission and Council with recommendations.

Ms. Anderson thought they might not need square footage. The tiers could be two bedrooms plus, two bedrooms, one bedroom and studio. Council Member Carroll suggested just use square footage and then said they were going around in circles.

Council Member Hunter suggested that staff come back with what would be the best model for the City. He was confident in the staff's ability to do that. He also commented on the need to consider fire access.

Council Member Taylor asked if they could put in place a maximum parking reduction or a threshold such as one stall per unit that developers could not go under.

Council Member Hunter said it was his experience that developers designed projects to fit within the code. They would not be inclined to go out and build a parking structure on good will alone. Mr. Woffinden responded that developers want to maximize their product. Developers are building to make money. They are trying to make as much money as they can. Council Member Hunter agreed and said that was the value in there being a hard minimum such as one stall per unit.

Council Member Carroll agreed the less arbitrary it is the easier it is for the developer. Ms. Anderson said that if the table only went down to 1.5 that was the bottom. She asked why there would be a table that went down to 1.5 and an additional minimum below that. Council Member Carroll mentioned the different criteria for reductions that could become additive and make it possible for a developer to have to have no parking.

Mayor Frost asked if there was a baseline level that there was a consensus should be the bottom threshold. Council Member Shelton suggested that they have staff come back and present their

proposal to the Planning Commission first to get their approval before it came before the Council. Mr. Woffinden replied that the lowest they had negotiated with other developers at the Planning Commission level was 1.8. Council Member Shelton said he felt American Fork needed to pay attention to what other cities were doing and trust the data that staff brought back to them as governing bodies.

Bruce Francis, Planning Commission Member, asked if staff could bring back a couple of different recommendations that were possible for the Planning Commission to consider, one based on the tiered approach based on square footage and the other that allowed for parking reductions if different criteria were met.

Ms. Anderson asked if the table that was displayed on the screen showed point or percentage reductions. She said they seemed like they were based on several studies and could be a good starting place.

Council Member Shelton asked if there was a consensus on decoupling parking requirements from density. Mr. Bunker asked if Council Member Shelton wanted to explain his point more. He said that right now in the CC-1 zone there is no limitation on density. If a developer can create the parking for the density then they can have as many units as they want. He continued if they decoupled the density from parking then they would need to set a maximum allowed density.

Council Member Shelton confirmed what Mr. Bunker said. He understood that current code required developments to be able to have 2.25 stalls per unit which served as a measure to reduce densities. However, if they reduced the parking requirement that could create the opportunity for developers to have higher densities in the area. He felt that there needed to be conversations and input from residents about the densities they wanted. He saw two questions: how much parking did they actually need in downtown and was it the metric they wanted to use to determine density? Council Member Hunter felt it was worth exploring; if they were going to put a floor on parking they needed a ceiling on density.

Council Member Shelton provided what was done in the TOD as a model. He mentioned Riverbend Drive as a place when the code allowed for two story homes to be built above existing neighbors. In the same area the Council had just approved a CC-1 zone. He felt it was important to make sure that existing residents were okay with these development and density changes. He liked what they did with the TOD in specifying where they wanted high density concentrated and included buffers and transitions. He wanted a separate conversation about density that was not tied to parking.

Ms. Anderson asked if Council Member Shelton wanted to limit density or height. Council Member Shelton replied both. He said that higher densities, because of the sheer number of people, created parking and traffic problems. He also hears from residents that in higher density areas people are frustrated that they don't ever get to know their neighbors because of transient residents.

Ms. Anderson said higher density could be a huge benefit to traffic problems because instead of spreading out where people have to come in, everyone is centrally located. Because of this, she did not see density as a problem, but as a benefit to help lower car dependency.

Council Member Shelton felt that American Fork was more urbanized than most areas. Ms. Anderson said that if they lowered the parking requirement it allowed for higher density. Ms. Peay asked if Council Member Shelton suggested an overlay zone where the closer projects moved to more traditional residential areas, the lower the allowed density would be.

Council Member Shelton said he thought that was something to consider. His question now, however, was how did they want to determine density in the CC-1 zone? He had a preference to decouple the two.

Ms. Anderson asked how he would determine density then. Mayor Frost said that was a good question because parking had been intended to determine density.

Mr. Bunker noted this was the current issue. They had a project that proposed a higher density, but because they could not meet the parking standard, their density would be limited. If they moved to tier parking according to square footage, then there would be more units in an area. That was not necessarily a bad thing. He noted that there was some urgency in figuring out the parking question, but that the conversation around decoupling density from parking was a conversation they could come back to down the road.

Mayor Frost wanted it noted on public record that they were talking about residential development in downtown. This conversation did not have anything to do with commercial spaces that have the ability to be grown and developed.

2. CC-1 zone architectural design elements.

Steve Goodwin, long term resident of American Fork with a background in architectural design, mentioned he had also brought Steve Cornell who worked with American Fork about ten years ago on architectural design elements in downtown.

He said that he was with FFKR Architects in Salt Lake, the largest architectural firm in Utah. They had worked on a lot of projects from historic renovations to casino work. He said their firm had twelve landscape architects on staff. He also said that Steve Cornell was the most esteemed historical architect in the state.

He said typically when there is a discussion about building an architecture they consider vision (what a City wants to be), a plan and design guidelines, and policy. He intended to primarily talk about vision.

He provided some examples of other cities that were going through design changes. The first was Helper, UT. What was once a dingy mining town that had a lot of boarded up buildings was going through major reconstruction. Many buildings were opening up with coffee shops, cafes, and art studios. In fact, Helper was taking some of that sort of business from Price that had similar bones. The next example he showed was 20th Street in Ogden, UT. He said it was one of the best examples of urban renewal in the state. These efforts for renewal started 40 years ago as a grassroots effort. It was now recognized as a place to be. He felt that both Helper and Ogden would be good cities for American Fork to talk to and suggested that they look at Ogden's master plan. He felt that Brigham City also had a great downtown and had Highway 89 going through the middle of it.

In regard to considering similar traffic patterns, he brought up Lehi because they had a huge traffic problem towards Saratoga Springs until Pioneer crossing opened. In talking with colleagues about American Fork's downtown he knew that UDOT had plans to increase traffic on Main St. He encouraged the Council to really get a sense of their vision and work with them to limit that increased traffic. He felt that there could just end up being a sea of asphalt with dangerous cars in between the two sides of American Fork's downtown. He noted that when he had talked previously with the Council they favored Spanish Fork's downtown over Lehi's. He said he felt Spanish Fork had more problems due to a wider street than American Fork. He recognized they had some interesting buildings such as their library and schools. Despite this, he felt there were buildings on Spanish Fork's downtown that were out of order and problematic.

Given all of this, Mr. Goodwin had a list of dos and don'ts. He said he went on the American Institute of Architects (AIA) website to see examples of historic building redesign. One of the design elements that he talked about was a BRT running through the middle of Main Street. He felt there was some real potential for a transit system like that. He felt they needed to think of Main Street as a place of higher density. The Council had the ability to control what that density looked like. He felt in thinking about the potential of American Fork's downtown and the five hundred seat theater, they needed to design things such that people could walk. This was part of the reason he felt the BRT was a valuable mode of transit for American Fork to consider. He was recently in Mesa Arizona who had put a new light rail train down the middle of their central thoroughfare. At the same time they pulled their sidewalks in and reduced traffic. This provided the area with a lot of rebirths.

He then talked about some don'ts beginning with Provo City's Center Street and the Civic Convention Center. He said they have a code similar to that of American Fork regarding parking that required the parking to be hidden behind the building. He displayed an example of a project following this code that ended up creating more of a problem than a solution. Further down the same street, just east of University was a new building called 63 Center Street. It was a three story building with storefront property on the main floor and apartments above to create a live-work facility. Although it was not calling on an architectural style, it was accomplishing a couple of things: it worked with the scale of its neighbors; there was architecture that felt in concert with the Provo Civic Center. He felt it constituted a good design. He said that one thing to keep in mind was to have new architecture be to scale with existing buildings. He felt that it was important that new buildings did not dwarf historic ones.

Council Member Shelter said he appreciated the information provided. As he looked at the pictures that addressed the scale of buildings he felt this came back to the density and height questions. If he remembered correctly there were a Wells Fargo and Zion's Bank building near the newer building. He could see how the architect was trying to match that. He asked how American Fork would look at that given that the City did not have Zion's Bank building. He didn't know if they had anything in the downtown area that was taller than two stories.

Mr. Goodwin said he felt that American Fork and Provo were in two distinct categories. Provo was in an emerging urban City and aspired for tall buildings. He felt there were opportunities for new buildings in American Fork, but at a smaller scale. If they wanted micro housing on Main Street they just limited it to three or four stories.

Council Member Shelton wanted to look at development from a form based approach based on different blocks. He wondered if having different block types that could be identified might work

better from an architectural standpoint because what might be right on two hundred East might not be what was right on Center Street.

Mr. Goodwin noted that his area of expertise was in traditional building architecture. That said, there were policies like what Council Member Shelton suggested that could help the City grow up in an organic way. He said that what American Fork was facing was a classic situation for a City; a really cool project was coming into a City that had a zoning ordinance that did not directly speak to the project or development's needs. He said it was hard to have a policy catch up to the solution wanted by the potential client. In a lot of ways the policy should have been changed years before. He then talked about an example in American Fork when the turn of a century house on one hundred East next to the Presbyterian School was turned into an apartment building. He said this was an example that was not a bad idea, but was implemented in the wrong location. There were five buildings that could have preserved the sense of a historic downtown that no longer matched.

Council Member Taylor said that one of his concerns with American Fork's Main Street in addition to the UDOT traffic problem was that it did not have any remaining historic buildings short of the bank. He talked about the old gas station that had the cool Texaco building that had gone away. He didn't feel as though downtown had a cohesive feel at all and asked how the City would go about remedying that.

Mr. Goodwin said that even if some of these older buildings needed to come down, they would still want to build new buildings with the same spirit and feel of American Fork's downtown.

Steve Cornell, Architectural Consultant, said cities constantly evolved. He said historic buildings are thought of as brick structures and, like in American Fork, there might only be a few left. He said that although Council Member Taylor said there was a cohesive feel to downtown, he would say there was. It just showed how the City had evolved over time. While the administration building might not be someone's favorite building, it was a good example of a 1950s office building. He felt American Fork had a really good core moving to the east.

Council Member Taylor wondered how they accommodate so many different tastes as they rebuilt downtown. He said there were incredible pictures of the Chipman Building where the drive thru is now and the beautiful Minuit home had been torn down. Do they try to rebuild those buildings or does the City become modern and energy efficient?

Mr. Cornell said there was a middle ground. They were not trying to resurrect buildings and bring them back. Rather, they were trying to avoid losing something like the Chipman building. It was a great building that had stature on Main Street. When they brought in new development they would want to define and support it with policy that worked with the City's downtown corridor. The new buildings would want to architecturally match the aesthetic of the existing area. A five story building in American Fork would not happen for the next one hundred years. You might see more three story buildings in the area causing an increase in density.

Council Member Shelton felt that it was up to the Council to determine their vision for downtown and then set the code to reflect that. He was concerned that if downtown was shaped by projects proposed by developers that they would get some good projects and some poor ones. Historic Main Street had been defined as one hundred West to seven hundred East. He felt that it was important to have architectural standards for different zones emanating out of this historic

core. He said when he heard that it took Ogden 20 years to redo their downtown he recognized how purposeful that effort was. He thought downtown was like growing a tree, it was not going to happen overnight.

Council Member Taylor listed five buildings he thought of as historic buildings: the Bank of American Fork, City Hall, the Presbyterian Church, the Harrington, the Tabernacle, and the Administration Building.

Mr. Cornell said that there was a national registry for historic buildings that they could reference to figure out American Fork's true historic area. Something interesting about that district was that if a City was in the district and your buildings are contributing buildings, meaning it was within a certain time period and had not been changed significantly, then any renovation that takes place on that building was eligible for a pretty major tax credit. Every business owner that owns a building in American Fork on that national registry should be aware of that. The Bank of American Fork took advantage of that when they did the renovation on their building and it had a huge payoff. As a nationally registered property the Harrington School Owners could tear the building down, but there were incentives if they did the renovation correctly. He said the five buildings mentioned by Council Member Taylor were great buildings. He said it was a gift to have those buildings left and noted that he remembered when City Hall was covered with white paint.

Mr. Goodwin chimed in that a primary question moving forward was how the City wanted to collaborate with a potential developer. He suggested putting together a landmarks commission who could work with the Planning Commission and the owner to try and translate some architectural design elements of existing structures into modern applications. He felt as though there were citizens who could jump in to help with those transitions during the period it took for policy to catch up to developers.

Ms. Anderson asked if the design would have to pass through that newly created landmark commission. Mr. Goodwin said yes. He said that some cities that had strongly defined historic districts had pretty strict policies on renovations. The Historic Landmarks Commission reviewed every submission.

Council Member Shelton said he loved the idea of a commission like that because he guessed that 90% of the businesses downtown didn't realize they were eligible for a tax credit. He felt that a Historic Landmarks Commission could work with the Chamber of Commerce or the Downtown Business Alliance. He said right now most businesses did not see the financial incentive to change anything. The tax credit, leveraged with the opportunity zone and a potential CRA could create a lot of momentum.

Mayor Frost said in regard to the CRA that any residential would not be considered. They would need to focus on establishing retail and commercial. Council Member Shelton wondered if the Alpine School District would agree to a partial CRA. Instead of a 100% tax increment, there was a 30% tax increment. Mayor Frost said he liked what he saw and how the attitude toward downtown had expanded. He felt that the current concept for downtown felt similar to what the TOD was before it was there.

Council Member Taylor said that he disagreed with Council Member Shelton that businesses didn't know about the advantages for renovation. He felt that some businesses did know and that

there was some additional energy that needed to get going in downtown American Fork. He noted that there were businesses that were doing well in the area who were not looking to reinvest into American Fork. He said that he couldn't think of a business that was thriving so much that they would have extra capital to really renovate their buildings.

Mr. Francis said he knew a few of the business owners on Main Street and that he had half a dozen businesses himself. He said that even with tax breaks if he spent \$10,000 he would only get \$2,000 back. He said that there were not a lot of businesses on Main Street that had a spare \$8,000.

Mr. Cornell said that producing the cash to start something like that was always difficult. He wanted to make the Council aware that the State of Utah had just restarted the Main Street Program. There was not a lot of money, but there were funds available for facade grants for businesses on Main Streets. The other funding source was the Certified Local Government Program, a local preservation partner with the State of Utah. Every year the City was eligible for up to \$20,000. Some major renovations had been funded by that source over time.

Council Member Shelton said that buildings are going to deteriorate over time. No matter what there would be a point where a business owner had to do something. He talked about working for a bank in Provo and how it took the Tabernacle burning down for the bank president to realize that the bank looked like the rattiest building on the street.

Mr. Cornell said if the Harrington got restored to a performing arts education center it would bring in a new group of consumers who wanted to spend their money at their lunch break. People would naturally be entrepreneurial if they had buildings in the area.

Ms. Anderson asked short of being designers themselves what could they put in their code to help with design and development standards. Mr. Cornell said it was exactly that, design guidelines such as allowed materials, percentage of glass, etc. that could be included. The City could then have a panel of experts that could review the applications against the guidelines and make determinations on if it fit the standards before going before the Planning Commission

Council Member Shelton responded to the Mayor's question that he did want to go back and do what they did with the TOD and put a form based code in place for downtown's redevelopment.

Mr. Cornell asked for feedback about the idea to create the oversight committee to help oversee the Harrington project and the historic downtown. Mayor Frost said he thought if they had an oversight committee he would want to make sure to have it for the entire downtown.

Council Member Shelton said he appreciated that Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Cornell had offered their services and he was impressed by what they had shared. He wanted to move forward towards developing a form based code and include the Landmark Commission. Council Member Carroll said she would need more specification on what this new commission would do and the parameters around what it would have control over. It was suggested by Council Member Shelton and Mr. Woffinden that they get started on a draft or working document.

Mr. Francis said he liked the idea of the new commission and felt they could advise on more than just one building. Although there were grants available he questioned if businesses owners would

be able to write the grants correctly to be able to get the money. He wondered if there was a resident who specialized in that sort of work who might volunteer their time.

Council Member Shelton said American Fork had a contract with the Chamber of Commerce that said they would promote and supporting initiatives like these. He hoped they would hold a Chamber Meeting that focused on downtown.

Council Member Taylor said that he felt as though the redevelopment of downtown deserved equal attention as to PARC funding. He said he would love to pull in local professionals to support businesses applying for grants. He felt they really needed a group who could get behind the effort.

Council Member Shelton suggested that there were two parts that needed to be moved forward: the policy side that the Planning Commission could work on and the Council creating this additional commission.

Council Member Carroll expressed some questions about how this new commission would fit in because she didn't know how they could enforce something that was not already in the code.

Council Member Taylor said he felt that the changes to the code and the addition of the commission needed to come at the same time. He felt this Landmark Commission could act like the PARC Tax Committee did for the City Council. They would review all of the applications based on the redevelopment standards and provide a report to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Wendelin said that they would be two distinct committees; architects (design standards) and zoning (planning) were not the same things. He said something could be added to the code that required that projects in the CC-1 zone were required to go through an architecture design process. Because they did not have an architect on staff, he saw the value in creating a committee of professionals.

Council Member Shelton felt like they could provide a recommendation as part of the staff report that was presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. Woffinden asked Council Member Shelton if the next step was for him to contact the Chamber. Council Member Shelton said that connection with the Chamber was Council Member Carroll's role. He felt that it would be useful to better understand the City's contract with the Chamber regarding downtown and to think about the role of the Historic Preservation Committee.

3. Adjourn.

Dated this 7th day of September 2021



Stephanie Finau
Deputy Recorder