



**NOTICE OF A MEETING OF THE VINEYARD  
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD  
September 11, 2019 – 6:00 PM**

---

Public Notice is hereby given that the Vineyard Redevelopment Agency Board will hold a meeting on Wednesday, September 11, 2019, starting at approximately 6:00 PM or as soon thereafter as possible following the City Council meeting in the Vineyard City Hall; 125 South Main Street, Vineyard, Utah. The agenda will consist of the following:

---

**AGENDA**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. CONSENT AGENDA**

**2.1. Approval of the August 14, 2019 RDA Meeting Minutes**

**3. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**3.1 DISCUSSION – Town Center**

*(20 Minutes)*

Flagship is requesting a discussion about the Town Center plan and Development Agreement. No action will be taken at this time.

**3.2 DISCUSSION AND ACTION – Waters Edge 3-Acre Park**

*(20 Minutes)*

The RDA Board will discuss the design and amenities to the 3-Acre park located north of the James Bay subdivision in the Waters Edge Development.

**4. ADJOURNMENT**

RDA meeting are scheduled as necessary.

The Public is invited to participate in all Vineyard Redevelopment Agency meetings. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during this meeting should notify the City Recorder at least 24 hours before the meeting by calling (801) 226-1929.

I the undersigned duly appointed City Recorder for Vineyard, Utah, hereby certify that the foregoing notice and agenda was emailed to the Salt Lake Tribune, posted at the Vineyard City Hall and offices, the Vineyard city website, the Utah Public Notice website, delivered electronically to city staff and to each member of the Governing Body.

AGENDA NOTICING COMPLETED ON: September 10, 2019

CERTIFIED (NOTICED) BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer  
PAMELA SPENCER, CITY RECORDER

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  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

**MINUTES OF A VINEYARD  
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD MEETING**  
City Council Chambers  
125 South Main Street, Vineyard, Utah  
August 14, 2019 – 9:04 PM

**Present**

**Absent**

Chair Julie Fullmer  
Boardmember John Earnest  
Boardmember Tyce Flake  
Boardmember Chris Judd  
Boardmember Nate Riley

**Staff Present:** City Manager Jacob McHargue, Public Works Director/City Engineer Don Overson, Assistant City Engineer Chris Wilson, City Attorney David Church, Community Development Director Morgan Brim, Planning Commission Chair Cristy Welsh, City Planner Elizabeth Hart, City Recorder Pamela Spencer, Building Official George Reid, Water/Parks Manager Sullivan Love

**Others Speaking:** Steve Hutchings with X Development

**9:04 PM      Redevelopment Agency Board Meeting**

1.  **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Fullmer opened the meeting at 9:04 PM.

2.  **CONSENT AGENDA**

2.1. Approval of the July 10, 2019 RDA Meeting Minutes

Chair Fullmer called for a motion.

**Motion:** BOARDMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT ITEM 2.1. BOARDMEMBER FLAKE SECONDED THE MOTION. CHAIR FULLMER, BOARDMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3.  **BUSINESS ITEMS**

3.1 **DISCUSSION AND ACTION – The Yard B Lot 2 Site Plan**

The RDA Board will review the golf facility site plan per the Tax Increment Participation Agreement between the Vineyard Redevelopment Agency and Fifty Mill LLC.

Chair Fullmer turned the time to City Manager Jacob McHargue.

49 Mr. McHargue explained that the Planning Commission (PC) had already approved a Conditional  
50 Use permit and the site plan. He further explained that it was written into the reimbursement  
51 agreement that the RDA would approve the site plan. He turned the time over to City Planner  
52 Elizabeth Hart.

53

54 Ms. Hart reviewed the site plan.

55 *Use:* outdoor commercial recreation with a driving range and a restaurant/bar

56 *Lot Size:* 8.51 acres (370,499 square feet)

57 *Building Square Footage:* 38,532 square feet, includes 56 hitting bays

58 *Building Height:* 29' (2-story)

59 *Golf Range Area:* About 240 yards

60 *Site Landscaping:* 62 percent of the total site; 56,319 square feet on the site and parking lot,

61 175,266 square feet of driving range

62 *Parking:* required 143 stalls, proposed 185 stalls

63 *Golf Netting Pole Height:* Range from 90 feet to 174 feet in height

64 *Distance to Residential:* About 432 feet

65

66 Ms. Hart used the renderings to show what the elevations and golf bays would look like. She also  
67 showed the material boards which would match what they were using in the Yard A development.

68

69 PC Chair Cristy Welch mentioned that the size of the sign in the renderings would be smaller than  
70 shown and that they would have to meet the city's Zoning Code. Ms. Hart added that sign permits  
71 were done internally. There was a short discussion about the sign permits. Mr. Church suggested  
72 that they look at the renderings as if the sign was not there.

73

74 Ms. Hart pointed out the differences between the renderings and the actual building permit  
75 submittals:

- 76 • One of the sides of the building had been changed and there were less windows
- 77 • Equipment room was changed to office space
- 78 • The outdoor patio looked different from the pictures

79

80 Steve Hutchings with X Development explained that they had changed the outdoor space to have  
81 more covered patio space.

82

83 Ms. Hart noted that the PC had required that the drop-off area be designed to let the cars know that  
84 it was a pedestrian crossing area. Mr. Hutchings explained that it would be painted asphalt with  
85 concrete cut to look like tiles.

86

87 Chair Fullmer asked about the number of bays. Mr. Hutchings replied that when designing the  
88 two-story building they were only able to get 56 bays. He reviewed the design of the bays.

89

90 Boardmember Riley asked PC Chair Cristy Welsh to talk about the questions and discussion that  
91 went on with the Planning Commission.

92

93 PC Chair Welsh said that one of the concerns was the use of the outdoor patio with music, drinks,  
94 concerts, and extending the hours, for example, to 2:00 AM. They also wanted the ability to use  
95 patio and range at all times. She said that she had asked the surrounding communities if they had  
96 any concerns with the noise level and the late hours and most of the residents were not concerned  
97 once the noise level had been explained. She said that the PC did approve them to hold concerts on

98 the field, but they would have to get a city permit. She added that PC did allow the patio use. Mr.  
99 Brim explained that staff did not want PC to approve a “forever” event permit. They wanted them  
100 to submit an event permit to the city. He added that the surrounding residents would be notified of  
101 each large event.

102  
103 PC Chair Welsh said that the biggest concern was how they would work out the parking issues.  
104 Most people were expected to park in the surrounding parking lots in front and around the venue.  
105 She said that other concerns were the crosswalks and wheelchair access. She said that when she  
106 looked at other parking lots, she had not seen one that did not strip or add something to slow down  
107 the traffic. She said that PC had told the developer that they needed to make it obvious that there  
108 was traffic calming in the area.

109  
110 PC Chair Welsh said that they had been concerned with the lighting, but that the lights were  
111 pointing down on the facility. She added that the nets were high so the lights on the nets would  
112 cause some light pollution.

113  
114 Boardmember Earnest asked if most of the buildings around the parking area would be medical  
115 and office use during the day and for concert use at night. PC Chair Welsh replied that they were,  
116 except the Panda Express on the west side. Boardmember Earnest asked about the restaurant in the  
117 facility. Mr. Hutchings replied that it would be the Golf Club’s own restaurant. PC Chair Welsh  
118 added that the landscaping would help buffer the venue.

119  
120 Chair Fullmer asked if the PC had looked at other facilities. Ms. Welsh replied that they had,  
121 which was why they had not discussed the size of the sign. She explained that they had looked at  
122 competitors’ signs and felt they looked tacky. Chair Fullmer felt that the Topgolf was a strong  
123 brand and she preferred a sign that people would recognize. There was a discussion about the sign  
124 and its approval. Chair Fullmer, Boardmembers Judd and Earnest agreed that they needed a larger,  
125 more obvious sign. Mr. Brim said that they could get up to 75 square feet with a waiver. He stated  
126 that they needed to be careful with the sign code because if they changed the sign code to allow for  
127 a larger sign, it would be allowed in other areas. He said that he would consult with the city  
128 attorney. PC Chair Welsh said that the current PC felt strongly about some of the decisions that  
129 they had made. Chair Fullmer stated that for her, the success of the business mattered and the  
130 lights on the sign made it impactful. She felt that the design made a big difference and was critical.

131  
132 Boardmember Riley felt that the sign was more critical because of things they lost in the facility,  
133 such as the third story. He also felt that the type of restaurant was a disappointment. He said that  
134 for the RDA to be accountable for the money they were spending there needed to be some  
135 accountability from the developer to the board. They had lost a couple of pieces, so the design of  
136 the sign was important.

137  
138 Mr. Hutchings said that the designers had designed a 75-square-foot sign to meet the design code.  
139 He felt that it needed to be recognized. He mentioned that they had a cross-parking agreement with  
140 the other businesses for venue use after 5:00 PM. He mentioned that they had a problem with the  
141 Megaplex parking overflowing into other properties. He said the they were trying to ensure that  
142 there was enough parking.

143  
144 Boardmember Earnest felt that it was a good parking plan. He said that he liked the food at  
145 Topgolf and wanted to know what they were going to do for food at the Golf Club. Mr. Hutchings  
146 said that the operator had spent a lot time looking for someone to do the food part of the business.

147 He said that he was still open to an outside vendor, but was having problems finding someone to  
148 do profit sharing with them. He stated that food and alcohol would be the biggest money makers  
149 for the business.

150  
151 Boardmember Judd asked about the number of stories on the building. McHargue replied that it  
152 was two stories with hitting bays. There was a discussion about the number of hitting bays.  
153 Boardmember Judd said that they approved \$450,000 with the understanding that it was 60 bays.  
154 He asked if they could or should hold back some of the money. There was a discussion about the  
155 agreement. Boardmember Judd asked how soon this needed to start building. Mr. Hutchings  
156 replied that they had already submitted a building permit.

157  
158 Chair Fullmer said that she wanted the sign to look better, the concrete to match the Megaplex's  
159 concrete, the bike parking to match the new zoning code that was passed earlier tonight, and a  
160 walkable area, with a quality design.

161  
162 Mr. Brim explained that to allow the sign to go beyond the 75 square feet, he would have to work  
163 with the city attorney to allow it only in this one area and not open it up to other areas. Mr. Church  
164 said that the fact that the RDA was in business with X Development meant they wanted them to  
165 succeed. He said that if they rewrote the sign code, they would run into other businesses who  
166 would want the same treatment. Boardmember Flake felt that the sign was not adequate per the  
167 standards. Mr. Brim said that he would have X Development bring in their ultimate sign and if  
168 they needed to, they would have to do a Zoning Code amendment. Mr. Church stated that they  
169 wanted all of the businesses in Vineyard to be successful.

170  
171 Chair Fullmer stated that it was hard for her to approve the site plan without knowing what the  
172 sign would look like. Mr. Hutchings replied that the sign in the first rendering they saw tonight  
173 was the sign they would be using. Mr. Brim asked Mr. Hutchings to provide the dimensions of the  
174 sign. There was a discussion about the sign.

175  
176 Chair Fullmer felt that the paint on the crosswalk should match what was in the Megaplex area.  
177 There was a discussion about the crosswalk. Mr. Brim mentioned that the drop-off area would be  
178 striped. Chair Fullmer requested that the crosswalk be colored to match the Megaplex. The  
179 discussion continued. Mr. Hutchings explained that it would be striped between the south and  
180 north crosswalks. There was a discussion about the crosswalks and parking areas. Ms. Hart quoted  
181 the parking code and said that the developer met the parking standards.

182  
183 Ms. Welsh mentioned that every rendering that had been submitted had a different sign on it.  
184 Boardmember Riley stated that staff needed to help with that. Ms. Hart said that the sign they were  
185 currently showing would be too large and would not meet the sign code. There was a discussion  
186 about the sign and its design. Boardmember Riley felt that if they were shown pictures, then they  
187 expected it to be built the same. He explained that what they were told the Megaplex would be like  
188 and what it ended up looking like were very different things. He felt that it was difficult to create a  
189 sign ordinance and cap it at 75 feet and know what that looked like. He expressed concern over the  
190 size of the signs in the Town Center and people not being able to see them on tall buildings. He  
191 said that he wanted the areas to be successful. He said that he was approving an end product that  
192 they saw in the renderings and that staff needed to ensure that what was being approved was being  
193 delivered to the city.

194

195 Chair Fullmer felt that it was important to incorporate more design elements on the backside of the  
196 building where it was one color, to make it more exciting. Mr. Hutchings explained that it was a  
197 tilt-up building, which was stronger and provided larger open spaces, and that it would cost more  
198 money to add a different face to the building. Chair Fullmer asked if they could put a design on it.  
199 Mr. Hutchings replied that they could add channeling but it was not the look that the owner was  
200 going for. He wanted a more modern building. There was a discussion about changes that could  
201 made.

202

203 Boardmember Judd stated that he liked the look of the actual drawings on the building permit and  
204 the simplicity. He felt that it met the requirements.

205

206 Chair Fullmer felt that the sign was a massive part of design element. There was a discussion about  
207 the sign on the building permit. Mr. Brim asked if they were okay with the sign. Chair Fullmer  
208 stated that if they approved the sign on the building permit then she might require different design  
209 elements such as lighting. Mr. Hutchings replied that it was the actual sign on the building permit,  
210 but not the actual logo. The discussion continued. Mr. Church felt that people would be drawn to  
211 the area because of the brand that was created, not the sign. Boardmember Judd asked if they could  
212 build the building and wait for the sign application. Chair Fullmer explained that if they did not  
213 change the sign ordinance, she would want them to add more design elements to the building. She  
214 asked if the venue would be able to compete with other businesses. The discussion continued. Mr.  
215 Brim asked if Chair Fullmer wanted different colors or different types of material. He said that the  
216 current sign would be three times larger than the code allowed. He said that if she was okay with  
217 the current sign, they could change the code to match the size. Mr. McHargue explained the way  
218 the sign code worked, which was to take the linear feet of the building frontage to 1 square foot of  
219 sign, but the size of the sign was capped at 60 feet. He suggested that they take the cap off and  
220 then the size of the building would determine the size of the sign. The discussion continued.

221

222 Mr. Hutchings stated for the record that they were okay with a bigger sign.

223

224 Chair Fullmer said that she preferred to see the deign presented upfront where she could see it and  
225 be able to make an informed decision. She wanted to see a product that was good, one she felt  
226 comfortable putting the RDA money towards.

227

228 **Motion:** BOARDMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO ACCEPT THE SITE PLAN THAT HAD BEEN  
229 APPROVED BY PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THE FORMALIZED FINANCING  
230 AGREEMENT ON THIS PROJECT.

231

232 There was a discussion about the sign.

233

234 **Amended motion:** BOARDMEMBER JUDD MOVED TO ACCEPT THE SITE PLAN THAT  
235 HAD BEEN APPROVED BY PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THE FORMALIZED  
236 FINANCING AGREEMENT ON THIS PROJECT WITH A REVIEW OF THE SIGN  
237 ORDINANCE. BOARDMEMBER EARNEST SECONDED THE MOTION.  
238 BOARDMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. CHAIR  
239 FULLMER VOTED NAY. MOTION CARRIED FOUR TO ONE.

240

241

242 **4.  ADJOURNMENT**

243

244 Chair Fullmer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

245

246 **Motion:** BOARDMEMBER FLAKE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:12 PM.  
247 BOARDMEMBER EARNEST SECONDED THE MOTION. CHAIR FULLMER,  
248 BOARDMEMBERS EARNEST, FLAKE, JUDD, AND RILEY VOTED AYE. MOTION  
249 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

250

251

252 RDA meeting are scheduled as necessary.

253

254

255

256

257 MINUTES APPROVED ON: \_\_\_\_\_

258

259 CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer \_\_\_\_\_

260 PAMELA SPENCER, CITY RECORDER

DRAFT