

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

**Present**

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

**Absent**

**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.

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

Ms. Hart reviewed the site plan.

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

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

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

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

*Golf Range Area:* About 240 yards

*Site Landscaping:* 62 percent of the total site; 56,319 square feet on the site and parking lot, 175,266 square feet of driving range

*Parking:* required 143 stalls, proposed 185 stalls

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

*Distance to Residential:* About 432 feet

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was a discussion about the sign.

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

#### 4. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Fullmer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

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

RDA meeting are scheduled as necessary.

MINUTES APPROVED ON: September 11, 2019

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: /s/ Pamela Spencer  
PAMELA SPENCER, CITY RECORDER