



**CAMP<sup>W</sup> & WILLIAMS**  
**JOINT LAND USE STUDY**  
**IMPLEMENTATION**

**Executive Summary**



**EAGLE**  
MOUNTAIN



## EAGLE MOUNTAIN

The City of Eagle Mountain is the sponsor of the JLUS Implementation contract. Situated immediately south of and abutting Camp Williams, land uses in Eagle Mountain are directly affected by (and impact) Camp Williams operations.

Areas along the SR 73 corridor are to various degrees located within one or more MCAs, including the lighting, noise/vibration, aviation safety and land use MCAs. In contrast, areas extending south from the Camp towards Pole Canyon are only subject to the aviation safety MCA.

### City General Plan (2005)

---

The Eagle Mountain GP (2005 version) is very broad and focuses on promoting master planned communities and projects with specific development agreements, in locations based primarily on planned regional transportation improvements. **The 2005 GP is currently being updated.** For purposes of JLUS implementation, the SR 73 corridor is the most critical area. In addition, a future long range highway is planned north/south along the Eagle Mountain border with Cedar Fort. However, this area is subject only to the Aviation Safety MCA .

For Eagle Mountain, the GP analysis was organized by areas within the City having common attributes. These include three sub areas of the SR 73 corridor (west, central and east); the large (planned) mixed use-commercial node at the west end of SR 73; the westerly aviation safety overlay area; and (as to light/dark sky only), the “Pole Canyon” annexation area (DAI) and remainder of the City (areas without vested entitlements only).

As noted, to a significant extent, Eagle Mountain uses Master Planned community development agreements to accomplish community General Plan objectives. A complex system of incentives is built into the development codes. That system has been successful in leveraging “trade-offs” whereby (for instance) increased density is permitted in exchange for increased recreational area or other public benefits.

### SR 73 West

This undeveloped area is subject to all four MCA overlays, is predominantly undeveloped, and mostly unincorporated. Portions appear to be within the City’s annexation area. The development of this area will influence what occurs to the west (in the unincorporated and very developable West Canyon area of Cedar Fort). Eagle Mountain has reported that owners in that area are considering requesting annexation. According to regional transportation plans, the future “Cedar Valley Freeway” alignment is within the western (Cedar Fort) portion of this area.

The current GP does not appear to contain specific recommendations for this area. This area is adjacent to Camp Williams and its future development will likely have a substantive impact on the long term viability of Camp Williams’ operations.

In addition, until zoned/entitled, due to the City’s “tiered” approach to regulating density, and lacking other controls, future residential density in this area may or may not comply with JLUS standards. For instance, the base density of 1.6 du/acre “as of right” can increase up to 5.2 du/acre as of right, with even higher yields possible by conditional use permit. This is most relevant to the undeveloped unincorporated areas west of

Clearview Ranch (if annexed), and the areas subject to the western aviation safety MCA (see discussion under planned Mixed Use Commercial Node).

Based on the above, the SR 73 West sub-area should be a priority area for JLUS implementation.

### SR 73 Central

This area is comprised of fully developed, developing and/or entitled MPCs or master planned subdivisions. It should be noted that a portion of the aviation safety MCA extends south of SR 73 to include portions of the fully developed “Cedar Pass” subdivision, however that development includes only residential homes with a maximum of 1 du/5 acres.

The current GP recommends rural residential in this central area and although all MPC development agreements have not been reviewed, it appears existing development is consistent with that GP policy.

The “Meadow Ranch” project does include a small planned “mixed use-commercial” area subject to the LU-B MCA, adjacent to SR 73.

Based on the largely built out and/or fully vested and entitled nature of this sub-area, the ability to change uses, density or design regulations in this area seems limited.

### SR 73 East

This area contains current heavy industrial uses (e.g. earth materials excavation and processing), located within the approved (but undeveloped) Talon Cove and Spring Run developments. Potential changes to regional transportation routes make this area unique.

The July 2011 future land use plan (unofficial) shows the “Talon Cove” MPC as industrial. The LUP designation for the adjacent (approved but undeveloped) “Spring Run” is unclear, however the master plan for the project depicts a mix of residential, mixed commercial and industrial. That layout is in large part predicated on the location of planned highway routes. Depending on the result of current transportation planning, the feasibility of the approved Spring Run Master Plan may be limited.

Due to the irregular Camp Williams boundary in this area, LU-A MCA only impacts the westerly and northerly areas of Spring Run, and (approximately) the western 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of Talon Cove. The remainder of the area is within the LU-B MCA (i.e. the easterly portion of Spring Run and most of Talon Cove). The LU-B MCA also affects a small (western) portion of a planned strip commercial (MU-C) area along SR 73, south of Talon Cove.

Based on the area’s proximity to I-15, the developing Mountain Valley Corridor and planned/developing highway infrastructure, **this area should be a priority for JLUS implementation efforts in Eagle Mountain City.**

### *Planned MU-C Node*

This large area is located along SR 73. Approximately ¾ of the area is subject to the aviation safety MCA (but no other MCA overlays apply). City staff have indicated that the current GP update may likely modify the planned balance of uses in this node, as well as reduce the potential geographic extent of the mixed use component.

### *Westerly Aviation Safety MCA (South of the MU-C Node)*

This extensive area extends southerly from the planned MU-C node. While increasingly remote from the Camp Williams boundary, the area is programmed to include densities, land uses and building/structure heights which may create future conflicts.

### **Light**

This MCA only impacts areas north of SR 73 (is essentially the same as the LU-A MCA). The 2005 GP does not address light issues, either generally or specifically as relates to Camp Williams.

### *“City Wide” Dark Sky*

The client has adopted a community wide Dark Sky ordinance, based in part on a model provided by the project consultant. This implementation tool will become a major benefit not only for military compatibility but for the entire community.

### **Noise**

The 2005 GP does not address noise, either generally or as relates specifically to Camp Williams. However, the noise overlay area only applies to the northern portions of the newly entitled “Clearview Ranch,” to unincorporated areas immediately to the west of Clearview Ranch, to the northern (built out) portion of “North Ranch,” and to the northern (developing) half of “Valley View.”

### **Height (Aviation Safety)**

The 2005 GP does not address this potentially significant issue, either with regard to proximal MPCs or with regard to the extensive north/south flight corridor along the border with Cedar Fort. The aviation safety MCA is by far the most extensive overlay in terms of land area impacting Eagle Mountain. It covers all of the three SR 73 sub-areas (as well as a portion of Cedar Pass); approximately ¾ of the large planned MU-Commercial node (which allows medium to high density residential) and a large area extending south from this node, which in part contains planned Rural Residential, Mixed Use Residential, and Mixed Use Commercial.

Camp Williams’ western flight corridor is also the future location of a major highway and abuts (to the west) the Pole Canyon annexation area, which includes large planned industrial and commercial land uses (Pole Canyon itself **is not** subject to the aviation safety overlay).

Eagle Mountain leadership has noted concerns for potential impacts on Camp Williams’ operations (flight safety) and a desire to collaborate with Cedar Fort officials with regard to the aviation MCA and other JLUS implementation objectives. (Note: Cedar Fort was not a participant in the JLUS Implementation project).

## General Plan Recommendations

---

### In General

- Take advantage of the timing of the City's GP update to advance relevant JLUS compatibility policies, goals, objectives and strategies, both with respect to proximal MPC development, as well as with regard to the west aviation safety MCA, "Dark Sky" standards and (perhaps) farmland preservation.
- Consider adding a new GP section to specifically and comprehensively address the value of Camp Williams, the JLUS and JLUS implementation, relevant compatibility issues and preferred or proposed mitigation strategies (specific to Eagle Mountain). Also consider policy statements and/or strategies as to subdivision and MPC development agreements, as relate to increases in base density (above MCA recommendations).

### Land Use

- In addition to a new "Compatibility" GP section, address specific policies, goals, objectives and strategies in the economic development section of the GP, especially as to undeveloped and unincorporated areas within LU-A and LU-B MCAs. Emphasize tools to shift higher density, FAR and incompatible ("sensitive") uses out of these areas. Include discussion of disclosure and Camp Williams notification of relevant changes (GP revisions, regulations, MPC entitlements, etc.). Perhaps suggest conditional use permits for sensitive uses, with appropriate use criteria/conditions, disclosure and notification.

### Light

- Modify the GP's environmental section to include recommendations about light pollution in general, as well as with regard to Camp Williams operations, mitigation strategies and tools, etc. Note the economic benefits (energy savings) of lighting controls and the possible need to review/modify public improvement design standards (street lights, parking areas, public recreation, etc.).

### Noise

- Address "noise/vibration" in the housing section of the new GP as to Camp Williams and ways to mitigate impacts (relocating density, construction techniques, disclosure, notification etc.). Perhaps suggest incentives for mitigation within this MCA, as well as disclosure.

### Height (Aviation Safety)

- Address aviation safety in the economic development section of the new GP as to Camp Williams, but also as to utility planning (telecom, alternative energy, etc.). Provide mapping to show the extent of the MCA and how it relates to planned commercial areas. Modify the Land Use/Transportation plan map accordingly. Use standards, notification and conditional use procedures to mitigate possible impacts. Collaborate with Cedar Fort and Utah County planning and land use staff/officials, as well as economic development and utility personnel/interests.

## City Zoning

The relationship of military compatibility overlay areas to current zoning is depicted on the Figure provided in the subsequent section of this overview.

Much of the area subject to the compatibility overlays (along SR 73) has already been either developed (or is developing) pursuant to MPC agreements/approvals, or has been granted entitlement approvals by the City. The City land use regulations for these entitled MPCs are in essence the respective development agreements, and this is what the City “zoning map” depicts for these MPCs.

The **extensive use of MPCs and related development agreements** limits the ability to implement JLUS recommendations (as to design, etc.) by creating variable “case by case” regulations, often undetermined until a specific development application is proposed and approved. This flexible approach creates uncertainty. When issued, such approvals also narrow the scope of possible subsequent GP and regulatory options, by expanding the number of principals having control over, or vested interests in, project entitlements. Therefore, “independent” changes to zoning and other land use regulations may not lead to desired outcomes (as to land use, noise mitigation, light reduction, structure heights, etc.) in these specific locations.

On a positive note, it appears that at least with respect to residential density, development under these agreements has to date been more or less consistent with GP (and JLUS) recommendations.

Notwithstanding the above, due to unique circumstances, Clearview, Talon Cove and Spring Run owners may be open to having collaborative discussions concerning mutual interests, but the timing, participation, content, approach and other aspects of any such efforts would need to be very carefully considered before initiating contact.

For instance, MPC principals may be willing to discuss lighting design standards, incentives for noise mitigation, “disclosure” and Camp notification of relevant changes, but probably not without leveraging changes to some advantage. The same logic would also seem to apply to Valley View and Meadow Ranch (no motive to impose additional process/standards without commensurate private benefit). North Ranch is built out and opportunities to implement JLUS recommendations appear to be minimal or non-existent.

## Land Use

### *Residential Density*

City staff have suggested that the current GP update is considering potential simplifications to the current incentive-based system.

With the general caveat as to approved MPCs and Development Agreements, the subject of “density” also is addressed in the land use regulations (subdivision and zoning) in various ways, primarily but not exclusively through the “tiered” incentive system. While the JLUS focus as to density is on the LU-A and LU-B MCAs, density (and land use) conflicts can also occur with respect to the aviation safety MCA.

Under the City’s “tiered” residential system of incentive-based entitlement, the City-wide as of right base density of 0.8 du/acre may be increased through density bonuses.

- **Tier I** (max of 1.6 du/ac) and **Tier II** (1.61 to 5.2 du/ac) are permitted **as of right**.
- **Tier III** (5.21 – 12.2 du/ac) and **Tier IV** (12.21 – 22.7 du/ac) require **conditional use permit**.

- However, “yield” may also be **limited or reduced** for conditional uses and (indirectly) with respect to slopes over 25%.

As to conditional uses the current regulations state:

*“Population Density. Population density or land use limitations where land capability and/or vicinity relationships make it appropriate to do so to protect health, safety, and welfare.”*

As to “unbuildable” slopes over 25%. This regulation applies to any development in the City:

*“In considering the layout of any development in the city, the developer shall conform to the following restrictions with respect to unbuildable lands. No construction may occur in areas that have slopes in excess of 25 percent, land restricted by power lines, high volume floodplains, alluvial discharge areas, floodplains and floodways, and wetlands.”*

How, when or to what extent these limitations (or bonuses) will/would be applied cannot be determined until a specific development application is received, reviewed and approved. As a consequence, it is not prudent to rely exclusively on planned or even zoned residential density to conclude that a given location (subject to an MCA overlay) will in fact, ultimately be developed in ways that are consistent with JLUS recommendations (as to density).

This fact elevates the role that **notification** (awareness) and active collaboration will need to play going forward.

### *Density (as to specific sub-areas)*

With the above noted caveat as to reliance on current “zoning” as to potential density, City regulations contain the following:

- SR 73 West

Unincorporated areas are not zoned (are not subject to City regulation unless annexed). Zoning requirements for Clearview are codified in the project’s development agreement. That agreement has not been reviewed, but it is our understanding that permitted unit yields per acre in Clearview are consistent with JLUS recommendations (i.e. do not exceed 2 du/acre).

- SR 73 Central

North Ranch (built out at **1 du/acre**)

Valley View (developing at max **1.1 du/acre**)

Meadow Ranch (developing at **1 du/acre**)

Cedar Pass (built out a **1 du/5 acres**)

- SR 73 East

Talon Cove (undeveloped, permitted max of **2.65 du/acre**)

Spring Run (believed to be no more than 2 du/acre).



### *MU-Commercial Node*

While the primary intent is employment, tax base, goods and services, moderate to high density residential can be approved in this area. These densities would likely exceed the JLUS suggestion of 2 du/acre maximum.

### *Western Aviation Safety MCA*

Current zoning designations include rural residential and mixed use residential, as well as mixed use commercial (east of Pole Canyon). While well off into the future, the potential for a new freeway in this area suggests that current assumptions may not reflect potential future land use intensity. It is likely that residential densities will exceed current expectations (especially as to rural residential), absent some type of near term intervention (such as land conservation).

### *Permitted Uses*

#### SR 73 West

With the exception of Clearview (presumed to be predominantly or exclusively LDR), these areas are not zoned and potential future uses cannot be determined. However, planned highway infrastructure and the lack of major physical or environmental constraints suggest this area may eventually include “sensitive” uses within the MCAOD area.

#### SR 73 Central

Permitted uses are codified pursuant to the respective MPC development agreement. Based on what we have been able to evaluate and discussions with City staff, with relatively minor exceptions (small MU-commercial areas), the SR 73 Central area is almost exclusively residential.

#### SR 73 East

Uses within Talon Cove are all residential, with the exception of a planned school in the far southeast corner, which is outside the LU-A MCA. In contrast, the Spring Run master plan does include a wide variety of potential non-residential uses in locations which could create conflicts with Camp Williams’ operations.

### *MU-Commercial Node*

This very large planned commercial node is envisioned as a major employment area. As such, current zoning permits a broad range of commercial, office, retail, personal services, institutional, recreational and other uses, many of which could potentially conflict with the aviation safety MCA (as well as with respect to building and/or structure heights).

### *Western Aviation Safety MCA*

Although more remote from Camp Williams, these areas (also within the aviation safety MCA), if developed according to current plans and zoning, would allow inconsistent uses. In particular are planned mixed use residential and mixed use commercial areas.

### *Conditional Uses*

Section 17.95 of the zoning regulations contains comprehensive requirements for submittals, notification of abutters, findings, general and optional conditions, as well as for enforcement, abandonment and revocation.

Many of the standards could be used as presently worded to address compatibility; however it would be prudent to consider adoption of more specific language.

Permissible conditional uses in residential zones include multi-family housing, Tier III and Tier IV developments, religious facilities, public and private schools, radio, microwave and transmission towers and small “neighborhood” scale mixed commercial/residential projects.

Permissible conditional uses in commercial zones include motels/hotels and mixed use residential development.

## Lighting

**NOTE: The following analysis preceded the adoption of new lighting standards in Eagle Mountain, and it is presumed that the recent adoption (December 2014) of the City-wide “Dark Sky” regulation addressed the concerns noted below and established a more comprehensive and consistent approach to lighting design standards and their applicability.**

Regulations and standards regarding artificial lighting were found in a variety of sections and do not seem to have been created/adopted in a coordinated or integrated manner, are vague and subject to multiple interpretations. These included the following.

- As to **conditional uses** (site plans are required for all conditional uses)
  1. Lighting plans are required for all conditional use applications-
  2. “A lighting plan, which indicates the illumination of all interior areas and immediately adjoining streets showing the location and type of lighting proposed.”
  3. As to projects subject to “master site plan” approval:
  4. When development proposals are larger than five acres in size, proposed to be developed in phases or sold in separate parcels, a master site plan and final master plat approval by the city council are required prior to approving the individual sites within the project.
- **Parking area and street lighting** (as to master site plan approval)

*“All parking lot light fixtures shall be installed to prevent light glare from adversely affecting adjacent properties. Pole-mounted fixtures are required in lots or along roads. Lighting of all pedestrian pathways is required. Lighting will be judged as to how adequately it provides for the health and safety of citizens. Design and location of standards and fixtures shall be specified on the site development drawings. Illumination shall be controlled so that glare or excessive direct light will not adversely affect neighboring areas. All streetlights and interior parking lot lights shall meet the city’s adopted design standards for lighting.”*
- **Building lighting** (as to master site plan approval)

*“Plans for exterior building lighting shall be approved as part of the site plan approval. Building lighting shall be shielded and directed downward so that the light source is not visible from beyond the property where the structure is located. Lighting shall not project above structures or flagpoles, nor beyond the property line.”*

- As to **parking area lighting** (general standard)

*“Lighting in Parking Areas. Parking areas shall have adequate lighting to ensure the safe circulation of automobiles and pedestrians. Such lighting shall be directed in such a way as to not be a nuisance to adjacent properties or uses. Light shields may be required.”*

- As to **small wind energy tower lighting** (allowed in any zone)

*“Exterior lighting on any structure associated with the facility shall not be allowed except that which is specifically required by the Federal Aviation Administration.”*

- As to **street lighting**

The City owns and operates Eagle Mountain’s electric utility. Also, as to approved MPCs and master planned subdivisions, it is assumed that City street light standards apply.

## Noise

The only current regulations for “noise” limit noise from wind energy facilities to a maximum of 65 dB at the property line (which is consistent with the JLUS noise impact MCA approach).

## Height

- (Principal Buildings)
 

Residential zones:	Generally no more than 35’; 20’ for accessory 50’ for accessory in an agricultural zone (except wind)
Commercial zones:	Five stories maximum as of right
Industrial zones:	Five stories maximum as of right
Small Wind Energy (free standing accessory):	45-65’, with building permit
Small Wind Energy (roof mounted accessory):	No more than 5’ above a roofline, higher with conditional use permit approval by the City Council.  (“minor modifications” permitted to wind energy standards by conditional use permit)

## Agriculture

The 2005 GP does include relevant discussion, however there is very limited if any farmland in proximity to Camp Williams (i.e. subject to MCAs). In contrast, there may be opportunities to mitigate potential future conflicts as to the **western aviation MCA** through farmland preservation, TDR or other methods (for instance in the RR zones). GP language could be expanded to include the potential use of farmland preservation to limit development within the westerly aviation corridor. Emphasis could be on economic development (agri-business) values, in addition to the complimentary benefits of supporting Camp Williams and public safety.

In terms of zoning, none of the following zones are presently located within any of the MCA overlay areas, however, they may present opportunities to mitigate or prevent compatibility conflicts in the westerly aviation safety overlay area.

### *Agricultural Zone*

Large areas in the southeast portion of the City (abutting the Lake Mountains) are zoned Agricultural. There is an explicit “right to farm” provision in the regulation which grants special status to farming operations in these zones. Minimum lot area for a single family home is five acres. Multifamily development is prohibited in this zone.

### *Agricultural Preservation Zone (APO)*

The “APO” requires Council approval, owner permission/request and a minimum of 80 acres. There appears to be only one area of the City zoned APO (southeast of and abutting the Cedar Pass subdivision). The limitations of current APO statutes are discussed in detail in the project’s Agricultural Protection Overlay Feasibility analysis included as a separate component of this Report.

## Land Use Regulation Recommendations

---

Based on the analysis, potential JLUS implementation **regulatory** opportunities seem to be limited to the following areas

### *SR 73 West*

#### *Westerly Unincorporated Area (if/when annexed)*

- **Adopt the full range of JLUS MCAOD recommendations for this area** (LU-A and LU-B, lighting, noise and aviation safety). In addition, include buyer disclosure requirements and Camp Williams notification requirements in any MOU.

#### *Clearview Ranch*

- Acquire and review the MPC master plan and development agreement to confirm density compliance and to identify any “sensitive use” and/or FAR conflicts. **Consider initiating discussions with project principals** to address buyer disclosure as well as notification to Camp Williams via an MOU as to any relevant GP/Project/Regulation changes. Consider voluntary adoption/use of “dark sky” techniques (or at least identify and evaluate intended lighting specifications). Finally, consider voluntary limitations or process options as to small wind energy towers.

### *SR 73 East*

#### *Spring Run MPC*

- There may be some opportunity to negotiate with Spring Run as part of the (potential) discussion relating to major highway plan adjustments under consideration by UDOT and the RPO. In general, the objective would be to shift density/development and any “sensitive” uses into the easterly section of the project (i.e. into LU-B and orient to SR 73).

#### *Talon Cove*

- Consider initiating discussions with project principals. Focus on Camp Williams notification of GP, Master Plan and zoning changes, and perhaps the adoption of lighting standards.

### *Planned MU-Commercial Node and Westerly Aviation Safety Overlay.*

See below under Height /Aviation Safety and Light.

## Light

### *Lighting Overlay (as to SR 73 West only)*

- Create one consolidated lighting design standard section for all (applicable) uses, public and private, subdivision and site plans, as of right/conditional, parking, building, signage, etc. Provide all necessary graphics, fixture details, etc.

### *Lighting Standards (City Wide/Non-Vested Uses and Lands)*

As noted, the City has taken the initiative to adopt and implement this tool.

## Noise

Impacts a very limited geographic area and even less area that is not developed or entitled. The main focus should be the area west of North Ranch (i.e. the entitled but undeveloped Clearview Ranch and the undeveloped unincorporated adjacent areas to the west).

Requirements should include **disclosure at a minimum**, plus if possible, **incentives** to secure noise attenuation construction methods.

## Height (Aviation Safety)

As part of the MCAOD, **adopt the full extent of the aviation safety overlay zone**, with the exception of vested projects. Address standards and procedures for height, land use, towers and wind energy facilities.

Page left intentionally blank.