

A graphic featuring a stylized mountain range in shades of blue and purple against a dark blue sky with radiating lines. Below the mountains is a brownish-orange ground area.

CAMP^W_G WILLIAMS
JOINT LAND USE STUDY
IMPLEMENTATION

A large green gradient background with a thin orange border at the top and bottom.

Executive Summary



HERRIMAN CITY

General Plan

Herriman's GP was recently updated (December 2013) and for that reason, it is unlikely that major policy changes or GP amendments will result from the JLUS Implementation program. However, Herriman is actively working with Camp Williams to selectively implement various compatibility tools, including the use of available funding for open space and recreational land "buffers" in critical locations.

The following findings are based on analysis of the most recent Herriman General Plan.

1. GP 2025 policies and strategies do not specifically address Camp Williams in the manner recommended in the JLUS final report.
2. The GP's proposed "Military Activities Zone" (MAZ) on GP pages 3-38, 3-57, etc., extends along the Camp Williams boundary, but does not "wrap around" the east side of Camp (i.e. the "panhandle" area along the most southerly part of MVC). This may not be an issue, based on development constraints and planned land uses in this location (industrial/commercial primarily). Also, the City MAZ is only ¼ mile wide (text ¼ mile vs graphic half mile). No specifics are provided on uses to be permitted in the MAZ, relevant design standards, etc., however, it is presumed the MAZ regulations will address noise, height, land use and light.
3. There are two small areas of "resort recreation" within this MAZ, along the northern Camp Williams property line; however, these seem unlikely to develop in the near term. These areas are not zoned for resort uses at present.
4. The west/central areas adjacent to the Camp Williams boundary are primarily proposed open space and recreation, which are generally compatible land uses.

Light

Not explicitly addressed in the GP, either generally or as to Camp Williams.

Noise

Not explicitly addressed in the GP, either generally or as to Camp Williams.

Height

The aviation safety MCA extending northeast of Camp Williams is not addressed in the GP or in the City's proposed MAZ (i.e. the proposed MAZ only applies to a partial ¼ mile radius).

Agricultural Preservation

The GP does not address farmland preservation in any comprehensive manner. There are zones ostensibly created for this purpose, but they allow lot sizes, densities and uses that seem contrary to the objective. Only one (the A-1 zone) is located within a portion of the MCAs. There is no farmland preservation overlay or TDR program.

General Plan Recommendations

1. Develop MAZ regulations for the City's proposed ¼ mile wide MAZ addressing light, land use, noise/vibration and height (aviation). Consider expanding the MAZ to cover the area recommended in the final JLUS report.
2. Focus on areas along the developing Mountain View Corridor (MVC) highway, especially any impacts on private, undeveloped or developing MPCs, such as Rosecrest and the Development Associates (DA) project, plus the proposed Salt Lake Community College area (east side of the MVC within Rosecrest).
3. Discuss options/issues as to the planned "resort recreation" in the area immediately abutting Camp Williams boundary (and to be w/in the City's proposed MAZ).
4. Confirm assumptions regarding limited near term development potential in the extreme southeast end of the MVC (panhandle, etc.) and any need to adjust implementation program emphasis/tasks accordingly.
5. Expand GP policy treatment of Camp Williams and compatibility issues (e.g., revise the economic development element, expand the width of proposed MAZ, possibly use TDR in an expanded MAZ, address lighting in the urban design element).

Land Use Regulation Findings

Land Use

The following zones are potentially impacted by the MCAs. It is noted that unless the development agreements for private MPCs (Rosecrest, Development Associates) provide for different levels of entitlements (more or less), the underlying base zoning applies.

FR-1

Forestry Recreation — Allows 1 du/acre, but is also subject to Hillside Overlay regulations (see below). Directly abuts Camp Williams. Various permitted and conditional uses, but existing topography, lack of utilities and other factors limit feasibility of near term development. The area is generally developing as low density single family residential.

FR 2.5

Forestry Recreation — Allows 1 du/2.5 acres, otherwise the same generally as FR-1. Also directly abuts Camp Williams.

RC

"Resort Community" - A very small area in close proximity to Camp Williams. Allows 1 du/ 2.5 acres. The RC zone contains very comprehensive and rigorous standards. A broad range of uses is allowed, but development feasibility seems limited due to topography, lack of utilities, and other factors.

Hillside Overlay

Covers the FR and RC zones — Extensive, comprehensive and strict standards. Allows 0.5 to 1.7 du/acre maximum. Will likely result in decreases in conceptual/permissible du/acre in the FR zoning districts.

A-1 — Agriculture/Single Family Residential. Allows a maximum of 1 du/acre. Directly abuts Camp Williams. Allows a wide range of permitted uses (including charter schools) and conditional uses (B&B, preschool, elderly residential, nursing homes).

RM — Residential Multifamily — Directly abuts Camp Williams and is also located in Rosecrest near the planned SLCC. Allows a minimum of 9 du/ac and a maximum of 20 du/ac. Also allows multifamily and elderly housing as of right and hotels and daycare by conditional use permit.

C-2 — Conventional general commercial zone. Affects a small area on the east side of the MVC (also located within Rosecrest). Allows a wide range of permitted uses (including elderly residential) and conditional uses (including hotels, daycare, hospitals). No apparent maximum du/acre standard (single and multifamily uses are not permitted in C2 zones).

M-1- Manufacturing Zone — Allows and includes conventional industrial uses and standards. The affected area is limited to the far southeast portion of the panhandle area. Structure height and lighting appear to be the only potential compatibility issues.

MU-2- Mixed Use zone — Allows up to 10-15 du/acre. Located in the Development Associates and Rosecrest MPCs, as well as in the panhandle area. Mandates a residential/non-residential mix. Strict design standards. Permitted uses are the same as permitted in the R-2-10, R-2-15 and RM zones. Permissible conditional uses are also the same (i.e. as per R-2-10, R-2-15 and RM zones), but conditional uses from the C2 zone are also permissible.

R-1-15, R-2-15, R-2-10 – The R-1-15 has a 15,000 square foot lot area minimum (i.e., 3 du/ac). The R-2's allow between 5.8 to 8 du/acre. All allow a wide range of permitted and conditional uses. These zones are located within the Rosecrest and Development Associates MPCs. R-2 also allows “dwelling groups.”

Wind Energy Zone – See section 10-28 below. These zones can only be created for a specific project. The zone permits commercial tubular towers up to 400' high, subject to a 2,000' separation requirement to agricultural and residential zones, as well as to various uses. “Small” wind energy systems for private use up to 80' high are also permitted, with a 3 acre site minimum.

Light

1. **Street lights** must be HPS and allowed lumens vary by right of way width (5300-16000). Fixtures must be either “refractive globe acorn” or “Herriman Tear Drop.” Neither appear to be Dark Sky compliant. Details (graphics) are located in the Town Engineering Standards- Volume #6.
2. “Shielded/Hooded” fixtures are required in the **Hillside Overlay** (applies to a large area abutting Camp Williams, including most or all of the “Development Associates” project area). Does not appear to apply to public road street lights under subdivision approval requirements.
3. **Parking area lighting** standards are “generic” (i.e. shall reflect light away from abutting properties, etc.). There is no Dark Sky standard (note the stricter standard in the HO zone). Also, it is unclear if these standards apply to public facility parking areas or only to private parking areas under site plan review.

4. There is also a “generic” statement/standard as to **sign lighting** (abutter impacts).
5. In the **C2**, all exterior lighting must be reviewed by the City and must comply with the conditions imposed, unless the planning commission directs a change in the lighting fixtures or design.
6. **Tower lighting** is restricted to FAA mandates.
7. In the **Resort Commercial**, outdoor lighting must be shielded or hooded to prevent glare onto adjacent properties and minimize the amount of light directed toward the sky.
8. In **R-2 “Dwelling Groups”** on **any public road** where street lighting is not in place, lighting shall be provided at least equivalent to light produced by a one hundred (100) watt incandescent bulb per each fifty feet (50') of frontage, or fraction thereof. Lighting is to be provided by a freestanding fixture, in the yard space between the building and public street, or attached to the wall of the building which is not more than thirty feet (30') from the street property line.
 - **Each parking area** shall be illuminated for safety by installing lighting fixtures which emit light at least equivalent to that of one 100-watt incandescent bulb per one hundred feet (100') in all directions; and
 - **All lighting** shall be shielded so as not to shine into surrounding **residences**.

Noise

The Town Code provides a generic reference to the International Building Code and its basic residential code. There are no references to or provisions for, sound attenuation in the zoning regulations. Also of note are provisions that require new development to consider highway noise (i.e. the MU and RM zones in the “Panhandle” area). Noise limits exist as to wind energy as well.

Height-	Hillside Overlay, FR and M-1 RC, R-1, R-2 RM, C2, MU-2, A-1 Monopole Roof Antennae Wind Energy Small Wind Energy (30kw) Roof Signs Steeple, water towers, etc.	Undetermined 35' max (principal building) 75' max (principal building) 100' max (conditional use in all zones) 15' above roofline max 400' maximum (rezone required) 35' as of right, 80' max or FAA if lower C2 and M1 up to 10 feet above the roofline. Exempt, except as to any FAA standards
----------------	---	---

Agricultural Preservation

There are “agricultural” residential zones, mostly located outside the extent of the MCAs (zone A-1 is the exception). There is no farmland preservation overlay zone.

Land Use Regulation Recommendations

There are a number of changes that could be made to the current zoning regulations to enhance and/or promote military compatibility. Many of these could be adopted absent wholesale adoption of the recommended “MCAOD” overlays and associated regulations.

- Under 10-1-8, **Site Plans**- add a specific reference to plan/improvement details in the MAZ.

- Under 10-2-1, **Definitions**, add a definition for “Dark Sky.” Also, clarify the term “structure” versus “building” and permit/compliance provisions (see “accessory building”). Define accessory structure. Also, clarify the term “noncomplying” (versus nonconforming).
- Under 10-5-5, **Appeals**, provide notification to Camp Williams as to any proposal in the MAZ.
- Under 10-6-6 B (GP amendments process), require Camp Williams notification as to any amendments affecting the MAZ areas.
- As to **Conditional Use regulations**- Consider amending notice and/or meeting requirements. As to permissible modifications/conditions of approval (**section 10-24-5**), conditional use criteria (**section 10-24-8**), and approval standards (**section 10-24-9**), the current language appears to be sufficient to allow noise attenuation, limit structure heights, reduce density, limit hours/mode of operations, stipulate lighting levels, increase setbacks or buffers, etc. As to extensions of approvals (**section 10-24-16**), require notification to Camp Williams for any extensions proposed in the MAZ and in any Aviation Safety overlay.
- Under section 10-28-8 - Small Wind Energy Facility
 - Modify section “A” to prohibit in the MAZ or Aviation Safety MCA or to at least require Camp Williams’ notification of proposed facilities.
 - Section 10-28-8 C 2 (Tower Heights) allows 80 feet, but also stipulates that the height “shall be reduced if necessary to comply with all federal aviation requirements.” This language may not be sufficient. Also, **section C 14** may create an internal conflict in the standards.

*“14. To prevent harmful wind turbulence from existing structures, **the minimum height of the lowest part of any horizontal axis wind turbine blade shall be at least thirty feet (30') above the highest structure or tree within a two hundred fifty foot (250') radius.** Modification of this standard may be made when the applicant demonstrates that a lower height will not jeopardize **the safety of the wind turbine structure.**”*
 - Create a new section 10-28-2-“F” under Findings, to note siting impacts on aviation safety/Camp Williams.
 - Under 10-28-4 (zoning requirements) limit the ability of the Appeals Board to modify standards for Wind Energy Facilities where such could impact Camp Williams operations.
 - Require notice to Camp Williams for any proposed modifications in the MAZ and Aviation Safety areas (i.e. section 10-28-5 A2 only “encourages” applicants to discuss proposals with neighbors). Notice should include proposed extensions of approvals (section 10-28-5 A3).
 - Suggest adding a new 10-28-6B “7” to require the plan submittal to identify the location relative to the Aviation Safety areas and MAZ overlay zones.
- Under **10-19-27, Standards for Single and Two Family Dwelling**- add provisions for sound attenuation in the MAZ.
- Under **10-19-30, as to “Monopoles”**- provide standards as to the MAZ and within the aviation MCA.
- Under **10-20-6, PUD Residential Uses**- clarify permissible residential uses as to MAZ uses. Current language allows “any” residential use. Also, require Camp Williams notification if such uses are proposed in the MAZ. Under 10-20-8, add a new section “D” to specifically address MAZ/Camp Williams (i.e. Effect on Adjacent Properties). Under 10-20-11 (Screening/Landscaping) and/or 10-20-12 (Signs and Floodlighting)- address MAZ/Camp Williams.

- As to **Section 25- Nonconforming Use**- In general, limit the ability to permit expansion etc. for such uses and structures located in the MAZ and in any Aviation Safety area, specifically expansions relating to height, density or incompatible land use.

The following Subdivision Regulation edits would be helpful as to JLUS objectives:

- Under 11-2-1, **Procedures**, revise to require notification to Camp Williams of subdivisions proposed within the MAZ overlay.
- Under 11-5-1, **Final Plat**, revise to include a note as to disclosure re: location within the MAZ overlay.
- Under 11-7-10, **Trails**, add language as to trails in the MAZ overlay (special considerations).
- Under 11-7-20, **Street Lights**, add language as to lights in MAZ overlay (full cut off, etc.).