

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, January 9, 2003

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Kent Forsgren, Commissioners Bart Hill, Cindy Roybal, Cory Ritz, Jim Talbot, and Sid Young, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. Mr. Young asked to be excused for the first part of the meeting.

Chairman Forsgren called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M. **Larry Jensen** offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion:

Cindy Roybal moved that the minutes of the December 5, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting be approved with corrections as noted. Bart Hill seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor. Jim Talbot abstained because he was not yet a member of the Planning Commission during the December 5th meeting.

Bart Hill moved that the minutes of the December 11, 2002, Special Planning Commission Meeting be approved with corrections as noted. Cindy Roybal seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor. Larry Jensen abstained because he was unable to attend the December 11th meeting. Jim Talbot also abstained because he was not yet a member of the Planning Commission during the December 11th meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING: THE STONEBRIDGE GROUP/RICHARD HAWS REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO REZONE 12.167 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED NORTH OF CLARK LANE AND WEST OF I-15 FROM BP TO A (Z-6-02) (Agenda Item #2)

Background Information:

The subject property has been in Farmington City for a number of years and has been zoned BP for most of that time. Land west and northwest of the subject property was recently annexed into Farmington City with the zone designation of "A" (Agriculture). However, the General Plan was concurrently amended with the annexation identifying the future land use of this area as "Mixed Use." Someday, this property may be part of a larger mixed use commercial development but for now the developer would like the City to down-zone the property to A until such time as the majority of the land is rezoned consistent with the General Plan.

Presently, an Economic Development Focus Group created by the City Council has been

formed to take another look at the General Plan to further refine the current Mixed Use designation and to also look at making changes to other land use designations north of Clark Lane and along the U.S. 89 corridor.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the background information.

Chairman Forsgren stated he may have a possible conflict of interest regarding this agenda item. He said he would conduct the meeting but would not vote on any of the motions. He opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING* and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Lisa Campbell (representing the Stonebridge Group) stated the developer had not been aware of the BP zoning until a tax notice had been sent. They were under the impression that the property was still AE. Because the development had not yet received funding for the project, there was inadequate cash flow with which to pay the increased taxes on the BP zoned land. The developer was asking that the property be down-zoned until such time that financing was in place and the development was under way.

With no other forthcoming comments, the Chairman *CLOSED* the public hearing and asked the Commission for their consideration.

Motion:

Larry Jensen moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the rezone for property located north of Clark Lane and west of I-15 from BP to A as requested. Cindy Roybal seconded the motion, which was approved by a vote of 4 to 0. Chairman Forsgren abstained.

PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO ESTABLISH A COMMUNITY CENTER IN THE LOCATION OF THE ROSE GARDEN AT THE CITY'S MAIN PARK LOCATED AT 125 SOUTH MAIN IN AN LR ZONE (C-1-03) (Agenda Item #3)

Background Information

Construction of the Community Center was approved as part of the bond election held last November. Some of the information presented to the public at that time showed the site for the Community Center on the same block as the City Hall. It is now proposed that the Community Center be constructed in the Main Park by the swimming pool. According to the City's legal counsel it is possible for the City to construct the Community Center at a different location other than the City Hall block. Mayor Connors and Max Forbush should be on hand to answer any of your questions regarding this matter.

Comparison Summary of the Two Sites:

Similarities:

- ↪ Both sites are surrounded by existing public uses. The City Hall site is next to the City Hall and the School District Complex, and the Main Park site is next to the Main Park (Swimming Pool), Elementary School, and the County Complex.
- ↪ Both Sites are next to or across the street from residential uses.

Dissimilarities:

- ↪ The City Hall site is next to two commercial uses (Lakes, Farmington Towing)
- ↪ The City Hall site is on a busy State route, meanwhile the Main Park site is on an Important Local street.

Advantages Unique to each site:

<u>City Hall Site</u> Two points of road access (100 North and Main)	<u>Main Park Site</u> More Parking in closer proximity to the site The location emanates greater civic pride (i.e., the beautiful building is very visible instead of tucked back into a block) More green open space Greater management control: the Leisure Services department already manage the pool at the same location. The City already owns the property
--	--

Parking:

The parking requirement for “auditoriums, Assembly Halls, Theaters, Churches, [and] Funeral Homes” outlined in Chapter 32 of the Zoning Ordinance is “1 parking space for every 4 seats. Where there are no fixed seats, 1 space shall be provided for every 40 s.f. of gross floor area.” The proposed Community Center will seat 300 people, which will require 75 packing spaces. However, the seating will not be fixed. Therefore, the Planning Commission may require that the 5,000 s.f. building have 100 parking spaces.

The Main Park parking plan shows 130 parking spaces available on site with more than double that located across Main Street at the County complex (and with a few more at Farmington Elementary).

The City Hall only has 44 parking spaces and these spaces just meet the needs of the existing City Council chambers. Three site plan options were prepared for the City Hall site location. Under these options the most parking spaces that can be hoped for is approximately 76. However, more spaces are available across the street from the City Hall at the school district offices.

Community Center Information

- ↵ The center will be used during the afternoon and evenings but not past 10:00 p.m. Primary hours of operation are between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.
- ↵ The center will be used a maximum of four evenings a weeks by the recreational theater group, 90% of this will be rehearsal time.
- ↵ On average the number of participants at most rehearsals for youth shows will be under 20 people. When performance times draw closer, rehearsals will involve the entire cast.
- ↵ The number of participants involved in performances for shows with adults will be about 10 to 20 people.
- ↵ Two shows a year are planned for youth 16 to 21.
- ↵ Receptions and other events will be held on Friday and Saturday.
- ↵ The building will be closed on Monday evenings and Sunday.
- ↵ Hopefully, the building will also eventually be used as a senior citizen center during the day.
- ↵ Small art classes of different varieties are also planned for during the day.
- ↵ The center will also be available for family reunions.
- ↵ Management functions will be conducted from the present Leisure Services offices.
- ↵ Adults will always be on hand every time the center is used.

Site Plan Information Still Needed:

- ↵ Architectural Plans meeting the standards of the Chapter 7 of the Zoning Ordinance including as a part of the exterior facade of the building or as architectural elements in the landscape, an element of "Farmington Rock."

- ↵ A Landscaping Plan shall be submitted which illustrates proposed landscaping and fencing in enough detail that the screening and aesthetic qualities of the landscaping can be effectively reviewed by the Planning Commission. All required Landscape Plans shall include:
 - Percent of site to be landscaped. A minimum of forty percent (40%) of a multiple-family residential site, fifteen percent (15%) of a commercial site, and five percent (5%) of an industrial site shall be landscaped. Upon a request by the applicant, landscaping percentages may be reduced if the Planning Commission finds that, due to the size of the parcel, the amount of landscaping required is unreasonable and cannot be located in useful locations. The Planning Commission may also require an increase in landscaping as a requirement for Conditional Use Approval if it is determined that such an increase is necessary to help mitigate some aspect of a proposed use;
 - A plant legend specifying the total number of each type of plant, each plant's common name, and size of plants at time of installation;
 - Location of individual trees, shrubs, groundcover, and other planting areas showing approximate distances from roadways, sidewalks, and buildings. The retention of healthy existing trees and other vegetation is strongly encouraged;
 - Description and location of any proposed ornamental landscaping elements (colored and crushed rock, gravel, large boulders, etc.);
 - Description, location, and dimensions of fences and landscaping protective devices;
 - All landscaped areas shall be provided with an automatic irrigation system that will maintain the living material in a good and healthy condition.
- ↵ For development for which outdoor lighting is proposed, lighting plans shall be required which illustrate the type and location of lighting proposed for structures, walkways, and parking lots. Lighting shall be designed, located, and directed so as to eliminate glare and minimize reflection of light into neighboring properties.
- ↵ Screening shall be provided in the following situations and according to the following standards:
- ↵ Screening shall be provided in the following situations and according to the following standards:

- The site plans shall indicate the location, height, design, and materials of walls, fences, hedges, and other buffers. These features shall be used to screen or conceal storage areas (including refuse containers), service yards, utility installations or other unsightly features, to minimize and negative impacts on adjacent property, and to create a harmonious streetscape.
 - A six (6) foot high masonry fence and/or a thirty (30) foot buffer zone with sufficient plantings of trees and shrubs to provide adequate suppression of sound and light, shall be constructed between a residential property line or zone boundary and any parking area, road, or driveway of a proposed use determined to be of a commercial or industrial nature. All fence shall be engineered to withstand wind loads up to 100 mph and shall be approved by the City Engineer. The Planning Commission may consider an alternative fence on it's own initiative or upon petition by affected proeprty owners.
 - Where visual barrier fencing containing wood, metal, plastic, or vinyl strips is either proposed by the applicant or required by the City, such strips shall be properly secured. Fences shall be constructed so that significant variation in top line, bottom line and/or height does not occur due to erratic grading of the site.
 - Where a parking lot is located across a street from a residential use or residential zone, a landscaped berm, three (3) feet in height with a slope ration not exceeding one (1) vertical foot for each three (3) feet of horizontal distance, shall be provided within the required setback along the street. The height of the berm shall be measured from the top of the parking lot curb.
- ↪ Grading and drainage plan.
 - ↪ Water and sewer plans.
 - ↪ The site plan shall include a table indicating the total area of the site and the percentage of that total which is occupied by structures, by parking and service areas, and by landscaping.

Other Issues:

- ↪ The City is wisely planning for a basement (the basement will be unfinished upon completion of the main floor of the Community Center). What will be the eventual use for the basement?
- ↪ Will the Community Center have a name?

- ↯ What is long term outlook for the recreational theater program? When current leaders move on to other things will program fizzle? According to Jo Ann Callahan an arts council is in place to handle the long term needs of the program. “Artists are passionate about what they do.”
- ↯ A traffic impact study may be required by the Planning Commission.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen stated the City is not asking for site plan approval at this time. The City is looking for a contractor for the Center and other projects approved in the bond election and the architect needs to know requirements of the conditional use approval to move forward. Mr. Petersen reviewed the packet background information in detail.

[Sid Young arrived at 7:20.]

Mr. Petersen said there were still a number of things lacking in the application, including: better architectural plans, decisions regarding an element of Farmington rock, landscaping plans with a legend showing plant types, outdoor lighting plans, utility plans, drainage and grading plans, consideration of ways to mitigate impact on nearby neighbors, and ways to eliminate parking in front of private residences.

Mr. Petersen discussed a possible mitigation for the Bass home, which is a flaglot adjacent to the swimming pool parking lot. He and Walt Hokanson of the Public Works Department felt moving the Bass driveway boundary about 18 feet to the north and then berming and landscaping the area would be a benefit to Mr. Bass and to the public. The City would lose as much as 10 parking stalls by constructing the screening berm. However, there would likely remain ample parking stalls for events. The Meyers home would also be screened by landscaping. Other issues needing resolution included: naming the building, planning for long term use and support, and a traffic impact study.

Chairman Forsgren opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING*.

JoAnn Callahan (1033 North Main), Art Director for Farmington City, was excited about the new building. She gave some background why the building had been considered and why the Main Park location was advantageous. Ninety percent of performing arts participants are youth who rehearse in the after-school hours—the junior high is in the next block. The performing arts groups will not be using the building every night leaving the building available to rent for such events as weddings or family parties. There is no public place currently in Farmington that can be used for wedding receptions. Farmington has always encouraged visual and performing arts and the building will be a great support to that work. Ms. Callahan said there is a committee currently being organized that will help with fund-raising.

When asked by Mr. Jensen regarding the use and design of the basement area, Ms.

Callahan said it was intended that the basement be left unfinished. The space would be ideal for art classes. The ceiling does not have to be very high. There would also be senior citizen activities and classes held in the basement. It was also planned that a piano already owned by the City would be placed in the basement so the space could be used as a rehearsal hall.

Commission members concurred that the ceiling height should be sufficient to house any eventual need. The cost of raising the ceiling in the basement would be minimal.

Mayor Connors explained some of the reasons the location of the Center had not originally been in the Main Park. He stated at the time the bond election was being prepared most of the attention of City officials was on the building itself and on park improvements needed for South Park, Main Park, and the proposed new park in the north end of the City. It wasn't until after the bond had passed that staff began to look seriously at appropriate locations. At that point it was realized that the City Hall block location had some serious drawbacks, including parking. Reasons to locate the Center at the Main Park included:

- Financing: the City already owns the Main Park property.
- The City's Police Chief recommended the Main Park location for public safety reasons.
- The Main Park location provides for much more parking in a better, closer location.
- The Master Plan for the downtown area supports the location at the Main Park.

Because of concerns about originally showing a location at the City Hall, the City had given notice of meetings to discuss the change. Public hearings had been held and public input had been seriously considered. The City had weighed neighborhood input and concerns. A sub-committee was organized to study all issues and talk with all interested parties. The City Attorney had reviewed the issues. The City Council discussed the move in detail during their meeting held the previous night and after weighing the advantages and disadvantages, they accepted the staff recommendation to name the Main Park location as the preferred location.

The Mayor said the building was not a single-use building. It would be designed with the Arts Councils' needs in mind, but the City Council will also hold public hearings in the building and it will be available for citizen activities of all kinds. Festival Days will be able to make use of the building.

When Mr. Talbot asked if the bonding included financing for land purchase, the Mayor said it did not. The bond was only intended to cover the construction of the building along with delineated park improvements.

Larry Jensen asked regarding the future plans for the Mary Meyers home and if it were going to remain as a single family residence.

Mayor Connors said the only current plans is to use the parcel in the rear of the property to expand park usage. Ms. Meyers would be living in the home for as long as she wished to stay there. Whether the property would be subdivided in the future and the home rented after Ms. Meyers left was unknown at this point. The City Council will have to address the issue when it is appropriate. It was evident that the Council would have to maintain flexibility in order to meet the needs of the City. If the home were ever to be used as anything but a single family dwelling it would have to go through the public hearing process.

Mr. Jensen expressed his strong conviction that single family homes form the base for Farmington as a community and make up its unique and high quality character. If those structures are lost to other uses, such as businesses, then that important base is lost. He hoped to keep the neighborhood feeling and sense of community in place by preserving single family homes. It was important for the City to be an example in this effort. As businesses encroach on the residential neighborhoods, the City becomes fragmented and loses its character.

Mayor Connors agreed with Mr. Jensen and said it would be important to consider those facts carefully while remaining flexible to address needs of the future.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) made the following points:

- ⌞ He felt adequate notification had not taken place regarding City action in changing the location of the Center.
- ⌞ The public had been given untrue information during the bond election, since it was advertized that the building would be placed on the City Hall block.
- ⌞ There needed to be a public hearing about the location change. He felt there had not been enough public input.
- ⌞ The Lake family was interested in selling the property to the east of the City Hall property, which could be used to expand land needed for the Community Center.
- ⌞ The Center was being squeezed into the Main Park location like a shoehorn.
- ⌞ The location of the swimming pool would be bad for the City and the mistake would be doubled if the Center is also located there.
- ⌞ Impact of the Center on the nearby neighbors would be too great if located at the Main Park.
- ⌞ The approval of the Bass flaglot was a big mistake.
- ⌞ The location of the Center at the Main Park location showed poor public safety planning.

- ↯ The Planning Commission should be looking more closely at the location instead of how high the ceilings in the basement are.
- ↯ If the downtown Master Plan is so important in regards to making the area a walkable community, why hasn't more attention been given to the needs of a grocery store and a post office.
- ↯ There are too many large-function buildings in the downtown area now. The City is adding one more.
- ↯ The building design is not attractive.
- ↯ The name of the Community Center should be named after those who pay to build it: the tax payers.
- ↯ The decision to relocate the building has already been made by the powers that be and there is obviously no real citizen input being considered.
- ↯ If the City officials are so interested in doing the right thing, they should make the building look right.
- ↯ There is plenty of room in the Heritage Park being constructed. Put the building there. Or at least look at other possible locations other than in a crowded downtown. An example would be out in west Farmington where there is plenty of room. Farmington City exists outside of the downtown area. Plans need to include those who live further out from the center of town. People will drive to outside areas.
- ↯ The Planning Commission and the City Council need to expand their vision of Farmington.

Max Forbush stated he would like to rebut comments made by Mr. Hayward. He made the following points:

- ↯ The decision to move the location of the Community Center to the Main Park had received due process with ample and legally required public notice. Public hearings had been conducted regarding having the Community Center in a walkable area of downtown. City officials had visited with interested individuals and with nearby neighbors.
- ↯ The displacement of the Rose Garden had been discussed in detail with members of the Lion's Club. The Rose Garden would be reconstructed on a site to the south of the Center.

- ↯ Public decisions are never easy because of the effect on people and their lives. The City officials have always tried to get as much input as possible. They have always contacted as many people as possible to get comments.
- ↯ Public safety has been a paramount concern. The Police Chief has thoroughly reviewed the situation and has recommended the location at the Main Park because of concerns about public safety.
- ↯ The location at the Main Park would effect fewer residents than the location on the City Hall block.
- ↯ Cost was a big issue. The cost of locating the Center at the Main Park was significantly less than locating it on the City Hall block.

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** *CLOSED* the public hearing and asked the Commission for their consideration. He stated he had attended 3 or 4 public hearings himself. He believed the public had been involved in the decision making process. The Planning Commission had some hard questions and had studied the issues in depth. They always listen to comments and had resolved many of the issues. He felt City officials were going in the right direction. The Chairman asked Mr. Petersen if indeed legal requirements for public notification and input had been observed.

Mr. Petersen responded in the affirmative. He said the City had invested heavily in the creation of the Downtown Master Plan. The Plan called for the Center to be in the downtown area. Public input into the Downtown Master Plan had been significant.

Mr. Jensen stated that the Planning Commission is not a “rubber stamp” body. Members did ask the hard questions and were determined in getting answers, resolutions, and appropriate actions in behalf of the City. He had served on the committee which took public input. He had heard the complaints and concerns of people, especially those living close to the Main Park. Conditions being presented were a direct result of public input and officials respect for citizen concerns. Such issues as the screen of neighbor homes, parking, and keeping the Meyers home as a single family home are being very carefully deliberated. Finances are an important issue. Mr. Jensen felt that the Main Park location was the correct location.

Mr. Jensen inquired about the timing of the construction of the Center. He felt that if done during the summer it would disrupt too many uses of the Main Park.

Mr. Petersen said it was planned that the swimming pool would continue to serve the public during construction of the Center. Farmington Festival Days would feel the affect of the construction, but several ideas had been suggested to alleviate impact on the activity. FABL would also be somewhat impacted, especially during Festival Days. Officials in charge of those events have been consulted and compromises reached to resolve the situation. It was the goal of the City to have all construction completed within one year.

Lafe Harrison (Layton Construction--architect for the Center) stated that there would be two boweries in place during the construction. Those would be replaced after construction of the new facilities.

The Planning Commission members discussed the issue, including the following points:

- ↯ Location at the Main Park makes more sense than location on the City Hall block. Parking is more plentiful and more accessible.
- ↯ Costs issues are crucial. The City must stay within budgeted amounts. The cost of the location at the Main Park will be less than the location near City Hall. The City owns all the property needed at the Main Park location. They would have to purchase property if the City Hall location were used.
- ↯ There would be no parking if the building were located at the Oakridge Park.
- ↯ It may be that the public process was not thorough enough at the north end of Farmington City. There did seem to be people in that area that did not know that the location was being changed.
- ↯ A great deal of input regarding Oakridge Park had been gathered.
- ↯ All questions originally asked by the Planning Commission had been resolved.
- ↯ The Downtown Master Plan was a good plan which should be followed.
- ↯ Mr. Bass has been shown the ideas for screening his property and is very happy with the idea. He stated he felt it would help add value to his property.
- ↯ The question was asked if the City was responsible to mitigate impact on Mr. Bass' home since the structure was constructed after the public park was there. Personnel from the Public Works Department felt that the screen idea for the Bass property would be beneficial for the public also and recommended it even though there may be no legal requirement for the City to do so.
- ↯ There was a concern that parking would be ample because some summer days the pool patronage uses all the stalls. Mr. Petersen explained that there would only be 5 performances held in the building during the year. The Performing Arts Committee were considering adjusting their schedule to hold those performances when the pool was closed for the season.
- ↯ The multi-use aspect of the building will be a great benefit to the citizens of Farmington.

- ↵ There would be future opportunities to consider conditional use requirements.
- ↵ The public process has been used to improve the concept of the Community Center.
- ↵ The concern was raised that the performing arts function of the building would out-grow the City's ability to financially support the activities. Ms. Callahan responded that plans for the stage area of the building were being purposely kept small. There will only be 300 seats in the audience. There are no plans to hold massive productions because the City deals mostly with youth in its performances. The size of the building should be perfect for the long term and there are no plans for future expansions.

Motion:

Sid Young moved that the Planning Commission grant conditional use approval whereby this approval shall be subject to further conditions by the Commission pending not only site plan review but also building and construction and approval. This motion for conditional use approval shall also be subject to the following conditions.

1. "No Parking" except for residents and/or guests of residents shall be posted and enforced on the west side of Main Street between State Street and the parking lot of the Main Park.
2. A landscape plan approved by the Planning Commission shall be prepared to screen the Scott Bass home from the Main Park parking lot.
3. The site plan for the community Center and park expansion area shall include among other things a wall, fence, hedge, or some acceptable combination thereof, as approved by the Planning Commission to effectively screen adjacent residential properties including but not limited to the Schulthies and Meyer properties.
4. It is strongly encouraged that the Mary Meyers home shall be maintained as a residential lot.
5. The City shall work to publicize plans for the Community Center and gain even more public input.
6. The City shall take public input regarding the name of the Community Center.

In discussion of the motion, **Mr. Petersen** reminded the Planning Commission that it would be impossible to bind a future City Council regarding the Mary Meyers home. They could, however, state reasonable concerns regarding the property.

Mr. Jensen suggested an amendment to the motion that it state that if the present City Council or a future City Council proposed a use other than a residential use for the Meyers home

that there shall be extensive public hearings. He also suggested that research be done to find out if the Meyers homes would qualify for historical preservation status.

Mr. Young agreed with the amendment as suggested by Mr. Jensen.

Cory Ritz seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Reasons for Motion:

1. Public process had been observed even beyond legal requirements.
2. The proposal made sense.
3. The action was a wise use of public funds.
4. The City had received a mandate from the public to build the Community Center.
5. The Downtown Master Plan called for a Community Center to be placed in the downtown area.

MOTION TO AMEND AGENDA

Motion:

Cory Ritz moved to reconsider Agenda Item #2 in order to establish findings for the motion. Bart Hill seconded the motion, which was passed by unanimous vote.

RECONSIDERATION OF AGENDA ITEM #2

Reasons for Motion:

1. The developer making the request, Rich Haws, has been cooperative with City officials and has demonstrated a willingness to be of benefit to the City.
2. There had been no negative input from citizens during the public hearing.
3. The action was consistent with the General Plan.

MOTION TO CONTINUE AGENDA AS OUTLINED

Motion:

Larry Jensen moved to continue the meeting with Agenda Item #4. Sid Young seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO DEVELOP HERITAGE PARK ON APPROXIMATELY 10.5 ACRES LOCATED BETWEEN THE FIELDSTONE SUBDIVISION AND U.S. 89 NORTH OF THE K-MART SHOPPING CENTER IN AN LR ZONE (C-2-03) (Agenda Item #4)

Background Information:

The development of the subject park has been contemplated for some time and was recently approved as part of the approval of the Oakridge Park Planned Unit Development back in 1997. Originally, it was contemplated that the park would have enough room for several ball diamonds and playing fields. But due to right-of-way acquisitions by UDOT there is not enough depth east to west to accommodate ball fields. Moreover, the City has purchased additional park property in west Farmington to meet these needs. It appears that the primary use of the park is for passive recreation and this is consistent with Leisure Services and Parks Master Plan recently adopted by the City.

Other Issues:

- ⌞ Over the years the property purchased for the park has been mostly referred to as “Oakridge Park.” The developers and property owners within the adjacent subdivision, and Farmington City anticipated that this would be the name of the park because the Subdivision is named “Oakridge Park Estates” and the main road in the Subdivision is named “Oakridge Park Drive.” However, even though the name of the subdivision is Oakridge Park Estates many people call it the Fieldstone Development to differentiate it from all the other subdivision in the area that bare the “Oakridge” name in one form or another. Nevertheless, the entire are is known as “Oakridge” and this will be its largest park. It may make sense to name the park “Oakridge Park.” Some have suggested naming the park “Oakridge Heritage Park.”
- ⌞ The water feature has been a source of controversy for many. The Planning Department has been asked the following questions: Will the park be used for ice-skating during the winter? What is the capital cost? What about the long-term operation and maintenance? How many years will this feature of the park hold up to vandalism? If it becomes too expensive, what is the contingency plan for this area? Will this detract from the water park planned for the swimming pool? Does the water park use secondary or culinary water? How many gallons of water a day will be used? Has the Health Department approved this? What will the anticipated ecoli-bacteria levels be? Will the Heritage Park water feature be operational during drought years: Does it look bad that the City plans to provide this service so close to the Cherry Hill water park which is a private venture?

Site Plan Information Still Needed:

- ↵ A Landscaping Plan shall be submitted which illustrates proposed landscaping and fencing in enough detail that the screening and aesthetic qualities of the landscaping can be effectively reviewed by the Planning Commission. All required Landscape Plan shall include:
 - Percent of site to be landscaped. A minimum of forty percent (40%) of a multiple-family residential site, fifteen percent (15%) of a commercial site, and five percent (5%) of an industrial site shall be landscaped. Upon a request by the applicant, landscaping percentages may be reduced if the Planning Commission finds that, due to the size of the parcel, the amount of landscaping required is unreasonable and cannot be located in useful locations. The Planning Commission may also require an increase in landscaping as a requirement for Conditional Use Approval if it is determined that such an increase is necessary to help mitigate some aspect of a proposed use;
 - A plant legend specifying the total number of each type of plant, each plant's common name, and size of plants at time of installation;
 - Location of individual trees, shrubs, ground covers, and other planting areas showing approximate distances from roadways, sidewalks, and buildings. The retention of healthy existing trees and other vegetation is strongly encouraged;
 - Description and location of any proposed ornamental landscaping elements (colored and crushed rock, gravel, large boulders, etc.);
 - Description, location, and dimensions of fences and landscaping protective devices;
 - All landscaped areas shall be provided with an automatic irrigation system that will maintain the living material in a good and healthy condition.
- ↵ For developments for which outdoor lighting is proposed, lighting plans shall be required which illustrate the type and location of lighting proposed for structures, walkways, and parking lots. Lighting shall be designed, located, and directed so as to eliminate glare and minimize reflection of light into neighboring properties.
- ↵ Grading and drainage plan.
- ↵ Water and sewer plans.
- ↵ Transportation and circulation plans (i.e., how many parking spaces are proposed)?

- ↵ The site plan shall include a table indicating the total areas of the site and the percentage of that total which is occupied by structures, by parking and service areas, and by landscaping.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the agenda item for the Planning Commission. He discussed the fact that there had been reaction to the name “Heritage Park.” He also listed concerns regarding the installation of a “water park” feature in the new park.

Chairman Forsgren opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING*.

Mayor Connors stated that since his election as a City Council member in 1993 and during his first year as mayor, it had been a goal of the City to construct a park in the Oakridge area. He said he knew that the park had been a dream of many citizens for even more years than that. Mayor Bell had left office regretting the fact that the park had not yet been constructed. There had been a great deal of work done for the park. Land acquisition, funding, designing, and public input were all carefully considered. The City has been greatly enhanced by the parks and trails developed during recent years. The park in the Oakridge area will add to the quality of life for Farmington citizens. It was noted that the park was designed to give ready access to the residential areas surrounding it.

Brent Mason (1646 North Oakridge) was the president of the Oakridge Park Estates P.U.D. home owners’ association consisting of over 114 homes near the proposed park. He was in favor of the park. There had been a great many public hearings about the design of the park and much effort in promoting the bond issue that would make the park possible. The citizens had overwhelmingly voted for the park. There had been many open houses and many committee meetings regarding it. Many of the neighbors had bought homes there after being told there would be a park at that location. He stated the water amenity would be a “zero water” facility. Cherry Hill had had a chance to respond to the water park and had not done so. The water park would be low cost and would only function upon request specific activation by a user. He requested the Planning Commission approve the conditional use.

Jerry King (1474 Moss Lane) gave a history of the process citizens had gone through to get the park approved. It had been a dream of his for 26 years. Mr. King had worked with several City administrations trying to get the park developed through a committee called Neighbors for a Better Farmington. The committee had campaigned for the bond election and used elements of the park in the campaign. The water park was a part of the campaign and was expected by those who voted for the bond. There was an overwhelming positive vote for the construction of the park. Mr. King asked the Planning Commission to support the elements of the park as presented to the citizens. He felt that the park was the main feature of the bonding campaign, and he asked that the Planning Commission maintain the integrity of the City of Farmington.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) had been the chairman of the Oakridge Architectural Review Committee since April of 1987 and had reviewed the plans for all the homes

in his subdivision. He had worked to have the bond passed. He felt that developments should be required to place building lots next to major roads so that when UDOT needs more room, building lots are cut and not parks. He was aware of a letter written in March of 1994 signed by Mayor Bell promising that the park in the Oakridge area would be constructed by the City. It was promised that the park would be the next priority for construction by the City. The homes in the area were placed very close to each other with little open space. The park was needed to fill the need for the space. The Planning Commission should approve the request regardless of the details that have been disputed. He said citizens had been promised that the park would take priority on the list of expenditures. Since governments always run out of money, it would only be right to take care of the park first. Also, Mr. Hayward felt that "Heritage" was a good name for the park.

Mark Rogers (1209 West Oakridge Drive) stated he was definitely in favor of basketball court. There was sufficient light during the summer time to provide enough time for basketball play. There was no need for extended night lighting. That would help avoid noise during the dark hours of the evening. He stated he had heard there was an underground water source that may be resurfaced as an amenity to the park. He felt that that would be unsafe for children and unhealthy due to mosquitoes. He felt the stream should remain piped. Regarding the water park, he said it would be an additional cost to recycle the water need for the feature. The water should be funneled from fresh water sources for the safety of users. The amount of water needed would be minimal since it would shut off when not being used. Motion sensors would be used to monitor when water was needed. He was in favor of the water feature. Mr. Rogers said that the road through the subdivision in which he lived was Oakridge Park Drive, therefore the Park should be named Oakridge Park as originally proposed.

Joel McCraw (1141 West Oakridge Dr.) said he was a member of the Baseball Association and was concerned with the fact that the park would not allow organized play. There needed to be more room for youth to play baseball and the new park was an ideal area for another diamond. Organized play was growing in popularity without any growth in facilities. The reason he bought the home in which he resides is because there was indications that a ball field would be part of the park to be constructed. There is a great need for places to practice and to play. There are no places to do so in the Oakridge area.

Cheryl Landheim (1622 Pinehurst) was excited about the park. She said it would get rid of the weeds next to her property. She said she had a strong sense of community and felt her neighbors would also feel responsible to take care of the park. If vandalism was observed, she felt the citizens would enforce protective measures.

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** *CLOSED* the public hearing. A discussion ensued, including the following points:

- ↯ Much of the concern expressed was regarding the proposed water feature for the park. Careful consideration needed to be given the feature. Some Commission members were against such use of water in a drought year in a desert state. Others felt it would be wise to get more information before making a decision. Some Commission members stated they were unaware that a water park had been

planned for the Oakridge area until after the bond election. Mr. King commented that the water feature was vandal proof. It was designed for fresh water but there would be no standing water on the area. A mat covered the floor of the feature to drain the water immediately. There would be not health risks. It was also designed with a water saver feature—the flow had been reduced by 40 percent.

- ↯ Discussion had also raised the issue about building a full basketball court with night lighting to provide for youth who need such facilities. Mr. King stated the half court had been specifically requested in order to discourage organized play and extended night use. Some members of the Commission felt that consideration should be given to constructing a full basketball court to meet the needs of a growing City with a younger population. The thought was expressed that the new park should be designed to incorporate as many activities as possible, even a soccer field, in order to meet the needs of the citizens of the entire City. The acreage should be used to the best advantage and not be limited to the use of the nearby residents. (Mr. Petersen stated that there had also been park property purchased in the west part of Farmington. A full baseball diamond was planned for that area. However, it may be a long time before that park is constructed.)
- ↯ Commission members discussed the name of the park. Some members felt that it would be well to name the park *Oakridge* to help people find it. Others felt it didn't matter what the name was because people would call it what they wanted to.
- ↯ Commission members asked about the priority of the bond issue projects and if indeed the City had given first priority to the Oakridge Park. They asked about cost estimates and if the bond election had provided enough financing for all the projects requested. Max Forbush, City Manager, had been invited to address the Commission. He stated there were more revenue sources than just the bond. All public projects must by law come in under budget. All projects would be studied and public input would be considered. Some projects may be trimmed, others may be phased. Other sources include grants, parks and recreation impact fees, and private donations. Mr Forbush reported the bonds had been sold on January 8, 2003, at 3.6 percent, which was an excellent rate.

Motion:

Cindy Roybal stated she felt that the discussion just held was worth while. It was prudent to review all information before making decisions. She moved that the Planning Commission grant conditional use approval, except for the water feature portion of the park, whereby this approval shall be subject to further conditions by the Commission pending site plan review and approval and the following:

- The name of the park shall be reconsidered.
- A drainage and grading plan shall be prepared including but not limited to the

resolution of issues caused by the drainage ditch at 1075 West.

- The budget for the project shall be reviewed.
- All possible uses of the park shall be considered including a baseball diamond and a soccer field.
- Water conservation plans for the site shall be submitted.
- Information regarding the percent of the site to be landscaped shall be submitted. A minimum of forty percent (40%) of a multiple-family residential site, fifteen percent (15%) of a commercial site, and five percent (5%) of an industrial site shall be landscaped. Upon a request by the applicant, landscaping percentages may be reduced if the Planning Commission finds that, due to the size of the parcel, the amount of landscaping required is unreasonable and cannot be located in useful locations. The Planning Commission may also require an increase in landscaping as a requirement for Conditional Use Approval if it is determined that such an increase is necessary to help mitigate some aspect of a proposed use.
- A plant legend specifying the total number of each type of plant, each plant's common name, and size of plants at time of installation shall be submitted.
- Location of individual trees, shrubs, ground covers, and other planting areas showing approximate distances from roadways, sidewalks, and buildings shall be identified. The retention of healthy existing trees and other vegetation is strongly encouraged.
- Description and location of any proposed ornamental landscaping elements (colored and crushed rock, gravel, large boulders, etc.) shall be submitted.
- Description, location, and dimensions of fences and landscaping protective devices shall be submitted.
- All landscaped areas shall be provided with an automatic irrigation system that will maintain the living material in a good and healthy condition.

In discussion of the motion, Mr. Jensen stated it was not the purview of the Planning Commission to consider budgetary issues. He suggested the motion be amended regarding the budget issues.

Ms. Roybal amended the motion to read : #3, the Planning Commission recommends the budget be met by the City Council.

Larry Jensen seconded the motion.

In further discussion of the motion, Mr. Talbot wanted clarification regarding the water feature. Ms. Roybal stated that the motion be amended to include language clarifying that consideration of the water feature was to be tabled. Mr. Jensen concurred with the amendment.

The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Petersen suggested that the Planning Commission plan a meeting with the Leisure Services Committee who could give clarification and information regarding the design and intent of the Oakridge area park. By consensus, the Planning Commission decided to hold a meeting with the Leisure Services Committee for discussion regarding the park.

Reasons for the Motion:

1. The park had been a goal of Farmington for many years.
2. The park had been promised to the citizens of the area.
3. The bond election indicated that citizens were in favor of the park.
4. The area was ideal for park construction.
5. The park would create a good buffer between U.S. 89 and residential areas.

PUBLIC HEARING: THE STONEBRIDGE GROUP REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO CHANGE THE NAME OF "BURKE LANE" (FROM MAIN STREET TO U.S. 89) TO "NORTH POINTE PARKWAY." THE APPLICANT IS ALSO REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION TO NAME THE NEW ROAD FROM THE FREE INTERCHANGE TO 1100 WEST TO "NORTH POINTE PARKWAY" (STR-1-03) (Agenda Item #5)

Chairman Forsgren declared a possible conflict of interest and stated he would not vote on the agenda item.

Mr. Petersen said names of streets are emotional and historical issues. He briefly reviewed history of Farmington involving Alan Burke, who came to the area in 1848 and was one of the first five permanent settlers of the town. He stated that Mr. Burke's wife was a daughter of William O. Smith, another historically important person. Some of the William O. Smith family were buried under the Lagoon race track. With the reconstruction of the Burke Lane area, a new road had been established. UDOT was giving Farmington the opportunity to name the road. One suggestion had been North Pointe Parkway. However, there were many other "North Points" in the county. Also, some citizens felt the name should reflect the town of Farmington. A more recent proposal was "Farmington Parkway." The commercial development being considered near the new road may be named "The Crossings at Farmington Parkway." There were advantages and

disadvantage to that name also.

Mr. Jensen commented that any change of historically significant names in Farmington should be given a great deal of thought, especially the Lanes that were so prominently a part of Farmington's character.

Chairman Forsgren opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING* and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Lisa Campbell (representing the Stonebridge Group) stated the construction of the overpass had established a new road that was not in existence previously. UDOT had given the opportunity to name the extension in honor of Farmington. The developer did not want a name that was not appropriate to the City.

Mr. Petersen stated that the reason the issue was before the Planning Commission was because UDOT was currently preparing a signage package that would include the name of the street.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) grew up in south Davis and was used to the duplicate name on streets in Bountiful. There are a lot of historical names that could be used instead of North Pointe. And where will people think "North Pointe" is—at the point of one of the mountains in the Wasatch range? Everyone knows where Burke Lane is. What is the point of changing the name? Give Burke Lane a number designation also. The applicant has not demonstrated a significant reason to change the name to North Pointe. Names are important to people trying to find a place.

Alysa Revell (208 West State Street) reviewed the significant points of history involving Alan Burke and his contribution and sacrifice for the town of Farmington. The Burke legacy should be maintained in the name of the lane. Changing the name is like tearing down an historic house. They are markers of early settlers. The names give special character and help define the City. Mr. Burke helped found the City and his descendants still live in the City today. Ms. Revell asked that the Planning Commission preserve the heritage of Farmington.

Chadwick Greenhalgh (208 West State Street) said he echoed the comments made by Ms. Revell. He was opposed to the name using *parkway* in it because of the big city connotation. Names should use *lane* to retain the flavor of the town. The real issue is what will be put on the signs on the freeway. Mr. Greenhalgh felt there was no need for a name, only directions to specific places of interest to those using the freeway, such as the justice complex, and the County Courthouse. The signs should not be an ad for commercial developments. As the County seat, Farmington should help people find what they need to find. The developer should not decide what the sign should say. Mr. Greenhalgh felt strongly that Burke Lane should remain as is and that the new road should not be given a name.

Ann Martinez (630 Ramsgate) agreed with the two previous speakers. She felt a parkway would have bad connotations not relevant to the City. She wanted to have Burke Lane kept the same straight through. The signage could include both a name and a number.

Shane Smith (662 North Compton Road) grew up in Farmington and had moved away for a few years. He said when he moved back to the area, Salt Lake City had turned into an LA on the Wasatch Front. Changing the name of Burke Lane was the first step to changing the unique and valuable character of Farmington. He opposed the change.

Ken Hardy (94 West State Street) suggested naming the new portion of the road “Burke Lane South.”

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** *CLOSED* the public hearing. Commission members discussed the issue, including the following points:

- ↯ With development comes changes to the City. UDOT had given the City an opportunity to name the new road. If the City does not name it, someone else will likely do it. It was felt that the name should reflect Farmington in some way. It was also felt that the name of the development should not be used.
- ↯ The road is a ramp. No homes will be built adjacent to it.
- ↯ Some Commission members felt Burke Lane, where it still existed, should retain its name.
- ↯ Some Commission members felt that there was an opportunity to entice commercial development by the use of an appropriate name to reflect the area. The name should be more of an enticement than just directions to the justice center and the courthouse.
- ↯ One suggestion was to name the new structure which bends into 1100 West as *1100 West*. Others felt that would be confusing for motorists.

After discussion, **Chairman Forsgren** asked that any motions be separated into two parts: one covering what is left of the original Burke Lane road, and the other covering the newly constructed connection to Clark Lane.

Motion:

Cory Ritz moved to deny the request to change Burke Lane’s name between Main Street and U.S. 89. Sid Young seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. Chairman

Forsgren abstained.

Motion:

Cory Ritz moved to table the issue of naming the portion of the new road between U.S. 89 to Clark Lane and turn the matter back to Staff for consideration of other options. Bart Hill seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. Chairman Forsgren abstained.

Reasons for the Motions:

- Farmington is sensitive to preservation of historically important landmarks.
- There is a public sense of preserving family heritage in the area.
- Public input indicated their preference for the motion.
- Time is needed to gather more information.

BUFFALO RANCH (Agenda Item #6)

Mr. Petersen stated the applicant for Agenda Item #6 had asked that the request not be considered. Therefore, the item was deleted.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT AND MISCELLANEOUS

Ken Hardy Relocation Request

Ken Hardy (100 West State Street) requested recommendation from the Planning Commission for a rezone of property located at 510 West 250 South in order to allow him to build a new home and locate his excavation business at that address. The property is currently zoned AE. He would need a spot zone of LM&B or an amendment to the ordinance. He was grandfathered in where he is currently living on 100 West State Street. The City would like him to move his business, so it would be a favor to both himself and the City. The new location would be on a deadend and out of the way. Mr. Hardy stated he had contacted all the neighbors at the new location and none of them objected to the rezone.

Mrs. Hardy stated they had tried to sell the land next to the freeway but were unable to. They would be happy to locate there.

Mr. Hardy stated that he would run his business for the next 15 years after which he would discontinue the excavation business and the property would be solely residential.

The Planning Commission discussed the issue, including the following points:

- ↯ Commission members commented they would like to be of help to Mr. Hardy, especially since it would be a benefit to the City.
- ↯ There is a problem inherent with spot zoning. The City officials are trying to clean up any spot zoning now existing in the City.
- ↯ Amendments to ordinances should be very carefully considered before doing so for one parcel. Ramifications city wide must be considered.
- ↯ Any motion made by the Planning Commission should be something the City Council would consider seriously.
- ↯ There may be a possibility of granting a “special exception” which had a precedence in the OTR (old townsite residential) zone.

After discussion and by consensus, the Commission directed staff to schedule a meeting with Mr. Hardy to discuss possible solutions. Mr. Ritz and Mr. Talbot would form a committee for that purpose.

New Bowery Location Report

Mr. Petersen reported that the City is considering the less expensive bowery structure for park improvements approved by the bond issue.

EDA/RDA Consultants

The City Council created a subcommittee to research qualified EDA and RDA consultants. The Council had requested the help of Jim Talbot and Larry Jensen.

Mr. Talbot and Mr. Jensen agreed to serve on the committee.

Dan Lofgren Apartments

It appeared that the City Council responded favorably to Dan Lofgren’s proposal for high end apartments on the Bourne property north of Lagoon Drive. Larry Haugen, however, was not in favor of the proposal.

Boundary Realignment

The City Council briefly heard a request to consider a boundary realignment with Kaysville in order to allow a development of “Patio Homes” to have easier access to utilities. The Council did not take the request under consideration because they felt not enough information

Farmington City Planning Commission
was available.

January 9, 2003

ADJOURNMENT

Sid Young moved to adjourn at 10:50 P.M. Larry Jensen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Kent Forsgren, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission