

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, January 11, 2007

PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

Present: Chairman Jim Talbot, Commission Members John Bilton, Andrew Hiller, Kevin Poff, Cory Ritz, Paul Barker, City Planner David Petersen, and Recording Secretary Jill Hedberg. Rick Wyss was excused.

Chairman Talbot called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. The following items were reviewed:

City Council Report

David Petersen reported the proceedings of the City Council meetings that were held on January 2, 2007 and January 4, 2007.

- The City Council approved the Planning Commission alternates, although the legislation to allow the alternates to act is not yet in place.
- The City Council finalized the Development Agreement and the Agreement for Development of Land between CenterCal LLC and Farmington City.
- The City Council adopted an Ordinance to rezone approximately 100 acres of property located north of Clark Lane, west of I-15 and south and east of Park Lane from A, BP, and LM&B to TOD.
- The City Council adopted an Ordinance amending Chapter 10 (Residential Development) text of the Farmington City General Plan.
- The City Council granted final plat approval for Farmington Ranches Phase 8 Subdivision and Associated Agreement with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.
- The City Council granted final plat approval for the Farmington Manor Subdivision.
- The City Council agreed to amend The Steed Place Development Agreement which will enable the demolition of the Thomas Steed house near 200 South and 200 East.
- The City Council adopted an Ordinance amending the Transportation Oriented Development (TOD) text.
- The City Council approved the Project Master plan for Station Park.

Agenda Item #3: Street Name Change Recommendation

Jim Talbot reviewed the petitioner's request which is to change the name of 175 West Street to Bayview Circle. Every property owner in the circle signed a petition agreeing to the change.

David Petersen stated that City staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the request. The sign blade should include "175 West" in parenthesis below "Bayview Circle."

[Kevin Poff arrived at 6:45 P.M.]

Agenda Item #4: Public Hearing: Brady Hall/North Park Development - Applicant is requesting a recommendation to rezone approximately 10 acres located at 48 West 600 North from OTR-F, and A-F to LR-F and a recommendation for schematic plan approval for a proposed planned unit development related thereto (Z-14-06 and S-24-06)

In response to a question from **Chairman Talbot**, **David Petersen** explained that the yield plan consists of 30 lots. The developer may qualify for an additional six lots since they may meet the 20% bonus requirement. The Planning Commission may require the applicant to submit a PUD application if they are uncomfortable with certain aspects of the proposal. He reviewed the "Suggested Motion" which includes a reverter clause which states that the LR-F zone designation will revert back to the original zone designation in the event the applicant is unable to obtain preliminary plat approval within 12 months of the zone change. The applicant has not yet determined whether the old adobe home will be preserved. The developer has agreed to place the larger lots near the old mill.

Mr. Petersen explained that the developer proposed that a row of four single-family homes be placed along the public road. The PUD will be located behind the single family homes. This proposal would set a precedent for the area and would decrease the possibility of the properties to the west being developed with a multi-family use. He passed out a copy of the revised schematic plan.

Agenda Item #5: Public Hearing: Trophy Homes LC - Applicant is requesting a recommendation to amend the General Plan by re-designating approximately 21.43 acres of property located at the southwest corner of State Street and 650 West (east of Farmington Creek and west of 650 West) from "Rural Residential Density" to "Medium Density Residential," to rezone the same property from A to R-4, and schematic plan approval for a proposed planned unit development consisting of 95 lots related thereto

David Petersen passed out copies of the e-mails he received from residents who are opposed to the proposed PUD. The Mayor and City staff informed the applicant that the application would not likely be approved but the developer chose to submit the application.

Chairman Talbot stated that he is in favor of preserving the larger lots in that area. He would prefer to delay any high density developments until the City is able to determine the impact that Station Park will have on the area.

Cory Ritz said this proposal is not consistent with the area and the residents are strongly opposed to it. The developer's proposal suggests that the County complex is an office complex, which it is not. Woodside Homes was allowed a higher density on the west side but it was in exchange for their preserving property for the Legacy corridor.

Agenda Item #6: Danville Land Investments, LLC, Woodside Homes - Applicant is requesting a recommendation for Preliminary PUD Master Plan approval for a development known as the Cottages at Station Park consisting of 414 dwelling units on 98.56 acres located west of I-15 and 1525 West Street, south of Shepard Lane, east of the UTA railroad tracks, and north of Burke Lane in the R-4 and LR zones (S-7-06 and S-11-06)

David Petersen referred to a letter dated December 15, 2006, which was sent to the Planning Commission by Thane Smith. It addresses the issue as far as Woodside is concerned, that was stated by the Planning Commission at the December 14, 2006, meeting where the item was tabled. The applicant's traffic engineer will be present to answer the Commission's questions. **Ron Mortimer** of Horrocks Engineers will also be available via telephone to respond to their questions. The proposal meets the requirements for Preliminary PUD Master Plan. The wetlands issues have not yet been resolved but the City received a letter from Jayson Gibson stating that the Army Corp. of Engineers supports the proposal so long as the storm water is filtered pursuant the draft mitigation plan. The City also received a letter from Howard Kent stating that they are willing to work with Woodside Homes to construct the detention basin off-site. City staff recommends that the Commission recommend Preliminary PUD Master Plan approval.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Jim Talbot, Commission Members John Bilton, Andrew Hiller, Kevin Poff, Cory Ritz, Paul Barker, City Planner David Petersen, and Recording Secretary Jill Hedberg. **Rick Wyss** was excused.

Chairman Talbot called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. **Kevin Poff** offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Andrew Hiller moved that the Planning Commission approve the minutes of the December 14, 2006, Planning Commission Meeting. **Kevin Poff** seconded the motion with changes as noted. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT

Chairman Talbot stated that the City Council report was given during the Planning Commission study session.

STREET NAME CHANGE RECOMMENDATION (Agenda Item #3)

Chairman Talbot explained that the petitioner is requesting that the street name “175 West” be changed to “Bayview Circle.” All of the effected property owners have signed the petition requesting the change.

David Petersen stated that City staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the request to change the name of the street.

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the street name change from “175 West” to “Bayview Circle.” **John Bilton** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- “Bayview Circle” is consistent with the street name “Bayview Drive” which already exists in the area.
- All of the property owners in the area have agreed to the change.
- The name change is consistent with the adjacent development.

PUBLIC HEARING: BRADY HALL/NORTH PARK DEVELOPMENT - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 10 ACRES LOCATED AT 48 WEST 600 NORTH FROM OTR-F, AND A-F TO LR-F AND A RECOMMENDATION FOR SCHEMATIC PLAN APPROVAL FOR A PROPOSED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT RELATED THERETO (Agenda Item #4)

Background Information

There are a number of issues related to the development of the subject property. These include, among other things, 1) a street to accommodate local through traffic, 2) wellhead protection, 3) appropriate Development in close proximity to the old Richards mill, 4) an acceptable “window” on Main Street/600 North, 5) cleaning up a non-conforming use (i.e., the auto shop), 6) disrupting as little as possible historic development patterns in the area without encouraging inappropriate future development, and 7) other.

1. Main Street (S.R. 106) is the only continuous north/south street in Farmington east of I-15 and U.S. 89. No local through street alternatives exist to accompany this major collector near the 600 North/Farmington Creek crossing. The final street configuration on the subject property should not preclude a local through street from taking place at this location.
2. The City’s number one well is situated on the south side of 600 North near Farmington Creek. Residential development is an appropriate use in the well head’s protection area.
3. The old Richards Mill is one of the most historic buildings in Farmington and northern Utah. Appropriate development is necessary to maintain the setting for the mill.
4. Any development of the subject property should provide an acceptable “window” on Main Street/600 North. Unlike other similarly situated communities, Farmington enjoys a strong central residential Main Street. Historic homes and other dwellings in this area face front, garages do not dominate the street, inappropriate fences do not exist, and street trees frame, or provide a canopy for, the urban landscape. For many, this “Normal Rockwell” setting represents what the community is all about. The City is now conducting a “visioning” process to identify its strengths and weaknesses, and actions most important to ensure a better future. An independent consultant, a BYU professor, is working with a committee of 60 citizens from all areas of Farmington. This committee identified and ranked dozens of issues, and placed near the top is the responsibility to preserve and enhance central historic Farmington. This recommendation is consistent with priorities or policies in the General Plan and versions of the General Plan adopted over the past 30 years. This committee will finalize their work later this month.

Additionally, and unlike highways in other communities, Farmington’s Main Street north of 600 North and S.R. 105 south of 200 South represent a residential highway with similar characteristics to the residential Main Street in Central

Farmington.

Moreover, over the years the City has expended its resources to maintain peninsulas and strips of landscaped right-of-way in the vicinity of 600 North and Main Street.

5. Most developments which qualify as “Low Density Residential” as identified in the General Plan will appropriately displace the existing non-conforming use on the subject property.
6. The 48+ blocks that make up downtown Farmington were all “platted” at the same time over a century ago. Through the decades this area gradually filled in with different house styles, lot sizes, residential types and other uses. This resulted in a “fine grain” residential blend characteristic of downtown as opposed to other neighborhoods in Farmington and elsewhere in Davis County which typically developed in three years or less with house styles, residential types, and lots internally the same.

The applicant is proposing the demolition, or disruption, of every existing structure on the property, which will result in a relatively small enclave (14 buildings or 28 dwellings) of attractive, high-end, attached for sale units adjacent to 600 North. This could disrupt the “fine grain” which typifies downtown if not developed in a sensitive way, even though the alternative housing type proposed by the applicant may meet the needs of the community’s changing demographics. And what about the precedent which may be set for the nearby Bradshaw, Evans and other properties west of the site (approximately 14.3 acres) located at the northern gateway to central Farmington, if the development of the subject property is not consistent with the General Plan? Answer: A major disruption may occur to the fine grain of downtown, especially if all the existing structures on these westerly properties are demolished.

7. The Planning Commission may identify other issues related to the property that are not mentioned in this staff report.

Perhaps three possible single-family residential development scenarios exist for the property: a) large lots exceeding 20,000 square feet in size, b) a conventional subdivision consisting of lots 10,000 square feet (or less in size, and c) a PUD. The table illustrates the possible ability of each development scenario to address the aforementioned issues.

	Question: Will the following development scenarios adequately address the issues identified in the staff report?		
Issue:	Large Lot	Conventional	PUD
Through traffic	Yes	Yes	Yes
Well-head protection	Yes	Yes	Yes
Richards mill	Yes	No	Yes
Acceptable "window"	maybe	maybe	maybe
Clean-up property	Yes	Yes	Yes
Compliment historic development patterns	maybe	maybe	maybe
Other	?	?	?

END OF PACKET MATERIAL

David Petersen displayed a slide of the aerial photo and pointed out where the property is located and where the old homes on the proposed property exist. He also displayed an overhead of the yield plan which demonstrates that the applicant may meet the requirements to obtain 36 dwelling units with ½ acre lots near the old mill site. He reviewed the six issues which were outlined in the "Background Information." After conducting a field trip to the property, the Planning Commission determined that most of the old homes that exist on the property are not significantly historical or valuable. The developer is working to preserve the old adobe home.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the applicant's revised schematic plan which includes four single family homes at the front of the development with the attached single family homes near the middle of the development. Access to the four single-family homes will be obtained off the road abutting the rear lot lines. By placing the detached single family homes near the front of the development, it will set a precedent for the properties that are located to the west of this project. He reviewed the "Possible Motion" which was included in the Planning Commission packet. He asked that the Commission verbalize their findings so City staff can present draft written findings for consideration by the Commission at their next meeting.

Public Hearing

Chairman Talbot opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Terry Drew (99 Cove Lane, Layton) stated that they are proposing that they replace five homes, outbuildings, and the Haugen shop which will improve the appearance of the area. The development will include an impressive entrance that will be muted by four smaller single-family homes that will be consistent with the old town. The attached dwelling units will be located to the rear of the single-family homes. And will appear to be larger homes on half acre properties and will allow the project to be economically feasible. By creating a PUD, it will allow the residents to have access to trails and other amenities, and will also provide more open space with fewer buildings. They have been contacted by over 15 individuals (young professionals and senior citizens) who are interested in the attached homes. He asked that the Planning Commission recommend approval since the LR-F zone designation conforms with the City's Master Plan and is consistent with the City's long term plans.

David Petersen showed a slide presentation and pointed out where older homes are located on the property and nearby properties. He is concerned about the housing stock that will be lost as a result of the development but is in favor of the precedent which may be set for the area if the developer is able to provide a quality development.

John Bradshaw (259 East 100 North) said he came to the meeting prepared to be a skeptic but after reviewing the proposal, he is impressed with the amount of work that has been done to create a plan that is consistent with the character of Farmington. He said he is concerned about **Mr. Petersen's** comments regarding the possibility of a road traveling through the Bradshaw property.

David Petersen stated that the road will not be constructed unless it is agreed to by **Mr. Bradshaw**.

John Bradshaw stated that the road will be not constructed on his property during his lifetime.

Don Bradshaw (650 North 90 West) said he owns five acres of ground west of the proposed property. He has spoken with Mr. Evans who owns three acres of ground. They have agreed that they will likely approach the City to develop twin homes if the current proposal is approved.

Joe Judd (82 West 600 North) said he is opposed to the development because it includes multiple units, it does not follow the intent of the City's General Plan, and it does not reflect the wishes of the residents of the area. He suggested that a legitimate third party traffic study be conducted since all of the traffic studies that have been done thus far have been speculative. If the City approves the request, the applicant should be required to draft CC&R's that prohibit the units from being rented.

Tom Owens (700 Rock Mill Lane) said the proposed development is in violation of 30 City standards. The OTR was instituted to protect the area from a project like this. He stated that the developer will need to apply for conditional use permits in order to proceed. He read the City's definition for conditional use permits. If this development is allowed, it is likely that the properties to the west of this property will be developed with multi-family housing. He said he is opposed to the proposed density and asked that the Planning Commission save historic Farmington.

Joel Anderson (57 West 600 North) said he is in favor of the project. In his opinion, the developer has made many concessions to improve the project and to meet the needs of the residents in the area. The developer has complied with the City's PUD requirements.

Gary Rose (48 West 600 North) stated that he is in favor of the project. The front portion of his property will be included in the development.

Richard Ellis (44 East 400 North) requested that **David Petersen** explain the City's proposal to have a road constructed through the area in the future.

David Petersen displayed an aerial photo and pointed out where the road may be aligned in the future. Main Street is the only north to south collector east of the freeway so it becomes congested when the freeway is congested. The proposed road would be a second local street and would increase safety in the area. If the property owners do not agree to the road being constructed, it may not occur.

Mr. Ellis said he is in favor of the project and believes it will be an asset to the City.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Talbot** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

In response to a question from **John Bilton**, **David Petersen** stated that the applicant is requesting the full 20% bonus on the yield plan.

Kevin Poff questioned whether the project will require multiple conditional use permits.

David Petersen explained that the development will be a PUD which is a conditional use so there will only be one conditional use permit required.

Kevin Poff asked if the developer still intends to include a variety of architectural styles.

Terry Drew said the four single family homes that will be located on Main Street will include different architectural styles. The developer will maintain control of the four single family homes. They will likely sell the larger lots.

David Petersen pointed out that the Planning Commission has the right, as part of the PUD process, to review and approve the elevations.

Paul Barker asked if the City has the ability to prevent the multi-family housing from creeping to the undeveloped properties in the area.

David Petersen said this is not a large development, whereas it only consists of 14 town homes. Through a recent visioning process conducted by the City, residents have indicated that they prefer smaller projects that are spread out. The homes that will be developed on this property are not the same quality of homes that exist on the adjacent properties. The developer is willing to create single family homes that face the main street.

John Bilton questioned why efforts are being made to preserve the old adobe home.

David Petersen said the Historic Preservation Commission strongly recommended that the home be preserved since it is one of the older homes in the City. It includes all of the elements of a pioneer home. The developer realizes the importance of the home and will have the home analyzed by an experienced contractor. The results of the analysis will be presented at a future Planning Commission meeting. If it is possible to preserve the home, it could be restored as a meeting place or as a dwelling unit since it was not included in the yield plan. If it is not possible to preserve the old home, it will likely be demolished and the property will be utilized as open space.

In response to a question from **Commissioner Ritz, Brady Hall** stated that they intend for the units to be owner-occupied. They are concerned that if the CC&R's include a clause prohibiting the units from being rented, it may cause an undue burden on homeowners if they are absent for an extended period of time or if the homeowner passes away. Due to the aesthetics of the home and the asking price, it is unlikely that the units will be rented. They prefer to not devalue the homes by limiting their rental ability.

In response to a question from **Commissioner Ritz, David Petersen** stated that other developers in the area have created CC&R's that prohibit dwelling units from being rented. Those CC&R's include a provision which address the possibility of the owner being absent for an extended period of time.

Terry Drew stated that they are willing to consider including a similar provision in their CC&R's. The issue can be further discussed during the PUD process.

Cory Ritz stated that a conventional development could include 30 buildings. This developer is only proposing 24 buildings. This development will likely generate less traffic than a conventional development. The concept plan is also better than that of a traditional development and is consistent with the City's Master Plan and zoning for the area.

Andrew Hiller agreed with **Commissioner Ritz's** remarks. He said the Planning Commission intends for the units to be owner-occupied. He encouraged the developer to include the rental restriction in the CC&R's.

In response to a question from **Kevin Poff, David Petersen** stated that if **Mr. Owens** is unwilling to participate in the land swap, the developer will reconfigure their yield plan.

Kevin Poff said so long as the developer is willing to provide trees consistent with the area and to provide a variation in the architectural styles, the development will be consistent with old town Farmington.

Chairman Talbot stated that City staff will review **Mr. Owens** information and include it in the public record, if he so desires. He said this area has been an "eyesore" for many years. This developer is willing to address the concerns of the City and develop a quality project. This project will also protect the well head. He suggested that the developer include a rental restriction in their CC&R's. The City has required other developers to alter their CC&R's since it is important to protect the area and the surrounding residents. He asked if the developer has provided adequate open space.

David Petersen said he is confident that the developer could provide adequate open space but there is a reverter clause in place in the event the developer does not perform.

Motion

Cory Ritz moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the request to rezone the property, and schematic plan related thereto showing four single family detached homes abutting 600 North Street, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following:

1. The LR-F zone designation shall revert back to the original zone designation if the applicant is unable to obtain preliminary plat approval within 12 months of the zone change.
2. The applicant shall work to preserve the adobe house as shown on the plans including working with the City to resolve any issues regarding non-conforming standards related thereto. In the event the applicant is unable to preserve the structure, he must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that it will not set a

precedent for future development in the area. If he is unable to do so, the City will re-visit its decision to rezone the property.

3. The front portion of the property shall remain OTR.
4. The applicant may modify the plan where necessary to better enhance the street scape on 600 North consistent with the General Plan and existing development patterns in the area. Such modification may be considered by the City Council at their rezone hearing and/or submitted as part of the PUD application for Preliminary (PUD) Master Plan approval and preliminary plat approval.
5. City staff shall take verbal comments from the Commission members, and present draft written finding for consideration by the Commission in their next meeting.
6. The homes/units shall include a variety of architectural styles, especially those homes which front 600 North.
7. The CC&R's shall include a clause, acceptable to City staff, restricting the twin homes from being rented and addressing property ownership issues.
8. In the event the old adobe home is demolished, the property shall be used as open space and shall not become a building lot.
9. The applicant shall provide a tree plan which shall include trees that are consisting with the existing trees that are located in the old town.

Andrew Hiller seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings:

City staff shall take verbal comments from the Commission members, and present draft written finding for consideration by the Commission in their next meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING: TROPHY HOMES LC - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN BY RE-DESIGNATING APPROXIMATELY 21.43 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF STATE STREET AND 650 WEST (EAST OF FARMINGTON CREEK AND WEST OF 650 WEST) FROM "RURAL RESIDENTIAL DENSITY" TO "MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL," TO REZONE THE SAME PROPERTY FROM A TO R-4, AND SCHEMATIC PLAN APPROVAL FOR A PROPOSED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF 95 LOTS RELATED THERETO (Agenda Item #5)

David Petersen displayed an aerial photo and pointed out where the property is located. He stated that City staff extended the mailing notice to include a 900' radius around the property. He reviewed the developer's request which is to amend the General Plan by re-designating the property from "Rural Residential Density" to "Medium Density Residential" and to rezone the property from A to R-4. He displayed an overhead of the schematic plan and elevations for the mansion type homes that will include approximately 3-6 units per home.

Public Hearing

Chairman Talbot opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Brent Skipper (Trophy Homes, 758 South 400 East, Orem, Utah) said Trophy Homes attended a neighborhood meeting to receive input from the residents and to find the highest and best use for the property. He gave Trophy Home's background information and stated that multi-family housing is their forte. He informed the Commission that Trophy Homes owns the property. He displayed a slide presentation which included the following information:

Concept Plan: The property consists of 21.43 acres. The plan includes 29 mansion homes that are tri-plexes (87 units/4 units per acre), 6 single family lots (12,000 sf each) along the south side of the property, and 34% open space.

Reasons for the zone change:

- The property is in close proximity to I-15 and Legacy Highway, the TOD zone, a large City park, and Clark Lane (which will be the secondary access to Station Park).
- The project will add a residential component to Station Park and will be pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Skipper read from Farmington City's General Plan and stated that this project is consistent with that Plan. He displayed a rendering of their schematic plan which includes the following features:

- The architecture will provide a rural feel.
- The units appear to be large single-family homes, but are actually tri-plexes that will be between 1850 and 1578 square feet with 2-car garages. The mansion style homes will provide a transition to the more rural areas of Farmington.
- The open space will be maintained by the HOA.
- These units will appeal to empty nesters or young professionals so they will not have a significant impact on the school system, will generate less traffic and will provide a higher disposable income to shop around the area.

- The neighborhood amenities include natural features, trails, half basketball court, tot lot, pavilions for picnic tables, tree lined streets and sidewalks to connect to open spaces, trails, and City Park. There will be an entrance monument dedicated to the City park and a road designed specifically for park use.

Mr. Skipper stated that the development will include high quality landscaping and architectural design which is consistent with the City's General Plan. He displayed photos of other projects they have developed. He explained that the single-family homes will face south and will be rear loaded which will prevent multi-family housing from creeping to the south. He reviewed the following findings from a traffic study that was conducted on November 12, 2006:

Traffic Summary: 635 daily trips generated; the project traffic is expected to have a minimal impact and can be adequately accommodated by the existing roadway; Horrocks Engineers indicated that Station Park will contribute much more traffic to the intersection than Creekside Estates.

Mr. Skipper concluded by stating that he has spoken with **Elizabeth Angyl** from CenterCal, who indicated that CenterCal is not opposed to the project since it will generate additional rooftops which will be an asset to Station Park.

Niels Plant (311 South 650 West) gave a brief history of the area. The area has experienced issues with high ground water, as well as issues with floating sewage and wells that have dried up. The proposed development, as well as the expansion to the jail, will cause the sewer system to overload since it can only support two lots per acre. He referred to his email to **Max Forbush** which was given to the Planning Commissioners during their study session. His email expressed his concerns regarding the following issues:

- The development will generate additional traffic along 650 West and State Street.
- The property value for those residents with large lots will decrease.
- Problems will occur between the residents who have farm animals and those who don't due to the smells and residents walking their horses along said property.

Dawn Whitaker (650 West) said the residents in the area are very concerned about the proposed development. This development would make it impossible for her to access her home. The development will create traffic issues since all of their roads would access 650 West. The residents are opposed to the property being rezoned to R-4 which would allow multi-family housing. The current zone only allows for two dwellings per acre. The City should not consider rezoning properties every time it is requested by a developer. She asked that the Planning Commission honor the work that has been done in the past to benefit the area.

Kelly Maxfield (121 South 650 West) said the developers did not consider the input that was given by the residents at the neighborhood meeting when they created this proposal. The

developer's main reason for rezoning the property is to maximize their return on this property. He moved to Farmington after reviewing the City's Master Plan and zoning for the area which allows farming. This type of development will prevent him from sharing agricultural experiences with school children.

Van Bass (599 West 250 South) said he is not opposed to the property being developed with half-acre lots but is opposed to the proposed density. He questioned why the development would include tot lots and basketball courts if the development is supposed to be limited to "empty nesters." He is concerned that the residents from the development will contact the Board of Health about the farm animals. The development will restrict the existing residents from being able to maintain their way of life.

Rulon Homer (586 West 250 South) said he lived in the area prior to the property being annexed into the City. He supports the input of his neighbors. He never would have anticipated that these type of units would be considered for this area. He asked that the Planning Commission maintain the integrity of the area, as well as the lifestyle. This may be a beautiful project in a different area.

Tonna Bounds (678 South 650 West) said this proposal is not appropriate for this area. She supports the input given by her neighbors. According to the City's Master Plan, the area between Glover Lane and State Street should be protected. She suggested that a committee be formed to work with the developers since there are many issues that the developers are unaware of.

Jay Petersen (219 South 650 West) said he moved to this area since it would provide a safe environment for his handicapped child. He has made a lifetime investment while the developer has only made a short term investment. He asked that the Planning Commission deny the applicant's request to rezone the property.

Deorr White (536 West 350 South) said his previous home was adjacent to a similar type project so he is aware of what comes with this type of development. In time, the units will become rentals and the development will be less desirable. He asked that the Planning Commission leave the zoning as it is, which will allow the existing residents to continue their rural lifestyles.

Roger Eggett (612 South 650 West) said he moved to West Farmington to live near residents who share his values and way of life. The residents in this area should not have to keep fighting to maintain their way of life. The City should inform the developers that the zoning will not be changed to accommodate a different lifestyle. He urged the Planning Commission to protect the properties from Glover Lane to Park Lane.

Ralph Crook (624 South 1024 West) said Heber City is experiencing controversy due to

horse properties that are located near new developments. If this development is allowed, it will set a precedent for other developers. He said his last home was in a PUD, similar to what is being proposed. Over time, the units became rental units. He asked that the Planning Commission deny the developer's request to change the zone designation.

David Safeer (790 West South Hampton) said he is concerned that the fees from the 95 units will not be capable of maintaining an entire community. He said the City has not experienced this type of maintenance issue.

Donna Blockwest (8 North 325 East) said her property is adjacent to the proposed development. She asked that the properties in the area remain rural since farm animals and property save children's lives. She is concerned about the future of their large animals if this type of community is allowed in the area.

Adam Langford (Trophy Homes) said the Planning Commission should be considering the region as a whole. The Station Park property was rezoned from Agriculture to TOD. There are many factors that will impact the Trophy Homes property such as the transportation corridors, the TOD zone, the jail, etc. Attempts have been made to create a development that will buffer the existing neighborhoods and their agricultural uses. They are willing to consider suggestions that could improve the development.

Mr. Langford made the following comments regarding the comments that were made by the residents:

- The Planning Commission findings can set forth a standard which other developers must meet or exceed.
- Trophy Homes can obtain a letter from Central Davis Sewer District stating that the development will not cause the sewer system to fail.
- A statement can be recorded on the plat so buyers are aware that their properties will be near agricultural uses.
- The asking price of these units is close to \$300,000 so it will not likely devalue the existing properties in the area.
- The tot lots and basketball courts are for the use of the children/grandchildren of the homeowners.
- A property management company will oversee the HOA. The HOA will be responsible for the maintaining the exterior of the units, as well as the landscaping.

David Thompson (Thompson Transportation) said this development will have a minor impact on the existing traffic compared to the transit that will be generated by the TOD area. This development will have two access points and will likely generate 50 trips/hour. The existing roads in the area can accommodate this type of impact.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Talbot** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

In response to a question from **Commissioner Poff, David Petersen** stated that Chapter 10 of the General Plan provides a lot size which equal no more than two dwelling units per acre.

Kevin Poff said this is a unique property due to its close proximity to the jail, commercial properties, and the Fairgrounds. He is opposed to allowing such a dense residential project next to the jail. He stated that the farmlands should be protected. Other developers in the area have made similar proposals but the properties have not been adjacent to residents who wish to continue their agricultural activities. He would not be opposed to this project if it were located north of Station Park since it does not have the same thresholds as this property (such as the creek, State Street, and Station Park). He expressed concern regarding the increased traffic on 650 West. He questioned whether there are plans to signalize the intersection at 650 West and State Street.

David Petersen said the intersection may be signalized when the traffic warrants it.

David Thompson said according to UDOT, the intersection will be raised and will include landscaping. UDOT has had civil plans drafted.

Andrew Hiller said the City should follow the General Plan and protect the properties between Glover Lane and State Street. The developer claims this property is unique due to its close proximity to the jail, Station Park, etc., but none of these issues have come about since Trophy Homes purchased this property.

Paul Barker said it is obvious that the City needs to maintain the existing zone and appreciate the residents who have lived in the area and want to continue their lifestyle. During the public hearing, there were not any residents who spoke in favor of the project.

Cory Ritz said the existing agricultural properties do not need to be buffered from Station Park since the TOD zone includes a buffer. The property is also buffered by the surrounding community such as the jail, the trail, the trees and the creek. Although the project may compliment Station Park, it does not compliment the existing neighborhood. Other developers in the area have received higher densities as an exchange, which this developer is not proposing. Contrary to what the developer may believe, the homes on the west side of the City sell for considerably more than what they are asking for the proposed units. He said the Planning Commission has a duty to the residents and the City to not deviate from the City's Master Plan for west Farmington which is two dwelling units per acre.

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council deny the request. **Cory Ritz** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- The City should make an effort to preserve the properties in that area where residents have a desire to continue agricultural activities.
- It would be unwise to allow 95 housing units adjacent to the jail complex.
- The proposed Station Park development north of the site does not justify the applicant's request because the General Plan already contemplates such a development, therefore, the designation for the property should remain "Rural Residential Density."
- The proposal is inconsistent with the City's Master Plan.

DANVILLE LAND INVESTMENTS, LLC, WOODSIDE HOMES - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION FOR PRELIMINARY PUD MASTER PLAN APPROVAL FOR A DEVELOPMENT KNOWN AS THE COTTAGES AT STATION PARK CONSISTING OF 414 DWELLING UNITS ON 98.56 ACRES LOCATED WEST OF I-15 AND 1525 WEST STREET, SOUTH OF SHEPARD LANE, EAST OF THE UTA RAILROAD TRACKS, AND NORTH OF BURKE LANE THE R-4 AND LR ZONES (S-7-06 AND S-11-06) (Agenda Item #6)

Background Information

The Planning Commission tabled this request on December 14, 2006. In response to this, the City received a letter from the applicant dated December 15, 2006, but received December 21, 2006.

The applicant informed City staff that their traffic engineer will attend the meeting to explain the traffic study prepared for the project. Maps, diagrams, and projected traffic counts on specific routes will be included as part of the presentation. The Farmington City Engineer and Horrocks Engineers will also attend the meeting to provide comments and answer questions.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL

David Petersen reviewed the Background Information. Issues relating to the storm detention are far enough along for the Preliminary PUD Master Plan process. He reviewed the information that was included in a letter from the developer dated December 15, 2006, addressing the concerns that have been given by the Planning Commission/City staff. The developer has provided the City with a snow removal plan and a landscape plan. He passed out a

copy of background information for **Sara Colosimo**, who is the developer's traffic engineer. He stated that the City's traffic engineer, **Ron Mortimer** from Horrocks Engineers, will be available on the phone to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Thane Smith (Danville Land Investments, LLC, Woodside Homes) explained where the trails will be located. He then introduced **Sara Colosimo**, who is their traffic engineer and **Judd Lawrence**, who is their civil engineer.

Sara Colosimo (Riley Transportation Consultants, Inc.) explained that the traffic study was performed according to UDOT's Category-3 requirements. She pointed out that the ratings range from an A to an F. Most cities are accepting of a D-rating. As requested by Woodside Homes, her analysis included several different scenarios, including the existing Hunters Creek Subdivision (180 units), with the addition of the Cottages at Station Park. She stated that the analysis did not specifically include the projected development in Kaysville but projected the growth at 25 years, which would include those numbers.

Thane Smith pointed out where the access points for the development will be located and how the traffic will likely travel through the area.

David Petersen explained that Access 2 will not be operational unless the two railroad crossings are closed down.

Sara Colosimo reviewed the five scenarios. The worst case scenario at the Shepard Lane intersection is a Level 3 which is not acceptable. That same intersection was projected to 2031 without including the number of The Cottages, and it was still found to be a Level E. She said the service would be brought to a Level D if the intersection included a 4-way stop rather than a 2-way stop.

David Petersen pointed out that the study did not extend beyond I-15. He asked **Ron Mortimer** if a Level D is acceptable for that area.

Ron Mortimer said the intersection at Shepard Lane and 2000 West will need to be signalized or have a roundabout constructed. There are not a significant number of driveways that access Shepard Lane so its capacity will not likely change. The intersection will fail before the road. He said he did not know how the road would function where the road narrows on Shepard Lane near the Oakridge Country Club. He said the desired level of service for the intersection at Shepard Lane and 2000 West would be a C. If an intersection is near an interchange, Level D is an acceptable threshold.

In response to a question from **Chairman Talbot**, **Sara Colosimo** pointed out that her study assumes that Shepard Lane will remain one lane in each direction in 2031.

Motion

Cory Ritz moved that the Planning Commission continue past 10:00 P.M. **Kevin Poff** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Sara Colosimo reviewed the findings of Table 1 of the Traffic Summary Analysis for 2031, which was included in the Planning Commission packet. She pointed out that her study included the area between Clark Lane and 1525 West but did not include Park Lane. The study included a ½ mile radius from each access point. She said her study focused on peak hour conditions with an assumption that the roads will be cleared during those times.

Chairman Talbot said he is concerned that the study only included a ½ mile radius from the access points since the Kaysville traffic will likely utilize the Woodside Homes arteries.

Judd Lawrence pointed out that the study factors in traffic growth of approximately 80%, based on the Wasatch Front Regional Council's factor.

In response to a question from **John Bilton**, **Sara Colosimo** stated that she would want to live in the area ten years from now since the transportation access will improve dramatically. The intersection at Shepard Lane may require a roundabout or signal.

Paul Barker asked if Horrocks Engineers has reviewed and accepted the traffic study.

David Petersen stated that the comments from Horrocks Engineers were not substantiative.

Thane Smith stated that representatives for Woodside Homes met with Horrocks Engineers to discuss the traffic issues. The engineers found that the roadways are capable of handling the traffic that will be generated by their development.

John Bilton asked if there are other Level D intersections in the City.

David Petersen said he did not know the answer to that question but he would be willing to further study the intersection levels.

Sara Colosimo stated that she analyzed the two railroad crossings in the area. The crossings are unsafe due to the sight distance which is only acceptable if vehicles are traveling no more than 15 miles per hour. The standard for crossings is 35 miles per hour. There are approximately 550 trips per day on the Burke Lane crossing and approximately 1,100 trips per day on the Flanders crossing. She recommended that oversized signs with flashers be installed near the crossings, that traffic calming be implemented and that median crossings be installed to provide a short term solution. The long term solution would be have the crossings leveled or to

have them closed. She recommended that the crossings be closed when the other routes become available.

David Petersen said the crossings can not be closed until the City can obtain Access 1, Access 2, and the Spring Creek access. He said the Station Park access could be available within two or three years.

Thane Smith stated that their homes will not be available for one year after they commence construction. Within two years, there will likely only be 20-30 homes constructed.

Kevin Poff asked if Woodside Homes would object to the motion including a condition that the homes will not be sold until the Spring Creek access is open.

Thane Smith said they would object to that condition since their traffic engineer has shown that the existing road network will function. The condition could be a conflict for Woodside Homes since they do not have control over the road.

David Petersen stated that the City may be forced to condemn the right-of-way if access to the Ford property is not arranged within one year since the railroad crossings create a liability for the City. If approval is given for the Cottages, Spring Creek will likely occur simultaneously with Access 1. He said the developer previously committed to flatten out the Burke Lane crossing, but that would still leave the Flanders crossing in an unsafe condition.

Thane Smith stated that they did agree to improve the crossings but it was recommended by Horrocks Engineers that the City use the funds to improve other areas within the City since the crossings will likely be closed in the future. He said Woodside Homes has been working through the issues for four years and have implemented the recommendations given by the Planning Commission. He requested that the Commission approve their request.

In response to a question by **John Bilton**, **Thane Smith** stated that there will be a Homeowner's Association. There will be single family lots. The HOA will maintain the exterior of the units and will own the private road.

John Bilton asked if Woodside Homes will maintain the UDOT property.

Thane Smith said **Cory Pope** informed him that UDOT has the funds to purchase the property. When the property is purchased, UDOT will maintain control of the right-of-way. The property could likely be purchased in 2007.

John Bilton said it is unfortunate that UDOT will own the property since it will not be maintained properly.

Thane Smith said the City could consider entering into an agreement with UDOT and the HOA to maintain/utilize the property.

Chairman Talbot said he was always under the impression that the property would be used as a green belt that would be maintained by Woodside Homes.

David Petersen said the developer presented diagrams to the Planning Commission showing the property utilized as ball fields.

Thane Smith said Woodside Homes proposed that the property be used as a park but they were never able to get authorization from UDOT. He suggested that an agreement be reached with UDOT to find a productive use for the property. He said Woodside Homes did not receive an open space credit for that property.

Kevin Poff said the City should be actively involved in negotiations to so UDOT is aware the City is actively pursuing a park.

The Planning Commission discussed the UDOT parcel and expressed concern that the area will not be properly maintained. The Planning Commission recommended that the City be involved with the negotiations to pursue a beautification easement, a green belt, or a park.

Thane Smith committed to work with UDOT to promote a land use that will enhance the community.

David Petersen stated that the City may be willing to be involved in the negotiations and may be able to contribute to the improvements.

Paul Barker suggested that Woodside Homes retain a beautification easement for a certain amount of time.

Motion

John Bilton moved that the Planing Commission recommend Preliminary PUD Master Plan approval for a development known as the Cottages at Station Park located west of I-15 and 1525 West Street, south of Shepard Lane, east of the UTA railroad tracks, and north of Burke Lane, subject to all Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following:

1. The applicant must provide written approval from U.S. Army Corp of Engineers regarding the proposed development and the wetland delineation in that portion of the project south of the proposed Legacy North alignment and written verification that the proposed fill embankment across Haight Creek is acceptable to the Corp.

2. The applicant must provide improvement drawings, including a grading and drainage plan and accompanying SWPP, and these plans must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Planning Department, Central Davis Sewer District, and Benchland Water District.
3. The applicant shall provide storm water detention in a manner and location acceptable to the City Engineer. This may include an off-site location.
4. The property must be rezoned to accurately reflect the Master Plan.
5. The applicant must enter into an agreement with the City that will provide, among other things, a traffic solution regarding the two unsafe railroad crossings near the project, and additional or alternative routes from the site.
6. Pursuant to both a previous verbal commitment by the applicant, and a verbal commitment provided by the applicant at the Planning Commission meeting, the applicant shall extend, or post a bond acceptable to the City, for a paved street from Sharp Shooter Drive westerly within the 950 North alignment to the western corporate limit line of Farmington City. The road shall consist of two safe travel lanes, the dimensions of which must be determined by the applicant and the City.
7. The CCR's must include language that will prohibit rentals into perpetuity. The language must be submitted to the Planning Commission for review and comment.
8. John Swain (or the City) must provide "review comments" regarding the landscape plan.
9. The applicant must be responsible for the snow removal in the "court yard" areas.
10. The applicant agrees to work with UDOT and the City to create a plan to beautify and maintain the property that UDOT will be purchasing from Danville Land Investments, LLC, Woodside Homes.

Paul Barker seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- The applicant made an effort to preserve property for Legacy North.
- The applicant has addressed the concerns of the Planning Commission and City staff.

- The Planning Commission recommended Preliminary PUD Master Plan approval despite their concerns regarding the future of the corridor and the traffic impacts that may be created as a result of the development.

ADJOURNMENT

Paul Barker moved that the Planning Commission adjourn at 11:05 P.M.

Jim Talbot, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission