

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, January 23, 2003

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Kent Forsgren, Commission Members Bart Hill, Cindy Roybal, Cory Ritz, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. Commission Member Sid Young was excused for the first part of the meeting.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion:

Cindy Roybal moved that the minutes of the January 9, 2003, Planning Commission Meeting be approved with corrections as noted. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

PUBLIC HEARING: GEORGE HADDAD REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR SCHEMATIC PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE MOUNTAINSIDE PLAT F SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 19 LOTS ON 7.523 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 775 SOUTH 350 EAST IN AN LR-F ZONE (S-5-02) (Agenda Item #2)

Background Information:

On May 25, 2000, the applicant and USDS Development, Inc., received schematic plan approval from the Planning Commission to develop the proposed 19-lot subdivision. Enclosed for Planning Commission review was the staff report and minutes from the May 25, 2000, meeting. The earlier schematic plan approval had since expired. In the meantime, USDS Development, Inc., developed the Hughes Estates Subdivision east of the Haddad property. Schematic plan approval was important for the developer (USDS Development, Inc.) because it became necessary to construct a road through the Haddad property in order to provide access to the Hughes Estates Subdivision. The road is now in place and USDS Development, Inc., even provided all utility laterals under the road to all the lots proposed on the Haddad schematic plan.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the background information. Mr. Haddad had received schematic plan approval in 2000, but the approval had expired.

Public Hearing:

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

George Haddad (1750 North 650 East, Centerville) stated he would like to obtain schematic plan approval to begin development of his property. He intended to develop the property in 2 or 3 phases.

End of Public Hearing:

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing and asked the Commission Members for their consideration.

Mr. Talbot stated he had driven the area and looked at it closely. He felt there were no impeding circumstances and that the development would work well.

Cindy Roybal asked if the reason the applicant was before the Commission was because of the expiration and no other reason, to which Mr. Petersen answered in the affirmative.

Cory Ritz inquired if there were conditions for the previous approval which should be considered at this time.

Mr. Petersen stated there were some concerns regarding the storm drainage system that he intended to bring before the Commission at preliminary plat review.

Motion:

Cory Ritz moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that they grant schematic plan approval for a proposed subdivision located approximately 775 South 350 East. **Cindy Roybal** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Reasons for the Motion:

1. The application was a resubmittal of a previously approval schematic plan. The plan had been thoroughly reviewed at that time and no changes had been made.
2. The Planning Commission would be able to review the plans again during preliminary plat submission.

AGENDA AMENDMENT

Motion:

Jim Talbot moved to have the Planning Commission consider Agenda Item #5 next in the meeting. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE STONEBRIDGE GROUP REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR A NAME FOR THE NEW ROAD CONNECTING THE PRESENT BURKE LANE/I-15 INTERCHANGE TO 1100 WEST (STR-1-03) (Agenda Item #5)

Background Information:

This agenda item was reviewed by the Planning Commission at the January 9, 2003, meeting. The Planning Commission approved a motion recommending that the City Council not change the name of Burke Lane between Main Street and the new interchange. However, the Commission tabled the request to name the portion of the new road between the present Burke Lane/I-15 interchange to the 1100 West/Clark Lane intersection in order to turn the matter back to staff for consideration of other options.

The City has received a recommendation from Horrocks Engineers, the City's transportation engineer, regarding the street name proposal. It is not uncommon for roads leaving an interchange in different directions to be identified by different names and this is consistent with the Planning Commission's first motion approved on January 9th. The developer maintains that "Farmington Parkway" is a good name. He is proposing an extensive landscape package all along the roadway which will be presented at the Planning Commission meeting. Moreover, in the future the median could also be landscaped.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen introduced the agenda item, stating that Rich Haws had come to present information and ideas regarding road names and landscaping plans.

Chairman Forsgren stated he may have a potential conflict of interest regarding the agenda item. He would conduct the meeting, but would abstain from voting.

Rich Haws (developer) presented the landscaping plans for the interchange area under consideration. The plan was extensive and would be consistent with plans for the Legacy Highway (assuming its eventual construction). Mr. Haws had been in contact with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), whose officials had expressed approval of the plan. UDOT officials had committed to install the landscaping if Farmington City would agree to maintain it. Mr. Haws commented that he wanted to work out an agreement with the City that his company would be the ones to maintain the landscaping. He also stated he would like to have the landscaping plan and the suggested name go before the City Council for their consideration simultaneously. He felt leaving the name *Burke Lane* in place between Main and the signal at Lagoon Drive would be appropriate. He felt, however, that the name *Farmington Parkway* should begin at the signal and continue along the new road as it curved south and connected to Clark Lane. Doing so would lessen potential confusion for traffic. Mr. Haws expressed his desire to get approval for the name *Farmington Parkway* because it helped create the appropriate environment and feeling needed to entice tax base entities to the area. The issue was somewhat urgent because UDOT would be deciding on sign packages very soon.

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

- ↯ Commissioners were influenced by the amount and content of public comment during the public hearing held at the last Planning Commission meeting. Commission members felt they needed to be respectful of citizen input respecting the historical nature of the Burke Lane name.
- ↯ Preserving the Burke Lane name on the original road and naming just the new section seemed to be an acceptable compromise which would be beneficial to the City.
- ↯ With the installation of the extensive landscaping, the new road would seem more like a “parkway.”
- ↯ Mr. Haws interjected that he felt the comments made during the public hearing wherein citizens opposed the new name was not representative of the majority of Farmington citizens.
- ↯ The new road is being built and will need a name. As it turns to the south, it is not in the location of the original Burke Lane. The City should take the opportunity to give the new road a name that would reflect the best interests of the City.

Motion:

Cindy Roybal moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve *Farmington Parkway* as the name for the new road connecting the present Burke Lane/I-15 interchange to 1100 West beginning at the signal on the new U.S. 89 off ramp. **Cory Ritz** seconded the motion.

Amendment:

After discussion of the motion, Ms. Roybal amended the motion to include the following language: “. . . subject to approval of the landscaping plan.” Mr. Ritz concurred with the amendment. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative, with Chairman Forsgren abstaining.

Reasons for the motion:

1. The motion included response to input gathered from citizens during a public hearing.
2. The motion was also responsive to the need for immediate action due to the UDOT deadline regarding sign package decisions.
3. The landscaping plans indicate *parkway* will be a good name.

4. An agreement with the developer to maintain the landscaping will be beneficial to the City.
5. The name and the landscaping will help create an increased tax base for the City.

AGENDA AMENDMENT

Motion:

Bart Hill moved that the Planning Commission consider Agenda Item #3 next in the meeting. **Cory Ritz** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

PUBLIC HEARING: SCOTT WOOD REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A SUBDIVISION (LOT SPLIT) BY METES AND BOUNDS LOCATED AT 224 WEST 1100 NORTH IN AN LR-F ZONE (S-5-02)(Agenda Item #3)

Background Information:

The previous owners of the subject property, Michael and Jody Gray, received schematic plan approval from the City for a lot split for the purpose of demonstrating to prospective buyers that a lot split was indeed possible. The City Council approved the Gray schematic plan request on November 20, 2002. In their approval they reversed the Planning Commission's recommendation for an extension agreement for sidewalk improvements.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

David Petersen briefly reviewed the background information, reminding the Planning Commission that the City Council had decided to reverse the Planning Commission's recommendation for an extension agreement regarding sidewalk improvements.

The Planning Commission discussed the issues. It was felt by Commission members that they understood the reasoning of the City Council but would still like to protect the City in the event that someday a sidewalk would be needed along Compton Drive (200 West).

Motion:

Jim Talbot moved that the Planning Commission grant approval for a subdivision by metes and bounds on property located at 224 West 1100 West subject to conditions of schematic plan approval and all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and that a recommendation go to the City Council to ask them to reconsider an extension agreement with the property owner for sidewalk improvements. Further, Mr. Talbot noted that the Planning Commission understood the reasoning of the City Council in reversing the Planning Commission's condition requiring an extension agreement for schematic plan approval, but that

in the event the situation changes on the property under consideration the City should maintain the right to require future sidewalk improvements. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Reasons for the Motion:

1. The intended land use is consistent with the surrounding area.
2. The action meets with City standards and ordinances.
3. The request for the extension agreement will provide protection for the City.

FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL (OR CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL) TO DEVELOP HERITAGE PARK ON APPROXIMATELY 10.5 ACRES LOCATED BETWEEN THE OAKRIDGE PARK ESTATES PUD AND U.S. 89 NORTH OF THE K-MART SHOPPING CENTER IN AN LR ZONE (C-2-03) (Agenda Item #4)

Background Information:

The Planning Commission granted conditional use approval for this application at the last meeting on January 9, 2003. Due to the unseasonably warm weather and other factors, the Public Works Department would like to start immediately grubbing the site and preparing the pad locations for the parking lot and playground area, etc., for the new park. Landscaping, however, will not be implemented until the fall to avoid the stress of planting during the hot, dry summer.

The City Manager, on January 22, 2003, recommended that the City Council not construct the water feature portion of the park. It would be too costly and all the public improvements planned as part of the November bond election must be under budget.

The architect and landscape architects for the park redrew plans to illustrate a flat playing field as part of the overall site for the Planning Commission consideration.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen presented information about the proposed park in the Oakridge area. He said the City Council had decided not to pursue the water feature in the park because of budgetary considerations and because of safety concerns. The current proposal is within budgeted amounts. Mr. Petersen said that Viola Kenney (Leisure Services Director) was satisfied there was adequate playing field space within the City at this point. The City Council had also decided to sell the lot at the northeast corner of the park to increase funding availability.

Denis Butler (architect) was present to answer questions if required by the Planning Commission. The Commission discussed the issues, including the following points:

- ↯ Ms. Roybal made the suggestion that the lot at the northeast corner be used for additional, needed parking.
- ↯ The architect explained the addition of a small retention basin near the west entrance to the park. He said it was a “backup” basin for the drainage system which could help when water backs up from the west in a heavy runoff. He said the small area would not take much water and would simply be there to handle excess water when the nearby basin overflowed.
- ↯ Commission members suggested that the entire park could be used as a detention basin if bermed properly.
- ↯ Chairman Forsgren detailed several substantial concerns regarding drainage in the entire area. He asked questions regarding a ditch on the east border of the park and if it would be left for drainage from the north. He asked several questions regarding potential flooding. Mr. Petersen suggested Paul Hirst (City Engineer) be invited to address concerns of the Planning Commission about drainage in the area and related issues about park construction.
- ↯ The Commission was being asked for conceptual approval of the park to allow Public Works to begin work on the park while the weather is favorable.
- ↯ The Commission briefly discussed the name of the park. The City Council had tabled discussion on the name.
- ↯ The relocation of the basketball court away from residences was a good plan. Commission members felt it would be good to encourage use of the park because they felt that if it was used there would be less chance for vandalism.

[Sid Young arrived at 8:15.]

Motion:

Cindy Roybal moved that the Planning Commission grant conceptual site plan approval thereby permitting the Public Works Department to begin preparing the site for the park subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinance and development standards and the following conditions:

1. The name of the park shall be reconsidered.
2. A drainage and grading plan shall be prepared, including but not limited to the resolution of issues caused by the drainage at 1075 West, and shall be reviewed and approved by the Farmington City Planning Department and the Planning

3. The landscape plan for the park shall be reviewed and approved by the Farmington City Planning Department and the Planning Commission.

Bart Hill seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, Commissioners felt that little league play would probably be acceptable in the park. However, junior high-age groups would be too much of an impact on the small park.

Amendment:

In further consideration of the motion, **Ms. Roybal** amended the motion to include language that would request the City Engineer consider using the entire park as an emergency detention basin. **Mr. Hill** concurred with the amendment.

A vote was taken. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Reasons for the Motion:

1. The motion will allow the Public Works Department to move ahead with grading and other preparations.
2. The Commission members will be able to review details of the park during later approval procedures.
3. The flat playing area of the park will provide room for a wide range of activities.
4. The park is a much needed amenity (and long-awaited by citizens) for the City.

The Commission was asked by Mr. Butler to briefly review elevation drawings of the new community center along with floor plans. The Commission members were generally in favor of the designs. However, Mr. Talbot commented that the building will be a show place for Farmington City. Of all the buildings in the City that should be an example to potential developers, it should be the community center. If builders were going to be required to use Farmington rock on the exterior of their buildings, then the community center should reflect that standard. He, and other Commission members, felt the exterior of the community center should include more Farmington stone.

Commission members also discussed the possibility of having a Farmington rock monument sign and what the disposition of the roses in the rose garden would be when relocated.

DISCUSSION ITEM: JIM WALKER REQUEST TO REVIEW THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING AN ACCESSORY DWELLING IN THE STEM OF A FLAG LOT

(Agenda Item #6)

Mr. Petersen reported that the agenda item had been withdrawn.

BED AND BREAKFAST ZONING PROPOSAL (Agenda Item #7)

Mr. Petersen briefly introduced the agenda item. He said Mr. Jeppsen had built a 3-story home on North Main and would like to further develop his property into a bed and breakfast facility. Doing so would necessitate either a zone text change (to include bed and breakfast use in the existing zone or some other zone) or creating a new zone.

Harv Jeppsen (1717 North Main) showed drawings of the potential bed and breakfast facility. He planned to build about 8 free standing, small units. He said that he planned to leave the 3-story home as a residence until the facility was successful, at which time he may convert the home into a bed and breakfast business also. If successful and if he gained approval, Mr. Jeppsen may consider expanding the units.

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

- ▭ The area has no other draw and is not considered a “destination” location. It may have difficulty attracting customers.
- ▭ The Salt Lake avenue area has many bed and breakfast units which are very successful when done well.
- ▭ Criteria (such as density and impact on neighbors) for a zone change or a new zone would have to be carefully considered due to the impact on the rest of the City.
- ▭ A bed and breakfast facility could be a better buffer for residential areas than an apartment unit.
- ▭ There may be a place for a bed and breakfast business in Farmington. To date, there are no such businesses in the City.
- ▭ What would happen to the property if the business failed?
- ▭ In general, Commission members felt if a bed and breakfast business were allowed, they would want it kept small.

The agenda item was for discussion only. No action was requested.

WEST FARMINGTON AND U.S. 89 CORRIDOR LAND USE STUDY UPDATE (Agenda Item #8)

Mr. Petersen reviewed information regarding economic studies and plans currently under way by City officials. The potential development in west Farmington being worked on by Rich Haws will have a great impact on the City and other potential areas of commercial development. Mr. Haws has suggested a new “mixed use” zone for that area. Discussion has indicated that a business park may be ideal for the location.

Another area given attention by City planning is the U.S. 89 corridor, where existing retail business have made some investment. Smiths will likely stay there now that the highway reconstruction will allow adequate access. That, of course, is the area where K-mart had located and has since vacated.

One of the concerns of City officials is that the commercial endeavors of the City are planned so that traffic congestion and other problems experienced in Layton do not happen here. What kind of commercial development is best for Farmington? Where should it be located? What will be the impact on the rural atmosphere of the City? When will it reach full growth? A great many questions have been raised. The City’s financial director has warned officials that if no new tax base is brought into the City, there will be a serious short fall of revenue within 10 years.

Mr. Petersen characterized the City as a “bedroom community” whose citizens commute to other counties for employment. He also said that Farmington at present is not considered by retail commercial developers as an ideal place to locate because of the relatively low number of homes.

A great deal of discussion and research has been done, including the prospect of hiring an economic development consultant. A focus group has been organized. The City Council appointed themselves, along with two members of the Planning Commission and staff members, as the focus group in order to define what the City needs and wants. City officials have taken several field trips to view other commercial developments--types, successful features, draw backs, and other information. A map was being used as a planning tool and given to the focus group on which to indicate their thoughts. Mr. Petersen reviewed future land use survey results for areas shown on the map.

Mr. Talbot discussed his past experience with economic development in the City. He cited several potential weaknesses in Farmington’s past approach to increasing tax base income. He said that the City probably should have encouraged other retail businesses to locate around K-mart in order to build the draw of customers. Nothing was done. In fact, K-mart paid for many improvements in the area, including the road to the west, and was given no incentives. If Farmington wants to entice commercial entities to the City, no matter what kind, they need to foster incentives and an appealing atmosphere. There was a lack of planning in the past which has resulted in the current lack of adequate economic tax base.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT AND MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Petersen reminded the Commission members of information regarding a workshop

presented by Envision Utah, which was included in the packet.

Interviews for a new Commission members will be held on February 6, from 5 to 6 P.M. in the City Offices.

The Planning Commission was invited to attend a special meeting regarding economic development on Thursday, January 30.

The Planning Commission was also invited to a tour of the new animal hospital built by Dr. Richard White on Shepard Lane. The tour will be held on Wednesday, February 19 at 6 P.M.

The City Council meeting included a "State of the City" address given by Mayor Connors.

The City Council discussed in detail the parks and recreation bond issue budget and projects that will be accomplished by the bond financing. Bond issue projects must come in under budget.

The Council decided not to allow ice fishing on Farmington Pond.

ADJOURNMENT

Sid Young *MOVED* to adjourn at 10:00 P.M. **Cindy Roybal** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Kent Forsgren, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission