FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, April 22, 2004

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Cory Ritz, Commission Members Bart Hill, Keith Klundt, John Montgomery, Cindy Roybal, Jim Talbot, and Jordan White, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman.

Chairman Ritz called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. at which time he offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Bart Hill moved that the minutes of the March 25, 2004, Planning Commission Meeting be approved. **John Montgomery** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

DAVIS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION FOR MINOR PLAN APPROVAL FOR A SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 3 LOTS ON .789 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 150 SOUTH 300 EAST IN AN OTR-F ZONE (S-4-04) (Agenda Item #2)

Mr. Petersen briefly introduced the agenda item. He mentioned that there were no significant changes since the Planning Commission had discussed the request during the last meeting.

Mr. Talbot asked if the School District was serious about putting three temporary trailers on the property for use as offices. The trailers would be very unattractive and will be a negative impact on the neighborhood.

Mr. Petersen suggested that the Planning Commission communicate to the School District that the trailers may be subject to Farmington ordinances and temporary use restrictions.

Ms. Roybal was concerned that the School District may use the trailers and then at some future point feel they were grandfathered and could leave the trailers on the site.

Mr. Montgomery suggested the School District may feel that the fences would provide visual mitigating factors.

Mr. Petersen said that the School District should be asked to come before the Planning Commission for conditional use review and approval.

Motion

John Montgomery moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed minor subdivision at 150 South 300 East subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the conditions of schematic plan approval and that the School District must submit an application to the City for conditional use approval for all proposed temporary trailers (or buildings) on the property west and north of the subdivision. **Jordan White** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous approval.

Findings

The action taken meets with Farmington ordinances and standards and is consistent with the General Plan for the area. The action is also consistent with the current uses adjacent to the property.

PUBLIC HEARING: CLAYNE WHITE AND FAMILY REQUEST FOR TEMPORARY USE APPROVAL FOR A "SHAVED ICE" STAND SITUATED IN THE SOUTHERLY END OF A PARKING LOT LOCATED AT 677 WEST SHEPARD LANE IN AN A ZONE (TU-3-04) (Agenda Item #3)

Background Information

The proposed temporary use is located in an A zone which does not permit such temporary uses. Nevertheless, on April7, 2004, City Council granted the applicant an exception pursuant to Section 11-28-120(i)(6) subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission of the temporary use.

END OF PACKET INFORMATION.

Mr. Petersen showed on a map the location of the proposed "shaved ice" business. He reviewed the background information with the Planning Commission.

Public Hearing

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

Clayne White (344 South Marie Circle, Kaysville) stated there were utilities available on

the site and that all City requirements had been met. He had talked to the neighbors, and they were in favor of the proposed business. Some of the neighbors' children will also be involved. Public health officials will be coming to check the business upon approval of the Planning Commission.

Public Hearing Closed

With no forthcoming comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues.

After questions from the Planning Commission, **Mr. White** stated that they would like to stay open until 9 P.M. on weekdays and 10 P.M. on weekends; however, 9 A.M. to 10 P.M. every day would be acceptable. The street is a dead end street and most traffic will be from games in the nearby park.

The Commission briefly discussed signage with Clayne White. In order to make the business successful, they felt he should erect signs that would help passers-by become aware of the activity. Signs would need to comply with Farmington ordinances.

Motion

Jordan White moved that the Planning Commission approve the application to create a "shaved ice" stand in the southerly end of a parking lot located at 677 West Shepard Lane subject to all applicable ordinance requirements and development standards and the following conditions:

1. The time period for the use shall begin on May 15, 2004, and shall expire on September 15, 2004;

2. The proposed location and precise dimensions of the "Shaved ice Shack" will be developed as depicted in the submitted site plan;

3. All signage will comply with the Farmington City Sign Ordinance;

4. Hours of daily operation shall be no longer than 9:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.

Cindy Roybal seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

The Planning Commission felt that the "shaved ice" business would be compatible with the neighborhood and would be a low impact on surrounding uses.

PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION REGARDING A PROPOSED BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN FRUIT HEIGHTS AND FARMINGTON CITY NORTH OF THE NORTH END OF NORTH COMPTON ROAD INVOLVING APPROXIMATELY 19.63 ACRES, INCLUDING SUBDIVISION AND ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS (A-1-04) (Agenda Item #4)

Background Information

A portion of Fruit Heights north of the north end of North Compton Road is surrounded on three sides by the Farmington City corporate limits. A developer, Hawkins Companies, now wants to develop part of this area. The proposed development (Deer Crest and Hidden Springs) contains 36 Lots on 15.97 acres. According to the Developer, Fruit Heights approved a zone change for the property and granted preliminary plat approval for the subdivision subject to the conditions that the proposed Mahogany Drive in Fruit Heights connects with North Compton Road in Farmington. Apparently, this is necessary because, like Farmington, Fruit Heights also has a dead end street limitation and the developer cannot develop the proposed subdivision in Fruit Heights without a second point of access.

A 1.790 acre portion of the 15.97 acres (the "1.8 Acre Property") is located within the Farmington City corporate limits. The developer cannot receive final plat approval for the 1.8 Acres Property from Fruit Heights so long as it remains in Farmington City. Furthermore, it is the understanding of City staff, that part of the proposed street necessary for the second point of access (Mahogany Drive/North Compton Road) is located in Farmington City and cannot be dedicated and improved without the approval of Farmington City.

In order to develop the entire 36 lot subdivision in Fruit Heights, the developer approached Farmington City with a proposal to adjust the common boundary line between the two municipalities thereby shifting the 1.8 Acre Property into Fruit Heights.

If the 1.8 Acre Property remains in Farmington City, the property owner has the potential to develop at least 6 lots. In return Farmington City has the potential to receive at least $33,792.00 in impact fees, an increase in property tax revenue, and approximately .18 acres of open space. All of these benefits to Farmington City would be lost if the 1.8 Acre Property is annexed into Fruit Heights.

The Developer is also proposing another boundary exchange to shift a parcel of land similar in size to the 1.8 Acre Property (the "other 1.8 Acre Property"). The developer does not own, nor is under contract to buy, the Other 1.8 Acre Property. The Other 1.8 Acre Property is characterized by steep slopes and possible fault lines. It is possible that no residential lots may be developed on the Other 1.8 Acre Property. Moreover, if the Other 1.8 Acre Property is annexed into Farmington City, it is possible that no significant increase in property taxes will be realized to help operate and maintain the extension of North Compton Road that will then all be in Farmington City.

Meanwhile, Farmington City staff also suggested that the developer and Fruit Heights consider a large boundary adjustment whereby the Farmington City corporate limits will increase in size to include the full 15.97 acre subdivision, an undeveloped parcel east of the subdivision, and the Other 1.8 Acre Property. However, the developer's 15.97 acre subdivision proposal, cannot be approved in Farmington without a second point of access. Therefore, it is proposed that an existing private dirt road now stubbed into the Somerset subdivision be utilized as a second point of emergency access subject to, among other things, the requirements of the Fire chief, and the existing conditions set forth in agreements and other documents between the Somerset HOA and the owner(s) of the 15.097 acre property.

The developer will benefit from the larger boundary adjustment because he will not be required to provide an expensive first point of road access and lengthy extension of utilities "leap frogging" from existing developed property past undeveloped property. The City will also benefit from the larger boundary adjustment because the City will receive more water impact fees to help pay for the cost of the water tank located in the extreme northeast corner of the city and other related culinary water facilities.

Finally, storm water runoff is an issue regardless if the larger, or smaller, or no boundary adjustment is approved by the two cities. Presently, according to the developer, about 1/3 of the subject larger area must drain into Farmington and 2/3 into Fruit Heights. All issues regarding storm water drainage, including but not limited to, storm water flows, pipe and detention basin sizes and locations, easements, constructions standards and future facility operation and maintenance should be resolved between the two cities and the developer prior to final plat approval by either city for any portion of the project. An inter-local agreement between the two municipalities may be necessary.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the agenda item. He covered the background information in detail. He also explained the proposed motion as presented in the packet for consideration by the Planning Commission.

Public Hearing

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

Mark Howard (681 West Eaton Court–just to the west of the planned subdivision) addressed the easement which he said was a private easement created through litigation between private land owners. It was not a public easement. The issue had gone to court several years ago. The court deemed the area a minor use easement just by two families. Before the developer has any right to use the easement, he must negotiate with the land owners. Roads that currently run through the area are not of a sufficient standard to bear any increased traffic use. They are deteriorating at a fast pace.

Page Walton (122 Oakridge Drive–Farmington Trails Committee) said that there had been discussion of a 10 foot trail. It was unclear where that trail easements will go. There are actually two trail connections that need to go through this subdivision. She said that the trail corridors need to be marked and walked with a member of the Planning Commission, the City Council, and the Trail Committee so that the trail will actually be constructed.

John Aoki (North Hampton Road)stated that property owners beyond the outside the subdivision have a prescriptive right to travel through the easement under consideration. He did not see how there could be a locked gate at that easement. There is currently a lot of traffic beyond what was allowed by the litigation. If the subdivision is approved there will be a lot of traffic that will be using the easement.

Charmaine Anderson (1914 Kesington) asked if the locked gate could be put on the Fruit Heights dirt road to keep the traffic from going through the subdivision. The easement under consideration is just an unimproved dirt road.

Jean Evans (713 West Springwood Drive) said she and her husband had been to every meeting in Farmington and in Fruit Heights regarding the proposed subdivision and not once had there been mention of the retaining basin along the west of the proposed subdivision. Three lots owned by the Evans will be in a water detention basin which will be negatively impacted once the subdivision is constructed.

Harley Evans (713 West Springwood Drive) stated that when their property was brought into the City, there were three lots. In the July 9, 2001, storm there was no flood water coming through his property because the flow went a different direction. He felt that if the subdivision was built, it would disturb the natural flow and would bring storm water onto his property. The County should not have sold the property. It was a flood plain put there for a purpose. He did feel that the property should be annexed to Farmington so that there could be proper control. In the

beginning the property was not allowed to have houses on it. The storm water runoff needs to be taken care of by the developer not by Mr. Evans.

Mike Flood (representative of the developer, Hawkins Companies) said the proposal before the Planning Commission was a simple boundary line adjustment. He spoke about the access that may be needed by fire emergency vehicles to the foothills in case of a fire on the hillsides. Mahogany Road would be a logical access. The benefit to the area would be obvious. There were other reasons for having the property in question come into Farmington City. He said the developer had been listening to concerns by the residents. There would need to be negotiations regarding the ingress/egress easement. It is not a simple task. The developer is vested in Fruit Heights where the subdivision is near final plat approval. It would be very easy to go ahead with Fruit Heights. However, the developer is open to going through Farmington because of benefits to the City and to the developer. The detention basin along the west boundary of the proposed subdivision will hold the water that would be directed towards it. He felt there would be a minimal amount of storm drainage water coming down through the detention basin. The contour maps would show that water drains to the south west corner of the subdivision only from about 1/4 of the proposed housing development. There is a large easement through Somerset for the drainage for that property. The majority of the storm water would go north west through engineered pipes. All these plans would be reviewed by the City Engineer. The trail corridor would be acceptable to the developer. They would be willing to work with the City in designing and providing the north-bound trail. If there are too many concerns to bring this property into Farmington, then Mr. Flood requested that there be a simple boundary line adjustment between the two cities and allow the two developers to move forward.

Harley Evans said that the property in question is too steep for a standard road. He invited the Planning Commissioners to take a field trip to the area. He felt the property should be developed in no less than 1 acre lots.

Mark Howell asked the developer about the easement connection in the southwest corner.

Mr. Flood said that there is currently an agreement with the property to the north of the easement. There would have to be more negotiations and work regarding the use of the easement property. He stated that in working with the Somerset HOA, he felt they were not concerned if there were an end to the easement in the future.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing. He stated that it was obvious that development would be accomplished. The question was whether the property

would be in Farmington or in Fruit Heights. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- Commission Members enumerated some advantages and disadvantages of having the property annexed into Farmington City. Advantages included the revenues that could help fund the new water tank through impact fees.

- The southwest easement is problematic. Mr. Montgomery asked why the developer had to use the easement rather than developing the standard road access to the north through Fruit Heights. Mr. Flood stated that it would be expensive and there was a trade off for the revenues that would go towards helping the City with the water tank.

- Commission members felt it would be advantageous for Farmington to have control over the property.

- There are clearly several issues that need to be resolved, including trail location, the southwest easement access, and the storm drainage.

- Mr. Petersen stated that even if the subdivision is constructed in Fruit Heights, there is a law that requires a developer to maintain historic water flows. If that is not achieved, Farmington could stop the project.

- Commission Members were concerned about the City's commitment to the developer by approving annexation.

- Would there be a possibility to have the lots adjacent to the Evans property enlarged to one-acre lots? The developer stated that in order to proceed with the subdivision, they would need to have the full 36 lots. He could not answer the question about the one-acre lots without consulting with his company. The lots had been designed according to topographical concerns, such as fault lines.

Motion

John Montgomery moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council consider a boundary adjustment with Fruit Heights to include all of the 15.97 acre subdivision, an undeveloped parcel east of the subdivision (1.6 acres), and the Other 1.8 Acre Property described in the April 22, 2004, Farmington City Planning Commission Staff Report subject to the following conditions and recommendations:

1. The Deer Crest at Hidden Springs subdivision must be developed in compliance with Farmington City development standards.

2. The developer shall receive no more than 36 residential lots on 15.97 acres as proposed unless issues related to storm water cannot be resolved acceptab le to Farmington City. All related impact fees and development fees shall be paid to Farmington City.

3. The City Council must give a waiver of open space requirements for the 15.97acre subdivision, except for the 1.8 Acre property referenced in the April 22, 2004, Farmington City Planning Commission Staff Report, as set forth in Section 11-12-065 of the Farmington City Zoning Ordinance. A waiver is recommended if the developer provides to Farmington City "comparable compensation, off-s8ite improvements, amenities or other consideration of comparable size, quality and/or value." Impact fees to be paid to Farmington City for off site culinary water facilities should meet this requirement. Furthermore, it should be noted that the developer may develop the lots presently located in Fruit Heights without the approval of Farmington City.

4. The developer shall provide property, approximately 10 feet in width, for a trail in fee title to Farmington City running the entire length adjacent to the east boundary of the undeveloped parcel east of the propos3ed Deer Crest at Hidden Springs subdivision and the parcel presently identified by the Davis County Tax I.D. #08-042-0035 in lieu of the .18 acre open space requirement (in conjunction with the development of the 1.8 Acre Property now in Farmington and zoned LR-F). This action will provide an equestrian (and pedestrian) trail for that segment of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail linking points north and points south consistent with the Farmington City Trails Master Plan.

5. All issues regarding storm water drainage, including but not limited to, storm water flows, pipe and detention basin sizes and locations, easements, construction standards and future facility operation and maintenance should be resolved between the two cities and the developer prior to final plat approval by either city for any portion of the project. An interlocal agreement between the two municipalities may be necessary.

6. The property shall be zoned LR-F upon completion of the boundary line adjustment.

7. City council should grant schematic plan approval concurrently with consideration of the boundary line adjustment. It is further recommended that the Planning

Commission consider preliminary plat approval and a recommendation for final plat approval at the same meeting when the time is appropriate.

8. A second point of access to the 15.97 acre subdivision for emergency purposes only shall be provided via an existing private dirt now stubbed into the Somerset subdivision subject to, among other things, the requirements of the Fire chief, and the existing conditions set forth in agreements and other documents between the Somerset HOA and the owner(s) of the 15.97 acre property, and the developer shall also install "crash gates" at 650 West Street in the Somerset PUD and Deer Crest Circle to prevent local non-emergency through traffic. When Mahogany Drive connects to the north into a fully improved street located in Fruit Heights, said private dirt road shall be vacated and conveyed to adjacent property owners.

9. The developer and Farmington City shall enter into a development agreement to include among other things the conditions set forth herein.

10. If Farmington City chooses not to pursue the larger boundary line adjustment described herein, or if Fruit Heights is unwilling to pursue the larger boundary line adjustment, then the Farmington City Council should still consider a boundary line adjustment regarding the 1.8 Acre Property and the Other 1.8 Acre Property referenced in the April 22, 2004, Farmington City Planning Commission Staff Report subject to conditions 4, 5, and 9 referenced above, and North Compton Road must be developed and dedicate din Accordance with Farmington City standards.

Jordan White seconded the motion, which passed by a 6 to 1 vote. **Jim Talbot** opposed the motion.

Findings

1. The City could use the economic benefit from the impact fees that would be charged to the subdivision.

2. Farmington would be able to control issues of concern in the development.

3. One of the major issues, storm drainage control, would be protected and achieved through condition #9 of the motion.

Mr. Talbot said he opposed the motion because he was not sure how much control there would really be. The southwest easement was a big concern. It seemed to him there would be

little the Planning Commission could say regarding how the development was created. He also did not want to put undo pressure on the Somerset HOA regarding the southwest easement.

PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF A RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND CHAPTER 11 OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND AMEND THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN RELATED THERETO BY RE-DESIGNATING SCORES OF ACRES TO OTHER VARIOUS DESIGNATIONS ALONG THE U.S. 89 AND I-15 CORRIDORS FROM THE CHERRY HILL INTERCHANGE AND THE SHEPARD LANE OVERPASS TO THE BURKE LANE INTERCHANGE AND THE GENERAL VICINITY OF THE DAVIS COUNTY JUSTICE COMPLEX (MP-3-03)

Mr. Petersen explained that the committee organized to review suggested General Plan amendments for property generally in the U.S. 89 and I-15 corridors had met 6 times. A lot of information had been discussed and accumulated. Not all of the input was before the Planning Commission at this time. He, therefore, suggested that the Chairman open the public hearing and take comments but that the agenda item be tabled to allow the Planning Commission to review all the information. Mr. Petersen introduced Rulon Dutson, the consultant retained by the City to help with the General Plan amendment process.

Rulon Dutson stated that the primary work before the City was to educate those who were interested so that the process could go forward with knowledgeable decisions. The committee discussions were productive even though diverse; they were cooperative and courteous. There were a number of compromises struck. The committee involved people who had interests along the 89 corridor. Mr. Dutson stated that General Plans needed to be easy to use or people and communities will not use them. Mr. Dutson also discussed the reason behind the content of the Chapter 11 draft. He detailed the content of the draft, reasons behind the decisions made, and possibilities for flexibility.

Public Hearing

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing.

David Dixon (1047 North 1100 West) stated there used to be an "S" zone in the City. That zone seemed to have been used for areas that had no other use. Most "S" zones turned into commercial uses. Mr. Dixon felt that "Mixed Use" zones may turn into the same kind of problem. He felt there was the potential that all "Mixed Use" zones could be developed into commercial uses, even though the ideal is that residents be included within most of those areas. If the intent is to have residential development then it should probably be identified as such. Mr. Dixon also discussed the need for traffic impact studies. It would be important to define the impacts from traffic on all areas of the corridor. It would be best to ensure enough traffic access

for Lagoon and other high need areas, and then all residential areas, and then accommodate other uses. There should be a way to monitor what can be handled. Does Farmington really know how much commercial development it wants.

Dave Potter (1745 North Main Street) said he would like to make the recommendation that the Planning Commission move the request forward. The area south of Shepard Lane has been zoned commercial for years, but nothing has been developed there other than the Maverik store. We need something in Farmington to produce tax revenues for the City. He encouraged the Planning Commission to move forward on the request.

Greg Bell (744 Eagle Way, Fruit Heights) stated that the thing that got him into public life was a proposal to put a "C" store on the northwest corner of Burke and Main. The area is so fragile along the Main Street corridor that it needs to be carefully considered. If commercial development is allowed along Main Street then it will anchor more commercial creep. The traffic on Main Street will then be very difficult. That road is not capable of handling that kind of traffic.

Harv Jeppson (1717 North Main) felt the text of the draft would protect the Main Street corridor against commercial creep. Mr. Jeppson felt that if the City were to cut out the potential of commercial development altogether along Main Street, it would hurt the City. Commercial development always goes on the east side of I-15 first, not on the west side. It is important to look down the road 20 or 30 years and think of the future land use. There is also a fairness issue. The City must be fair to the citizens of Farmington, to the property owners, and to the opposition.

Stuart Adams (3271 West 1875 North) stated the process of the committee work had been a positive event. The current draft represents a consensus of the committee. He represented property owners within the CMU zone. There were a great many different kinds of uses described for that zone. If a combination of uses is welcome, it would be a good situation. The free enterprise system will dictate what is needed. Mr. Adams suggested that the plan be left the way it is because it has had a great deal of work by many people.

Matt Hess (572 South 900 East--representative of the Hess and Leonard families in CMU and NMU zones) said he was also a member of the committee. Some of the thinking behind the mixed use zone was to give the Planning Commission the flexibility to allow control and to look at projects on a case by case basis. The zone gives the City a great deal of flexibility. The committee was also concerned by traffic. Horrocks Engineers was still working on the problem. Mr. Hess reported that home owners had become increasingly comfortable with the traffic on Clark Lane because of the one-way frontage roads. Mr. Hess talked about sub-district planning opportunities. He encouraged the Planning Commission to adopt the plan as is.

Rich Haws (1865 Bellevista Drive) complained that no representatives of the Haws company were invited to participate with the committee. He asked that the Haws people be able to give input into the draft. There had been suggestions given, but only some were reflected in the document. There was a significant amount of input he would like to give to the City. For example, the amendment indicated a specific number of units allowed in portions of the corridor. He recommended that the specific number of units required be done through zoning and not through the General Plan.

Michael Hess (565 East 504 West, Layton) felt that the map should be left the way it was. The committee had spent a great deal of work on what was presented. He felt that the Planning Commission should proceed forward and let people know what uses were allowed for their land.

Kent Buie (358 Rio Grand) said the concept of mixed use is a good concept. In the past, cities have had a tendency to isolate uses, and it has not worked as well as it should have. Mixed uses are more usable for the public. Mr. Buie agreed with Mayor Bell; the City has become quite progressive. The general thinking is very good. There are some safeguards in the process. Mr. Buie felt that there should be some designations about specific densities in some areas because it lets property owners know exactly what they can do with their property.

Mark Callister (1957 Somerset) said he was chosen to serve on the committee because he reflected the interests of the Somerset area. The NMU zone was a compromise of concerns expressed through the committee meetings. Mr. Callister emphasized that the General Plan should be general but there were conditions set by the committee because of the compromises reached. It was crucial that the Planning Commission realize that if the map is changed, particularly in the NMU zone, it could change significantly how the residents feel.

Kent Sulser (290 North 500 West, Bountiful) stated there should be a conversation between Farmington City and Davis County regarding land use and commercial development. The County has a great deal of interest in Farmington and the land uses planned. The County could assist in enhancing potential commercial development if cooperation existed between the two entities. They could help in decisions being made regarding the General Plan. Access is essential to commercial development. The impact of the commuter rail stop will also impact economic development around that area.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further forthcoming comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing.

Mr. Petersen mentioned that Horrocks Engineers had been invited to the last two committee meetings. Traffic engineers like to see the land use element first, then they make

determinations about traffic flow and needed road improvements. There are two elements to the General Plan: the land use and the traffic element. The interchange will be very important and should be carefully studied. The decision from the Planning Commission will be crucial. Mr. Petersen discussed the reasons behind the decisions that were made. The land use of the property just to the north of Lagoon and the area north of the Smiths store were areas of great concern. He felt that Mr. Haw's did have input into the process because of the one-on-one input given to the City staff. The committee did go with non-residential uses on the north side of Burke Lane in deference to preferences of the City Council. However, the Planning Commission may wish to reconsider that proposal. Mr. Petersen also stated that there will be a note on the map indicating that the text of the General Plan overrides the map. It would be well to have a Planning Commission work session prior to the May 13th meeting.

Chairman Ritz commended all those who had served and worked hard on the committee. He thanked those people on behalf of the Planning Commission. He requested a motion to table the request to allow time for the further consideration of the draft. The Chairman opened discussion up to members of the Commission while the information given by citizens was fresh.

Mr. Talbot stated that he had been to many meetings where Mr. Haws had a great deal of input and that Mr. Haws' views had been considered and even given a great deal of weight. Mr. Talbot also felt that office buildings designation north of Smiths and K-Mart did not fit where the map indicated.

Jordan White said he relied heavily on the committee and the consultant because of the work done and because of the expertise represented. He felt the map needed to represent what is best for the Farmington citizens as a whole. It should protect that general health and welfare of Farmington citizens.

Cindy Roybal had been a member of the committee. The work of the committee represented a great deal of compromise. Mixed use areas on the north were the focus of the committee's work. They did not discuss much about the commercial area to the west, nor did they consider in detail the Kent Buie proposals. In fairness, she felt representatives of both parties would be welcome to give input. There had been home owners from the west side of Farmington who contacted Ms. Roybal and had asked what they could anticipate for their area. Over all, she was very pleased that a compromise had been reached. It would be good to move forward after making sure everyone has a say in the process.

Mr. Hill reported he had sat on the committee. It had been an interesting process. What had been produced was a consensus of those who worked very hard. It had taken a great deal of time. Mr. Hill felt the document read well. The substance of the General Plan was in the text. The text contained specific conditions and safeguards. He believed that development would come

according to what the market could bear. He had been impressed with how everybody had come together.

Mr. Klundt and Mr. Montgomery both expressed their appreciation for those who had spent such a great deal of time to come to the compromise document. They also felt respect for the work completed and felt it would be dangerous to second guess the committee.

Mr. Petersen stated that legally the Planning Commission would have to wait for next meeting before taking final action on the amendments. After discussion, the Commission decided to meet at 5 P.M. on May 13th for a work session.

Motion

Cindy Royal moved that the Planning Commission table agenda item #5 and continue the public hearing until May 13th to allow time for a thorough review of all proposals and input. Members of the public were encouraged to submit comments in writing prior to the May 13th meeting. Copies of the draft document would be available in the City Offices if citizens wished to review it. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT AND MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Petersen discussed the idea of going on a field trip to consider Kent Buie's new proposal. Commission Members felt that they could check proposed areas on their own to get a feel for what the Buie project would be. Since there was nothing of real comparable merit, a field trip may not be a good use of time.

Ms. Roybal stated she felt strongly that Mr. Buie should try harder to meet and cooperate with the residents in involved areas.

Chairman Ritz reported several locations where ordinance violations were occurring within the City. Mr. Petersen said he would investigate.

Mr. Talbot read a letter of concern from a 14 year old resident of Farmington who encouraged the City to protect the City from the West Nile Virus mosquitoes.

Mr. Talbot also reported a disturbing infestation of large rats in parts of the City.

ADJOURNMENT

John Montgomery moved that the Planning Commission adjourn at 9:50 P.M.

_____

Cory Ritz, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission