

# FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, May 10, 2007

---

## PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

**Present:** Chairman Jim Talbot, Commission Members John Bilton, Andrew Hiller, Kevin Poff, Paul Barker, Rick Wyss, Planning Commission Alternates Randy Hillier and David Safeer, Assistant City Planner Jared Hall, and Recording Secretary Jill Hedberg. Cory Ritz was excused.

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

### Agenda Item #1: Minutes

The Planning Commission reviewed the minutes of the April 26, 2007, Planning Commission meeting.

### Agenda Item #2: City Council Report

**Jared Hall** reported the items from the City Council meeting that pertain to the Planning Commission.

### Agenda Item #3: DAI (Public Hearing continued from April 26, 2007) - Preliminary PUD Master Plan Approval for Palmer Estates, a 20 lot residential planned unit development on 9.66 acres in the B and OTR zones on property located at 100 West 600 North (S-17-06)

**Jared Hall** stated that the applicant was not prepared to appear before the Planning Commission at this time. The item will be continued to a future Planning Commission meeting.

### Agenda Item #4: Phil Squires (Public Hearing) - Applicant is requesting a recommendation for Schematic Plan Approval for the Wild Woods Subdivision, consisting of three new lots on 3.232 acres in the LR zone at 350 South 100 East (S-7-07)

**Jared Hall** reviewed the conditions that are being required by the Fire Chief which were included in the "Background Information." The applicant continues to work with the Public Works Department who has concerns about snow removal. They are also concerned about the width of the road since the road would have to be closed if a water line broke. City staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend Schematic Plan approval.

[Kevin Poff arrived at 6:41 P.M.]

### Agenda Item #5: Gardner Development Corp - (Public Hearing) - Applicant is requesting Conditional Use and Site Plan Approval and a recommendation for Final Plat Approval for Phase 1 of the Village at Old Farm, consisting of one two-family dwelling at approximately

**1500 North Main in an NMU zone (C-9-07) (S-8-07)**

**Jared Hall** explained that the public utilities and access will be served by Main Street. This unit will serve as a model home for the residential portion of the project. The lot is 20,000 square feet so it will not be a non-conforming property if the developer is unable to finish the rest of the project.

[**David Safer** arrived at 6:47 P.M.]

**Agenda Item #6: (Public Hearing continued from April 12, 2007) - Nixon & Nixon, Lock-It-UP Self Storage - Applicant is requesting Conditional Use Approval to develop Class "A" self storage units on property located at 549 West Bourne Circle, 3.011 acres in the CMU zone C-5-06)**

**Chairman Talbot** said he reviewed **Greg Bell's** letter and thought that it made sense.

**John Bilton** said he continues to support the storage unit proposal. The definition for primary and secondary sites is subjective. Station Park will likely be the gateway to Farmington so that will be a primary area. The Martinez property will also be a primary commercial piece. Although it may be argued that this is a primary property, not all properties can be primary. This property would not be considered primary if Lagoon were to move their entrance to the north since it will include a large amount of asphalt with kiosks.

**Paul Barker** said this property has features that could make it primary or secondary. It could be considered a primary site due to its close proximity to the freeway and to Station Park. The property may also be considered primary since the access is controlled by a semaphore (traffic light). The property could be considered a secondary property due to the width of the site.

**Rick Wyss** said there have been comments made that this may be an ideal location for an office building. He questioned whether there will be an office user who is interested in this property in the near future. This property is located next to a large gas station and does not have the visibility of a primary site.

In response to a question from **Kevin Poff**, **Jared Hall** stated that this application was received by the City prior to the creation of the zone text. The applicant offered to write the standards since they were not in existence at the time of this application.

In response to a question from **Rick Wyss**, **Jared Hall** stated that the main issue the Planning Commission should be considering is whether this property is a primary or secondary site.

**Kevin Poff** said during previous discussions, he was prepared to vote in favor of the project until it was decided that the application could not be considered separate from a planned center development. He does not think the Planning Commission needs to determine whether the site is primary or secondary since the application was received by the City prior to the creation of the zone text.

**Chairman Talbot** said whether the site is primary or secondary will be determined by what type of tenant is willing to develop this property. The City does not know whether there will be an office user interested in this location. The property owner should have the right to develop the property with an appropriate use.

**Rick Wyss** said it does not seem likely that a developer would want to construct an office building that overlooks the back side of a gas station.

**David Safeer** said a hotel operator may be interested in this location. Although Station Park is considered a primary site, it does not necessarily make the surrounding properties secondary.

**Rick Wyss** said he described the property to a City Attorney, including the fact that the property is located in an embankment and behind a gas station so it has limited visibility. The Attorney indicated that the visibility issue is key when determining whether a property is primary or secondary.

**Chairman Talbot** said he has lived in Farmington for 15 years and has never considered this area a gateway to the City. He considers the area south of Lagoon near the freeway off-ramp a gateway to the City. There are office buildings in this area due to the good visibility.

**Kevin Poff** said it appears the City considers Main Street to be the gateway to the City since they constructed their rock monument sign at that location.

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, Rick Wyss, Alternate Planning Commission Members Randy Hillier and David Safeer, Assistant City Planner Jared Hall, and Recording Secretary Jill Hedberg.

**Chairman Talbot** called the meeting to order at 7:10 P.M. **Paul Barker** offered the invocation.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**John Bilton** moved that the Planning Commission approve the minutes of the April 26, 2007, Planning Commission Meeting with the noted changes. **Paul Barker** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor. **Kevin Poff** and **Andrew Hiller** abstained since they were not present at the April 26, 2007, meeting.

**CITY COUNCIL REPORT**

The City Council report for May 1, 2007, was given during the Planning Commission study session.

**PUBLIC HEARING: DAI (PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED FROM 4/26/07) - PRELIMINARY PUD MASTER PLAN APPROVAL FOR PALMER ESTATES, A 20 LOT RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ON 9.66 ACRES IN THE B AND OTR ZONES ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 100 WEST 600 North (S-17-06) (Agenda Item #3)**

**Chairman Talbot** reported that the applicant was not prepared to appear before the Planning Commission at this time so this item will be continued to a future Planning Commission meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING: PHIL SQUIRES - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION FOR SCHEMATIC PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE WILD WOODS SUBDIVISION, CONSISTING OF THREE NEW LOTS ON 3.232 ACRES IN THE LR ZONE AT 350 SOUTH 100 EAST (S-7-07) (Agenda Item #4)**

**Background Information**

**General:** The application is for the subdivision of an existing lot with a home into 3 new lots, all over ½ acre. The applicant’s existing home will remain and portions of the lot will become new parcels. The challenges lie in the access and provision of utilities to the new lots. The existing lot is currently accessed by way of a 20' right-of-way at the dead-end of 100 East. The application proposes to extend and expand some portions of that right-of-way further to serve two more lots. In doing so, the proposal is to dedicate the right-of-way and create a turn-around area for emergency services.

**Access:** The applicant’s lot and the two new lots would be accessed by the newly dedicated 20' - 25' right-of-way. The situation requires a special determination by the Planning Commission. Streets that are less than the City’s standards cannot be dedicated to the City except under section 12-8-100. Essentially, the Planning Commission can make a recommendation to the City Council that a street with modified standards be dedicated as public, and the City Council

approves by resolution. Only widths and configurations can be modified in this manner, not construction standards.

***Technical Reviews:***

FIRE: The only real concern during the schematic review was from the Fire Department. The Chief met on two occasions with the applicant and staff. It is staff's understanding that he agreed to accept the 20' access with the following conditions:

1. The rear portions that will be a part of the turn-around provided will be wider, 25'.
2. A new hydrant will be installed on 100 East as part of this development.
3. At the time a home is built on Lot 3, the Fire Department will review again and may require a second hydrant and looping of the line from 100 East, through lot 3 and connected to 10 West where the water lines currently dead-end.

The hydrants are currently spaced well beyond the distances that we currently look for in emergency services. 100 East currently dead-ends without any provision for emergency services to perform a turn around, but with existing homes. This project would add two homes, but would also provide a turn-around that is needed already, and one, if not two, needed fire hydrants on 100 East.

UTILITIES: Lot 1 (the existing Squires home) is on a well and not connected to the water lines. They have no desire to change that situation. Lot 2 is proposed to have water and sewer lines to 100 East. Lot 3, because of grade and distance, cannot connect to sewer in 100 East, but will connect to sewer and water in 10 West, behind it, through the Maxwell lot (an existing home also involved in the subdivision). Public Works and Engineering continue to look at this situation but schematically, it is acceptable.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Jared Hall** displayed an overhead of the Schematic Plan for the Wild Woods Subdivision and pointed out where the Maxwell and Squires properties are located. The two property owners would like to subdivide their properties to create a 3 lot residential subdivision. All of the lots will meet the square footage requirements for the LR zone. He reviewed the "Background Information" that was included in the Planning Commission packet.

**Public Hearing**

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

**Phil Squires** (350 South 100 East) offered to answer any questions the Planning Commission may have.

**Chairman Talbot** asked if City staff has any concerns regarding the proposal.

**Jared Hall** said the ordinance allows the City to accept dedicated roads that are narrower than 27 feet which is the City standard. The narrow road width and the location of the utilities may be an issue for the Public Works Department but those issues can likely be resolved.

[**Cory Ritz** arrived at 7:20 p.m.]

**Phil Squires** said the adjacent property owners are only willing to sell him property for the 28' radius.

**Chairman Talbot** suggested that the property owners dedicate a utility easement on the front portion of their property since it is not likely that they would build on that portion of the property.

**Phil Squires** reviewed the Public Works Department's request to have a blow off at the end of the existing 30' wide road with water meters for lots 2 and 3.

**Jared Hall** said those issues can be worked out during the Preliminary approval process.

**Mark Summerhayes** (427 South 100 East) said he is concerned about the safety of the children in the area during the actual construction. He is also concerned about the utility easements that are being proposed.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

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

**Kevin Poff** asked if the reviewing agencies have expressed concern that the road does not meet the City's street standard.

**Jared Hall** said the Fire Chief is accepting of the street width.

**Kevin Poff** asked if it is appropriate to allow additional homes next to Woodland Park due to the noise that is generated from the park.

**Chairman Talbot** said they are only proposing the addition of two new homes to the

area. The buyers should be made aware that there may be noise issues at certain times of the year.

**Motion**

**Paul Barker** moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Schematic Plan for the Wild Woods Subdivision with the following conditions:

1. The applicant must work with public works, engineering and planning staff while preparing a preliminary plat and improvement plans to resolve any issues related to access and utility provision;
2. Prior to building on Lot 3, a second fire hydrant and looped water line to 10 West will be provided unless specifically waived by the Fire Department.
3. The applicant will consider providing easements for the utilities which will be located in 100 West.

**Kevin Poff** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**Findings**

- The proposed schematic plan is in keeping with the zoning and general plan of the City;
- The proposed schematic plan promotes better emergency service provision with turnaround and needed hydrants.
- The property north of lot 3 will not be landlocked since it is owned by Lee Maxwell.

**PUBLIC HEARING: GARDNER DEVELOPMENT CORP - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL AND A RECOMMENDATION FOR FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR PHASE 1 OF THE VILLAGE AT OLD FARM, CONSISTING OF ONE TWO-FAMILY DWELLING AT APPROXIMATELY 1500 NORTH MAIN IN AN NMU ZONE (C-9-07) (S-8-07) (Agenda Item #5)**

**Background Information**

*General:* The Village at Old Farm mixed use PUD is coming along through the approval process, having received schematic plan approvals, preliminary master plan approvals and preliminary plat approval for the residential portion of the project. The developers are now *requesting a simple phasing of the residential portion of the project while they continue to resolve larger*

*issues related to the final master plan approval.* The proposal is to subdivide a single 20,000 square foot lot from the remainder of the residential property, which would comprise phase 2. This subdivision would allow the developers to construct the first of the twin home units. It is the only unit that fronts to and accesses directly from Main Street. They intend to use it as a sort of model home so that potential buyers for units in phase 2 will have a reference.

**Improvements:** No new public improvements would be included with this phase of the Village at Old Farm. Only a single access driveway for the twin home would be required and laterals for utilities. The site planning for this unit includes a proposed “turn around” to allow the residents to turn their vehicles around and face Main Street as they exist the driveway.

**Other:** Due to the unique situation, where this particular unit will not depend on the remainder of the project for infrastructure in order to develop, staff felt it would not be inappropriate to phase the residential development and allow the applicants a chance to begin with construction on this unit while the final approvals are secured for the rest of the project.

It is proposed that the area of this phase of subdivision will be 20,000 square feet. This will ensure that until the remaining phases are approved at least 10,000 square feet will be devoted to each dwelling unit in the first phase.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Jared Hall** displayed an overhead of the Site Plan for Phase 1. He explained that a twin home will be constructed on the property as a showpiece to allow potential buyers to know what will be available in the residential area in the future. The lot will be 20,000 square feet which meets the size and setback standards for this zone. He displayed an overhead of the rendering for the twin home. He reviewed the “Background Information” and “Possible Motion” that were included in the Planning Commission packet. If the Planning Commission recommends approval for Phase 1, it does not grant vesting rights for future phases.

In response to a question from **John Bilton**, **Jared Hall** stated that this will be a model home. If the applicant wants to include a sales office in the model home, they will have to apply for a temporary permit.

**Rick Wyss** asked if there will be a street built to provide access to this property.

**Jared Hall** said the model home will be accessed from Main Street. It will have a circular drive so traffic can enter the main road facing forward.

**Kevin Poff** asked if the developer has received approval to develop the project in phases.

**Jared Hall** said the ordinance allows for projects to be built in phases. This City has

always anticipated that this project would be built in phases since there is a residential and commercial component.

### **Public Hearing**

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

**David Dixon** (1047 North 100 West) said this home will be used as a spec home for potential customers to view. Phases 2 will likely include a sales office. In the event the home is sold earlier than anticipated, they will build another spec home. The home will be constructed using Farmington stone and hardy plank siding. It will have 1,600 square feet on the main and upper floor with 1,000 square feet in the basement. The property does not require a fire turn around due to its close proximity to Main Street.

**Dorene Poulsen** (1732 North Main) said she will withhold her comments until the Planning Commission considers Phase 2 of the project.

**Jared Hall** clarified that a separate conditional use permit will be associated with the remaining residential areas.

**Sherry Floyd** (792 Dandelion Circle) said her property is located next to Phase 1. When the developer first began this project, they were promised that there would not be multi-family housing along the entire fence line. She is disheartened that the developers have not kept their word and are now proposing a multi-family unit in her rear yard. She asked that the developer address the following questions:

- What is the height of the twin home?
- What are the setbacks?
- Will the existing dirt road be modified?

She asked that the Planning Commission consider the drainage issues in the area. Her home was flooded in 2001 as a result of run off from the east. She said she was told by the developer that one of the units in this twin home will be worth more than any home on her street.

**Brian Floyd** (792 Dandelion Circle) said after being assured by the developer that there would not be multi-family housing next to their lot, they purchased their lot and paid a higher premium since it was not adjacent to twin homes like the other homes in the area. He was told by **Dave Dixon** that their input will not make a difference at this point in the approval process.

**Chairman Talbot** said the developer received approval over two weeks ago so it is too

late for the residents to appeal the decision.

**Brian Floyd** said he only received a mailing notice for two of the five public hearings. His neighbor did not receive any notices. He understands that the plan has changed so the developer's promises are no longer valid but his opposition to the twin home has not changed. He expressed concern that the twin homes may depreciate the value of his home, whereas a single family home would have increased the property values in the area. He said he is concerned about the water draining from Leonard Lane onto his property and the surrounding properties. Many of the homes in the area have flooded on more than one occasion. During a previous discussion with the City Manager, he was told the City was not aware that there are water issues in this area.

**Chairman Talbot** said at this point in the development process, the developer only needs to verify that they can handle the water on the 20,000 square foot lot.

**Matt Poulsen** (1732 North Main) said in 1983, a culvert under Main Street was clogged. The water flowed directly onto this property. He hopes the developer can divert the water from the cul-de-sac as well as from the future residents of the twin home.

**Quinn Gatrell** (787 West Dandelion Circle) said he signed up to receive notices from the City regarding this project. He has not received any notices. At the open house that was held for this project, he was not opposed to the proposal since it included single family homes. He is opposed to the multi-family units that are now being proposed adjacent to single family homes. He disputed the statement that was made by the developer that the twin homes are worth more than the existing homes in the area. He requested that the City verify that the developer proceeds with the plan that is being proposed. He also asked that the City provide him notices of future meetings regarding this project.

The Planning Commission and City staff discussed the need for the Planning Commission to have a copy of the mailing lists that are created since there have been several public hearings where residents have complained that they did not receive proper notification.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

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

**David Dixon** addressed the comments that were received during the public hearing, including the following points:

- The setbacks for this property are generous.

- The dirt road is not part of this lot so it will not be effected by the twin home.
- In the event the catch basin on the southeast corner of the lot is not kept clean, it is possible that the water could flow into the rear yards of the homes in the area. The developer will provide a drainage swale to handle any water that may flow onto the property if the catch basin is not properly maintained.
- The building height is between 25 and 28 feet which is less than a typical two story home.
- The units in Phase 1 will have basements. They had a soils report done on the entire site so they are aware of which homes should not have basements.
- The residents in the area asked him how the units will compare in value with the existing homes so he informed them that these units will be valued at \$350,000 each.
- During previous discussions with the residents, he informed them that they would make an effort to keep the mansion homes away from the single family homes. He does not think the twin homes will have an adverse effect on this neighborhood.
- The developer sent out a mailing notice for the open house to all residents who live within 300 feet of the project. The notice for the City Council meeting was expanded to include the residents who live within 900 feet of the project. Based on the public comment received at those meetings, they have changed five of the twin homes to single family homes.

**Kevin Poff** said he does not remember a single family home being proposed for this particular lot.

**David Dixon** said if there is a map that indicates that a single family home would be built on this property, it would have been from over one year ago. The map may have shown one roof top so the residents may have assumed it was a single family home.

**Quinn Gatrell** said the plan was not clear so it appeared the roof top was that of a single family home. The developer never made mention that it was a twin home.

In response to a comment made by **John Bilton, Jared Hall** said this model home will have the same advertising restrictions as any other home in the area that is for sale.

**Jared Hall** responded to the comments that were made regarding the drainage in the area by saying that the City Engineer has reviewed this phase of the project and has found the drainage to be acceptable.

**David Dixon** said the City Engineer has never expressed concern regarding the drainage on this property. The City does not even have record that the property was flooded in 2001. If the property was flooded as a result of a backed up storm drain, it is an issue for the City to resolve. As a safeguard, the developer has provided a swale that will handle the water in the event the catch box fails. Their efforts to address the drainage on this property will actually benefit this property and the surrounding properties.

**Chairman Talbot** said if the water is coming from Leonard Lane and the Somerset area, it is a City issue but the developer is willing to work with the City to rectify the problem.

### **Motion**

**Kevin Poff** moved that the Planning Commission approve the re-phasing of this project and grant conditional use approval for the proposed twin home and recommend final plat approval of Village at Old Farm Phase 1 Subdivision to the City Council with the following conditions:

1. The Developer must continue to work with staff to correct any deficiencies in the plat and related site plan in preparation for recording and construction;
2. The Developer must comply with all conditions of the preliminary plat and preliminary (PUD) master plan approval;
3. This unit shall be subject to all pertinent portions of the development agreement which is to be recorded concurrent with phase 2 of the Village at Old Farm Subdivision;
4. Subdivision approval is predicated on the approved site plan, which may not be modified except by formal amendment to the Conditional Use Permit.

**John Bilton** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

- Approval is being granted for an isolated property which is separate from the rest of the development. This approval will not grant vesting rights for future phases.
- Development of this parcel will resolve the drainage issues for this property, as well as for the adjacent properties.
- The provided forward facing access to Main Street, as requested by the City.

**NIXON & NIXON, LOCK-IT-UP SELF STORAGE (PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED FROM APRIL 12, 2007) - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING CONDITIONAL USE**

**APPROVAL TO DEVELOP CLASS “A” SELF STORAGE UNITS ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 549 WEST BOURNE CIRCLE, 3.011 ACRES IN THE CMU ZONE (C-5-06) (Agenda Item #6)**

**Jared Hall** said all of the information relating to this application was included in the Planning Commission packet.

**Rick Wyss** asked the Assistant City Planner if City staff would support a motion to grant conditional use approval.

**Jared Hall** said it is the Planning Department’s opinion that the site would be better suited for a future development that would enhance the gateway to the City, but that does not mean that they have an undivided mind about the issue.

**Rick Wyss** asked if City staff would be opposed to a motion of approval.

**Jared Hall** said the property has characteristics that indicate it may be a secondary site. City staff recommends the “Possible Motion” which was included in the Planning Commission packet. In the event a party is aggrieved by the Planning Commission’s decision, they have the right to appeal the decision.

**Public Hearing**

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

**Dan Nixon** (Ogden, Utah) said they would like to be a community business partner with Farmington City. The City Council approved this use in this zone. They asked for his help to write the ordinance. The City Council’s previous actions make this use appropriate for this property. During a site visit to the property, **Mayor Harbertson** expressed concern that the building will have too much visibility. Although the first part of the building is visible from Park Lane, this use is one of the 35 allowed uses in the CMU zone. He does not think there is another use that will be more attractive than what he is proposing. He considers himself a quality developer and a good community partner. If the City considers this area a gateway to the City, he is willing to provide additional landscaping features such as a waterfall, etc. to contribute to the grand entrance.

**Rick Wyss** asked the applicant how much he is willing to contribute to enhance the gateway to the City.

**Dan Nixon** said he has not determined how much he is willing to contribute but he is willing to provide the water fall and he is prepared to spend additional money to make the

property more attractive.

**Chairman Talbot** expressed appreciation to **Mr. Nixon** for his willingness to go above and beyond the scope of other developers. Based on his professional experience, he is able to tell if a site is appropriate for a specific use. He said the City has not had experience determining what types of properties are primary and what types of properties are secondary. He asked the applicant how many of his locations are located in a gateway to a community or are considered primary sites.

**Dan Nixon** said 4 of his 5 facilities are adjacent to large commercial sites. 3 of the 5 facilities were built from the ground up. The other two were existing facilities that were improved/remodeled.

**Jim Kane** (Owner of Self Storage Facilities in Atlanta, Georgia) said he is **Mr. Nixon's** friend and business associate. He owns a property in Georgia that is considered prime property. He met the needs of the residents by providing attractive landscaping and architectural features. In the end, the residents unanimously approved of the facility. **Dan Nixon** has a great reputation in the industry for building a high quality project and fulfilling the commitments he makes.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

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

**Rick Wyss** said he appreciated the applicant's presentation regarding the definition of primary and secondary sites since it is one of the few definitions the Planning Commission has been given. He asked **Chairman Talbot** for his professional opinion as to whether the site is primary or secondary.

**Chairman Talbot** said he has not considered this property to be a primary site. Many properties are considered primary because a primary tenant is willing to build at that location.

**Rick Wyss** said he has heard that there is a possibility that an office building or hotel may locate in this area in the future but he does not think either of those uses will be better quality than what Nixon & Nixon is proposing.

**Jared Hall** said this site may be considered a primary site if it were not subdivided and located adjacent to a gas station. It would have been considered differently if were part of one parcel in a unified development. The nature of the subdivision will effect future development in the same way that the storage unit facility will effect future development in the surrounding areas.

**Rick Wyss** questioned whether the City's primary objective is to collect revenue from a tax base or if their primary objective is to find an aesthetically pleasing use. The proposed use will be as aesthetically pleasing as anything that would locate there.

**Jared Hall** said the City is concerned that other quality users may not be interested in developing in this area if the storage unity facility is allowed there. He said a Class "A" self storage facility is being constructed next to the Gateway shopping center in Salt Lake City. The future will tell if the storage units effect future development in the area.

**Chairman Talbot** said it is his understanding that it would not be possible to develop a larger facility than what is being proposed due to the wetlands and the water table. He said he has been told that basements are not allowed on this property.

**Harv Jeppson** said he is familiar with the site because he owns property in the area. It would be very difficult to develop the north end of the property.

**Chairman Talbot** said the water issues may prevent a primary user from considering the property a primary location. It would be difficult to construct a quality project that is visually appealing and affordable due to the water problems.

**Rick Wyss** said he questions whether the storage facility will prevent future business development in the area since a Class "A" self storage facility is being constructed in Salt Lake City's prime commercial area.

**Dan Nixon** said Utah has a perception problem with Class "A" self storage facilities. They want to correct that perception by providing a quality project. Of the 300 storage unit facilities that are considered primary facilities, none of them have the same quality that they will provide. He said most customers prefer that their storage facility be located in a neighborhood rather than an industrial area.

In response to a question from **Rick Wyss**, **Dan Nixon** said unsecured storage facilities experience issues relating to crime. He has 3,000 storage units and has only had one incident where an RV window was shot out. Their Farmington location will not have RV storage.

**Andrew Hiller** said it is difficult to consider this property a primary location since there is a gas station on the corner. He said a gateway can be lively or it can be quiet and peaceful. He would prefer that this location be a quiet gateway to the City since it is located so close to Main Street.

**Rick Wyss** asked the applicant how he plans to contribute to the area.

**Dan Nixon** said his facility is a quiet use for the area since it only receives 50 visits per

day and is closed on Sunday. He is willing to contribute funding so there is landscaping to the point where his property becomes visible. They have always planned to provide extra landscaping to the shoulder of the road. It is likely that **Greg Bell** will also provide improvements for Lot 2. He said he is willing to provide a large water fall (\$15,000-\$20,000) that will protrude into the larger area beyond the easements.

**Chairman Talbot** asked the applicant what impact it would have on him if the City does not allow a pylon sign.

**Dan Nixon** said his other properties have landscaped monument signs so it would not have a significant impact on him.

**Chairman Talbot** asked **Paul Barker** if he thinks it is likely that a developer would construct a hotel at this location.

**Paul Barker** said it is logical that a hotel would be built adjacent to Station Park since hotel patrons prefer a retail opportunity within walking distance. There is a possibility that this could be a “spillover” location in the future if there is a high demand for hotels in Farmington.

**John Bilton** said he feels strongly that Class “A” self storage is a good use for this location. If the Planning Commission grants conditional use approval, they should create strong findings for their decision.

**Cory Ritz** said he considers this property a primary site based on visibility. He considers it a secondary site based on the water issues, the accessibility to the property and the fact that it does not have direct access to Park Lane. He said preferred uses such as an office building or a hotel will likely develop property closer to Station Park. Class “A” self storage is a good use for this property. He said if the conditional use is approved, a monument sign should be used since it is more appropriate for the community.

**Kevin Poff** stated, although this use may not be the preferred use, it is not an inappropriate use for this property. He said the Planning Commission has considered many issues relating to the application, such as if the project has to be part of a planned center development, and whether the property is a primary or secondary location. He is now realizing that the City received the application prior to the zone text being written. Therefore, it is not appropriate to require the applicant to meet the requirements of the zone text.

### **Motion**

**Rick Wyss** moved that the Planning Commission grant Conditional Use Approval and site plan approval to develop Class “A” self storage units on property located at 549 West Bourne Circle which is a secondary site, and therefore, is an appropriate location for this use.

Approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The landscape plan must include tree screening along Park Lane at no less than 40 foot on center. The landscape plan must also include a waterfall, as per the commitment given by the developer.
2. The applicant must provide landscaping on the UDOT property, so long as it is approved by UDOT.
4. The site plan and landscaping plan must be reviewed by the Planning Commission during a future work session.

**Kevin Poff** seconded the motion, which passed by a 5 to 1 vote.

### **Findings**

- The property is a narrow, marginal commercial property which is located at the end of a cul-de-sac with limited visibility. The property also has severe wetland issues.
- The zone text pertaining to primary and secondary sites was not created at the time the applicant submit his application, therefore, it is not appropriate to require him to meet those conditions.
- Standard for Class A self storage facilities are set forth in Section 11-28-220 of the Zoning Ordinance. Certain standards and conditions contained in this section “shall apply” to all Class “A” Self Storage developments. Paragraph (2) (a) thereof states:

Location. Class “A” Self Storage is an ancillary commercial use and shall be located on secondary commercial sites or small pockets of land that are not quality commercial or residential sites. Class “A” Self Storage shall not prevent the development of, or displace higher, better and more intense commercial uses typically found on primary sites adjacent to high traffic major streets on visible and accessible building lots. Nevertheless, they should be located near high traffic areas close to residences and businesses and/or sites which may be visible but not accessible.

- The developer is willing to work with the City to create a quiet gateway traveling eastward to the main street.
- The City set a precedent for the area by approving the gas station separate from a planned center development.
- This use will be as aesthetically pleasing as any other use that may develop on this type of property.
- The developer has gone to great lengths to work with the City to provide a quality, attractive project.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

**Farmington Rock Discussion**

**Jared Hall** reported that Farmington rock is not as abundant as it once was. It may be difficult for the quarry to provide enough rock for the buildings at Station Park.

**Chairman Talbot** said although Farmington rock is an attractive feature and it is consistent with the materials that were used by the pioneers, it is no longer plentiful and is becoming costly. The City needs to consider other alternatives for future developments.

**Jared Hall** said he will bring this issue before the Planning Commission at a future meeting.

**Relay for Life Event**

**Andrew Hiller** passed out packets containing information pertaining to the American Cancer Society's Relay for Life event.

**Downtown Master Plan Report**

**Kevin Poff** said the Downtown Master Plan committee has been asked to consider the future of Farmington's downtown business core. They will focus their efforts on the area around State Street and Main Street. Most of the major stake holders (the County, the City, and the Davis County School District) are planning for major retrofits in the near future.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Kevin Poff** moved that the Planning Commission adjourn at 9:15 p.m.

---

*Jim Talbot, Chairman  
Farmington City Planning Commission*