

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING AND STUDY SESSION

Tuesday, June 7, 2005

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Cory Ritz, Commission Members Keith Klundt, Annie Hedberg, Cindy Roybal, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen, and Recording Secretary Jill Hedberg. Kevin Poff was out of town but participated over the phone. John Montgomery submitted his resignation on May 27, 2005.

Chairman Ritz called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M. **Jim Talbot** offered the invocation.

Chairman Ritz said the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the NMU text, not a particular development. He said if changes needed to be made to the zoning, it would be a policy decision. He reminded the citizens that the meeting was a session for the Planning Commissioners to discuss the zoning, not a public hearing.

Mayor Connors said the City Council had created a Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMU) concept and a Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) concept. Both concepts were “mixed-uses” and shared the same elements. The NMU was intended to have a less intense commercial use. The

City Council had requested the text to be created without considering specific developments. If zoning changes were needed, the City Council should be addressed rather than the Planning Commission. He said the intent of the NMU should not be altered through the text.

He offered the Planning Commission the following items to consider:

1. The Community needed additional developments in order to strengthen the tax base but the developments should not be excessive.
2. There had been a considerable amount of time and money spent to reach the decision that the retail square footage should not exceed 300,000 square feet along the entire U.S. 89 corridor between Lagoon and Cherry Hill.
3. As a policy, the City Council had decided that more intense commercial uses should be in the CMU area. There should be less commercial use in the NMU.

He said there was 300,000 total square feet of retail allowed. 250,000 square feet would not be appropriate in the NMU zone. It would be contrary to the policy decision made by the City Council and it was not appropriate for the Planning Commission to change the policies. If a developer's project required additional square footage, the City Council should be addressed.

**FARMINGTON CITY - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION TO
THE CITY COUNCIL TO ENACT CHAPTER 20 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE**

TITLED “NEIGHBORHOOD MIXED USE (NMU) ZONE” (ZT-8-04) (Agenda Item #1).

David Petersen informed the Planning Commission that **Kevin Poff** would participate in the Meeting over the phone and that **Jim Clark** of Bear West was in attendance.

He displayed the NMU guiding principles:

1. Low to medium density residential, open space, agriculture was permitted. All other uses would be conditional.
2. No non-residential use on Main Street.
3. Use the NMU residential components to buffer non-residential components.
4. Keep Main Street as a viable traffic corridor.
5. High development standards consistent with low impact commercial and neighborhood residential characteristics of NMU.
6. Preserve residential character of Main Street and protect residential uses within and adjacent to NMU zones.

He provided a revised copy of Dan Anderson’s changes which included City Staff’s recommendations.

He outlined the basic decision that needed to be made.

A. General Plan NMU concept at North Farmington location

Yes or No. He said City Staff assumed the answer would be yes and stated a lot of work would be required if the Planning Commission answered “no”.

He reviewed the Public Comment Summary.

- Minimize impact to adjacent residential uses and neighborhood

- 900 West / All neighborhoods to the south
- No commercial creep
- Protect Main Street
- No traffic into residential areas: direct to Frontage Road
- No multi-family housing – high density residential a concern

- Don't use money as a determining factor

- Don't decrease property values

- Safety of school children

- Economic growth and a strong tax base are good things

- The text should not be restrictive, but flexible

- Rigorous steps for approval must be necessary

- Economic impact to existing commercial a concern
- NMU area should be primarily residential
- A large commercial component for the NMU is acceptable
- “It’s the Box” it is too big, all the other commercial is acceptable.

B. Alternatives

B1. Single Family Residential Development

Pro:

- a. Meets guiding principles 1-5

Con:

- a. May not meet guiding principle #6 because the long term viability of a quality neighborhood adjacent to U.S. 89 is questionable. Such a neighborhood may not be compatible with surrounding neighborhoods over time.
- b. Home builders won’t construct single family homes there.

B2. Medium Density Residential

Pro:

- a. Meets guiding principles 1, 2, and 3.
- b. Some say it can meet guiding principles 4, 5, 6 (some say it can not)

Con:

- a. Some say “hodge podge” development will result (this doesn’t have to be the case)
- b. 300 d.u. may be too much for area from an appearance standpoint (it may not)
- c. Traffic may impact southern neighborhoods

Risks:

Funds required up front to implement traffic improvements at Mountain Road/Main and Somerset/Main may be limited - which may hurt quality of development.

B3. Primarily Medium Density Residential with Small Scale Office/Retail

Pro:

- a. Meets guiding principles 1, 4, and 5.

Con:

- a. Probably cannot meet guiding principles 2, 3 and 6 because:
 - Surrounding density not high enough; therefore
 - Retail must be “car” oriented hence Main Street location is desirable.
 - Even if it is 51/49 small scale office and retail will not work without a draw because of density (this may not be the case)
 - Small scale office/retail may not work against U.S. 89.
- b. Some say “hodge podge” development may result
- c. Traffic may impact southern neighborhoods

Risks:

Same as B2. Funds required up front to implement traffic improvements at Mountain Road/Main and Somerset/Main may be limited - which may hurt quality of development.

Mr. Petersen displayed a slide which illustrated an existing count of the rooftops within one mile of the area master planned NMU, which totaled 2,116. The total number of dwelling units in this mile radius at future build-out is 3,078 or 1.53 dwelling units per acre. A similar roof top illustration was presented showing the density within a one mile radius of an NMU development at 1700 East and 1300 South in Salt Lake City. The density in this area was ____

units per acre.

B4. Primarily Non-Residential

Pro:

- a. May meet guiding principles 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 (depending on how it is implemented)
- b. Helps City's tax base
- c. Risks regarding funding for traffic improvements minimized
- d. Perhaps no "hodge podge" development
- e. Traffic not re-routed to southern neighborhoods

Con:

- a. May not meet guiding principle 5 because of the words "low impact"

Risks:

- a. Some say a "box" (i.e. large grocery store) necessary for other non-residential uses to survive.
- b. If implemented wrong, huge incompatibility issue may result
- c. No cap on "box" size may cause unforeseen problems

4A. Primarily Residential/Box with Limited Ancillary Non-Residential

C. Implementation

B1. Single-Family Residential Development

Can it happen with the current proposed text? Yes, conditional.

B2. Medium Density Residential

Can it happen with the current proposed text? Yes.

B3. Primarily Medium Density Residential with Small Scale Office/Retail

Can it happen with the current proposed text? Yes.

B4. Primarily Non-Residential

Can it happen with the current proposed text? Yes, but reduce risk by placing a cap on the size of box. If the cap is not large enough, place a low cap and anticipate Alternative 2.

B4a. Primarily Residential/Box with Limited Ancillary Non-Residential

Can it happen with the current proposed text? Yes, but reduce risk by placing a cap on the size of box. If the cap is not large enough, place a low cap and

anticipate Alternative 2.

Mr. Petersen stated the central issue being addressed was the square footage of the retail store or “box”. He asked the Planning commission’s opinion regarding the size of the box.

Chairman Ritz asked what the square footage for a CMU zone was since it had already been approved. He said the NMU should allow less square footage than the CMU.

Mr. Petersen informed the Commissioners that 65,000 square feet was the maximum square footage allowed in the CMU zone. If a 30,000 square foot development were allowed, the result may be Medium Density Residential. He stated that Harmon’s reported to the City that they would not build something less than 50,000 square feet.

Jim Talbot said grocery stores had not always been built so large. He felt the text should be addressed, not a project. He recommended capping the square footage at 40,000 square feet for the NMU text.

Keith Klundt recommended the square footage being capped at 40,000-50,000 square feet.

David Petersen said he would provide the Planning Commission Members with statistics

regarding the prototypes of Utah grocery stores.

Chairman Ritz recommended the square footage cap being 45,000 square feet.

Cindy Roybal recommended the square footage cap being 40,000-45,000 square feet.

Annie Hedberg recommended the square footage cap be 40,000-45,000 square feet. She suggested defining the percentages allowed per use. She said NMU's listed on the internet were categorized by square footage and acreage.

The Commissioners agreed that Farmington residents would likely drive to the development due to the City's density and layout.

Jim Carter stated that Annie Hedberg's findings often deal more with already built out high density areas. In such cases, development would likely be a transit-oriented development. He said many NMU's gradually expanded so there would not be as great an impact on the existing neighborhood. It would be difficult to determine usage percentages until the application had been established.

Chairman Ritz did not think it was appropriate to specify square footages in the NMU text. He thought it should be addressed during the conditional use process or through zoning

requests.

Kevin Poff asked if the City would have the authority to deny a project.

Jim Carter said B2 and B3 were conditional. B4 was conditional with special standards on top of the usual uses. B4 would be more difficult to receive approval.

Kevin Poff recommended the square footage cap be 40,000-45,000 square feet.

Jim Talbot felt extremely large pads in the NMU would take away from a “neighborhood feel”. He felt NMU pads should be limited to 7,500 square feet. He said most sit-down restaurants would require 8,000-10,000 square feet.

Chairman Ritz requested City Staff provide the Commissioners with research regarding restaurant sizes.

Jim Talbot suggested allowing one user per pad. He said the K-Mart Center was allowed two usages on the pad when there was only meant to be one.

David Petersen reviewed the draft which included Dan Anderson’s changes, as well as alterations made by City Staff. The draft was dated 6/7/05.

Planning Commission Members reviewed the NMU text and discussed the following points:

- 11-20-103: The language was suggested by Dan Anderson. The language “health, safety, and welfare” seemed redundant to some Commissioners. It is mentioned elsewhere in the City Code.
- 11-20-103b: The Master Transportation Plan was referenced. The Planning Commission discussed the NMU Committee’s recommendation to eliminate convenience stores as a conditional use. **Mr. Talbot** asked for the verbage to be included.

Mr. Talbot suggested the square footage for buildings abutting major arterial roadways be 7,500 square feet rather than 15,000 square feet. He also felt a building should be limited to one tenant. Planning Commission Members agreed to change the square footage threshold to 7,500 square feet.

- **Mr. Petersen** stated that multi-family dwellings had been capped at 4 units.
- 11-20-103b: The Planning Commission agreed that conditional use square footage should be 7,500 square feet rather than 10,000 square feet in order to keep

the text consistent.

- 11-20-103c: The Planning Commission agreed to strike the word “mature” when referencing landscaping.
- 11-20-103d (2i): The Planning Commission agreed the Economic Impact Analysis should be prepared by an expert acceptable to the City.
- 11-20-103d (2i): The Planning Commission agreed not to include the verbage referencing “negative”.
- 11-20-105: There will only be nine units per acre allowed as is stated in the City’s General Plan..
- 11-20-106. The verbage addressing building facades was deleted.
- It was suggested that “C.U.P.” be stated as “Conditional Use Permit”.
- 11-20-106b: Planning Commission Members felt the wording “cultured stone” should be deleted. They suggested an element of Farmington rock be included in the exterior.

- 11-20-106d (4): Commissioners agreed to include the verbage "...that are compatible in design with adjacent properties.
- "Development/project" was replaced throughout the text with "NMU zone".
- 11-20-108: Commission Members agreed that developments should not be limited to hollyhocks, daisies and columbine.
- 11-20-111b: It was agreed to include the wording "canvas-like material".

The Planning Commission Members agreed to amend the agenda for the Planning Commission Meeting to be held on June 9, 2005, in order to further discuss the NMU Zone text.

ADJOURNMENT

Cindy Roybal moved that the Planning Commission adjourn at 7:10 P.M.

Cory Ritz, Chairman

Farmington City Planning Commission

