

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, June 12, 2003

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Vice-Chairman Sid Young , Cindy Roybal, Cory Ritz, Jim Talbot, Jordan White, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. Chairman Kent Forsgren and Commission Member Bart Hill were excused.

Vice-Chairman Young called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. **Jordan White** offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jordan White moved that the minutes of the May 22, 2003, Planning Commission Meeting be approved with corrections as noted. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

BOYER WHEELER FARM L.C. REQUEST FOR FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR PHASE 5 OF THE FARMINGTON RANCHES SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 67 LOTS ON 27.32 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2000 WEST 200 NORTH IN AN AE ZONE (S-2-03) (Agenda Item #2)

Background Information

The Farmington Ranches Subdivision, Phase 5, has open space parcels within the interior of the Subdivision which will be designated as common area. When a subdivision contains land which is reserved in private ownership for community use, the subdivider shall submit with the final plat the name, proposed articles of incorporation, and by-laws of owner or organization empowered to own, maintain, or pay taxes on such land. It is expected that the covenants, conditions, and restrictions for Phase 5 will be very similar to the covenants, conditions, and restrictions recorded with previous phases.

As part of the Development Agreement for the Farmington Ranches Subdivision, the developer will provide a conservation easement acceptable to the City over and across the open space within the subdivision and in an appropriate amount of acreage west of the subdivision near the Great Salt Lake. A few weeks ago the Planning Commission granted conditional use approval for the Buffalo Ranch development. Thereafter, the City Council approved a conservation easement in conjunction with this development which covers some 99.3 acres of land. This conservation easement is sufficient in meeting the Development Agreement requirements regarding open space for the Phase 5 Subdivision.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the background information and discussed details of the conservation easement. He stated the application was similar to Phase 4. He recommended an additional condition be placed on approval in that the conservation easement be recorded concurrently with the final plat.

Motion

After a brief discussion, **Cory Ritz** moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council final plat approval for Farmington Ranches Subdivision, Phase 5, subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards, ordinances and the following conditions:

1. Conditions of preliminary plat approval.
2. The developer shall obtain a flood control permit from Davis County and submit a copy of the permit to the City for City files.
3. Review and approval of the final plat and improvement drawings including a grading and drainage plan by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Central Davis County Sewer District and Weber Water Basin Conservancy District.
4. The developer shall install an acceptable diversion off-site on Shepard Creek near the western boundary of Phase 2 whereby all storm water for the Farmington Ranches project shall be conveyed to the Great Salt Lake.
5. Submit for review by the City covenants, conditions and restrictions for this Phase of the project.
6. Final plat approval of Phase 5 shall be subject to all requirements and conditions as set forth in the Farmington Ranches Development Agreement (Agreement 2000-23) and any amendments related thereto.
7. A conservation easement acceptable to the City shall be recorded concurrently with the final plat.

Cindy Roybal seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, **Vice-Chairman Young** allowed a comment by the applicant.

Dick Moffat (representing the applicant) stated the developer was currently implementing their third try at resolving water issues in the area. The efforts were being made in attempts to cooperate with neighbors.

A vote on the motion was taken which indicated unanimous approval.

Findings

1. The action corresponded with prior approvals in the development.
2. The Master Plan had recently been amended by the City Council as recommended by the Planning Commission. The action complied with the amended Master Plan.
3. The developer had demonstrated a cooperative spirit with City requirements.

HAWKINS COMPANIES REQUEST FOR FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE PROPOSED TUSCANY COVE AT LAKE POINTE SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 25 LOTS AND 2 PARCELS ALL ON 15.156 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1700 SOUTH (LUND LANE) AND 300 EAST IN AN S (SUBURBAN) ZONE (S-3-99) (Agenda Item #3)

Background Information

A copy of the Development Agreement has been submitted to the Council for their first reading on June 4, 2003. It is expected that this Development Agreement will be finalized soon.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the agenda item. The City Attorney had been contacted regarding the issue about the road/trail access to the east. A final status had not been determined. Mr. Petersen explained the preliminary results of negotiations between Farmington City and Centerville City and land jurisdictions. The park just south of the proposed development will be constructed and maintained by Centerville. The road entering the development area from 200 East (Lund Lane) will be dedicated to and maintained by Farmington. A letter had been received from the Frodshams indicating their willingness concerning the road dedication. Part of the road is also owned by the LDS Church. Mr. Petersen also summarized issues regarding culinary water and potential water pressure problems for lots 1, 2, 3, and 20 through 25. Water users in Farmington all have at least 60 psi of pressure. It may be that those lots could have as little as 40 psi.

Vice-Chairman Young invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Randall Vickers (engineer and representative of the developer) said engineering for the water system in the development would comply with conditions set by the City Engineer. The problem exists because of the elevation of the new water reservoir. The State requires only 20 psi and all lots in the development would exceed that requirement.

Mr. Vickers discussed the road connection to the east. The developer had been required to design the road and describe the center line placement on the final plat. It was unclear whether the access would be a road or a trail. It was planned that a keyed gate would be installed so that

access for vehicles would be restricted to authorized users. Pedestrian use would be unrestricted.

Mr. Petersen stated the road would need to be gravel near the development to provide a transition to the paved roads.

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

- ▮ There was great concern on the part of the Planning Commission members regarding the potential for low water pressure on some of the lots. Property owners would complain about the low pressure especially in light of the fact that all other Farmington residents had higher pressure. Potential property owners need to have full disclosure regarding the possibility of having psi below 60 on their lots. A note should be placed on the plat, in title documents, and in CC&Rs.
- ▮ It seemed more reasonable to have the drainage of the storm water taken through the Centerville property to the south, especially considering the proposed park could include detention basins. However, Mr. Petersen reported that Centerville was adamant about not dealing with the drainage. It will need to go down Lund Lane.
- ▮ The City Attorney had counseled that all off-site drainage easements be obtained as a condition to approval.
- ▮ It was noted there are still many unresolved issues attached to the request.
- ▮ Documentation needs to be received regarding acceptable easement forms for the 3 types of off-site easements: trail, culinary, and storm drainage.
- ▮ The Planning Commission felt they would like to have the City Attorney help decide if the access to the east is a private or a public road or trail.
- ▮ Commission members inquired whether or not affected property owners had been contacted regarding possible keyed access to the access going east.

Motion

Jim Talbot moved that the Planning Commission table consideration of final plat approval for the Tuscany Cove at Lake Pointe Subdivision until the following can be achieved:

1. The City Engineer and the developer's engineer must determine exactly which lots will be effected by possible low water pressure and what the water pressure will be. The developer shall make provisions to notify potential property owners regarding the possibility of having psi below 60 on their lots. A note acceptable to

the City Attorney should be placed on the plat, in title documents, and in the CC&Rs for the subdivision.

2. The 3 off-site draft easement forms (trail, culinary water, and storm drainage) shall be submitted for review and approval by the City.
3. The City Attorney must render an opinion regarding the access road to the east as to whether or not it should be identified as a public or private road on the final plat.

Jordan White seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

1. The Commission felt the potential for psi problems needed to be clarified.
2. Storm water drainage systems are issues of concern. Off-site easements forms must be reviewed before approval is granted.
3. The public and/or private use of the access road to the east is also an important issue which needs to be resolved.

BILL PETERSON REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO REMOVE AN EXISTING BILLBOARD AND CONSTRUCT 2 NEW BILLBOARD SIGNS AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF GLOVERS LANE AND THE FRONTAGE ROAD IN A C ZONE (C-6-03) (Agenda Item #4)

Background Information

The Planning Commission reviewed this agenda item on May 22, 2003, and tabled action pending resolution of a number of issues which are outlined below with an explanation from staff after each issue.

1. Further investigate the background of why the parcel was rezoned commercial.

The parcel was zoned for commercial uses as part of an annexation request by the Elliott family in the late summer of 1985. The Planning Commission at the time determined because of the location of the parcel that it was not suitable for residential use. They approved a motion 5 to 1 on July 9, 1985, recommending that the City Council annex the piece of property located at 122 West Glover's Lane and change the zoning from R-20 to C-2.

Apparently, the property owner proposed the development of a convenience store. On August 21, 1985, the City Council conducted a hearing regarding the matter where several people attending the meeting were heard. Mark Adams opposed the proposal due to increased traffic and the type of people a convenience store would bring into the neighborhood. John

Percival felt the same adding that he thought there would be too many stores of this type if another one were built. Sharon Adams opposed the environmental change which would be created by so many convenience stores in Farmington stating "this is a beautiful place, let's not ruin it." She did not want her children hanging around with people who habitually congregate in such places. Despite the opposition, the City Council unanimously adopted a resolution to consider annexing the parcel.

Later the City Council held another public hearing on September 18, 1935. The property owner presented their plans for the property. They had been approached by Robertson Marina, a retailer of boats, etc., for an outlet at that location. Other possibilities included a Top Spot convenience store run by Texaco, RV sales, or storage. John Percival again voiced opposition. Jonathan Hughes, an adjacent property owners, was very much in favor stating that if this were to pass, he probably would also rezone. The City Council approved a motion to table the agenda item. Finally, after another meeting discussing the matter, on October 2, the City Council waited until October 16, 1985, to approve the annexation and zone change.

2. **Receive more information from the applicant regarding height and setback standards including the height of the northern billboard in relation to the Glover Lane viaduct.**

This issue may be a moot point due to the findings discovered related to issue 3.

3. **Find out the State requirement for billboards and whether or not the proposal is consistent with those requirements.**

City staff contacted Luanna Middleton from the UDOT Region One office. Mrs. Middleton is responsible for all sign permits and sign issues adjacent to I-15 in her region. She stated that whether the City approves two billboards or not, if they are not separated by distance of at least 500 feet, UDOT cannot approve two billboards. This is a Federal law established by the Highway Beautification Act of 1960. Lady Bird Johnson was a major proponent of the Act. The distance between Mr. Peterson's north property line and southern property line of the two commercially zoned parcels is approximately 440 feet. It is impossible for the applicant to meet the 500-foot standard. Mrs. Middleton recommended that property owners approach her first about billboards before trying to receive permits from the City. Sometimes municipalities issue permits prior to her approval which often results in the property owners being very angry when UDOT turns down their request regarding signs.

Mrs Middleton contacted UDOT Region Two after not being able to find a record in Region One for the billboard already established. So far it appears that License #2-1012 Utah SCH provided by the City Planner is not a valid permit number in any of UDOT's records. Now that she has been informed of the address and location of the billboard, she would like to visit the site and meet with the sign owner/property owner before any determination on the status of the existing sign is made. She will be back in touch with David Petersen.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed notification policies of the City. He also reviewed the history of why the parcel in question had been zoned commercial. At the time of annexation, City officials felt a commercial zone was reasonable because it could not be zoned residential due to its close proximity to the freeway.

Mr. Petersen also reported his discussions with State UDOT officials concerning the placement of the 2 proposed billboards. According to UDOT, the signs would not be approved if placed within 500 feet of each other. UDOT officials also indicated that applicants should go through their processes before going to cities, because cities are not aware of UDOT requirements. There had been times when cities had given approval and then applicants have been turned down by the Utah Department of Transportation and had been very angry. Mr. Petersen also reported that UDOT had no record of the existing billboard.

Vice-Chairman Young invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Bill Petersen (373 East Oak Lane) stated the existing billboard was an approved, licensed billboard. According to UDOT, it was a legitimate sign. He explained his current request and suggested that if the 2 new billboards could not be approved because of space requirements, then he would like to have the Commission consider approval of just the most northerly proposed board. According to his understanding, his request was within the perimeters of City ordinances and should be allowed. He would like to build the board according to City standards and specifications—going as high and as wide as ordinances allowed. He also felt that the height off the ground of the proposed board would actually make the board look smaller. Mr. Petersen reiterated that he felt he was entitled to be allowed to do what he had requested. In his discussions with UDOT officials, they told him to get the City's building permit before approaching UDOT. He saw no good reason to have his request denied.

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

- ▮ A parcel just south of the commercially zoned property and also owned by Bill Petersen, is not zoned commercial. At this point, ordinances would not allow a billboard to be constructed on that property. If measurements were correct, the second billboard would have to go on this southern parcel in order to have the required 500 foot distance between the two signs.
- ▮ Requirements for conditional use approval have been legally set by the City Council. It would be outside the realm of Planning Commission prerogative to approve an application that did not meet the standards as set forth in the ordinance.
- ▮ Some members of the Planning Commission especially questioned whether or not the application met Conditional Use Standards as set forth in section 11-8-105. Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) were discussed at length (especially paragraph 1).

- ↯ Planning Commission members wanted to have more information regarding set back requirements.
- ↯ UDOT officials were adamant about the 500 foot distance requirement between any two signs.
- ↯ Some Commission members felt that the existing sign could be improved and that if it were replaced, that may be a good thing.
- ↯ The current application requested permission for 2 signs. If only 1 sign was to be considered, a new application would have to be filed. This would observe reasonable consideration of those who wish to make public comment and know accurately what the application involves.
- ↯ The City Planner reported he had received public comments regarding the application. The comments received were in opposition to the request.
- ↯ The use of billboards on the parcel is not necessary beneficial to Farmington City. There is no revenue that will be gained from the signs. There are other uses that could be considered beneficial to residents that would fit on that property.
- ↯ Commission members, by consensus, felt they would like to recommend that the City Council waive an application fee for a new submittal.

Motion

Jim Talbot moved that the Planning Commission deny the applicant's request to remove an existing billboard and to construct two new billboard signs at the southwest corner of Glover's Lane and the frontage road for the following reasons:

1. The request does not meet UDOT and Federal requirements.
2. The proposed billboards were larger than the 300 square foot size discussed in the Sign Ordinance.
3. The billboards exceeded the height limit established by the Farmington City Sign Ordinance.

4 As noted in the staff report dated May 22, 2003, the billboards were not consistent with the Farmington City General Plan and do not follow the conditional use standards outlined in Section 11-8-105 of the Zoning Ordinance nor does the application meet the purpose and intent of the Farmington City Sign Ordinance (Section 15-1-020).

Cory Ritz seconded the motion. A vote was not taken.

In discussion of the motion, Commission members asked whether or not it would be good to have the City Attorney give an opinion about considering a new application during a public hearing. They also questioned the best methods of public notification since the property under consideration was in an unusual place.

Jim Talbot moved to reconsider the previous motion. **Jordan White** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Jim Talbot then moved that the Planning Commission deny the applicant's request to remove an existing billboard and to construct two new billboard signs at the southwest corner of Glover's Lane and the frontage road for the following reasons:

1. The request does not meet UDOT and Federal requirements.
2. The proposed billboards were larger than the 300 square foot size discussed in the Sign Ordinance.
3. The billboards exceeded the height limit established by the Farmington City Sign Ordinance.
4. As noted in the staff report dated May 22, 2003, the billboards were not consistent with the Farmington City General Plan and do not follow the conditional use standards outlined in Section 11-8-105 of the Zoning Ordinance nor does the application meet the purpose and intent of the Farmington City Sign Ordinance (Section 15-1-020).
5. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council waive a second application fee with regards to a second conditional use application that may be necessary to enlarge the existing billboard.

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

Findings

1. The application does not comply with Conditional Use Standards #1, #2, #3, #4 and #6 set forth in section 11-8-105 of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. UDOT officials indicated some question regarding the legitimacy of the existing sign.
3. The application for two signs does not meet Federal regulations calling for a 500 foot distance between the two.

PUBLIC HEARING: HARV JEPSON REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO

THE CITY COUNCIL TO AMEND THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO ALLOW “BED AND BREAKFAST/INN” AS A CONDITIONAL USE IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES (ZT-3-03) (Agenda Item #5)

Background Information

Over the years Farmington, located between the Wasatch National Forest and the Great Salt Lake and the center of Davis County, has become a tourist destination for thousands. The State’s largest and really only amusement park is located in the City. Other attractions include the Country Fairgrounds, Farmington Canyon, the bird refuge, and Farmington Pond (the State’s most visited and fished “urban lake”). A railroad park has also recently been constructed in Farmington. Moreover, the City has recently taken steps to preserve downtown by enacting an ordinance uniquely fitted to the original townsite. The City also has an active Trails Committee and has established several miles of trails and/or has several miles of trails that are in the planning process. The State of Utah is also planning to construct a multi-million dollar visitor center by Farmington Bay.

Mr. Jeppson previously presented his lodging concept to the Planning Commission a few meetings ago. He is attempting to fill an untapped lodging niche missing in the local tourism market.

Tourism done right is a good industry for any City. It brings outside dollars directly into the community. Lodging taxes can be beneficial and often retail sales often increase. Tourism is a clean industry, and environmental impacts can be minimal.

The early stages of tourism development in such destinations as Pigeon Forge/Gatlinburg in Tennessee are characterized by tacky mom and pop miniature golf course, motel, dining, and recreation uses. These are often decorated by homespun type signs and large plastic dinosaurs. Eventually, as an area begins to experience more success and property owners increase their capital, these uses give way to more upscale establishments, which over time become even more upscale again.

If Mr. Jeppsen’s lodging facility can become successful, even though the location is not adjacent to one of Farmington’s larger attractions, this could be indicative of the future tourism potential in our community. Tourism provides a great tax base.

Mr. Jeppsen provided a copy of the Salt Lake City ordinance which allows for bed and breakfast uses in residential neighborhoods. However, it appears that ther B & D facilities are all contained within one building.

Mr. Jeppsen is presenting a multiple building concept. Notwithstanding this, the Planning Commission may wish to pursue the applicant’s proposal for the reason stated above.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the background information and stated he felt there was a need to work with the City Attorney to get a clear definition of “bed and breakfast” establishments. Most ordinances in Utah deal with bed and breakfast facilities that are contained in a single building. Mr. Jeppsen’s proposal is for several separate buildings.

Public Hearing

Vice-Chairman Young opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Harv Jeppson showed elevation drawings of “log-cabin” type structures which he said would be decorated on the inside according to different themes. He also showed a site plan where the buildings would be located. The property would be developed with creeks and bridges and other landscaping amenities. Mr. Jeppson felt the bed and breakfast use would fit well with any future use of surrounding properties and would likely be a good buffer between any eventual use and residents. He also stated that he would not finance the project but would bear the financial burden himself.

Public Hearing Closed

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

- ⌞ The economic study currently being conducted by the City would give some good direction regarding bed and breakfast use on the property. The study is expected to be completed shortly.
- ⌞ A bed and breakfast facility would be less of an impact on surrounding neighbors if it were contained in one building rather than a multi-building approach. Several members felt a need to explore the benefits and disadvantages of both the single-building and the multi-building approaches.
- ⌞ The concept is similar to the Alaskan Inn facility in Ogden Canyon.
- ⌞ Jim Talbot approached several neighbors who had indicated at this point they were not in favor of the endeavor.
- ⌞ There were comments reflecting a concern about the bed and breakfast business in Farmington. Commission members felt it was important to ensure the business could remain viable long term.
- ⌞ Commission members felt the bed and breakfast concept could be a very good business for Farmington, but felt they needed more information and a broader scope regarding economic development in the City before making a decision.

- ▮ A legal definition of “bed and breakfast” from an attorney would also be very helpful.

Motion

Jordan White moved that the Planning Commission continue this application pending City staff:

1. Working with the attorney to develop a definition for the term “bed and Breakfast.”
2. Preparing language as part of the Comprehensive General Plan that would also support the bed-and-breakfast concept.

Cory Ritz seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

1. In general, the Planning Commission felt supportive of the proposal to change the text of the current Zoning Ordinance to allow a bed and breakfast/inn as a conditional use in residential areas. However, a clear definition of the term needs to be finalized before such consideration.
2. The Planning Commission wanted to look at ordinances from neighboring counties where such bed and breakfast facilities exist.
3. When the decision is made, it will be done with the entire City of Farmington in mind, because a bed and breakfast would be allowed in the LR and other residential zones.

PUBLIC HEARING: STEVEN AND BETTY BANGERTER REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO AMEND CHAPTER 10 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO ALLOW “ACCESSORY DWELLINGS” IN AGRICULTURE ZONES (ZT-6-03) (Agenda Item #6)

Background Information

The Bangerters appeared before the Planning Commission on May 22, 2003. For a number of reasons outlined in the minutes, the Planning Commission encouraged the Bangerters to pursue their proposal.

The Planning Commission may also wish to improve the standards for “Accessory Dwellings.”

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen noted the applicant was not present.

Motion

Cory Ritz moved that the Planning Commission table consideration of recommendation to the City Council that Chapter 10 of the Zoning Ordinance be amended to allow accessory dwellings in agriculture zones. **Jordan White** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL ENACTING CHAPTER 40 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE REGARDING DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION ZONES AND REGULATIONS (ZT-4-03) (Agenda Item #7)

Mr. Petersen briefly introduced the agenda item. The City Attorney recommended the action. The ordinance had been drafted by Mike Mazaran's office. It was intended as a preservation ordinance and contained protective areas of varying degrees in concentric circles going out from the City's drinking water sources. Mr. Petersen stated it may be helpful to the Planning Commission to see a map of the City's drinking water sources and how such an ordinance would impact surrounding neighbors.

Mr. White commented that similar ordinances in other cities did cause impact on nearby property owners and that it would be helpful to see a map of the City's drinking water sources.

Motion

Cory Ritz moved that the Planning Commission continue the public hearing and Planning Commission consideration of the ordinance establishing drinking water source protection in Farmington and establishing drinking water source protection zones and regulations until June 26th in order to allow time for further study. **Cindy Roybal** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

MOTION TO EXTEND THE MEETING BEYOND 10:00 P.M.

Jim Talbot moved that the Planning Commission continue the meeting past the 10:00 P.M. deadline. **Jordan White** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

FARMINGTON CITY/OTR ZONE TEXT CHANGE FIRST READING (ZT-5-03) (Agenda Item #8)

Mr. Petersen introduced the agenda item and stated that there would be a public hearing on the zone text change in the near future. He reported that a citizen committee had worked on

the text during several meetings.

The Planning Commission discussed the proposed text change, including the following points:

- ▭ The ordinance as written, especially the section on fences and on demolitions, seemed excessively restrictive. Where it could be argued that those sections would protect truly historic structures, it was also true that they may also restrict property owners from improving structures that were not historic and were in disrepair and possibly even dangerous.
- ▭ The ordinance did not give enough allowance for individual tastes, especially with regards to fencing.
- ▭ Old is not always better.
- ▭ There is a need to carefully define “historic.”

WOODLAND PARK TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS (REVIEW AND COMMENT) (Agenda Item #9)

On behalf of City Council members, **Mr. Petersen** requested the Planning Commission give input into the draft document titled “Woodland Task Force Recommendations.” Planning Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- ▭ The proposed sound wall does not fit the surrounding nature of the park. The park is a natural park which should be left as such as much as possible.
- ▭ Any changes in the park should be done through the public hearing process.
- ▭ Changes to the existing park, such as moving the concrete stage, would involve a great deal of expense. The City has other priorities for funding. Where would the money come from?
- ▭ The City has spent a great deal of money lately on community amenities, such as Heritage Park, the Community Center, and the water park. It would be prudent at this time to concentrate on completing those improvements and not to extend City resources further.

S&S TRAIN WAREHOUSE REQUEST (DISCUSSION ITEM ONLY) (Agenda Item #10)

By consensus the Planning Commission decided to defer discussion on the matter to the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Cindy Roybal to adjourn at 10:50 P.M.

Sid Young, Vice-Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission