

# FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, August 14, 2003

---

## PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

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

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

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Sid Young** moved that the minutes of the July 10, 2003, Planning Commission Meeting be approved with corrections as noted. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

## PUBLIC HEARING: THE BOYER COMPANY REQUEST FOR SCHEMATIC PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE PROPOSED FARMINGTON RANCHES EAST SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 55 LOTS ON 27.86 ACRES LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF CLARK LANE AND 1525 WEST STREET IN AN AE ZONE (S-6-03) (Agenda Item #2)

### Background Information

The Boyer Company is the developer of the Farmington Ranches Subdivision located west of 1525 West. This subdivision contains common areas similar in configuration and size as proposed in the Farmington Ranches East Subdivision. Problems have occurred in the landscaping and maintenance of the Farmington Ranches common areas (see enclosed letter from David Petersen to Dick Moffat dated August 11, 2003); and it is recommended that the Planning Commission take steps to ensure that these problems don't carry over to the Farmington Ranches East proposal. The Farmington Ranches "West" Subdivision could be a great example of how to incorporate native grasses as an attractive landscape feature requiring little water in our arid climate. Nevertheless, many of the landscaped areas in the Farmington Ranches "West" Subdivision have been unattractive areas for broad-leaf weeds.

What is the proposal for Farmington Ranches East? What can be done to prevent the same problems that exist in the Farmington Ranches "West" Subdivision from carrying over to the proposed "East" Subdivision? Should the Subdivision be redesigned to accommodate a more typical common area with lawn and trees and a sprinkler system, or should it be redesigned to have a more centralized large meadow around the wetland areas?

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the background information. Landscaping problems existed with the preceding phases of the Farmington Ranches project. Open space areas had been replanted with native grasses, but broad leaf weeds had grown up in stead. The weeds were very high and caused not only esthetic problems but line of sight problems for traffic. The Farmington Ranches homes owners' association had petitioned the City to enforce maintenance of the open space area. After research, Mr. Petersen stated the native grasses should do well if the broad leaf weeds are cut or poisoned. He also stated that professionals in the field cautioned that the native grasses do take several years to become established but that they would be very successful if handled correctly. The City would like to have assurances that the current phase of Farmington Ranches does not have similar problems to previous phases. Mr. Petersen also reviewed his suggestions for requirements to ensure the open space areas in the current phase has better success with the native grasses. Other issues needing resolution include removal of portions of Lots 27 and 40 that encroach on wetlands, the fact that Lot 26 is the only lot facing 1525 West for several blocks, and whether or not to pipe the stream along Clark Lane.

Mr. Petersen stated that Mr. Moffat, representing Farmington Ranches, responded in a letter regarding three of the issues. The letter indicated the developer's willingness to preserve native plants and grasses in construction areas rather than trying to replace them after construction damage. The developer also revised the site plan to remove portions of Lots 27 and 40 that encroach on wetlands. However, the developer liked the design of Lot 26 and felt the market would favor the "exclusive" access on 1525.

### **Public Hearing**

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

**Dick Moffat** (90 South 400 West, Salt Lake City) stated Farmington Ranches officials had sprayed the broad leaf weeds and were working to control them in order to allow the native grasses a chance to become established. The area along 1525 would have a manicured look. The developer wanted to leave the corridor along Clark Lane as an amenity with the stream open and groomed. He stated, however, that if the City required the action, the developer would pipe the stream.

**Gerry Tully** (representative of Farmington Greens, residence at: 261 East Broadway, Salt Lake City) stated he did not see anything in the current plans that was contrary to what had been agreed upon. Open space landscaping in the western areas of the nation was certainly different than what could be expected in the east. People need to realize that areas in Utah with native plants and grasses would be brown and dry. Mr. Tully supported the idea of having the stream open to help create the ambiance of wildlife. He also concurred that the native grasses would need patience. He felt the plans as currently presented would be an asset to the area.

**Public Hearing Closed**

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

- ↯ Mr. Ritz raised a safety issue regarding school children and their route along Clarke Lane to school. Mr. Petersen reported he and other City officials had met with School District Officials. A rough grade trail will be constructed through Farmington Greens. Some staff members supported paving the trail. Others, including the Farmington Trails Committee, felt the trail should be groomed but left unpaved. It had been discussed and it was decided to leave the trail natural for a least a year to see where the low spots were that collected water and if there were other problems.
- ↯ Current plans called for a sidewalk on the north side of the road with equestrian and other uses on the south side. After discussion, it was decided equestrian use may be better on the north side especially if the stream was left open. Portions of the sidewalk would be finished sooner than originally anticipated.
- ↯ Traffic patterns and impact were discussed, especially as relating to the load on Shepard Lane. Mr. Petersen reported the current transportation plan was such that residents commuting from Salt Lake from the new subdivision would be encouraged not to use Shepard Lane.
- ↯ Mr. Young stated that if the stream was left opened, a clear maintenance agreement would need to be in place.
- ↯ Mr. Moffat stated that the developer planned to preserve as much of the native grasses as possible so that revegetation would not be necessary.
- ↯ Mr. Moffat also stated that the developer would rather not have a flag lot access to Lot 26. They would prefer access for Lot 26 on 1525.

**Motion**

**Cory Ritz** moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve schematic plan for the proposed Farmington Ranches East Subdivision located at the northeast corner of Clark Lane and 1525 West Street subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following conditions:

1. The developer shall provide a conceptual landscape and long-term maintenance plan, including funding, for the subdivision. The landscape plan shall include strategies for the periods during and after construction. Based upon the concepts outlined therein, the developer may have to make modifications or changes to the lot configuration shown on the schematic plan. The developer shall include plans

to preserve the native grasses on site, including how he proposes to accomplish this. Included in the landscape plan shall be an assessment of the site by a landscape professional acceptable to the City and the developer. Soils shall also be analyzed to determine if the existing vegetation is acceptable or if anything needs to be done to supplement the existing vegetation. The landscape plan shall also include strategies if the ground is disturbed during construction, including soil analysis and preparation, revegetation, and weed control.

2. It is recommended that the stream along Clark Lane be left open and in doing so, the developer shall submit a maintenance plan to the City for review by City Departments.
3. A committee shall be organized including the developer, members of the City Staff, and nearby interested property owners for the purpose of determining sidewalk placement on the north or on the south side of Clark Lane.

**Sid Young** seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, it was suggested that conditions be **amended** to state that a 5 year limit be placed on security requirements to ensure growth of the native grasses. Both Mr. Ritz and Mr. Young concurred with the amendment. A vote was taken indicating the motion passed by unanimous vote. The Chairman abstained.

### **Findings**

1. The motion provided for open space maintenance until the native grasses were established and maintenance free.
2. The application complied with City ordinances and standards and with the General Plan. It also complied with the Master Plan for the subdivision.
3. The motion provided for citizen and professional input regarding pedestrian safety and access along Clark Lane.
4. The action provided that open space be maintained.

**PUBLIC HEARING: DANVILLE LAND INVESTMENTS L.L.C. REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE PROPOSED HUNTER'S CREEK SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 170 LOTS ON 150.68 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2000 WEST 800 NORTH IN AE AND AA ZONES (S-4-03) (Agenda Item #3)**

### **Background Information**

The Farmington City Planning Commission voted on June 16, 2003, to table this application in order to allow time for Danville Land Investments, LLC, and Farmington City to enter into a mutually acceptable funding agreement regarding a "frontage road" leading from the development area in the southwesterly direction to the new Burke Lane interchange. The developer met last week with the City Council on August 6 to discuss the terms of this agreement. Both parties are close to finalizing the agreement, and City staff felt it appropriate at this time to recommend a preliminary plat approval for the project subject to the finance agreement being signed. Details regarding the finance agreement will be discussed at the Planning Commission meeting.

The developer submitted three wetland maps for the project. One wetland map accompanies the yield plan, another the preliminary plat, and another is the actual delineation approved by the Army Corps of Engineers. Even though all the wetland maps should be the same, all three wetland maps are different. The wetland delineation is very important because it helps determine the overall number of lots and the design or layout of the subdivision plat.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** briefly discussed updated transportation plans for the area. He stated that City ordinances required the developer to submit a revegetation plan as part of the preliminary plat application. He suggested the Commission may wish to table action on the agenda item for two reasons: 1) the number of lots had not been confirmed, and 2) a landscaping and maintenance plan had not yet been received by the City.

### **Public Hearing**

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

**Gardner Crane** (representing Danville Land Investments, LLC) stated the application had been tabled during the last meeting of the Planning Commission to resolve traffic designs. He requested that the Planning Commission not table the request again, but rather approve it contingent on receipt of landscaping plans and conditional on a lot count not to exceed 172.

**Lane Sweat** ( 1875 West) suggested the City require an amount from each property owner in the new subdivision with which the City could build a local park. He felt the open space being provided by Danville was unusable by the public. He also stated that existing homes in the area do not have the advantage of City water, even though at the time of annexation they were assessed additional taxes.

**Mr. Petersen** reported that the Parks and Recreation Master Plan called for a regional, 17-acre park for the general area. He suggested Mr. Sweat write a letter to the City Council about having a smaller local park for the needs of the citizens close to the proposed subdivision. The City is appreciative of such input. Mr. Petersen also reported the developer will need to bring water to the subdivision. The lines will go right by the existing homes, allowing them to

connect to the system.

**Betty Jane Bangerter** ( 712 West 1875 West) reaffirmed the need for the City to bring water to the existing homes near the proposed subdivision.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the need to ensure the existing homes can be provided with City water lines into which they can be connected.

**Mr. Ritz** raised the issue of density. He enquired regarding the 4218 elevation demarcation and whether or not larger lots could be placed further west of the proposed design in order to lessen the density of the subdivision. The Commissioners briefly discussed open space and the density of the proposal.

### **Motion**

**Sid Young** moved that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary plat for the proposed Hunters Creek Subdivision located at approximately 2000 West 800 North subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinance requirements and the following conditions:

1. Review and approval of the plat and improvement drawings by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Central Davis County Sewer District, and Farmington Area Pressurized Irrigation District (FAPID).
2. Review and approval by the City Engineer of a grading plan showing by appropriate graphic means the proposed grading of the subdivision and the storm drainage facility plan showing the needed storm drainage facilities with runoff calculations and location, size, and outlets of the drainage system.
3. Identify the FEMA 100 year flood plain on the preliminary plat.
4. Prepare a preliminary trail easement for the trails identified on the preliminary plat.
5. The developer shall submit a soils report as required by the Subdivision Ordinance as part of the preliminary plat submission.
6. The developer shall enter into an Improvements Agreement with Farmington City to provide adequate access to serve the project. In conjunction with this, the Developer and/or City must be successful in obtaining an acceptable railroad approval from UTA east of the project.

7. The developer shall enter into a written Development Agreement for the project with the City prior to or concurrent with final plat approval.
8. Developer shall provide a stub street to the north in the vicinity of Lot 407 to the Cort Lodder property located in Kaysville.
9. The developer shall submit a yield plan acceptable to the City including a landscaping and maintenance plan as required in association with preliminary plat approval as outlined by City ordinance within two weeks of the date of this meeting. The plan shall include an accurate wetland delineation approved by the Army Corp of Engineers.
10. The developer is strongly encouraged to look at designing the subdivision with larger lots rather than maximizing the yield plan. The plat design shall not call for lots to exceed 172 in number.

In discussion of the motion, Planning Commission members suggested that interested citizens write letters to the City Council regarding installation of a smaller local park in the area of the subdivision. Commission members also discussed the need to have City water lines brought to the existing homes. Mr. Petersen commented that the subdivision will aid the transportation plans of the area and lessen the burden on existing roads.

It was noted that Mr. Ritz had strong concerns regarding the high density of the subdivision plan.

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

### **Findings**

1. Citizens would have the opportunity to suggest the installation of a smaller local park in the area of the subdivision.
2. City water lines will be brought to the existing homes in the area.
3. The subdivision will aid the transportation plans of the area and lessen the burden on existing roads, especially Shepard Lane.
4. The request met with City standards and ordinances and complied with the General Plan.
5. Concerns remained over the high density of the subdivision, but yield plans indicated the number of lots was allowed.

**PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE PROPOSED HUNTER'S CREEK SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 170 LOTS ON 150.68 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2000 WEST 800 NORTH IN AE AND AA ZONES (S-4-03) (Agenda Item # 4)**

**Background Information**

The land contained within the requested subdivision was originally part of the park proposed for the area. Initially the placement of 1075 West was planned further east of the park property. Subsequent plans for the U.S. 89 corridor required that the frontage road (1075 West) be moved further to the west reducing the overall area of the park. The proposed area for the subdivision became smaller and smaller and is now a remnant piece with not much utility regarding the park. Several months ago prior to initiation of the bond which eventually was approved by the citizens to fund the park, the City recommended that the proceeds from the proposed building lot (or one-lot subdivision) should also help finance improvement of the park.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** explained the reason for the application. The City needed to sell the lot in order to raise funds to help complete the park project.

**Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing

**Brent Mason** (1646 Oakridge Park Drive) reported he was the president of the home owners' association (HOA) adjacent to the park, including 114 property owners. The association was in opposition to the sale of the lot because it would diminish the size of the park. The association felt that the City had made certain promises at the time the bond election was in process. They felt they had been cheated out of amenities promised, such as the water park, and that this was another attempt at lessening the facilities and space of the park. They felt the sale was not needed. However, if the sale was to go forward, they wanted to make sure that certain restrictions would be in place. They wanted any construction on the lot to comply with codes, covenants, and restrictions placed on the rest of the subdivision. They also wanted to have the lot become part of the home owners association. The HOA also requested that a monument sign be placed on the property to enhance the entrance at that location.

**Wendy Weeks** (1199 Oakridge Park Drive) was very strongly against the sale of the lot. She lived in the home next to the lot and reported having to pay extra for the corner view lot. She would now be losing both the corner and the view. She said that she felt it would be very important if the sale did occur that occupants be required to meet the same standards required of all the homes in the subdivision. She agreed that a monument sign should be placed at that location and that proper set backs be required so that her home would not have a negative impact because of a neighbor building too close to the lot line. Ms. Weeks was also very concerned

about drainage runoff from the lot in question. She worried that when a home was constructed it would cause runoff to enter her property and increase problems that she already experienced with drainage. Ms. Weeks felt her property value would be diminished and that the City had reneged on promises made at the time of the bond election.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

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

**Cindy Roybal** said she had strong feelings that the lot should remain part of the park. However, considering the need of the City to obtain funds to finish the park in an appropriate manner, she had considered the sale. After hearing input from citizens regarding holding any potential builder to very high standards and with the addition of a monument sign at that location, Ms. Roybal felt the lot could be used as a building lot.

### **Motion**

**Cindy Roybal** moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the minor plat request for Oakridge Park Estates, Phase III, located at approximately 1190 West Oakridge Park Drive subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following conditions:

1. Development of the subdivision shall be subject to all conditions of the preliminary and final plat approval granted to the adjacent Oakridge Park Planned Unit Development on December 11, 1996, including, but not limited to the following:
  - A. The future homebuilder for the subject lot shall submit architectural plans acceptable to the City and consistent with the requirements for homes within the Oakridge Park Planned Unit Development.
  - B. A landscape plan shall be submitted for review and approval which illustrates, among other things, the landscaping proposed between the frontage road (1075 West Street) and the proposed lot line of the subject lot.
  - C. The Public Works Department must review and approve all plans for utility laterals for the proposed lot.
  - D. Grading and drainage plans for the proposed lot shall be reviewed and approved by the City as part of the building permit application.
2. A note shall be placed on the final plat indicating a soils report has been prepared and submitted to the City for the proposed subdivision in accordance with the

Subdivision Ordinance.

3. The applicant shall prepare a final plat consistent with all standards and requirements outlined in the Subdivision Ordinance.
4. In cooperation with the Oakridge Park homes owners' association, a monument sign similar to the one located at the south entrance to the subdivision shall be constructed and maintained by the City on the lot in question in compliance with City sign ordinances. The lot shall be reconfigured to allow for the monument sign.
5. A grading and drainage design shall be submitted by the applicant in which runoff from the lot shall be retained on site or routed to the road.
6. Construction on the lot shall be in compliance with Fieldstone CC&Rs.
7. The applicant shall notify the homes owners' association of the sale of the lot and the possibility that the lot owner could be included in the HOA.
8. Any potential builder shall be encouraged to work with the adjacent property owner when designing and constructing a home on the lot in question.

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

**Findings**

1. The motion provided the City with means to increase funding for the Heritage Park.
2. The motion complied with City standards and ordinances and with the General Plan.
3. The motion provided a means whereby the property owners of adjacent homes could give input into building design and construction.
4. Any proposed home construction would be held to high quality design and construction.

**MOTION TO AMEND AGENDA**

**Bart Hill** moved that the Planning Commission amend the agenda in order to consider Agenda Item numbers 5, 8 and 13 concurrently. **Cindy Roybal** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING: JOSH BIESINGER AND DAVID CROFT REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO VACATE RIGHT OF WAY APPROXIMATELY 15 FEET IN WIDTH ON THE EAST SIDE OF 300 EAST FROM THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 300 EAST/200 SOUTH INTERSECTION RUNNING THENCE NORTHERLY 133.29 feet (Agenda Item #13)**

**Background Information**

One of the applicants, Josh Biesinger, presently owns a large parcel nearly 18,000 square feet in size. The purpose to vacate the right of way is to provide an additional 2,000 square feet thereby allowing Mr. Biesinger to subdivide his lot. The 300 East right of way is a 99 foot wide street and even after the proposed street vacation of 15 feet, there still remains another 12 feet before the back of the sidewalk which provides enough room for a 4 foot sidewalk and a 7 ½ foot park strip meeting Farmington City standards.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** briefly reviewed the background information.

**Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission. The applicant felt no need to address the Commission.

**Public Hearing Closed**

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

**Mr. Ritz** questioned whether or not approval of the request would set a negative precedence in the City.

**Mr. Petersen** reported that because of the unconventional lot sizes and street widths found especially in the original townsite, such action had been taken in several other circumstances. The action would not set an unwarranted precedence.

**Motion**

**Bart Hill** moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to vacate right of way approximately 15 feet in width on the east side of 300 East from the northeast corner of the 300 East/200 South intersection running thence northerly 133.29 feet with the following conditions:

1. An easement shall be reserved for an existing utility located in the vacated portion of the street.

2. The applicant shall provide a survey and a legal description of the vacated right of way for the ordinance and vacation order.
3. The applicant shall enter into an extension agreement with the City to provide sidewalk along 300 East and 200 South the entire distance as these two right of ways abut the property.

**Sid Young** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

1. The request met with all Farmington City standards and ordinances and complied with the General Plan.
2. Such action found precedence in numerous motions taken previously by the City Council for property in the original town site.

### **PUBLIC HEARING: JOSH PAUL BIESINGER REQUEST FOR APPROVAL FOR A LOT SPLIT BY METES AND BOUNDS CONTAINING .46 ACRES LOCATED AT 185 SOUTH 300 EAST IN THE OTR ZONE (S-7-03) (Agenda Item #5)**

### **Background Information**

Presently Mr. Biesinger's parcel is 17,994 square feet in size. He must have at least 20,000 square feet of land in order to meet the minimum 10,000 sq. ft. lot size for each of the lots proposed as part of the subdivision application. Therefore, Mr. Biesinger is also requesting that the City vacate 15 feet of the 300 West right of way (see related agenda item) thereby bringing the total square footage of the parcel to 20,000 square feet.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL

**Mr. Petersen** briefly reviewed the agenda item.

### **Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

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

### **Motion**

**Bart Hill** moved that the Planning Commission approve the lot split by metes and bounds subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and subject to receiving approval from the City Council to vacate 15 feet of the 300 East right of way. **Cory Ritz** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

1. The motion action would allow the Biesingers to subdivide the lot and build a home for a parent requiring assistance.
2. The request met with all Farmington City standards and ordinances and complied with the General Plan.

### **PUBLIC HEARING: JOSH BIESINGER REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT AN ATTACHED GARAGE EVEN WITH THE FRONT SETBACK OF A PROPOSED SINGLE FAMILY HOME LOCATED AT 185 SOUTH 300 EAST IN THE OTR ZONE (C-10-03) (Agenda Item #8)**

### **Background Information**

Recently adopted OTR provisions require that attached garages which are flush or even with the front face of the home must receive conditional use approval from the Planning Commission.

Additionally, all structures requiring a building permit must meet the new construction design guidelines as set forth in Section 11-17-070 of the Farmington City Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Department and/or Planning Commission may request a recommendation from the Farmington City Historic Preservation Commission regarding applications for permitted or conditional uses. It appears Mr. Biesinger's single-family dwelling proposal meets setback and orientation, mass and scale, building height, building and roof form, and color standards contained in the ordinance.

Regarding building materials, at the time of writing this staff report, the applicant retrieved the building plans to make corrections and therefore the type of building materials are not known at this time. Hopefully, the Planning Commission will receive building elevations necessary to make a decision regarding this application some time before the meeting or at the meeting.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** briefly reviewed the item.

**Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing.

**Public Hearing Closed**

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

**Motion**

**Bart Hill** moved that the Planning Commission grant conditional use and site plan approval to construct an attached garage even with a front setback of a proposed single-family home located at 185 South 300 East subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards. **Sid Young** seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, it was suggested the conditions be **amended** to include the requirement that the garage plans be reviewed and approved by the City Planner. Both Mr. Hill and Mr. Young concurred with the amendment.

A vote was taken indicating a unanimous vote in the affirmative.

**Findings**

1. The motion was consistent with previous actions.
2. The motion meets with City ordinances and standards.
3. The request was for a single family dwelling.
4. The request provided for a re-investment in the neighborhood.
5. The design was in line with the rest of the homes in the neighborhood.

**PUBLIC HEARING: BUTLER &EVANS REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A MEETINGHOUSE FOR THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS LOCATED ON 3.02 ACRES AT 14 SOUTH BONANZA (APPROXIMATELY 1700 WEST) IN AN AE ZONE (C-8-01) (Agenda Item #6)**

**Mr. Petersen** stated that the request had been approved previously but the time limit had expired. Packet materials included past minutes and information, including conditions set. Previous Planning Commissions had required an increase in the use of Farmington rock, which was part of the present application.

**Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission. The applicant felt no need to address the Commission.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

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

**Mr. Ritz** asked if it was wise for the application to come before the Planning Commission at this time, or if they should wait until the building was actually needed. In discussion of the request, the applicant affirmed the desire to have the agenda item considered at this time.

### **Motion**

**Cory Ritz** moved that the Planning Commission grant conditional use and site plan approval to Bulter & Evans Architects to construct a meeting house for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints located at 14 South Bonanza subject to compliance with all applicable Farmington City ordinance requirements and development standards and the same conditions of approval granted by the Planning Commission on June 18, 2001, and July 16, 2001. **Cindy Roybal** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

6. The request met with all Farmington City standards and ordinances and complied with the General Plan.
7. The application had been previously approved as presented.

### **PUBLIC HEARING: STEVEN L. AND BETTY F. BANGERTER REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO ESTABLISH AN ACCESSORY DWELLING LOCATED AT 712 NORTH 1875 WEST (Agenda Item #7)**

**Mr. Petersen** stated that the City Council had recently approved an amendment to the City ordinances allowing accessory dwellings in the agricultural zones as a conditional use. The Bangerters were applying for approval to establish an accessory dwelling for use by family members.

### **Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission. The applicant felt Mr. Petersen had explained the agenda item fully.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

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

**Mr. Young** requested information regarding set backs.

**Mr. Petersen** explained that the accessory building itself (not an accessory dwelling) was grandfathered in because the applicant had originally received a building permit for the building from Davis County prior to annexation to the City.

### **Motion**

**Sid Young** moved that the Planning Commission grant conditional use and site plan approval to establish an accessory dwelling located at 712 North 1875 West subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and the following conditions:

1. Only family members of the single-family dwelling existing on the same lot may occupy the accessory dwelling.
2. No rent or other compensation may be charged of the occupants of the accessory dwelling.
3. The conditional use permit shall be recorded with the Davis County Recorder's office and shall expressly state it terminates upon the sale of the property.
4. No separate utility meter for the accessory dwelling shall be allowed.
5. The accessory dwelling shall comply with all construction housing and building codes and shall also comply with all procedures and requirements of City building regulations.
6. Only one mailbox shall be allowed for the parcel identified by the Davis County Tax ID #08-059-0015.

**Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

1. The applicant is providing housing for family members only under conditions where family members can enjoy a degree of independence but also having assistance readily available when needed.

2. The accessory dwelling will have a minimal impact on the neighborhood in terms of traffic, noise, parking congestion, and it is compatible in scale and appearance of the single-family dwelling now existing on the lot.
3. The accessory dwelling is subordinate in area and size to the existing single-family dwelling.
4. The applicant is providing at least one off-street parking stall for the accessory dwelling.
5. The accessory dwelling is compatible with the residential/agriculture character of the neighborhood.

**PUBLIC HEARING: DENNIS AND SUSAN GREENHALGH REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO EXCEED THE 15 FOOT HEIGHT LIMIT SET FOR ACCESSORY BUILDINGS BY CONSTRUCTING A BARN/GARAGE/WORKSHOP/STORAGE STRUCTURE APPROXIMATELY 17 FEET IN HEIGHT LOCATED AT 93 EAST 400 NORTH IN THE OTR ZONE (C-2--03) (Agenda Item #9)**

**Background Information**

The applicants are proposing to construct an accessory building which appears to be compatible with other buildings in the neighborhood. Section 11-17-0-70 (new construction design guidelines in the OTR zone) states that all structures requiring a building permit shall meet the standards therein. It appears that this accessory building meets those standards.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the agenda item. He stated the plans for the garage met all setback requirements.

**Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing.

**Chadwick Greenhalgh** (State Street) stated he had recently completed a similar project on his property. It had turned out quite successfully. His father would be doing a quality project, and Mr. Chadwick Greenhalgh was in support of the application.

**Public Hearing Closed**

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

**Motion**

**Cindy Roybal** moved that the Planning Commission grant conditional use approval to exceed the 15 foot height limit for accessory building by constructing a garage approximately 17 feet in height located at 93 East 400 North. **Sid Young** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**Findings**

1. Precedence for the project had been set. The Planning Commission was confident in the quality and compliance of the proposed project.
2. The project will add to the neighborhood.

**DAVID PLUMMER REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE BUFFALO RANCH HORSE OPERATION LOCATED WEST SOF THE FARMINGTON RANCHES SUBDIVISION AT APPROXIMATELY 2100 WEST CLARK LANE IN AN AE ZONE AND AN A ZONE (SP-1-03) (Agenda Item #10)**

**Background Information**

The Planning Commission granted conditional use approval for this agenda item on April 10, 2003. Thereafter, the City Council approved amendments to the Farmington Ranches Development Agreement and Conservation Easements recorded over the property on May 14, 2003. Site plan approval for the Buffalo Ranch development should comply with these previous approvals. Some Information regarding he approval sis still not available at this time.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** stated the project had been discussed at length in previous City meetings. The application would need to be consistent with previous approvals. An amendment to the trail easement would need to be accomplished before approval. Mr. Petersen recommended approval be tied to the trail easement update and that a temporary trail easement through Boyer Company property be affirmed. The developer had color swatches for the building exteriors. Mr. Petersen explained the private water line that would run through the property and suggested the property owner enter into an agreement with the City wherein the developer would maintain the lines. Mr. Petersen also felt that the trail head should be identified on the plat.

**Motion**

**Cory Ritz** moved the Planning Commission grant site plan approval subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and the following conditions:

1. The City's public trail and proposed trail head shall be identified on the plans.

2. The applicant shall meet all conditions of the conditional use approval granted by the Planning Commission on April 10, 2003.
3. The applicant shall meet all conditions of the city Council's motion for approval set forth on May 14, 2003.
4. Public improvement drawings and any grading and drainage plans related to the project shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, Public Works Department and fire Department and other related utility agencies.
5. The project master plan for the Farmington Ranches Subdivision as set forth in the Farmington Ranches Development Agreement No.2 shall be updated to comply with the City Council motion for approval on May 14, 2003. The plan shall include, among other things, "southern trail easement" and drainage easements discussed at the May 14 meeting.
6. The City must receive a temporary trail easement from The Boyer Company as per the May 14 motion.
7. Exhibit B as part of the Conservation Easement shall be updated to show the drainage easement and trail easements appropriately.
8. The exterior elevations for any homes and offices as part of the Buffalo Ranches site plan must be reviewed and approved by the City in accordance with Chapter 7 of the Farmington City Zoning Ordinance.
9. Any water lines outside the public right-of-way shall be considered private lines where maintenance responsibilities are left to the private property owners.
10. The developer shall enter into an agreement with the City to specifically deal with the maintenance and ownership of the water line.

**Sid Young** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. The Chairman abstained from voting.

### **Findings**

1. The motion was consistent with previous approvals.
2. The motion provided for the updated plan to include all appropriate trail amenities.

**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 #11)**

**Mr. Petersen** stated the Agenda Item #11 would not be ready for consideration until a later meeting. He stated that the Planning Department was researching similar ordinances in other communities. Issues involving whether or not to have a bed and breakfast as a single building or whether to allow multiple buildings would need to be addressed.

**Motion**

**Sid Young** moved that the Planning Commission table consideration of agenda item #11. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO ENACT CHAPTER 40 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE REGARDING DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION (ZT-4-03) (Agenda Item #12)**

**Mr. Petersen** asked that the Planning Commission review the information in Agenda Item #12 as a first reading. He would have more information at the next Planning Commission meeting.

**Motion**

**Sid Young** moved that the Planning Commission table consideration of agenda item #11. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**JOE GRAVES DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL(Agenda Item #14)**

**Mr. Petersen** introduced the discussion item. He stated the Popp parcel in question had been added to the study area recently when considering the OTR for the final parcels in the original townsite area. The Popp parcel was on the southwest corner of the 200 East and 200 South intersection. Two buildings existed on the parcel, both were historic structures. The small rock building had been build in 1854. The larger building had been considered unrestorable. However, no City staff or architects had been allowed inside to determine whether or not that was accurate.

**Mr. Graves** had several proposals for the property, including multi-family dwellings and an office building. He stated, however, that he was open to any suggestion the City may have. He felt preserving the 1854 rock structure would be possible. He was less convinced that the large,

white building could be made usable. He also stated there was a rock wall along the east boundary line of the property that should be preserved. He committed to Mr. Petersen that he would allow City officials inside the larger, white historical structure.

The Planning Commission discussed several possibilities, and by consensus stated they would likely look favorably on development and improvement of the parcel. No binding promises were given.

**MISCELLANEOUS, CORRESPONDENCE, CITY COUNCIL REPORT (Agenda Item #15)**

**Mr. Petersen** covered several miscellaneous items of business, including the following:

- ↯ Matthew V. Hess had written a letter, included the packet, that contained valuable input for City consideration.
- ↯ Dave Erickson had terminated his request for annexation of property located at 1600 West, Frontage Road.
- ↯ Planning Commission members were invited to attend the 2003 Annual Convention of the Utah League of Cities and Towns to be held beginning September 11, 2003. Those interested in attending should contact Margy Lomax in the City Offices. (Registration information was included in the packet.)
- ↯ Mr. Petersen included in the packet information about the “Union Pacific Railroad Industrial Development Team Track Briefing.” A citizen had submitted the information requesting the City consider having a “truck stop” in Farmington. By consensus, the Planning Commission felt the facility would not fit in the community.
- ↯ Information was included in the packet regarding the Certified Citizen Planner Seminar.
- ↯ The City Council approved “Park Lane” as the name of the connection between Main Street and Clark Lane. The road had been called “Burke Lane,” but with the new alignment many officials felt it should be renamed.
- ↯ The City Council adopted the Original Townsite Residential zone (OTR) for major portions of the downtown area.
- ↯ Accessory dwellings were approved by the City Council as a conditional use line item in the agricultural zones of the City.
- ↯ The City Council approved a boundary line adjustment between Farmington City and Centerville City near the Tuscany Cove project.

- ▯ The City Council approved small auto dealerships in downtown Farmington under very strict conditions.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Cindy Roybal** moved to adjourn at 10:15 P.M.

---

*Kent Forsgren, Chairman*  
*Farmington City Planning Commission*