

**FARMINGTON CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
May 8, 2014**

---

**STUDY SESSION**

***Present:** Commissioners Heather Barnum, Kent Hinckley, Kris Kaufman, Mack McDonald and Rebecca Wayment, Community Development Director David Petersen, Associate City Planner Eric Anderson and Recording Secretary Heidi Gordon. Chairman Brett Anderson and Alternate Commissioners Karolyn Lehn and Michael Nilson were excused.*

**Item #1. Minutes**

The Commission discussed the minutes from the April 17, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. The Commission would like more detail included in the minutes regarding the signage discussion.

**Item #3. Norm Frost/Ovation Homes – Final Plat Approval for Farmington Hollow and The Cottages at Farmington Hollow Conservation Subdivision**

The following 2 conditions need to be added to the Final Plat approval:

6. Applicant must show an access and maintenance easement for the creek.
7. Applicant must address any issues Davis County Flood Control may have with discharge from the detention into Haight Creek.

**Item #5. Jared Darger – Requesting Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit Approval**

The applicant is requesting site plan and conditional use permit approval for a contractor yard on the Stathis property located at 650 West and 1300 South. Public Works would like to see the Extension Agreement go through showing sidewalks, curb and gutter for the property. Also, there was a discussion about the type of fencing that will be used.

**Item #6. Farmington City – Recommendation to Amend Zoning Ordinance Chapter 18 (Mixed Use District)**

The Commission and staff discussed The Haws Companies' (THC) applications. Also, agenda item #11. (Review of THC proposal for 3 pylon signs) will be moved after agenda item #3 so item #6 and #11 can be discussed together for the benefit of the applicant.

**Item #7. Farmington City – Recommendation to Amend Zoning Ordinance Chapter 43**

This application has been withdrawn.

**Item #8. Farmington City – Recommendation to Amend the Definition of Flag Lots in the Subdivision Ordinance**

Staff provided a first draft of amending the ordinance as shown in the staff report.

**Item #9. Farmington City – Recommendation to Amend Zoning Ordinance Chapter 12**

This change is regarding Conservation Subdivisions. Staff has many proposed changes. David Petersen recommended two or three commissioners meet with staff to go through the changes and compile a report to bring back to the Planning Commission.

**Item #10. Farmington City – Recommendation to Amend Zoning Ordinance**

Staff said this change would amend the zoning ordinance by modifying the definition of adaptive reuse to include certain commercial uses.

**Item #11. Review of THC Proposal for 3 Pylon Signs**

As part of THC development agreement, the Commission reviewed THC's proposal for 3 pylon signs. There was some concern regarding the accuracy of the renderings that were provided by the Applicant. Additionally, the Commission is concerned that the signs so close to the freeway may resemble a billboard which may cause issue with billboard advertisers that the City has previously rejected.

---

**REGULAR SESSION**

***Present:** Commissioners Heather Barnum, Kent Hinckley, Kris Kaufman, Mack McDonald and Rebecca Wayment, Community Development Director David Petersen, Associate City Planner Eric Anderson and Recording Secretary Heidi Gordon. Chairman Brett Anderson, Commissioner Brad Dutson, Alternate Commissioners Karolyn Lehn and Michael Nilson were excused.*

**#1. Minutes**

Heather Barnum made a motion to table the Minutes from the April 17, 2014 Planning Commission meeting as to provide expanded explanation of the signage discussion. Kent Hinckley seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**#2. City Council Report**

Eric Anderson gave a report from the City Council meeting on May 6, 2014. The City Council approved the Eastridge Estates Schematic Plan with all the conditions from the Planning Commission. Brentwood Estates Preliminary Plat was tabled because of concerns with the appeals process. City Council had some concerns with Pheasant Hollow's Schematic Plan, which included issues which may arise from a future soil and geotech report. As a result, some of the conditions have been amended and the Council would like Preliminary Plat to be a public hearing.

***Motion:***

Kris Kaufman made a motion that the Planning Commission move agenda item #6 (modifying Chapter 18 of the Zoning Ordinance) and item #11 (review of THC sign proposal) after item #3 (Ovation Homes Final Plat approval), remove item #7 (modifying Chapter 43 of the Zoning Ordinance)

from the agenda and switch agenda items #8 (modifying Chapter 12 of the Zoning Ordinance) and #9 (modifying the definition of flag lots in the Zoning Ordinance). **Rebecca Wayment** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

### **SUBDIVISION APPLICATION**

#### **#3. Norm Frost / Ovation Homes – Applicant is requesting a recommendation for Final Plat approval for the proposed Farmington Hollow and The Cottages at Farmington Hollow Conservation Subdivisions consisting of 67 lots on 23.5 acres located at approximately 1350 West and 1800 North in an LR Zone. (A-2-13; S-18-13)**

**Eric Anderson** said the Planning Commission has reviewed this numerous times. The biggest change is that Ivory Homes will be doing the 47 lots on the western part of the property and that Ovation Homes will be completing the 17 lots on the eastern side. They have separated the subdivision into two different plats, although it will be addressed as one item for the evening. All issues have been addressed, except for a few minor revisions made by the Development Review Committee (DRC). These revisions will be completed prior to review by the City Council. **Eric Anderson** also mentioned there will be a few conditions added to the motion, as discussed in the Study Session.

**Norm Frost**, 722 N. 1550 W., Kaysville, stated he feels they have satisfied the citizens and the Planning Commission. They look forward to now moving forward with the project.

#### ***Motion:***

**Kent Hinckley** made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the final plat for the Farmington Hollow Conservation Subdivision subject to all applicable Farmington City codes and development standards and the following conditions:

1. The landscape buffer and side treatments along 1800 North and the pocket park shall be maintained by an HOA, and the landscape plan shall be approved by staff prior to Final Plat approval;
2. The CC&Rs shall be submitted to and reviewed by staff prior to Final Plat approval;
3. The annexation must be finalized and recorded prior to consideration of Final Plat approval of the City Council;
4. Improvement drawings for the project shall be reviewed and approved by each member of the Farmington Development Review Committee (DRC);
5. The location of the trail and the adjacent westerly lot lines shall be staked, reviewed and approved by the City, and the trail shall be dedicated to the City prior to Final Plat approval;
6. The Applicant will show the maintenance and access easement for the creek on the final plat;
7. The Applicant will address any issues Davis County has with any discharges into the creek.

**Rebecca Wayment** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

#### **Findings:**

1. The proposed development meets all of the standards and requirements of a conservation subdivision in the LR zone such as minimum lot sizes, lot widths and setbacks.
2. The proposed development is at a density of 2.85 units per acre, which is consistent with the adjacent neighborhoods and the LDR General Plan designation of 4 units per acre.
3. The road layout will mitigate thru traffic and be prohibitive to high speeds.

4. 1800 North Street shall be landscape and retain its rural character.
5. Larger lots shall be situated on the periphery of the project providing an acceptable transition to adjacent neighborhoods.
6. The overall layout follows the low density residential objectives of the General Plan.
7. In spite of the realization that the pipelines were in a different location than originally thought, the applicant provided an updated yield plan and was able to obtain the 67 lot threshold.
8. The Haight Creek Draw is shown on the Master Trails Map as a future trail corridor; the current plan has this trail shown.

#### **ZONE TEXT CHANGE**

**Item #4. Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation to amend the Zoning Ordinance by modifying Chapter 18 (Mixed Use Districts) regarding housing for the elderly, assisted living, and/or other similar uses. (ZT-5-14)**

David Petersen stated that the City added “Residential facilities for people with disabilities” in Chapter 18. Elderly and assisted living facilities was meant to be included in this definition; however, upon review, staff feels the elderly and assisted living facility uses should be their own line items within the ordinance.

**Mack McDonald opened the public hearing at 7:16 p.m.**

No comments were received.

**Mack McDonald closed the public hearing at 7:16 p.m.**

#### ***Motion:***

Heather Barnum made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council amend Section 11-18-105 by adding the following uses to table 18.3 in all mixed use zones related thereto except the OS zone:

“Residential facilities for the elderly”

“Assisted living facilities”

Rebecca Wayment seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

#### **Finding:**

The modification makes certain that elderly and assisted living facilities are included in Chapter 18 without compromising federal housing language.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS**

**Item #5. Review of The Haws Companies proposal for 3 pylon signs as part of Development Agreement.**

David Petersen said this item was previously tabled at the last Planning Commission meeting as a result of two 3 to 3 tie votes. The Applicant has prepared a new proposal for the Planning

Commission which only includes two pylon signs instead of three, but the signs are now 70' tall in lieu of the original proposed 60'. **David Petersen** stated the Applicant also provided elevations of the signs from south-bound and north-bound view from I-15. **David Petersen** also clarified it is not a public hearing.

**Scott Harwood**, The Haws Company, 33 S. Shadow Breeze, Kaysville, stated they worked hard to address the concerns from the Planning Commission that was previously discussed. THC got the impression that three signs was too much so they decreased it to two signs. Since one of the signs was removed, an additional panel was added to the remaining two signs. They will also ensure one sign is filled before construction of an additional sign.

**Kent Hinckley** doesn't feel the pictures are accurate. Currently, the signs look like they are east of the power lines, which would be in the railroad tracks. The signs would need to be west of the power lines, but that would put sign #1 where the red barn is located. It also appears the signs would be taller than the power lines. **Scott Harwood** stated Yesco is very familiar with these types of signs. There is plenty of room between the power lines and the railroad, but Yesco will ensure the signs will fit and will not be built in either the power line or railroad easements.

**David Petersen** said based on the GIS map, there is approximately 55' between the power line and railroad tracks. He said they will look into how the width of the power line corridor; **Scott Harwood** said THC will ensure they will comply with the corridors and easements.

**David Petersen** asked about the width of the sign. **Scott Harwood** said the panels are 20' in width. **Heather Barnum** asked how far the signs are from the actual development project. Based on the GIS map, it would be approximately 1500'. **David Petersen** asked what the finished grade is of the property in comparison to the freeway. **Scott Harwood** stated it is roughly 15-20', depending on the exact area. He also clarified that the signs will be 70' in addition to the 15-20' grade drop making them a total of 85'-90' high. He said they determined the proposed height with Yesco based on what they are going to need for their tenants' visibility.

**Kris Kaufman** asked staff how these signs compare to the Station Park pylon signs. **David Petersen** said from finished grade, they are 100', but they are next to the Park Lane interchange so the height is much shorter as seen from the travel lanes of the freeway.

**Rebecca Wayment** wanted to know heights of other signs within the City. **David Petersen** said the City has 5 billboards ranging from the Regan billboards at 42.5' to the Yesco billboards at 50'. THC's signs would be approximately 20' taller. The distance from the current billboards to the freeway is 150' which is the same distance as the proposed THC pylon signs.

**Rebecca Wayment** understands that signage is a great way to advertise, but has some concerns with these specific signs. She feels THC's proposed signs are too close to the freeway; they are not congruent with the development they are advertising. She feels the tenants would be better served with the signs located internally in the development.

**Mack McDonald** asked the original proposed height of the interior McDonalds' sign to City Council. **David Petersen** said it started at 100', staff recommended approximately 35', but City Council approved it at 50'-55'. City Council was concerned that a tall sign like this in the interior of a development would set a precedent for other companies requesting similarly tall signs.

**Heather Barnum** also expressed concern that these do not fit the surrounding area and seem excessive. She also feels this portion of property has been protected from billboards and allowing this type of signage may create this area as a target for billboard companies in the future.

**Rebecca Wayment** added to her previous thought of having the signs located closer to the interior of the development. Target, Walmart and other stores located off Parrish Lane in Centerville have their pylon signs as more of a gateway into the shopping district. She feels this location would be a better fit for the signs. **Scott Harwood** stated SPARC would prefer the signs next to I-15 as they did not want large signs within the development. He also stated the tenants do not want to be at a competitive disadvantage to the shops at Station Park; he feels these signs along the freeway would fulfill their visibility needs. **Kris Kaufman** asked, despite opinions from SPARC and the Commission, what does THC feels is the best solution for the signage. **Scott Harwood** said what they are presenting is what he feels is the best solution.

**Kris Kaufman** asked if approval of the pylon signs would be in replacement to singular store signage in the interior or if these would be in addition to possible single store signs within the development. **David Petersen** said possibly. **Rebecca Wayment** added that although moving the pylon signs to the interior may add additional signs, typically, regular store fronts do not add their own large singular signs. There may be a few stores that request it, but the majority will advertise on pylon type signs when available.

**David Petersen** reviewed the sight distance standards from Traffic Audit Bureau (TAB). Based on the TAB standards, these signs clearly meet the requirements as there are no obstructions in the sight distance. He also continued that occasionally billboards are 100-150' high. Although there may not be obstructions of view, companies do this so they do not have to compete with any lower signs. **Heather Barnum** stated she feels that since there are no obstructions of view or lower signs to compete with there is no reason for the signs to go so high.

**Kris Kaufman** asked what the City's standards are for these types of signs. **David Petersen** said for a commercial complex the maximum height of a ground sign is 20'; this height may be increased to 40'. These standards may also be adjusted by the Planning Commission. The Applicant is asking for a deviation from the standard.

**Mack McDonald** added that he is comfortable with the sign and the sign location. He feels location is critical for these tenants. If the sign was placed internally, he feels it would need to be lifted higher as the lower panels would blend with the buildings. He is not, however, comfortable with the sign height; he feels it is excessive. **Kris Kaufman** agrees with Mack McDonald.

The Commissioners all agreed they are not comfortable with the proposed height of the pylon signs. If following the City's standards, the signs would be 40' in addition to the 15' grade drop for a total of 55' in height. They also agreed that two signs is adequate and that one sign must be completed prior to construction of the second sign. As for the width of the sign, **David Petersen** said that discussion can be postponed until THC comes forward with their first developmental plan review.

***Motion:***

**Kent Hinckley** made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend approval of The Haws Companies' proposal for 2 pylon signs as part of the Development Agreement at 55' from grade as measured at the base of the sign (or approximately 40' in height from the grade of the freeway) with the following conditions:

1. One sign needs to be filled prior to a second sign is erected;
2. The width of the sign will be determined concurrently with the first development plan review within the project;

3. If due to easements or some other unforeseen circumstances, the sign is relocated to a different site than presented by the developer then it will come back to the Planning Commission for review and approval.

**Kris Kaufman** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Findings:

1. The signs are clearly visible from the freeway;
2. The two pylon signs will not compete for attention as there are no other commercial signs located in Farmington on the west side of I-15 north of Park Lane;
3. The signs will help the success of the project and will be good for local economic development;
4. The signs, as opposed to much taller signs closer to the commercial uses within the project, will not compete with other signs in the development;
5. On balance, less tall signs in height on the freeway are better than monster high signs in the interior of the project.

**ZONE CHANGE**

**Item #6. Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation for zone change approval on property (7400 s.f.) located at approximately 1450 North and 1075 West from an LR (Large residential) to an R-4 Zone. (Z-1-14)**

**Eric Anderson** said a Conditional Use and Site Plan approval was before the Commission on February 20, 2014. The City is in the process of selling this property to Dr. Leaver for the construction of a dental office. Before that can happen, a part of the property needs to be rezoned from LS to R-4 so Dr. Leaver can construct a parking lot for his building. **David Petersen** added that when the Commission approved the Conditional Use and Site Plan, this rezone was added as a condition to that approval.

**Mack McDonald** opened the public hearing at 8:33 p.m.

No comments were received.

**Mack McDonald** closed the public hearing at 8:33 p.m.

***Motion:***

**Rebecca Wayment** made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council rezone the property as requested. **Heather Barnum** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Findings:

1. The proposed rezone is consistent with the General Plan;
2. It will allow Dr. Leaver the highest and best use of his (future) property and is beneficial to the City because we can sell this oddly shaped parcel to someone who can use it.
3. The intended use of commercial makes sense here as it is on the General Plan to be as such and is near existing office space.

## CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION

### **Item #7. Jared Darger (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting site plan and conditional use permit approval for a contractor yard on 1.4 acres of property located at approximately 650 West and 1300 South in the LM&B Zone. (SP-1-14)**

Eric Anderson said the Applicant is requesting a conditional use permit for a contractor yard in south Farmington. Currently, Mr. Stathis owns a property just north of the Meadow View subdivision. Jared Darger would like to do a land swap with Mr. Stathis which would mean Mr. Stathis would move his facility to South Farmington. Staff and the DRC would like the sidewalks, curb and gutter to be completed along 650 West in spite of the fact that the northerly portion of 650 West on the east side is currently unimproved. As a compromise, the City will have the engineering of the road completed so that the required improvements will not need to be redone when the rest of 650 West is completed.

Kent Hinckley asked how much curb and gutter will the applicant have to put in. Eric Anderson said approximately 420'.

Jared Darger, 15757 S. Packsaddle Dr., Bluffdale, said they have worked to ensure what they want to do complies with all the City's ordinances. They have already done the plans for the curb and gutter. Later on, Mr. Stathis would like to build something like the Farmington Bay Business Park.

**Mack McDonald opened the public hearing at 8:40 p.m.**

No comments were received.

**Mack McDonald closed the public hearing at 8:40 p.m.**

Mack McDonald said there was concern regarding the height of the fence as discussed in the Study Session. He added that based on their plans, there is a 2' berm in place which would increase the 6' fence to 8'. The Commissioners agreed that a 2' berm in addition to the 6' high fence would be appropriate and that the fence needs to be constructed of a solid material.

#### ***Motion:***

Heather Barnum made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the site plan and conditional use permit subject to all applicable Farmington City codes and development standards and the following conditions:

1. The applicant will improve his portion of 650 West according to Farmington City Development Standards for a Minor Collector and the engineering specifications as determined by the City Engineer;
2. The applicant shall provide a sign plan for any and all signs on the property and such sign plan must be approved by the City;
3. The applicant shall clarify what is being stored, type and quantity in the portable steel containers to the Fire Department for approval;
4. The applicant shall screen the storage site through the use of landscaping or fencing from view from any public street;
5. The height of the fence shall be at least 6' from the berm or 8' where no berm is present;
6. The fence must be solid and opaque.

**Rebecca Wayment** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

## **ZONE TEXT CHANGES**

### ***Motion:***

**Heather Barnum** made a motion that the Planning Commission move agenda item #10 (modifying the definition of adaptive reuse) up to be reviewed as the next item on the agenda. **Rebecca Wayment** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

### **Item #8. Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation to amend the Zoning Ordinance by modifying the definition of adaptive reuse to include certain commercial uses. (ZT-2-14)**

**David Petersen** provided a brief background on the item. **Craig Holmes** owns a windshield repair business in the BR zone. He would like to also do a U-Haul truck business rental, but it is not a permitted use in the BR zone. The Planning Commission approved a zone text change within the ordinance, but the City Council denied it on the basis that it would allow everyone the same conditional use opportunity within the entire zone. City Council wanted to preserve the historic nature of the City's downtown area. After a few requests, staff is again reviewing it. The business could now be allowed as a special exception under a modified definition of adaptive reuse within the Zoning Ordinance. Since Mr. Holmes has an historic building that is eligible for the historic registry, he would be allowed a special exception for his truck rental business. Mr. Holmes is the only one that would fit this requirement in the area. **David Petersen** read through the modified definition of adaptive reuse as shown in the staff report.

**Mack McDonald** opened the public hearing at 8:54 p.m.

**Craig Holmes**, 262 E. 2200 S., Kaysville, owns the property on 97 N. Main St. He explained he will only have one U-Haul unit in front of the business at a time and will be either a trailer or a small van. Any other rental equipment available will be placed behind the building.

**Mack McDonald** closed the public hearing at 8:55 p.m.

**Kent Hinckley** likes the idea of only one small trailer or van in front of the business, but asked staff how the Commission might regulate or monitor this. **David Petersen** said since the Applicant may come in as a special exception that would be added as a condition to the exception. He also added that if any of the Commissioners are not comfortable with the 10 permitted or conditional uses based on special exceptions if the owner meets the historic preservation eligibility criteria then let staff know so it can be removed from the list.

**Mack McDonald** stated he knows the owner will comply with all conditions the Commission determines, but in the end, customers returning rental trucks may not comply as they leave trucks in front of the business when returning them. He does not feel this type of business is congruent with the current feel of downtown Farmington.

**Rebecca Wayment** stated that some of the business uses along Main Street, like Mr. Holmes, are grandfathered in. She wondered what the conforming uses within the zone are. **David Petersen** said these uses are found in Chapter 15.

**Kris Kaufman** asked the Commissioners if there is any that is supportive of the zone text at shown in the staff report. None of the Commissioners were comfortable with the zone text change. He then asked how many would be supportive of an alternative motion to determine adaptive reuses. **Mack McDonald** stated he would not be supportive. **Kris Kaufman** never had a problem with it when it was previously before the Commission and he is supportive of the Applicant with all the time and money he has spent in trying to allow this rental business.

**Kent Hinckley** explained he is conflicted as he does not feel it appropriate to amend the ordinance to meet the needs of one person. He is also not comfortable with placing a U-Haul in front of a home after placing it with the historical distinction. **Craig Holmes** explained U-Haul was established by a WWII veteran and established his network through small downtowns like downtown Farmington. **Kent Hinckley** would like to see signage similar to what would have been found in these small downtowns as to possibly maintain the historic feel. **Craig Holmes** has been working with U-Haul headquarters to do some historical signage; however, the logo has hardly changed.

**Rebecca Wayment** does not feel the list of 10 uses provided in the staff report fit within the historic district of downtown Farmington. **Mack McDonald** agrees that it does not fit with the downtown feel.

**Heather Barnum** is not comfortable making a decision based on one situation. She does not feel it is a necessary change to make.

***Motion:***

**Heather Barnum** made a motion that the Planning Commission deny recommendation as stated in the staff report. **Kent Hinckley** seconded the motion. Heather Barnum, Kent Hinckley, Mack McDonald and Rebecca Wayment approved the motion; Kris Kaufman opposed it.

**Findings:**

1. It is not enough leverage to change the ordinance for one person and one circumstance.
2. There is not a need to add exceptions to the current ordinance.

**Kris Kaufman** added that had the motion been approved, he would have removed items 3, 6, 7 and 8 from the list of 10 adaptive reuses.

**Item #9. Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation to amend the Zoning Ordinance by modifying Chapter 12 regarding Conservation Subdivisions (ZT-3-14)**

**David Petersen** asked the Commission if they would like to discuss the item at this meeting; all were in agreement to continue the item until a later date. He suggested putting together a subcommittee that could review the changes in depth with staff at another time. The Commissioners felt all should be in attendance when reviewing the changes. **David Petersen** suggested having an early Study Session that is dedicated solely to reviewing these changes. The Commissioners agreed that is the best solution. The Study Session will begin at 5:30 p.m. on May 22, 2014.

***Motion:***

**Rebecca Wayment** made a motion that the Planning Commission continue item #9 (zone text amendment to Chapter 12) until the next Planning Commission meeting on May 22, 2014. **Kent Hinckley** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**Item #10. Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation to amend the Subdivision Ordinance by modifying the definition of flag lots. (ZT-4-14)**

**Eric Anderson** said the Commission and City Council have all provided input on amending the definition of flag lots to make the design requirements a little tighter.

**Mack McDonald** opened the public hearing at 9:33 p.m.

No comments were received.

**Mack McDonald** closed the public hearing at 9:33 p.m.

**David Petersen** stated there is one change to the amendment as proposed in the staff report; under design requirement k), the driveway standard is 14%, not 15% as listed.

***Motion:***

**Kent Hinckley** made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council amend Section 12-7-030 (10) of the Subdivision Ordinance to read as follows with the exception to k):

**12-7-030 Lots.**

**(10)** Flag lots may be approved by the Planning Commission and the City Council and are prohibited except:

1. To reasonably utilize an irregularly shaped parcel;
2. To reasonably utilize land with severe topography;
3. To provide for the protection of significant natural or environmentally sensitive areas;  
or
4. To allow a property owner reasonable use and benefit of a parcel of land not otherwise developable.

The creation of a flag lot subdivision, therefore all applicable subdivision ordinances, standards and regulation apply. Flag lots are for single family residential dwellings only and are prohibited if the proposed flag lot will increase the number of access points onto a major thoroughfare or re-subdivide an existing lot or lots in a recorded subdivision.

The design requirements for a flag lot are as follows:

- a) A flag lot shall be comprised of a stem portion and a flag portion.
- b) The stem portion must be contiguous to a dedicated public street.
- c) All buildings can be placed on the flag portion only.
- d) The front yard shall be considered one of the two sides of the flag portion that adjoins the stem and all buildings must face the front yard.
- e) A flag lot must comply with all requirements, standards and ordinances as determined by the underlying zone district in which it is located; this includes setbacks, building height accessory buildings, minimum lot size, etc.

- f) Minimum lot size calculations excluded the stem and only take the flag portion of the lot into considerations.
- g) The stem shall be at least 28' wide and no longer than 150' long.
- h) The stem shall service one lot only.
- i) No more than two flag lots shall be allowed in a subdivision.
- j) For back-to-back flag lots, a reduction of each stem to 20' wide is permitted where the stems abut one another.
- k) The access drive shall be at least 20' wide and no greater than a 14% grade. The drive shall be paved with a hard surface such as asphalt or concrete and conform to all applicable Fire Code regulations, including access to fire hydrants, emergency access and turnarounds.
- l) The access drive must have a minimum of 4' wide landscaped yard along both sides when no abutting stems exist, but when abutting stems exist, a 4' wide landscape yard will be required on the outside edge only.
- m) All utilities and related services (including easements) shall be provided to the flag lot in accordance with the applicable regulation and ordinances adopted by the City.

**Rebecca Wayment** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

**Findings:**

1. The proposed amendment is reasonably necessary because there is too much flexibility in the current ordinance;
2. The design requirement in the updated ordinance labeled c, d, g, h, i, j, k and l are the changes to the previous ordinance, and these requirements give stricter definition to flag lots and allow for less flexibility in flag lot design.
3. In addition to those design requirements listed above, broadening the definition on when flag lots are prohibited, places stricter regulations on the use of flag lots and when they are allowed.
4. The Farmington City General Plan is based on the overall goal of creating within the community a healthy, attractive and pleasant living environment for its residents. This goal is the most significant element underlying the General Plan. This text amendment strongly supports this goal.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***Motion:***

At 9:55 p.m., **Kris Kaufman** made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was unanimously approved.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Mack McDonald**  
**Farmington City Planning Commission**