FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
September 3, 2015

STUDY SESSION

Present: *Chair Rebecca Wayment, Commissioners Brett Anderson, Heather Barnum, Kent Hickley, Alex Leeman, and Dan Rogers, Community Development Director David Petersen, Associate City Planner Eric Anderson and Recording Secretary Lara Johnson. Commissioner Bret Gallacher was excused.*

Item #3. Jared May – Requesting Recommendation for Minor Plat Approval and a Waiver for the May PUD Subdivision

Eric Anderson said this item was previously recommended for denial as it did not meet the 10% open space requirement and the Commission did not feel the historic shed preservation in lieu of the open space was an adequate exchange. **Eric Anderson** said the City Council agreed with the Planning Commission that the historic shed preservation was not an appropriate exchange in lieu of the open space; however, the City Council did approve Mr. May's 3 lot schematic plan and gave staff direction to explore a zone text change to Chapter 27 of the Zoning Ordinance. Chapter 27 zone text has been amended to include a waiver of certain PUD standards; Mr. May is now requesting this waiver. **Brett Anderson** asked what the City receives in return for the waiver. **David Petersen** said the City Manager will negotiate just compensation. **Rebecca Wayment** expressed concern that approval of this item could then set a precedent that a waiver can be bought in lieu of open space. **David Petersen** said approval of the waiver is discretionary and is only available to parcels that do not exceed one acre. **Alex Leeman** asked about the layout of the 3 lots on the parcel. **David Petersen** explained Mr. May has shown how 3 lots fit; however, the lots would be awkwardly shaped and difficult to build on. By requesting a PUD, Mr. May is able to create 3 rectangular and more buildable lots.

Item #4. Ben Barrus – Requesting Recommendation for Farmington Creek Estates Phase III Plat Amendment and a Minor Plat (One Lot Subdivision)

David Petersen explained the history of this parcel in Farmington Creek Subdivision. When Phase III of the Subdivision was recorded, the City acquired a 20' wide strip of land next to the then D&RG rail road right-of-way (ROW) in hopes of providing a trail connection from 500 South to Glovers Lane. Additionally, the developer set aside land for a pocket park next to the trail ROW which has since been transferred to an inactive HOA. After the land was platted, UTA acquired the rail road ROW and announced a Rails to Trails project for it. Additionally, the City did not want an additional pocket park to maintain with the soon to be 40 acre regional park, 11 acre park next to the elementary school and another 10 acre park in the vicinity. The residents in the area approached the City about what could now be done. The City entered into a memorandum of understanding with the residents in the PUD that the City will deed the 20' strip of land to the property owners, and the HOA will deed a portion of the neighborhood park property to an adjacent owner and the remaining portions of this parcel be transferred to the City to establish a buildable lot. Residents and the City agreed upon these terms; however, the ordinance had to be amended to allow for it. Now that the ordinance has been amended, staff recommends approval of this item.

REGULAR SESSION

Present: *Chair Rebecca Wayment, Commissioners Brett Anderson, Heather Barnum, Kent Hickley, Alex Leeman, and Dan Rogers, Community Development Director David Petersen, Associate City Planner Eric Anderson and Recording Secretary Lara Johnson. Commissioner Bret Gallacher was excused.*

Item #1. Minutes

Kent Hinckley made a motion to approve the Minutes from the August 20, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. **Dan Rogers** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Item #2. City Council Report

Eric Anderson gave a report from the September 1, 2015 City Council meeting. He said Farmington Fields Plat Amendment and the Meadow View Conservation Subdivision Phase II Final Plat were both approved. The Eagle Cove Conservation Subdivision schematic plan was also approved as 16 lots, 13 of those being TDR lots, and with the cul-de-sac design layout, as was recommended by the Planning Commission.

SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

Item #3. Jared May (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting recommendation for minor plat approval, and a waiver of certain standards thereto, for the May PUD Subdivision consisting of 3 lots on .72 acres located at 984 North 300 West in an LR-F (Large Residential-Foothill) zone. (S-10-15)

Eric Anderson showed the vicinity map. He explained this is proposed as a 3 lot subdivision on .72 acres. The applicant has shown that he can get 3 10,000 sq. ft. lots; however, the 3 lots would be odd shaped and difficult to build on. The applicant is proposing 1 larger lot with 2 smaller 8,000 sq. ft. lots. As discussed in the Study Session, City Council requested staff do a zone text change for PUDs as found in Chapter 27 of the Zoning Ordinance. The approved provision now waives all PUD requirements, include the 10% open space requirement. **Eric Anderson** pointed out if the applicant fulfilled the 10% open space requirement as the lot currently stands, it would result in approximately 3,000 sq. ft. and would require an HOA to manage it. Although other options were discussed in exchange for the open space, the City Council felt a zone text change to waive the PUD standards would be a better option.

Brett Anderson asked if the applicant could still put 3 lots on the parcel if the waiver was not included. **Eric Anderson** said yes, he could still build 3 lots; he would just have to create an HOA for the 3,000 sq. ft. open space.

Jared May, 94 Compton Rd., said that the yield plan shows 3 rooftops; however, the lots would be odd-shaped. The waiver would make the lots more buildable. At the last City Council meeting, **Jared May** said he presented a petition of 60% of the surrounding neighbors that were in favor of the schematic plan with only 1 neighbor that was not in favor of it. He said many of the surrounding lots are 8,000 sq. ft. to 8,500 sq. ft. although the zone no longer allows for lots of that size. **Jared May** said the concerns the neighbor has brought up to him is that he does not want to live in a subdivision and feels this project would contribute to the feel of a subdivision. **Jared May** stated he feels this is the first of many new projects that could come to the area. He also stated that he feels leaving the current home located on the property is a detriment to the neighborhood.

Dan Rogers asked the applicant how long he has owned the lot. **Jared May** said he has owned the lot for 7 years. He explained he had this previously "pre-approved this plan in theory" by Max Forbush; however, boundaries have changed and other things have come up that have taken this process significantly longer to finalize. **Dan Rogers** asked the applicant if he purchased the lot with the proposal to subdivide it. **Jared May** said yes, he did purchase it to subdivide.

Heather Barnum asked if the size of home that will be built on the lots will be consistent with the homes surrounding it. **Jared May** said yes, the homes will be slightly larger than those surrounding the lot but will be consistent in the fact that it will not exceed the height. **Heather Barnum** asked if the yards will also be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. **Jared May** said the front setback should be approximately 20' and that the proposed houses may be slightly closer together than the surrounding homes.

Dan Rogers said this is a nice area and having driven by the current home on the property, he can sympathize with the community's desire to remove it. He does feel, however, that the area includes lots of open space with trees, grass and small homes. He feels what is being proposed will stand out in the neighborhood. **Jared May** said when he presented this to City Council, all but one of the neighbors petitioned that they were in favor of the project and that many are wanting to purchase the lots as they want to stay in the neighborhood.

Rebecca Wayment opened the Public Hearing at 7:21 p.m.

One email from a resident was received; the resident was not in favor of the development. The email was entered into public record. No other comments were received.

Rebecca Wayment closed the Public Hearing at 7:21 p.m.

Rebecca Wayment expressed concern that this project will not fit into the neighborhood, but understands residents' desire to remove the current dilapidated house. **Heather Barnum** also feels seeking a waiver for the 10% open space will all reduce the open feel of the neighborhood which will also make the project stand out even more. **Brett Anderson** pointed out that if there was a concern from the neighborhood about the density, there is an absence of opinion.

Brett Anderson asked for the setbacks of the lots. **David Petersen** said the applicant is proposing 20' front setback, 13' rear setback and a 7' side setback. **Rebecca Wayment** asked if the Commission has discretion to recommend setbacks in a PUD. She feels giving a deeper front setback may appear like there is more green space.

The Commissioners and staff reviewed the front setbacks of the surrounding homes in the area. Based on the review, many of the homes are setback further than what is being proposed by the applicant. **David Petersen** clarified that the front setback for the LR zone is 25'; under the PUD, the applicant is proposing 20'. **Rebecca Wayment** suggested the Commission approve the PUD and the waiver as well as add a condition that the front setback be 25' to be more consistent with the neighborhood.

The Commissioners continued to discuss the setbacks and the project. **Alex Leeman** feels that even with amended setbacks, he does not like a large home on a tiny lot. **Kent Hinckley** agreed and added that he did not feel comfortable the first time this project was presented and is still not

comfortable with it. **Heather Barnum** agreed, but added that requiring the front setback to be 25' would at least provide a little more "breathing room."

David Petersen asked the Commission for clarification. He asked if the Commission wanted to adhere to the LR zone setback requirements, except a small deviation to the rear setback on lot 3. **Heather Barnum** said yes; she feels comfortable making a recommendation that is consistent with the Ordinance.

Motion:

Heather Barnum made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Minor Plat for the May PUD Subdivision subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall receive a full waiver for any applicable PUD requirements as found in Chapter 27 of the zoning ordinance, except the setback deviation from the standard, through a vote of not less than four (4) members of the City Council;
2. All lots will meet the standard for setbacks as stated for the LR zone.

Dan Rogers seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Findings:

1. The proposed subdivision would match the densities of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. The proposed Minor Plat submittal is consistent with all necessary requirements for a Minor Plat as found in Chapter 5 of the City's Subdivision Ordinance.

Item #4. Ben Barrus (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation for a Farmington Creek Estates Phase III Plat Amendment and a minor plat (one lot subdivision) related thereto on .73 acres located at approximately 769 South Country Lane in an AE – PUD (Agricultural Estates – Planned Unit Development) zone, and a number of boundary adjustments along the eastern boundary of the PUD. (S-31-15)

David Petersen showed the vicinity map of the Farmington Creek Estates Phase III. He said the City is proposing a boundary adjustment with an adjacent property owner leaving the remainder of the HOA owned lot as a buildable lot. **David Petersen** said the one caveat that the City is requesting is that they reserve a trail easement to connect the subdivision to the D&RG trail.

Ben Barrus, 872 Country Lane, said staff adequately explained the request.

David Petersen also added that the City entered into an agreement that they will deed the 20' strip of property adjacent to the UTA Rails to Trails ROW to the property owners in exchange for the property owners requesting the boundary adjustment and that the City will receive a TDR for lot 320-A.

Alex Leeman asked if there have been any changes since this was previously presented to the Commission. **Ben Barrus** said the trail easement has been added, but stated that he feels it would be a smart addition. He also asked if the trail access will be built and maintained by the City. **David Petersen** said yes, it will be built and maintained by the City.

Rebecca Wayment opened the Public Hearing at 7:55 p.m.

Matthew Cameron, 754 County Ln., said he and his wife spent a long time looking for the right location to build a home. They picked their lot in Farmington because of the view of the mountains and the easy access to the trail system. He said he thoroughly reviewed the Master Plans for the PUD and decided to build on his lot as the lot across the street would be a park. He said upon moving in 2 weeks ago, he discovered a home will be built in the lot across the street. He expressed frustration that the design of the Master Subdivision Plan included a park; he asked the Commission not to deviate from the original plan.

Bryan Justesen, 803 Country Lane, suggested putting the trail easement on the north side. He also briefly explained a little of the history of this item. He said the builder was supposed to put the park in, but did not. After the recession in 2008, the builder went out of business. He created an unformed HOA to try and collect money for the creation of the park. **Bryan Justesen** said they made an attempt to see if residents in the community were interested in putting money toward the park, but only 30% agreed to contribute and pay for maintenance. Since there was not enough support, residents felt selling the property would be beneficial as it would give someone an opportunity to take care of it.

Ben Barrus also added that this solution being presented to the Commission has been 11 years in the making. He hopes a resolution can soon be reached.

Rebecca Wayment closed the Public Hearing at 8:02 p.m.

David Petersen said he will further look into putting the trail between the lots or, as suggested, putting the trail on the north side of the lot. **Rebecca Wayment** asked for more clarification on the location of the proposed trail easement. **David Petersen** showed the locations on the vicinity map. He said the City will have to further review the location of the wetlands to best determine the location of the trail easement. **Heather Barnum** suggested adding a condition that the applicant work with staff to determine the best location of the trail easement based on wetlands impact and the drainage easement.

Dan Rogers asked if the Commission is able to address any of Matthew Cameron's concerns. **David Petersen** said Mr. Cameron's concerns are valid; however, in reviewing it in a bigger context, what is being proposed is an adequate solution. He added that the City Parks and Recreation Department did not want the pocket park and the homeowners did not want to pay for an HOA park. In the near vicinity of the subdivision will be the City's 50 acre park, the 11 acre park adjacent to the new elementary school and the 10 acre park on 1100 West and Glover Lane.

Motion:

Alex Leeman made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend approval to amend the plat for the Farmington Creek Estates Phase III PUD by implementing a boundary adjustment and establishing an additional lot in place of the park property located at 769 South Country Lane (.73 acres), and approve boundary adjustments along the entire east boundary of the PUD thereby eliminating a 20' wide strip of property now owned by the City, subject to all applicable Farmington City codes, ordinances, and development standards and the attached memorandum of understating between the property owners and Farmington City and with the condition that the City retain a trail access easement and that the applicant work with staff to select the best location for the trail easement. **Heather Barnum** seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Findings:

1. In May of this year, property owners within the PUD and Farmington City entered into a memorandum of understanding whereby the City agreed to deed a 20' strip of land to the

owners, and the HOA agreed to deed a portion of the neighborhood park property to an adjacent owner and remaining portions of this parcel to the City for purposes of establishing a building lot.

2. Upon receiving a recommendation for the Planning Commission, the City Council approved amendments to the Zoning Ordinance on August 18, 2015 enabling the additional lot within the PUD, and approval of the boundary adjustments, while at the same time reducing the total amount of open space for the development.
3. The 20' wide strip of "trail" property is no longer needed because the UTA established a trail next to the PUD which connects 500 South to Glover's Lane.
4. The 20' wide property as presently situated is difficult to maintain, but now each abutting property owner will be able to maintain their respective strip of additional land.
5. A pocket park is no longer needed on Country Lane due to the close proximity of the new Elementary School in the vicinity, the City's new 10 acre park next to the school, and the regional park north of the PUD.

CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS

Item #5. Brad Knowlton/Ascent Construction (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting approval for a conditional use related to a new office building located at the northwest corner of Park Lane and Main Street in a BP (Business Park) zone. (C-9-15)

Eric Anderson said the applicant is proposing a 2 story office building on the corner of Park Lane and Main Street. He said the parking for the building will be located on the west and north side of the building. The applicant has met the requirement for 15% open space. **Eric Anderson** also reviewed the standards of Section 11-14-050 regarding minimum lot and setback standards allowing the building to be brought closer to the street and Section 11-7-107)7)(b) regarding a buffer between a residential property and a proposed use of a commercial nature. The Ordinance explains a buffer may include a 6' high masonry fence and/or 30' buffer zone with sufficient landscaping surrounding it. **Eric Anderson** said staff felt this item should be presented to the Commission. Based on what the Commission feels regarding the buffer, the proposed site plan could change significantly. Staff wanted direction prior to final site plan review. **Eric Anderson** also requested the Commission delegate final site plan review to staff. He added that if the site plan does not move, the plan does meet all site development standards as found in Chapter 7.

Rebecca Wayment asked what the current buffer is on the site plan with the adjacent residential property. **Eric Anderson** said the buffer is 5' from parking lot to property owner with an approximately 5' change in elevation from property line to curb and gutter.

Bob Murri, 513 Greystone Dr., said he is representing Brad Knowlton of Ascent Construction. He stated that the Davis Economic Development Groups is working to promote offices in Davis County so residents can live, work and play here. The proposed building is approximately 22,000 sq. ft. with approximately 11,000 sq. ft. He said the building meets all City requirements, codes and ordinances. With regards to the buffer, there is currently a 5' buffer, but it will feel larger as the building is pushed to front Park Lane and Main Street. **Bob Murri** explained it would be very costly to move the site at this time. He also feels they have met the standard as there is already a constructed 6' masonry wall.

Rebecca Wayment asked for further clarification on the masonry wall. **Bob Murri** stated the wall is already constructed by the Hampton Inn on the western border of the site down to the residential property line. They would extend the wall along the north side of the site to the road. He

said they would use the same material on the wall or are open to other suggestions, like Farmington Rock, for the wall.

Rebecca Wayment opened the Public Hearing at 8:26 p.m.

Debbie DeJong, 763 N. Main St., expressed some concerns with the proposed development. She said as a resident of Farmington for 36 years, she has worked to preserve as much integrity of Main St. as possible. She explained she understands the progress that is happening within Farmington and is in support of it; however, she feels the proposed building is more contemporary and is not conducive to the Main Street look and feel. Also, she is in favor of putting a 30' buffer between the residential home and the commercial use. She feels that buffer should also include trees as she is very upset about the trees that were previously removed. She also asked why the parking stalls on the north side of the parking lot, as shown on the schematic plan, were wider than other stalls in the parking lot.

Pat DeJong, 715 N. Main St., said she feels a 6' masonry fence would be sufficient. She asked for further details on the lighting as the hotel lights always flood into her windows. She also suggested that 2 driveways would help mitigate the increase in traffic this building will bring, although, the short distance to the traffic light on Main St. may cause problems. She also asked what will be parked in the larger parking stalls, as previously mentioned. She asked that the Commission thoroughly view this item before any final decisions are made.

Brad Knowlton, 478 Island View Cir., said he is looking forward to this project and feels it will be a great addition to the City. He said he is not looking for any additional standards that were given to the Hampton Inn. He feels the 5' buffer and the 6' wall is a sufficient buffer. He also has plans to include a nice landscaped buffer as well. With regards to concerns about the larger parking stalls, he assured the residents no equipment or heavy trucks will be stored at this location; the proposed building is a professional office. **Dan Rogers** asked Mr. Knowlton why there was a different size of parking stalls if it is not for heavy equipment. **Brad Knowlton** said it is more convenient to have larger stalls for those driving pickup trucks.

Brad Knowlton also added that it would be challenging to move their site plan 30' to accommodate a buffer as UDOT has plans to expand Park Lane which will drastically decrease the front setbacks. **Alex Leeman** asked what the shaded box area is located at the North West corner of the building as shown on the site plan. **Brad Knowlton** said it is a required loading and unloading area; although, he said he is unsure why it is a requirement.

Dan Rogers asked if there is a restriction for normal business hours found in the Ordinance. **David Petersen** said no, there is not a restriction on business hours.

Rebecca Wayment closed the Public Hearing at 8:44 p.m.

Bob Murri explained UDOT granted 2 accesses as they own the ROW on Main Street and Park Lane. The Park Lane access will be the main entrance; the Main Street access will be for emergency purposes only and will have a crash gate on it. If the Commission requires a 30' buffer to the residential property, it may impact the ability of emergency services being able to access the facility through the Main Street access. **David Petersen** stated the applicant may get re-approval from UDOT to move the access; however, that is not ideal. He also said currently the applicant has 16 more stalls than what the ordinance requires.

David Petersen asked the applicant if the current site plan reflects UDOT's ROW for the widening of Park Lane. **Brad Knowlton** said the site plan does not currently reflect the UDOT's street

dedication for Park Lane, but the current plans take it into account so that is why the building sits backs further on the site plan. He again stated that he feels they are not asking for anything that was not granted to the hotel. **Heather Barnum** asked if the hotel was granted a waiver of the buffer. **David Petersen** said no as the hotel property does not touch residential property, otherwise the buffer would have been taken into consideration. **Brad Knowlton** questioned why there is not a buffer between the small home located on the south east side of the hotel on Park Lane. **David Petersen** said that property is zoned as Business Park (BP) so the current 6' masonry fence satisfied all requirements. The proposed site plan is adjacent to a residential property, to the north, which will remain residentially zoned.

Brett Anderson explained that he feels the Ordinance may not be clear as to if the Commission gets to dictate which buffer is required, the 6' masonry wall and/or the 30' buffer, or if the applicant gets to choose one or both and then it fulfills the requirement. The Commissioners discussed their interpretations of the Ordinance. The Commissioners want to ensure the right interpretation is made; however, they also want to do what's best for the City and for the residents. **Bob Murri** explained he feels they have met the condition with the 6' fence. He offered that they are also willing to go higher on the fence if that provides a more adequate buffer for the resident. **Brett Anderson** said he feels as it is currently written, the Ordinance does not imply that other buffer alternatives are available, like a buffer distance less than 30' or a wall could be taller than 6'. He asked staff to include this standard within the Ordinance as part of a later discussion to ensure it is better clarified.

Heather Barnum asked the applicant about the distance from the back of the wall on the north side of the parking lot to the edge of the second row of parking stalls. **Scott Evans,** the architect of the site plan, said it is 24'; however, he was told that the emergency access from Main Street would only need to be 20'. **David Petersen** said that the City standard is 24' so that distance would need to at least meet that standard.

Rebecca Wayment stated that she feels that is it critical to maintain the feel of small town Farmington along Main Street. She feels the City should include a 30' buffer as it is an office building adjacent to a residential area and this buffer is to assist in maintaining the look of Farmington. **Heather Barnum** agreed; she feels that other businesses on Main Street, like the Lagoon office building, have maintained the look and feel of downtown Farmington with trees and landscaping.

Kent Hinckley said he felt a judgment should not be passed on this item tonight as there needs to be more clarity as to if the City or the developer has the option to pick "and/or" with regards to a 6' masonry fence or a 30' buffer. The Commissioners discussed the reason for a buffer. Based on Section 11-7-107(7)(b), the buffer is to provide suppression of sound and light and not to preserve a look and feel.

Brett Anderson asked for more information on the applicant's lighting plan. **Bob Murri** said the parking lot lights will be on a timer. If it is night, the lights will be adjusted off; they will not remain on all night like the hotel.

David Petersen suggested that the City Attorney be consulted to determine if the Ordinance reads the requirement as a 30' buffer or up to 30' as well as determine who dictates the "and/or" of the buffer options. He did also add that based on Section 11-14-050, the side and rear setback may not be less than 10' so the current 5' buffer will need to be increased to at least 10'. **David Petersen** also suggested that a site plan be presented showing the Park Lane expansion and that staff discuss with UDOT the option of the Heiner home as that would allow the developer more flexibility. **Brett Anderson** also asked if the loading and unloading area can be reviewed to see if it is necessary. **Rebecca Wayment** is comfortable tabling the item until questions presented receive adequate solutions.

Motion:

Heather Barnum made a motion that the Planning Commission table the item based on the following items:

1. Review by the City Attorney on Section 11-7-107(7)(b);
2. A plan is proposed showing the Park Lane Expansion;
3. Consult with UDOT to discuss their timeline for the Park Lane expansion and to discuss potential hardship negotiations for the Heiner Home that is located on Park Lane;
4. Ask for further clarification on the 20' versus the 24' requirement for the emergency access on Main Street;
5. Review of the loading and unloading drop off requirement;
6. Request that these items be expedited.

Dan Rogers seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Item #6. Michael King/Azure Midstream (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting approval for a conditional use and site plan related to a new office space and light industrial uses on a property located at 1262 South 650 West in a LM&B (Light Manufacturing and Business) zone. (C-11-15)

Eric Anderson said this is a conditional use request for light metal repair. It is for 2 units, as shown on the Site Plan in the staff report; one unit will be a single office place and the other is a small warehouse. This use is compatible for the LM&B zone. Staff is recommending approval of this item.

The applicant was not present at this meeting.

Rebecca Wayment opened the Public Hearing at 9:26 p.m.

No comments were received.

Rebecca Wayment closed the Public Hearing at 9:26 p.m.

Rebecca Wayment asked what is surrounding this location. **Eric Anderson** said it is near the soccer fields and dance studio. **Rebecca Wayment** asked if there are plans for a 4 way stop to assist with traffic at 650 West and Glovers Lane. **Eric Anderson** said with the new high school, it will be reviewed.

Motion:

Dan Rogers made a motion that the Planning Commission approve a conditional use permit for the Azure Midstream office to be located at 1262 South 650 West, subject to all applicable Farmington City codes, ordinances, and development standards and the following conditions:

1. Normal business hours shall be limited to 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday;
2. No hazardous materials will be stored on site;
3. Equipment storage inside the building shall be maintained at ground level, and there will be no stacked storage racks.

Alex Leeman seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Findings:

1. The proposed use is very low impact in comparison to most light industrial and manufacturing uses.
2. The proposed use of the particular location is necessary to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the community.
3. The proposed use complies with the regulations and conditions in the Farmington City ordinance for such use.
4. The proposed use conforms to the goals, policies and governing principles of the Comprehensive General Plan for Farmington City.
5. The proposed use is compatible with the character of the site, adjacent properties, surrounding neighborhoods and other existing and proposed developments.
6. Adequate utilities, transportation access, drainage, parking and loading space, lighting, screening, landscaping and open space, fire protection and safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular circulation are available.
7. Such use shall not, under the circumstances of this particular application, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the persons resigning or working in the vicinity, or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity.

OTHER BUSINESS

Item #7. Miscellaneous: A) Farmington Rock Discussion

David Petersen said staff discussed Farmington Rock with the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and that he feels they are just as divided as the Planning Commission. The HPC pointed out there are many historic residential homes and nonresidential uses within the City that do use Farmington Rock. He said there are also many buildings within the City that have Farmington Rock. He feels an appropriate compromise would be to have a designate area, like possibly the OTR zone, that will have a Farmington Rock standard. The Commissioners on the HPC felt this may be an adequate compromise. **David Petersen** said he will draft changes then re-present them to the Commission for review and a recommendation before the item re-appears on the Planning Commission agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

At 9:55 p.m., Heather Barnum made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was unanimously approved.

Rebecca R Wayment

Rebecca Wayment
Chair, Farmington City Planning Commission