FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
October 5, 2017

STUDY SESSION

Present: *Chair Heather Barnum, Commissioners Roger Child, Connie Deianni, Bret Gallacher, Kent Hinckley, Alex Leeman, and Rebecca Wayment, Community Development Director David Petersen, and Recording Secretary Heidi Gordon. Associate City Planner Eric Anderson was excused.*

New Planning Commissioner Introduction

Roger Child introduced himself as the newest member of the Planning Commission. He has lived in Farmington for the last 25 years, specifically in the old town area of the City. He works for the LDS Church where he was instrumental in turning welfare farms into commercial and residential developments for many years. He currently works for the temple department in property acquisition and market feasibility to determine the highest priority of needs for temples globally. He said he is in a PhD program for Urban Planning and Economics at the University of Utah. **David Petersen** pointed out that every area of the City is now being represented on the Planning Commission.

Item #3. Joe Kennard – Requesting a recommendation for schematic plan and preliminary PUD master plan approval of the proposed 41 lot Mountain View PUD Subdivision; and a recommendation for a rezone of 11.93 acres of property from AE to R

David Petersen said the applicant was trying to assess the Planning Commission thoughts on the development, so they came before the Commission during the Study Session at the last meeting to discuss a few things at the table. The applicant felt they received a lot of great feedback. **David Petersen** provided a little information on the property. He said the property east of 650 W. used to be owned by the Bangerter family, which was used for farming. He said when UDOT purchased the property from Mr. Bangerter, Mr. Bangerter purchased additional property by the new City gym and started farming there. **David Petersen** said UDOT has stored pipes on this property, but also used about two-thirds of the original property to build Legacy Parkway. He said a while back, the applicant contacted UDOT and was able to negotiate the sale of the remaining property as surplus property. **David Petersen** said the property is currently zoned AE. The applicant is seeking a higher density than the ½ acre lots allowed in the AE zone because the property is close to Station Park, the charter school, City gym, and other new developments. He said the applicant is seeking to rezone the property from AE to R (Residential), which allows for 8,000 sq. ft. lots on a yield plan.

David Petersen said the applicant is also proposing a Planned Unit Development (PUD) in addition to the rezone. He said there are 3 similar developments within the City that have been well received, which are Ovation Homes, the Fairways of Oakridge, and the most recent development Kestrel Bay Estates. He said the applicant has recruited the builder of Kestrel Bay, Brighton Homes, to be the builder of the proposed development. **David Petersen** pointed out that the Kestrel Bay subdivision has been well received by the neighborhood.

David Petersen explained the approval process the applicant is currently going through with each step of their application. He said for a property rezone, the application seeks a recommendation

from the Planning Commission with an included public hearing, and then seeks a final decision from the City Council with a public hearing. He said for a PUD, a preliminary PUD master plan is presented to the Planning Commission for a recommendation, then to the City Council for a final decision. **David Petersen** said both the rezone and PUD are legislative acts, which gives the City a lot of discretion in the state of Utah. He also mentioned that a PUD is like adding another zone on top of a zone. **David Petersen** said for the subdivision process, the applicant presents the schematic plan with a public hearing for recommendation by the Planning Commission, then to the City Council with a public hearing for a final decision. He said the applicant is trying to group all first steps and initial public hearings together. If the applicant makes it past the first steps, and the rezone is approved by City Council, the applicant then presents the final PUD master plan for a recommendation by the Planning Commission, and then a final decision by the City Council. The applicant will also be presenting the preliminary plat and then final plat for a final decision by the Planning Commission. **David Petersen** said the final PUD master plan and the preliminary and final plats are administrative acts; they also do not require additional public hearings. He said at this point, the most important decision to be considering is the rezone, which the commissioners can vote either for or against a recommendation to the City Council regarding it.

The commissioners expressed concern that the subdivision feels "too crowded," and that the applicant is seeking a density bonus in exchange for open space, but then is requesting a waiver for the open space because he cannot meet the open space requirement. **David Petersen** mentioned that many of the residents that came to the previous public hearing feel that the environment surrounding their properties has changed. They do not feel the property has the "feel" of the AE zone. He said staff has even been approached by a few property owners to discuss trying to get commercial developments in the area. He feels many of the residents are lamenting that the area has changed, but they still want value for their property. He feels something like this development will allow the property owners to maintain their property values.

Connie Deianni asked about the traffic this development might add to 650 W., as was mentioned in the previous public hearing by a few concerned residents. **David Petersen** said based on previous experience, like Kestrel Bay, a minor collector road can handle additional trips from a housing subdivision. He said the City can pay a traffic engineer to review it, but said the City has done that enough times to know the result will be insignificant.

Item #4. Misc.

David Petersen explained to the commission how a building height is determined. He said a property owner can manipulate grade in order to meet building height requirements; however, what is being proposed is a small element of the house that sticks up past the maximum building height requirement.

REGULAR SESSION

Present: *Chair Heather Barnum, Commissioners Roger Child, Connie Deianni, Bret Gallacher, Kent Hinckley, Alex Leeman, and Rebecca Wayment, Community Development Director David Petersen, and Recording Secretary Heidi Gordon. Associate City Planner Eric Anderson was excused.*

Item #1. Minutes

Rebecca Wayment made a motion to approve the Minutes from the September 21, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. **Connie Deianni** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Item #2. City Council Report

David Petersen gave a report from the October 3, 2017 City Council meeting. He said a budget update was given; Farmington City received more sales tax than originally anticipated. He also said each department has kept their budget down over the last year, which has helped the City come in significantly under budget. He also said the Swain PUD Subdivision Schematic Plan and Preliminary PUD Master Plan was approved without any concerns. A revision was also passed for the demolition standards within the Ordinance.

Heather Barnum also took a moment to introduce **Roger Child**, the newest member of the Planning Commission. **Roger Child** briefly highlighted his experience and qualifications.

SUBDIVISION / PRELIMINARY PUD MASTER PLAN / REZONE

Item #3. Joe Kennard (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation for schematic plan and preliminary PUD master plan approval of the proposed 40 lot Mountain View PUD Subdivision on 11.93 acres of property located at approximately 650 West and 250 South, and a rezone from AE (Agriculture Estates) to an R (Residential) zone related thereto. (S-12-17 and Z-2-17)

David Petersen showed the property on an aerial map. He said most of the property was once Bangerter Farms when UDOT purchased it and used two-thirds of it to build Legacy Parkway. The applicant approached UDOT and had the property declared as surplus property so he could purchase it. He said the property is zoned AE, which allows for ½ acre lots. **David Petersen** said the applicant is asking to rezone the property to the R zone, which has a minimum lot size of 8,000 sq. ft. He said the applicant is also seeking a density bonus. For the R zone, the applicant's yield plan results in 34 lots, so the applicant is seeking a 20% density bonus, which would result in an additional 6 lots.

David Petersen said the applicant is fashioning the development after three others found within the City, Ovation Homes, the Fairways of Oakridge, and Kestrel Bay Estates. The applicant would like to do detached single-family homes.

David Petersen said the applicant is requesting a PUD to obtain the density and lot sizes that are being proposed. As part of the PUD process, the applicant is required to provide open space. He referenced the schematic plan in the staff report. He said the middle entrance into the subdivision has open space placed at the east end of it, which will also include a trailhead. He said there is another parcel of open space in the southwest corner; this parcel helps the City because the long dead-end currently does not have a turnaround for fire trucks or snowplows. The proposed open space parcel would solve an issue the City has had for some time. **David Petersen** said the City requires a second point of access into the subdivision because it exceeds 24 lots. He explained the applicant previously had two strips of open space on each side of the road, but has since shifted the road to the north resulting in one open space parcel to the south of the road that will be used for a detention basin. **David Petersen** said the applicant still falls 7% short of the 20% open space requirement required for the density bonus, so the applicant is seeking a waiver from the City Council. He explained the waiver is not like a special exception, but comes at quite a cost to the developer. He said the money obtained by the waiver is used for open space elsewhere within the City.

Heather Barnum asked staff how often developers ask for a density bonus in exchanged for a higher open space percentage, but then seeks a waiver for that open space. **David Petersen** said he does not know an exact number; however, he feels almost every PUD has asked for a waiver of some degree or another since the waiver was amended in the ordinance. He said the City has only received approximately 3-4 waiver requests since the waiver was introduced a few years ago.

Roger Child asked if the City is trying to assemble open space funds for any future projects. **David Petersen** said open space funds would be used for the City's new regional park.

Rebecca Wayment said she understands that PUDs can request a waiver of open space, but she is uncomfortable with the current applicant's request because they are seeking a density bonus by providing additional open space, but then seeking a waiver for that open space. She feels what the applicant is requesting is a "double dip" on the way the Ordinance is written. She feels it should be one or the other. **David Petersen** said he is not sure if other applicants have requested something similar, but he can research it.

Alex Leeman asked what the default lot size is within the R zone. **David Petersen** said the current AE zone allows for ½-acre lots, but the R zone is 8,000 sq. ft. lots. He said a huge percentage of the homes around the cemetery, the Sommerset subdivision, the orchard homes off of 1400 N., and most of the homes around the Oakridge Golf Course are all in an R zone. He said the R zone was one of the main residential zone used within the City until the mid-1980s. He said shortly after that time, the most prevalent zone became the LR (Low-Density Residential) with 10,000 sq. ft. lots. He said there are now more LR zones than R zones within the City. **Alex Leeman** asked for clarification that the applicant is seeking a density bonus on the yield plan even within the R zone that allows for smaller lots. **David Petersen** said yes; he said even if the applicant requests for a rezone to the LR zone, it would decrease the density, but the applicant could still seek a density bonus and waiver for the open space. He said one of the major differences between the R zone and the LR zone is that the LR zone allows homes to have a secondary dwelling unit if it meets the building code. He said secondary dwelling units are not allowed within the R zone, but that the lot sizes are 2,000 sq. ft. smaller.

Kent Hinckley said it was mentioned that waivers for open space are costly, but pointed out that they must be still be economical enough for the developer to still seek one. **David Petersen** said the developers sit down with the City Manager and present their profit projections, among other things, to him. He said developers often have much to gain with a development; however, there is significant risk to developing, so developers have to maintain their margin of profit to make it worth the risk. He said the City Manager takes all the information presented by the developer into account, but also makes the waiver worth it for the City. **David Petersen** said the City has obtained up to $85,000 for a waiver in the past, so waivers can be very beneficial for the City.

Randy Rigby, 245 S. Cobblecreek Rd., said he is here with his business partner, Joe Kennard and Brighton Homes' president, Patrick Scott. He said he is a 63-year citizen of Farmington; he has traveled this property for many years as his family helped settle Farmington. He said he also owns property that is now being developed into Miller Meadows Subdivision. He said he takes pride in developing something that will make the community proud. He said his hope for this subdivision is for it to be a win-win for everyone. He thanked the Planning Commission for taking their time and effort to listen and thoroughly review this project. He thanked staff for working candidly with them through various issues. He also thanked his neighbors and residents of the community for working with him and his partners. He said he recognizes there is a lot of change happening around this area, and he understands it has not been easy for those living here. He appreciates all the feedback that has been given by the neighbors. He said they are working hard to be mindful of the neighbors' needs, but are also trying to allow the

neighbors (or their children) the opportunity to have maximum value for their property at some point. He said the City Manager stated to him that he is not in favor of having open space just for the sake of having open space. The City Manager feels it is sensible to use open space in other locations of the City where it makes more sense. **Randy Rigby** said they feel the proposed open space does make sense. He said the open space parcel on the southwest corner better helps the community by providing a turnaround for fire trucks and snow plows. The open space in the middle of the subdivision provides a beautiful entrance into the community. The open space located on the south of the access into the subdivision will serve as a detention basin, but will also provide a nice entrance into the community. He said the open space grounds will be kept within the PUD, so an HOA will maintain the grounds in perpetuity so it will continue to look nice. He thanked everyone, and asked for the Commission's support in this project.

Roger Child asked the applicant about the starting price point for the homes. **Randy Rigby** said they would have liked to build another Miller Meadows type subdivision; however, looking at the development costs and the location of this property next to the overpass and Legacy Parkway, they knew this project would have to be more of a transitional piece. He said it is important to them to keep this property as single-family residential homes, and that they have seen how well the Ovation Homes and Kestrel Bay projects have been received. He said he recognizes the need for higher density single-family residential projects for young, growing families and retirees that want a smaller lot with little maintenance. He said their price point for these homes would be approximately $350,000 to $450,000.

Heather Barnum asked the applicant if their target audience is the retiree type community. She expressed concern that the elevations provided to the Commission were of two-story homes, which she does not see as being a good fit for that community. **Randy Rigby** said they would offer 1 and 2-story homes so there will be a combination of older and younger families. In talking with the builder, they feel it is good for marketing to maintain flexibility so the homes are not just limited to the 55+ market. **Heather Barnum** mentioned to the applicant that there are a lot of concerns from citizens regarding the ingress and egress of the traffic. She feels it is something to consider with a younger target audience, as the traffic will be heavier among this community.

Heather Barnum asked if the homes would have basements. **Randy Rigby** said due to the high water table, the homes would not have basements.

Heather Barnum asked about the proposed side, back, and front setbacks and what the Ordinance requires. **David Petersen** referenced the applicant's schematic plan, as found in the staff report. He said the rear setback is proposed as 15' and both sides as 5'. He said it would be similar to the Kestrel Bay, Ovation Homes, and the Fairways of Oakridge projects. **Heather Barnum** asked if the setbacks meet the Ordinance. **David Petersen** said the Ordinance requires 8' on one side setback, and 10' on the other, but the applicant is proposing 5' for both side setback as part of the PUD. **Heather Barnum** asked about the front setback. **David Petersen** said the applicant is proposing 20' to the garage, and the Ordinance requirement is 25' front setback for the R zone. **Randy Rigby** added that a few of the residents have expressed a desire to have fencing around the project. He said they are planning to build a 6' solid fence around the property to be mindful of the neighbors, especially those with horse property, but that would also help with the rear setback around the outside lots of the community.

Roger Child asked if any of the adjacent neighbors have expressed interest in developing their own property. **Randy Rigby** said there is little desire by the current property owners; however, the property owners are aware that their children may want to consider it down the road. He said they are trying to work with the property owners to ensure access can still take place for development in the future.

Heather Barnum said that the Planning Commission previously committed to hold another public hearing for the residents to see what the applicant decided to do with a revised plan. She said the changes include removing one lot, providing and rearranging of the open space and an easement for the City.

Heather Barnum opened the public hearing at 7:44 p.m.

Todd Gibbs, 595 W. 350 S., said he attended at the last meeting when the applicant presented his plans; he was anxious to see what changes would be made. He said he is concerned about the impact this project will have on 650 W. since the community has yet to see the full impact the high school and City park will have on the road. He said he previously heard from many of the commissioners that there was concern regarding the proposed density of this project, and the applicant decreased the density by 2%. He said 2% is not enough to change his feelings of this development, and he does not believe that is enough to change the impact on the area. He asked that the commissioners maintain the type of neighborhood they currently have with regards to lower density housing, and wait to see the impact of everything else coming in before another project is added.

Krissy Guess, 553 W. 250 S., said she has concerns with the proposed density. She said she feels only removing one lot from what was previously proposed is like a "slap in the face." She said she would love to see a project that more closely resembles Miller Meadows. She said the property that the project is being proposed on is very ugly, and she would love to see it cleaned up; however, she does not feel there needs to be so many homes in the project. She also expressed concern about the impact all the young families will make on the elementary schools because class sizes just keep getting larger and larger with the new growth. She also asked if a fire station is proposed for the west because it needs one.

Paulette Hewitt, 541 W. 250 S., provided pictures of Kestrel Bay Estates to the Commission. She said she does not feel the surrounding neighborhood is opposed to having homes built on the property because the property is currently a big mess. She would like to see something similar to Miller Meadows. She referenced the pictures she provided to the Commission. Kestrel Bay does not have any sidewalks, it has a gazebo in the middle of grass and sidewalk that looked completely empty, the homes' central air units are approximately 2 ½' apart from each other with the small side setbacks, and there is no way to access the back of the homes if there is a fire. She said she recognizes ½-acre lots are not going to happen for this property, but she asked if the lots could be closer to ¼ acre, similar to Miller Meadows' smallest lots. She expressed concern regarding the placement of open space, the amount of open space proposed, and what the open space could look like down the road. She is also concerned about the traffic impact it will have on the area.

Taunalee Homer, 586 W. 250 S., said the applicant has proposed a parcel of open space on 250 S., but it will not be something that can be accessed by the proposed community. She said there is currently a turnaround/trail head on that parcel that is not maintained by UDOT at all. She asked who is responsible for maintaining the space along Legacy Trail, as it seems no one is maintaining it. She also asked if the 2-story homes will be proposed along the back line of the project and the single level homes be located on the interior. She is concerned that if 2-story homes are allowed along her side of the property, her mountain view will be destroyed.

Eric Oldroyd, 558 W. 350 S., said he came tonight hoping there was a good faith effort on the applicant's part to meet the concerns presented at the last meeting, but the project was only reduced by one lot. He said he is not against the project, but does not think that many lots are needed. He feels what is being proposed will be beautiful homes. He said there has been talk of apartments on this

property by the community; however, he does not think the Planning Commission would recommend apartments anyways. **Alex Leeman** clarified that apartments have not been proposed, and that a zone change would have to happen in order for apartments to be considered.

Heather Barnum entered in an email received by resident Jim Checketts.

Heather Barnum closed the public hearing at 7:58 p.m.

Alex Leeman said his concerns with the previous plans were addressed regarding open space parcels B & D, but he understands now that the placement of those were because the neighbors aren't interested in selling their lots. He expressed concern that when the adjacent property owners would like to develop (or the property owners' children do), it is the City's hope that those developing would do so in a way to maintain the continuity of the neighborhood layout and the way the roads are put in. He expressed concern on how that could happen if the open space is adjacent to the roads. He asked how the City could ensure continuity without losing dedicated open space or preventing logical development of the surrounding area. **Randy Rigby** said, as was previously mentioned two weeks ago at the discussion during the Study Session with the Commission, they are very open to do whatever will work the best. He said in working with staff, he and staff felt setting the open space aside as a retention basin was a good solution. If a future developer wanted to come and access the road, the detention basin would have to be released by the HOA and City, which would require a future developer to replace it in another location or meet the City's standards to release it. **Alex Leeman** still expressed concern on how that would all take place. He asked where the detention basin could be moved. **Randy Rigby** said he is unsure, as that would be up to a future developer. **David Petersen** said an easement of restriction could be placed on the open space to ensure the open space would have to be made up somewhere.

Alex Leeman said he is concerned that for whatever reason, a property owner chooses not to plug into the current road system, then this road remains without homes along it. He wants to make sure future development comes in the "right way." **Randy Rigby** said it is not their desire to hold the property hostage so others cannot develop in the right way, and that they are open to looking for the right vehicle to ensure future development fits into the continuity of the area. He said that his mother owned property in Centerville, but did not want to develop when the surrounding property around her did. He said they are now having to deal with creating that continuity on those 10 acres of property when it could have easily been resolved when the surrounding property was developed. He said he wants to make sure that does not happen to this area; however, he respects the current adjacent property owners' decision not to develop at this time. **Alex Leeman** suggested looking into an option to record an agreement within the HOA documents that the HOA is to work with adjacent property owners in the future regarding the potential purchase of the property. He feels something like this, or another creative solution should be included to ensure the continuity of this area of the City.

Bret Gallacher said that he recognizes the adjacent property owners' desire not to sell; he said he does not feel it is this applicant's responsibility to foresee any possible development and to plan for all sorts of scenarios to ensure development happens in the way we would like it to happen. **Alex Leeman** said he agrees; however, he feels it is the Planning Commission's responsibility to look at that to ensure it happens. He said that he commends the applicant for all the work they have done, especially with regards to working to meet the neighbors' needs. He feels future developers would be silly not to plug into the proposed roadway and utility systems that the developer is proposing.

Roger Child asked if system improvements, like water and sewer, have been included to accommodate future development. **Randy Rigby** said yes, all of those concerns have been addressed and resolved by the DRC.

Randy Rigby said it was mentioned in the public hearing that UDOT owns the parcel on 250 S. He said that is true; however, it is not a trailhead, as was previously mentioned in the public hearing. He said when they were designing the project, the City asked for a better turnaround for snowplows and fire trucks, while also provided a better access to the Legacy Trail. He said what is being proposed for that parcel will better functioning and will meet the City's needs. **Alex Leeman** asked if it would be owned and maintained by the HOA. **Randy Rigby** said yes, and the HOA would maintain it. The streets will be public, but the HOA will take care of the park strips. **Heather Barnum** asked if the HOA would still maintain it even if the community cannot access it. **Randy Rigby** yes, the HOA will maintain it.

As was also referenced in the public hearing, **Randy Rigby** said they are working with UDOT to determine who maintains the space along the Legacy Trail because it is not well maintained. He said they are looking into acquiring that land and tying it into the property in an effort to make it better. **David Petersen** said when UDOT formulated Legacy Parkway, they put the trail in with beautiful landscaping and trees. He said approximately a year after it was built, UDOT said they no longer wanted to maintain it and turned it over into the cities care. Unfortunately, none of the cities had money to maintain it, so the cities entered into an agreement with the County for the County to maintain the areas surrounding the trail. **Heather Barnum** asked that staff take feedback to the County asking for better maintenance around the trail. **Randy Rigby** said he feels it would greatly enhance the area if the proposed HOA could take the space back. He said they would be interested in entertaining some kind of agreement with the County to make it look better. **Heather Barnum** asked if there is a slope from the trail to the back of the property. **Randy Rigby** said the property is mostly flat.

Rebecca Wayment asked if the development includes sidewalks. **David Petersen** said yes, the schematic plan includes sidewalk on both sides. The proposed sidewalk would be standard size, including a 7 1/2" park strip. **Heather Barnum** asked if the proposed sidewalk is included in the front setback that was previously discussed. **David Petersen** said no, the sidewalk and park strip are not included in the front setback that was discussed.

Rebecca Wayment said one resident asked about the placement of the single story homes versus the placement of the two story homes. She asked for clarification of it. **Randy Rigby** said he assumes it would be personal choice. He said property owners would be able to choose their lots, as well as the layout of their homes. **Taunalee Homer** expressed concern her view will be gone if the homes will be mixed and matched. **Heather Barnum** invited Mrs. Homer and the applicant to discuss the issue together offline if they choose to do so.

Connie Deianni said the concern regarding small lots still has not been discussed. She said every resident in attendance mentioned the size of the lots. She asked if the rezone request is not approved, if the property will remain zoned AE, and the applicant can still build on larger lots. **David Petersen** said the commission is making a recommendation, so regardless of how the commission votes, the applicant still has an option to go to the City Council. He also clarified that yes, the property would remain zoned AE, and the applicant does have the option to build homes on ½ acre lots.

Alex Leeman said the Zoning Ordinance states that the Planning Commission should consider the following when determining a recommendation, which includes if it is "reasonably necessary," if the proposed amendment is in the public interest, if it is consistent with the General Plan, and if it is in harmony with the Zoning Ordinance. He said he recognizes this is a legislative act, but felt it was beneficial to mention those standards as something to think about when considering the rezone.

Roger Child said that the Homer's share the largest property line than any other property owner. He said he recognizes they are not ready to develop as this point, but as the most affect neighbor, he was curious about their long-term goals with their property. **Taunalee Homer** said yes,

they are the most affected adjacent property owner to his project, and will continue to purchase property in this area. She said the reason she is buying additional property is because she does not want things to change, which is her long-term property goals. She said she feels when UDOT purchased the property, they ruined any chance for the lots to be sold as ½ acre lots. She said she recognizes her children may want to sell her property, and that they most likely will not be selling it as horse property because she believes horse property will soon be zoned out of the area. She said she currently has a nice view of the mountains, and she would like to maintain it. She expressed concern that if 2-story homes were built along her property line, she would lose her view.

Rebecca Wayment said she is big on open space; however, after reviewing the guidelines **Alex Leeman** brought up and reviewing comments from the previous public hearing, she feels it is important to really vet out these decisions since the City has to live with these decisions long term. She walked through her thoughts on the guidelines listed in the Ordinance that should be considered when making a recommendation. She said the first guideline listed asked if the project is reasonably necessary. She said she feels they have heard a lot about how medium high density is a nice transition between a neighborhood and apartments, as well as provides a buffer from uses like Station Park and the City gym. She said she wishes the apartments on 650 W. and Clark Lane were never approved. She said she does not see this as a buffer as the school, gym, and park are already there. She feels like this project is much higher density than it needs to be. She feels that west Farmington has always had bigger lots. She said even when the Ranches development came in, there was significant amounts of open space and larger lots. She feels that although the new normal might be larger homes on smaller lots, she feels there are still enough people that want space between their homes. She said she remembers the approval process for Kestrel Bay and Ovation Homes, and how much push back was received by the community over those projects. She said she recognizes the need for mid-price range homes, but she feels it is important to provide lots that have a yard for kids to grow up in. She said she does not feel this project is reasonably necessary.

Rebecca Wayment said the next guideline listed was if the project is in the public's interest. She said 650 W. has gone through very horrific years, and she feels for the homeowners located on it. She said there will be a new high school opening next fall, which will bring a huge amount of student traffic to 650 W., and the City does not know what all the traffic concerns will be yet. She said the West Davis Corridor will also make a large impact on the whole area. She feels it is not in the public's best interest to subject them to move massive construction by putting a medium higher density project in the area.

Rebecca Wayment said the third guideline listed is if the amendment is consistent with the General Plan. She said it is not likely that there will be an overhaul of the General Plan in the near future, so it is up to the Planning Commission and City Council to determine what fits in this area. She said if the governing bodies do not want high density in the area, the General Plan does not have to change, especially so quickly. She said she is concerned with approving things that are not consistent with the General Plan because she feels there may be things approved for the area that just don't make sense.

Rebecca Wayment said the fourth guideline to consider is if the amendment is in harmony with the Zoning Ordinance. She said she is unsure on how that guideline should be interpreted. She said she sees this request as an applicant asking for the AE zone to be rezoned to R to allow medium higher density by seeking a 20% density bonus in exchange for more open space that cannot be accommodated, so an amount of money will be paid to the City for a partial waiver of the open space requirement. She expressed concern that this part of the City could easily be consumed into high density to medium higher density housing. She said she would like to maintain a more spacious feel for this area of the City, as that is what it has always been.

Rebecca Wayment said she also echoes the concerns presented by **Alex Leeman** regarding the open space. She said she does not feel the open space parcel on 250 S. should be considered an addition to the project since it will be completely inaccessible by the proposed development, unless a cut through is eventually made through the surrounding undeveloped property. She said she feels a nice park in the middle parcel of open space would be a nice addition. She said her biggest concern is with the open space and the density bonus. She said typically when a density bonus is granted, the City receives something in return. She does not feel this will happen in this case because the placement of the open space could easily be removed later on by someone saying it no longer makes sense. **Alex Leeman** pointed out that it may make sense for the applicant to seek a waiver for this project's open space. The project is located directly across the street from the City's new gym and park, so the project would have a direct benefit of the money paid to the City for the waiver.

Bret Gallacher said this project was brought before the Commission four weeks ago, and the open space and density was discussed. He felt like the Commission sent the group away with the biggest concerns being the density and the placement of the open space along the road entrance. He feels those concerns have not been met. He said he has a lot of respect for the developers, but he feels they wasted time by not changing the density more than one lot. He said he is leaning toward not recommending this project to the City Council.

Kent Hinckley said that he agrees with the comments provided by **Rebecca Wayment.** He said he does not agree that this property or project would be a transition. He feels a transition is from one thing to another; however, this property is off by itself. He said no one will ever know it is there as the property is tucked away from the main road. He does not feel good calling this project a transition piece.

Alex Leeman said his parents are in their mid-60s and have recently moved into an area with smaller lots and minimal yard maintenance. He said it has been a good thing for his parents, and many others in their same shoes. He said he feels if this subdivision were approved, the lots would sell very quickly. He said he is not bothered by the lot size and density of the project. He is also not bothered by having the project in this area. He appreciates the fact that this developer is working hard to try and put a small master plan in for the area, but also recognizes, and respects, that he does not have the full cooperation of the neighbors that want to stay for the time. **Alex Leeman** said the open space is still a big concern for him. He is concerned the open space will later be swallowed up down the road. He feels that is makes more sense for the applicant to pay for the waiver of open space. He feels like the applicant does not have the full "buy off" to make this project really great, but feels that not recommending approval of it could result in something much worse later on. He said he recognizes that the next developer proposing something would have to go through the same process, or that this applicant may even come back with something different; however, he is still unsure if he would vote in favor or denial of a recommendation at this point.

David Petersen said that the applicant and staff discussed challenges presented by the Commission during the previously meeting when this item was presented. He said they must have all missed the large concern regarding density. He said staff and the applicant's main take away was that the main concern was more about the configuration of the project. **Heather Barnum** said density was discussed at the previous meeting. **Alex Leeman** said he does not mind the density. **David Petersen** said it was not specifically asked that lots be removed from the schematic plans. **Heather Barnum** said she felt it was not the Commission's place to say how the density should be addressed, so it was left to the developer to amend it. She felt the discussion that took place left the applicant some ideas on how to go about addressing the density. **David Petersen** said the interpretation of the conversation was that a reconfiguration, specifically regarding open space, needed to take place. When staff discussed the schematic plans with the applicant after the previous Planning Commission meeting, the applicant

explained a lot about why the project was configured how it was because of the many constraints they have on the property. He said that was when staff felt it would be effective to bring the applicant to the Commission's Study Session two weeks ago to explain the reason for the configuration. **Alex Leeman** said he understands that any configuration will be challenging because the property is an odd shape and it abuts the freeway. He also pointed out that abutting the freeway is also the reason why ½-acre lots will not sell in this area, and why he feels the density is a good fit.

Heather Barnum expressed frustration that the density did not change, and that the applicant is seeking a density bonus in exchange for 20% of open space, but is then seeking a waiver for the open space. She said she is not comfortable with the density, the minimal amount of open space, and granting a bonus for more density. She said she does not see this project as a win-win for all those affected by it. She said she does not disagree that the proposed lots would sell, but she does not understand why the lots cannot be larger than what is being proposed. She feels ¼-acre lots would still sell just as fast. She feels if this project is ultimately not approved, any other project would still have to come through the same approval process and the same arguments would still apply, so she is not concerned that something worse could come in for this property.

Roger Child asked if the City had a traffic count for the new high school. **David Petersen** said yes, the high school has been included in the City's Master Transportation Plan. **Roger Child** asked how many trips the proposed subdivision would add to the traffic count. **David Petersen** said a trip is considered two ends, and a subdivision of this size would add approximately 400 trips per day. He said when Kestrel Bay came in with 63 homes on the Frontage Road, the traffic did not make any significant impact, even during peak traffic times. He said when traffic is mentioned during public hearings, it is only considered significant during big developments. He said this project is considered low density, and the impact would be minimal. He said the Commission can require the developer to obtain a traffic study, but based on past projects, staff is confident that the results will be what was just explained.

Roger Child said he noticed that the largest neighbor this development will have is the trail system and the freeway. He also noted that there will be an additional freeway, the West Davis Corridor, coming in soon, which will also impact this area. He feels having all these freeways in this one area will change what development could take place on this property. He believes ½-acre lots will not be the market, especially when it abuts a freeway. He said he believes "outdoor living" is changing with the new generation of kids growing up; he believes the next generation is not accustomed to playing outside as much as previous generations. He said there is also the large City park across the street that could be easily accessed. He feels pocket parks may be used as a marketing tool by developers, but they do not benefit a lot of people, especially since kids playing at a park unsupervised is becoming more difficult. **Roger Child** said if he were a property owner next to this development, he would appreciate it because it will increase property values, especially as the new freeway comes in. He recognizes that neighbors do not want to sell at this time; however, their property will eventually develop and having a project with this density will significantly enhance the property values surrounding it. **Roger Child** also pointed out that having the option to later move open space so a property owner could access the infrastructure that could be brought in by this development is a huge value to the surrounding properties, as someone else is fronting those significant costs right now. **Roger Child** also said there is a very big need for affordable housing in Farmington. He said the City is currently priced out for many people's children that want to live here, and it is a big problem. He pointed out that it is hard to believe that affordable housing is considered $350,000+. He said in City planning, it is a good thing to have a spread of property values within the City to provide a wider diversity of demographics within the City. He said he is sad to see west Farmington moving to a higher type residential density; he recognizes the challenges that must bring to the long-term residents of the area, as change is difficult. **Roger Child** said he feels the biggest catalyst for change was having the freeway and Station Park come to the area. **David Petersen** also pointed out that in 2020, the Legacy Parkway agreement will expire, which means

the road can be extended to three lanes, quiet pavement is no longer required, and the speed limit can be raised to 70 mph.

David Petersen said in the previous public hearing, many residents were in favor of smaller lots because they cannot sell their property as is. He said the conversation among the residents was different tonight; however, staff has been approached by residents in this area seeking options to build office or retail on their property because that is how hurt they feel their property value is by the City park, high school, charter school, Station Park, and the freeway. He said it is challenging because it seems there is a wide span of desires for this area among the property owners. **Alex Leeman** said he feels this area is very unique because it was once on the outskirts of town; however, it is now located right in the middle of town. He said he is against any sort of retail or other commercial use for this area; he feels the City park should be surrounded by residential.

Connie Deianni said she feels her concerns have been well stated. She said she does not feel anyone objects to residential for this property, but that most object to this amount of density. She said she does not agree that this property should be ½-acre lots, especially as it was pointed out that the freeway is the largest neighbor to this property. She said she understands people do not seek to live next to a freeway; however, she feels there should be a happy medium between larger lots and what is being proposed. She said she does not know how many lots should be removed, but she also recognizes that the Commission could have been more specific at the last meeting so the applicant would have had more information to take back to the drawing board.

Alex Leeman said he is not bothered by the density. He said he feels it is an important element of City Planning to offer something for everyone. He said the City has many ¼ acre lots, but very little smaller lots like what is being proposed. He feels there is a demand for smaller lots, and that it brings a little diversity to the community. **Kent Hinckley** said that he is certain the smaller lots would sell very quickly, but he feels the smaller lots in this area are misplaced because of the other lot sizes surrounding it.

Roger Child said that he lives in downtown Farmington, and that he is currently living in his second home within the old town area of the City. He said something he loves about his neighborhood is the huge diversity of property types within a short radius of where he lives. He said there is a wide mix of people from newly marrieds, retirees, families with kids, and more. He feels it makes for a well-balanced neighborhood. He feels having a neighborhood so uniform means the same demographic moves in and out during a similar life cycle. He feels having a wide diversity of people and situations is the ideal place to live, which is why he loves living in the old town of Farmington.

Rebecca Wayment said she does not disagree that the small lots would sell fast. She said she often watches the real estate, and Farmington has some of the lowest number of houses on the market at any given time. She said she knows it is difficult to find lots, and that she does feel like there needs to be a place for everyone, but she disagrees that larger lots would be harder to sell. She said she would like to see affordable housing come to the City, but wants to see it in the right location and configuration to also meet the City's needs.

Heather Barnum said she also echoes the City Manager's comment, as was mentioned by the applicant **Randy Rigby.** City Manager Dave Millheim said the City does not want open space for the sake of open space. She said she would like to see the open space maximized to make the most out of the development. She expressed concern regarding the detention basin, and if it is being added just to fulfill the open space requirement. **Randy Rigby** clarified that the detention basin is required for water retention for the development. **Heather Barnum** pointed out that the applicant is still only meeting 13% of the open space requirement, and obtaining a waiver for the additional 7% open space required for a

density bonus. **David Petersen** reminded the Commission that the City has never not qualified detention basins to meet an open space requirement. **Heather Barnum** expressed concern that the applicant is not willing to provide more "breathing room" within the development with additional open space or larger lots. **Alex Leeman** asked **Heather Barnum** if she is in favor of the rezone then, but not the schematic plan. **Heather Barnum** said she does not disagree that a rezone will happen, but she does not want to recommend a rezone without a plan that makes sense. She said she feels this property will remain residential, and not commercial, but she would like to see a plan that meets the needs of the City. She also said she is not bothered by a waiver for the open space; however, she would like to see more space for the homes.

The commissioners discussed possible findings if a recommendation for denial is made. **David Petersen** said the Commission can craft findings during this meeting, or make a recommendation for denial and staff presents the findings at the next meeting to ensure the findings are well articulated. He said the applicant may still go before the City Council at the first meeting in November so the findings would be approved before that time. **Bret Gallacher** asked for clarification on the applicant's options if a recommendation for denial is made by the commission. **David Petersen** said the applicant can withdraw his application, he can take the recommendation for denial and still present to the City Council, or he can revise his plans and come back before the Planning Commission seeking a recommendation for approval. He also added that if the applicant receives a denial for a rezone from the City Council, the applicant cannot make a request the same zone for one year.

The commissioners discussed the motion, and the feelings of each commissioner regarding it. The majority of the commissioners were in favor of recommending a denial of the motion; Commissioners **Alex Leeman** and **Roger Child** were in favor of recommending approval of the motion.

Motion:

Kent Hinckley made a motion that the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council deny this proposal and that staff will propose adopted findings for denial for the Planning Commission's consideration at the next Planning Commission meeting on October 19, 2017. **Rebecca Wayment** seconded the motion. Commissioners **Connie Deianni, Bret Gallacher, Kent Hinckley** and **Rebecca Wayment** voted in favor of the motion; Commissioners **Roger Child** and **Alex Leeman** voted to deny it. The motion passes on a 4-2 vote.

OTHER

Item #4. Miscellaneous: a) Brock Johnston / Rainey Homes – Applicant is requesting special exception approval to exceed the height requirement of a main building for property located at 537 Daniel Drive in an AE (Agriculture Estates) zone. (M-5-17)

David Petersen said there is a middle portion of the proposed roof that exceeds the height requirement of a main building. He said if the proposed gable was straight across, the applicant would have met the height requirement with ease, but with a pitched gable, the height limit is exceeded. He said a home with the same plans has been approved in the neighborhood. He also pointed out that the part that exceeds the height limit is in the center of the home, adds architectural appeal, and does not appear to be higher than the front of the home. Staff is recommending approval of the special exception.

Heather Barnum asked if the applicant will continue to use this plan, and if the Commission should plan to see many more special exception requests regarding the issue. **David Petersen** said the

area of the home that exceeds the limit is only a middle feature. He said it might be something to be addressed with a text amendment, but that would take several months to consider. He said a special exception would allow the developer to move forward on this home right now. **Bret Gallacher** asked how a text amendment could be included on something that exceeds the height requirement in only one spot, but that still looks like it meets the requirement. **David Petersen** said the text could be tweaked regarding the "step down provision" that gives flexibility to builders regarding the height requirements.

Alex Leeman reviewed the standards to consider for special exceptions. He felt this request meets those standards as it is not detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of the community, does not impact traffic, and is located on a lot that can accommodate the request.

Brock Johnston, Syracuse, said he appreciated being able to listen to all of the discussion regarding the Mountain View PUD Subdivision. He said Rainey Homes is interested in similar type developments. He said the main reason for larger homes on smaller lots is because people cannot afford to purchase a $300,000 ½-acre lot in Farmington because the end product could easily be a home valued over a million dollars. He said building on larger lots very quickly prices out many people that are interested in the area. He said people would like to purchase "cute," well-designed homes, so building on smaller lots allows this to be possible. He said with regards to the special exception he is seeking, he could easily flatten the portion of the roof that exceeds the height requirements; however, it would drastically change the architectural integrity of the home. He said Rainey Homes takes pride in building nicer looking homes, and wants to preserve that look. He said long-term, he could see a similar building on a smaller lot. He said there is a huge demand for people that want to live in Farmington. He reiterated **David Petersen's** suggestion to amend the text amendment to allow for leniency when a small portion of the roof exceeds the height requirements. He also mentioned that they would like to have the ability to build this home more often, so a text amendment would help meet their needs in order to do so without having to request a special exception each time.

Heather Barnum asked about the size of the lot that this home is being proposed on, and if the height will be obstructing any view. **Brock Johnston** said the lot size is 0.28 acres, and that the home will be on the corner facing west. The home adjacent to it faces south so no view will be obstructed.

Rebecca Wayment said she really likes the way the home looks, and is a fan of the 2-story homes. She referenced a home in a nearby community, and wondered if this home will be similar in size. **Brock Johnston** said the home being referenced is larger than the proposed home being presented for the special exception. He said the proposed home roofline goes up higher, but that is a result of a steeper roof pitch and not a taller home.

Motion:

Alex Leeman made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the special exception, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following condition: the application only applies to an adjustment of the fixed dimension related to a height increase up to 32'. **Bret Gallacher** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. The proposed special exception is desirable in that it allows for the highest and best use of a property.
2. An identical home has been built in Miller Meadows and is a good fit for the neighborhood.

3. Because the tallest point of the roof is stepped back from the front façade of the home, the height increase is largely unnoticeable from the street.
4. The proposed special exception is not detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of the persons residing or working in the vicinity.
5. The proposed special exception does not create unreasonable traffic hazards, and Lot 603 of the Miller Meadows Subdivision, where the special exception is to be located is sufficient in size to accommodate the use.

Item #4. Miscellaneous: b) Farmington Rock Discussion

David Petersen said staff was hoping to collect all surveys back, but a few are still outstanding by members of the City Council and the Historic Preservation Commission. The commissioners discussed their upcoming schedules to ensure as many people as possible would be in attendance for the discussion. It was settled that a special meeting would be held on October 12, 2017 to discuss Farmington Rock.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

At 10:06 p.m., **Alex Leeman** made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was unanimously approved.

_____

Heather Barnum
Chair, Farmington City Planning Commission

FARMINGTON CITY
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
October 12, 2017

REGULAR SESSION

Present: *Chair Heather Barnum, Commissioners Roger Child, Connie Deianni, Kent Hinckley, Alex Leeman, and Rebecca Wayment, Community Development Director David Petersen, Associate City Planner Eric Anderson, and Recording Secretary Lara Johnson. Commissioner Bret Gallacher was excused.*

MISCELLANEOUS

Item #1. Farmington Rock Discussion

Eric Anderson said in Section 11-7-070 of the Ordinance, it lists the standards for construction of multi-family residential, commercial, commercial recreation or industrial conditional uses, or permitted uses on an undeveloped site. Within paragraph C-1, it states, "All commercial, commercial recreation and industrial developments shall be designed to include, as part of the exterior façade of buildings or as architectural elements in the landscape, an element of "Farmington Rock." He said a definition is not included for the term "element." **Heather Barnum** wondered if a previous Planning Commission amended the Ordinance to add in that Farmington Rock could be included as part of the landscape. **David Petersen** said he is unsure if that took place, as the Ordinance was written a long time ago.

Connie Deianni asked if this standard applies to multi-family residential. **David Petersen** said this sentence is listed under the standards of construction for multi-family residential and commercial; however, it does not list multi-family residential in the subsection. **Eric Anderson** also pointed out that it does not include institutional uses. He said an example is that the City Hall did not need to include Farmington Rock; however, it was included in the front planter boxes on the City's own accord. He said Commercial Recreation uses mostly applies to Lagoon; however, Lagoon does not usually include Farmington Rock in their designs. **Connie Deianni** asked if this standard applies to certain zones or for all of Farmington. **Eric Anderson** said Chapter 7 of the Ordinance applies to the entire city, unless otherwise specified. However, he said paragraph C does specify the inclusion of Farmington Rock to specific uses.

Alex Leeman asked for clarification that Farmington Rock is not required for uses like government buildings, schools, churches, etc. **Eric Anderson** said yes, Farmington Rock is not required for institutional buildings like Commission Leeman listed. He said some of those uses have included Farmington Rock, but that those uses have "sovereign status" so the City does not have authority to mandate the inclusion of Farmington Rock.

Eric Anderson reviewed the Farmington Rock Preference Survey and the results of the survey as completed by the Planning Commission, City Council, and the Historical Preservation Committee. He said based on the results, there is a slight preference for Farmington Rock. He explained the purpose of the survey was to find out the general feeling the governing bodies have with regards to Farmington Rock. **Eric Anderson** said based on the survey, the majority of the governing bodies were in favor of allowing the City more discretion to require Farmington Rock when it makes sense. Staff and the commissioners further discussed the results of the survey.

David Petersen showed an aerial view of the City and all buildings that have Farmington Rock on it or in the landscape within the City. He provided the Commission a table showing percentages of buildings with Farmington Rock and without Farmington Rock within different building type categories, including church buildings, schools, city buildings, other public buildings, medical/finance/office buildings, retail buildings, industrial buildings, and other buildings. He reviewed each category, and the percentages provided. He also provided a table listing the "hundred percenters" for non-residential and commercial buildings, which are buildings solely made from Farmington Rock.

David Petersen said the early City settlers used Farmington Rock in the beginning when most settlers were very poor. Once the settlers had enough money, they moved on to use other building materials besides Farmington Rock. He said in the 1950s and 1960s, many cities began putting metal over historical buildings in order to make the buildings look more like the big box retail stores. He said in the 1980s, cities began having the idea of creating themes, which is when Farmington Rock became required. He said he believes there is merit in leaving the standard as is, but writing in a caveat that acceptable alternatives to the standard must be approved by the Planning Commission. **David Petersen** said another benefit of leaving the standard, with a few amendments, is the City would get a lot higher quality masonry buildings. He pointed out that there is a compromise; however, because the design standards in Chapter 18 for the mixed-use zones are significantly different and Farmington Rock would look inappropriate on many of those buildings. He feels the Commission can find a good medium.

Alex Leeman expressed concern that if the standard for Farmington Rock remains, and a caveat is included that alternatives must be approved by the Planning Commission, it would come down to whether or not the Commission thinks the building is "pretty enough." He said he thinks problems could arise if the Commission arbitrarily disagrees with the developers' building plans. **David Petersen** said developers like flexibility within a standard, and they like to negotiate. He feels amending the current standard would achieve both of those things.

Connie Deianni said she feels it would be helpful to have a required percentage of Farmington Rock, otherwise, there is nothing stopping someone from not including it. **Roger Child** mentioned the cost of Farmington Rock is extremely high. He said even if the rock is free, the labor for the rock is where the high cost comes in. He said it is also important to define what Farmington Rock is because based on where the rock comes from, there can be different color hues to it.

Roger Child said it is his opinion that the requirement for Farmington Rock depends on the scale of the building. He said a large building may be required to have it; however, the size of the building would wash out the use of the rock, but would still cost the developer a lot to include it. He said in his mind, the historic rock buildings that bring charm to Farmington are because of the scale of the buildings. He said the historic rock buildings are small and quaint. He feels the use of Farmington Rock on a large commercial size building does not add any benefit to the City. **Roger Child** said he feels there would be a lot of conflict from developers if the City required Farmington Rock on commercial buildings around Park Lane. He said the office park, for example, will be catering to a high-tech job base that will want a sleek office building, and Farmington Rock would not fit. He feels it is important to require Farmington Rock in the right places within the City.

Alex Leeman said he feels Farmington Rock does not just dictate the look of the building, but it also dictates the color pattern of the building, as it was mentioned every rock has a different color hue depending on the location it comes from. He said an example of this was Wasatch Pediatrics. The proposed building at the time had a tan hue; adding Farmington Rock would not have matched their color pattern, which would have dictated the architectural style of the entire building. He feels requiring rock has the potential to change an entire building.

Heather Barnum said she is not overly concerned about requiring Farmington Rock since it does not fit with a lot of architectural styles, but she does want to preserve historic elements and materials. She feels an example of another historic material is brick; it is not extreme in style so it does not date like other styles and remains a classic look within a city. She said another example is Station Park; it is not extreme in colors or style, but has a classic look and feel to it. She expressed concern that a new office park could look overly high-tech and modern, which is a style the City has heard complaints on, particularly the new high school. She said she does not feel Farmington Rock should be required in all areas of the City, but she said she would be interested in requiring it in certain areas with the caveat that the Planning Commission would also review it. She said she trusts that future Planning Commission members will work to preserve the feeling that is being discussed.

Kent Hinckley said he feels there are a lot of cities with nice buildings; however, some cities have a unique look and feel than other cities. He said when he visited the east coast, Williamsburg looks and feels significantly different from the surrounding cities because they have maintained a different look and feel so much that the roads are even different. He feels the fact that Farmington Rock is hard to get or expensive to use has not stopped a lot of people at this point. He feels that if the City wants to be unique, it has to have some element to maintain the culture of it. He said he was leaning toward getting rid of the Farmington Rock prior to the survey staff conducted, but after he felt like he recognized that the Rock gives a certain look and feel to the City. He feels this may have been the governing bodies' original intent when they began requiring Farmington Rock in the 1980s. **Heather Barnum** pointed out that although it was a requirement, it has not been enforced over the years. **Kent Hinckley** said he feels if it remains in the Ordinance, it should be strictly enforced, or the requirement should be removed all together.

Alex Leeman said he feels it is too late to start strictly enforcing a rock requirement. He referenced Santa Fe, New Mexico; there are four colors that buildings can be painted. He said it has been that way since the beginning, and it has not altered. He feels Farmington is not at that point because there is no place within the City that has a style that is predominately Farmington Rock.

Rebecca Wayment said she feels cities were having this same discussion 100 years ago in that someone probably wanted to build something more modern but did not really fit the style of the city. She said she feels you can always start something new to move forward in making a change, even if the City cannot go backwards to change what has already been done. She said she feels the City can still create the look and feel it wants for Farmington to set it apart without it turning in to something like Layton or Centerville. She said she does not feel it has to be Farmington Rock.

Connie Deianni said she agrees on the desire to maintain the look and feel of Farmington, but expressed concerns on how to enforce it. She pointed to the fact that the standard already requires Farmington Rock, but it is unclear if anyone is even enforcing the requirement at this point. **Rebecca Wayment** said when the Parrish Lane corridor in Centerville was being planned, the Centerville Planning Commission had a design standard that developers had to meet. She said developers brought in color scheme, design plans, building materials, and more. She said it was very subjective on whether the Commission liked the plans or not. **Eric Anderson** said it is a very slippery slope regulating colors, and other specifics as part of the approval process because it is potentially legally indefensible.

Kent Hinckley said he talked with a neighbor that recently moved to Farmington from California. He asked her perception on Farmington Rock. She said she liked that the rock was often used in the buildings around the City. He reiterated that the general perception is often one that Farmington has rock in its architecture. **Roger Child** said that 100 years ago rock was used out of necessity on buildings. He said those buildings were significantly smaller in scale than what is often built now. He feels to

require Farmington Rock now, due to the scarcity of the rock, many developers may use an imitation rock, which has the potential to look very bad. **Alex Leeman** said he likes the idea that smaller buildings include Farmington Rock.

Connie Deianni suggested that since the standard requires an "element of Farmington Rock," that a rock monument sign be required in front of larger buildings. She said it could be a unifying look within the City since it may not be realistic to require all buildings to include Farmington Rock. She also agreed that requiring Farmington Rock on the façade of a larger building does not make much of an impact. **Alex Leeman** said he likes the idea of rock monument signs. He said he imagines it being similar to a college campus in that many of the buildings are designed differently, but each building has a uniform sign tying the buildings all together.

David Petersen referenced a book titled The Image of the City by Kevin A. Lynch. He said most every city planner reads the book. He said the book covers a landmark study that took place in Boston in the 1960s. The author asked residents to draw Boston to scale to show how much matched reality. The study showed that people drew what they knew. He suggested considering looking at parcels that have road frontage. He said one example are the two remaining parcels in the BP zone, both of which have road frontage. He suggested ensuring those parcels look compatible. He said Shepard Lane has a wide mix, so he is unsure what can be done there. He said if the UDA plan for the mixed-use business park be followed, that area should remain compatible. Station Park is another example of a compatible feel within the City.

David Petersen pointed out that the one element that is the most unifying within the City, but is often overlooked, is the tree line on Main St. and State St. **Alex Leeman** agreed; he asked why there is so much focus on Farmington Rock when the City could be requiring park strip trees everywhere within the City. He feels if the City were to choose a theme to mandate, he would be in favor of focusing on trees.

Roger Child referenced the Thomas Arts building. He said the building is a classic, yet high end look; however, he feels due to the window line and size, they would have a difficult time finding tenants. He said rock facades often dictate a smaller window size, which is problematic in leasing a building. He feels the Thomas Arts building still works because it is smaller scale and owner occupied; however, it would not work on a larger scale building. He feels if the requirement for Farmington Rock is maintained, it should be required on smaller, owner occupied buildings found in the historic district, or that an element be included in the landscape of the building. He feels if this is the case, it should be clarified if a boulder classifies as an element in the landscaping.

Heather Barnum asked the commissioners who is in favor of amending the Ordinance. After a brief discussion, the majority of the commissioners were in favor of modifying the Ordinance with additional provisions.

Heather Barnum then asked the commissioners for three to four points that stuck out over the discussion that they would like to consider when amending the Ordinance. The following points were discussed:

- Maintaining a "rock element" within the ordinance, which could be included in the building, the landscaping, or signage (all 6 of the commissioners were in favor of this point);
- Considering the scale of a building, and if it is street facing, which could include a higher percentage of rock requirement for a smaller scale building (4 of the 6 commissioners were in favor of this point);

- Determining cultural, unifying, or historical elements, specifically within architectural styles, in the City (2 of the 6 commissioners were in favor of this point);
- Requiring tree strip requirements on all street frontages (3 of the 6 commissioners were in favor of this point); and
- Applying the amended requirements to multi-family residential units (5 of the 6 commissioners were in favor of this point).

The following were points discussed, but supported by the listed commissioner:

- **Roger Child** supported amending the requirement for specific zones, or more specifically to main street entry ways into the City and to historic downtown;
- **Alex Leeman** supported removing the Farmington Rock requirement all together and requiring trees instead; and
- **Heather Barnum** supported gathering 3-4 building materials that could maintain the cultural integrity of the City, which could also include approved synthetic materials.

David Petersen said staff will take the points discussed, and will bring more information regarding potential changes to the Ordinance at the November 2, 2017 Planning Commission meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

At 8:25 p.m., **Alex Leeman** made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was unanimously approved.

Heather Barnum
Chair, Farmington City Planning Commission