

**FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

April 20, 2017

STUDY SESSION

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

Item #3. Chris Jenkins / Hunter's Creek HOA – Requesting conditional use permit approval to construct a park and improve other landscaping features on 3 different parcels

David Petersen said the Hunter's Creek HOA approached the City about amending the existing conservation easement to allow for some minor park improvements in certain areas of the conservation easement where such improvements were not previously allowed. The HOA received City Council approval to amend the Hunter's Creek HOA Conservation Easement on February 7, 2017. David Petersen said the original conservation easement and amended easement have been included in the staff report. The amended conservation easement stipulates that the park improvements go through a conditional use review by the Planning Commission. Eric Anderson showed the HOAs submitted plans and explained the areas the HOA would like to improve. The commissioners agreed that these improvements would be a good thing for the area as many of the open spaces remaining in conservation easements look as though the builder ran out of money. Alex Leeman was appreciative that the HOA went through the process of amending the conservation subdivision and raising the funds in order to do the improvements.

Item #4. Brady Lee – Requesting conditional use permit approval for a home occupation teaching tennis lessons on 1.0 acres of property

Eric Anderson said the applicant recently purchased this property on 650 W. with the purpose of living in the existing home and building two tennis courts on the rear of the property where tennis lessons can be taught. Eric Anderson said staff first thought this use could be considered under the minor commercial outdoor recreation use, which is a conditional use. Since there is an existing home on the property, the minor commercial outdoor recreation use will not work. Staff felt the other reasonable use would be a home occupation, like swimming or piano lessons. Eric Anderson said with a home occupation, the applicant could have 8 pupils, but not to exceed 16 at any given time. He also said there are other standards found in Chapter 28 of the Zoning Ordinance for a private multi-purpose sports court; however, those standards will be covered during site plan and building permit approval.

Eric Anderson said there are some "boiler-plate" conditions included with the motion, like hours of operation and lighting; however, the conditions are just suggestions and can be amended. Eric Anderson also pointed out that Condition #5 is a requirement found under Home Occupations in the Zoning Ordinance, but was included as a condition to ensure the applicant is aware that only one unrelated employee can be on site at any given time. Connie Deianni asked if up to 16 cars can be parked there at one time. Eric Anderson said the applicant will be providing parking in the back, but the applicant could also use the gym and charter school parking across the street if necessary. Heather Barnum asked what signage the applicant could have with the home occupation. Eric Anderson said the applicant can have a 12"x12" sign in the window of the home.

Item #5. Paul Allen – Requesting conditional use permit approval for an accessory dwelling unit above a detached garage on 1.55 acres

David Petersen said a notice was sent out regarding this item, which stirred up the neighborhood. He said there have been accusations regarding an illegal renter in the home, and an unkempt yard. The City has since sent a notice to the applicant regarding debris and a potential renter in the basement, and will pursue those violations. In talking with the City Attorney, **David Petersen** said the recommendation is to hold the Public Hearing and take comment to ensure the alleged violations are unrelated to the conditional use permit that is being considered. **David Petersen** also clarified that the accessory building has already been built, and that what is before the Commission is for the accessory dwelling unit to be built inside the accessory building; however, it cannot be rented and is only available for a relative to live in it. Staff and the commissioners discussed the ramifications of Code violations, and the wording to use when tabling the item for alleged violations.

Item #6. Farmington City – Requesting conditional use permit approval for a water tank on 1.34 acres of property

Eric Anderson said the City is wanting to upsize the tank located near Jerry Preston's new subdivision, The Residences at Farmington Hills. **Rebecca Wayment** asked if the new tank would be above where the new homes will be built. **Eric Anderson** said yes, it would be above the houses, as well as below some homes. **Larry Famuliner**, Farmington City's Water System Supervisor, said the current tank is approximately 100 years old and is a 100,000 gallon tank. He said the City would like to upsize to a 2 million gallon tank, which would service 80-90% of homes in the City for fire protection and consumption. **Larry Famuliner** said the City has been trying to get the new tank for approximately 10 years; however, it has been difficult finding a location free of fault lines. He said all reports for the proposed location have come back positive, and that the last thing is the conditional use permit approval for the tank. Commissioners asked if the tank has already been financed, if the infrastructure is already in, and how much of the tank will be seen above ground. **Larry Famuliner** said yes, the money is already set aside for the new tank and the infrastructure will be new to accommodate the new tank. He said the current tank sits out about 3' with a fence surrounding what is above ground; he thinks the new tank may be seen slightly more, but it will still be difficult to see it.

Connie Deianni pointed out that there were numerous geological surveys completed for Jerry Preston's subdivision; she asked why the same studies have not been completed for such a large water tank. **Larry Famuliner** said the City has used the same geological firm that Jerry Preston has used to determine fault lines, so the firm is very familiar with the proposed location. **Connie Deianni** asked if the City used the information from Jerry Preston's site, or if the firm independently looked at the proposed location for the tank. **Larry Famuliner** said the firm looked at it independently, as it was important to ensure elevation and no fault lines before deciding it was the correct location for the new tank. **Kent Hinckley** and **Connie Deianni** expressed concern that so much was required of Jerry Preston's subdivision to ensure safety; however, this seems to be ready to be voted upon without what seems to be the same extensive amount of review. **Eric Anderson** said studies are typically not reviewed by the Commission, as was done with Jerry Preston's subdivision; however, due to the large public outcry, that information was provided. **Heather Barnum** asked how close the nearest resident's homes would be. **Eric Anderson** said they are approximately 200-300' away.

Kent Hinckley suggested asking for a second opinion on the results found by the firm the City has hired. He reminded the Commission and staff that a second opinion was asked for by the City for Jerry Preston's subdivision, and additional recommendations were made to ensure the safety of the subdivision. He feels asking for a second opinion in this situation too would be a good idea. **David Petersen** clarified that a second study was not completed, but that it was a review of the original study

Jerry Preston had completed. **Alex Leeman** said he feels many people are concerned developers are willing to cut corners to make more money, so often the City will do more to address public clamor; however, he said he does not have the same concern with the City. **Kent Hinckley** said that the City is made of people that may make mistakes; he feels a second opinion will ensure safety in the proposed location for the new tank. **Bret Gallacher** asked if **Kent Hinckley** is concerned that the tank could slide. **Kent Hinckley** said he does not have that concern, but feels the Commission should hold the City to the same standard as Jerry Preston with his subdivision development. **Connie Deianni** agreed, she feels when Jerry Preston's subdivision was under review, the Commission was given lots of documentation ensure it was safe to build; however, there is nothing like that included for a 2 million gallon water tank. **Larry Famuliner** explained the City hired engineers to initially test if there was a fault line on the property. Once it was determined that there was not a fault line on the property, the City then moved forward to hire a big engineering firm to design the tank and how to put it in the hill. The engineering firm designing the tank hires their own geotech firm to look at the soil so they have the best understanding of the tank location to ensure the safety of it.

Alex Leeman said when the Jerry Preston subdivision was being reviewed, he wanted more information for a couple reasons. He said the first reason was private citizens opposing Jerry Preston brought their own geologist that claimed the property was not safe for building, so he wanted someone to address that concern. He said the second reason is developers come and go, which can cause concern because potential liability problems may not be able to be addressed. The statute of limitation runs out, so if a problem does not happen within the maximum of 9 years, a property owner is out of luck. He wanted to be more sure with a private developer. **Alex Leeman** said the City will always be insured and responsible for the security of the water tank; in the event there is a problem, the City should always have the remedy.

Connie Deianni asked if the proposed location for the upsized water tank was included in Jerry Preston's geotech study. **Larry Famuliner** said in order to conduct the geotech study, there were sporadic digging stops all around the property. They did not dig up whole plots of ground to determine the soils report. He also said a land swap occurred with Jerry Preston around the time of the soils report, so he cannot say for sure all of the proposed location of the water tank was included in the study.

Bret Gallacher is concerned the soil testing standards were met for single-family homes; however, he is not sure if those same standards apply to a 2 million gallon water tank. **Heather Barnum** feels the City will take all necessary precautions to ensure engineering standards will be met, and does not feel the City needs to be held at the same level as a private developer. She also feels the City will be responsible in maintaining the water tank. **Rebecca Wayment** feels that if there is any engineering concerns that may come up, the City will look at other options. She feels the City is looking at the long-term investment for the citizens and is not trying to cash out on the land.

Kent Hinckley asked if there are additional studies still being completed. **Larry Famuliner** said there was a preliminary study completed 6 months ago to determine fault lines, which do not exist on this property. The City then hired an engineering firm to design the water tank, and that engineering firm hires a third party geotech firm to test the soil. The information that geotech firm presents is the data that will be used in designing the tank and location for it. **Larry Famuliner** explained the hired engineering firm is waiting on their hired geotech firms results, and then the firm will review the information to make sure it is consistent with what has been seen as it begins to design the tank.

Connie Deianni asked if there will be a paved road to the water tank. **Larry Famuliner** said the road will be paved to a point, and then it will be dirt road. There will be a large easement of the road and location of the tank.

Bret Gallacher asked if it was beneficial for the City to move Jerry Preston's subdivision through so the water tank could go in. **Larry Famuliner** said the City has been trying for almost 10 years to find a location for the new water tank. The City has tried approximately 5-6 different people at that elevation; however, they have not been able to find a seller that has a large enough plot of land where there is not fault lines. He said Jerry Preston was willing to do a land swap, among other things, in order to help the City make this work. He said the timing of it just happened to work out.

REGULAR SESSION

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

Item #1. Minutes

Kent Hinckley made a motion to approve the Minutes from the March 23, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. **Bret Gallacher** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Item #2. City Council Report

David Petersen gave a report from the April 18, 2017 City Council meeting. He said UDOT has requested that the City Council declare impacts that the West David Corridor will have. He also said UDOT will give a pedestrian overpass to Buffalo Trail if the Glovers Lane alignment is chosen. It was also discussed that the Farmington City Sign will have to be relocated, but that City Council is comfortable with doing so. **David Petersen** also said it was discussed that Symphony Homes will be improving their side of 1525 W.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Item #3. Chris Jenkins / Hunter's Creek HOA (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting conditional use permit approval to construct a park and improve other landscaping features on 3 different parcels of property located at approximately 705 North Rifleman Drive, 800 North Browning Lane, and 850 North Foxhunter Drive in an AE (Agriculture Estates) zone. (C-6-17)

David Petersen said this was discussed in depth in the study session. The HOA would like to landscape 3 different areas, as shown in the staff report. He said all areas, except the first, are included in the subdivision's conservation easement, which means only native grass and other landscape restrictions can be done. The HOA has gone before the City Council to amend the conservation easement to allow for the improvements they are requesting. **David Petersen** said the HOA is now seeking the conditional use permit to follow through on the improvements the HOA hopes to complete. Staff is recommending approval of this item.

Heather Barnum asked if the Commission is granting conditional use of the current plan, as shown in the staff report, will it also include future changes the HOA may want to make. **David Petersen** said in the Study Session, a park was discussed as a future improvement; he said additional improvements like the park will be completed as resources allow, and that the HOA will come back in for additional improvement requests.

Chris Jenkins, 371 E. 100 S., Bountiful, said he is the architect representing this motion, and did not have anything to add at this time.

Heather Barnum asked if the HOA will maintain these improvements as part of its dues. **Chris Jenkins** said yes, the HOA dues will pay for maintenance on the improvements.

Heather Barnum opened the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

No comments were received.

Heather Barnum closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Alex Leeman and **Bret Gallacher** both expressed appreciation that these improvements are taking place.

Motion:

Bret Gallacher made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the conditional use subject to all applicable codes, development standards and ordinances. **Alex Leeman** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. When the City Council amended the conservation easement, they did so with the understanding that these park improvements would be constructed in the future.
2. The requested uses are consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and the Amended Hunter's Creek Conservation Easement.
3. The requested improvements will beautify the area and are only a small portion of the overall conservation area, which will remain in a natural state.

Item #4. Brady Lee (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting conditional use permit approval for a home occupation teaching tennis lessons on 1.0 acres of property located at 167 South 650 West in an AE (Agriculture Estates) zone. (C-7-17)

Eric Anderson said the applicant wants to build two tennis courts on the back of his property. He said the applicant is intending to teach tennis lessons. Staff originally thought this could come before the Commission as a minor commercial outdoor recreation use; however, due to the existing home on the property, the use is not allowed. It was felt that this use could be done as a home occupation, like swimming or piano lessons. **Eric Anderson** reviewed Section 11-35-040 from Chapter 35 of the Zoning Ordinance, which regulates home occupations. A home occupation may have over 8 pupils, but not more than 16 pupils receiving instruction at any one time. **Eric Anderson** clarified that staff was not sure if there would be more than 8 pupils, but due to the nature and intensity of the use staff felt it was appropriate for the applicant to seek for conditional use approval. He also said the conditions to the motion are suggestions, but that they can be removed or changed if the Commission chooses to do so. Staff is recommending approval of this item.

Brady Lee, 167 S. 650 W., said he is available for questions.

Bret Gallacher said the home occupation will allow for up to 16 students; he asked if the applicant anticipates up to 16 students and if they would have all 16 at the same time. **Brady Lee** said he plans to offer private, semi-private, and group classes ranging from 6-16 kids. He said it might be possible to have 16 students at once during the group classes.

Connie Deianni said the staff report stated the applicant will provide parking and access to the courts away from 650 W. She asked if there is enough parking for 16 vehicles. **Brady Lee** said there is enough parking for 16 vehicles with the driveway and the additional parking found in the back of the property. He said in his experience, there are rarely 16 vehicles at once because parents usually carpool.

Heather Barnum asked the applicant if he is aware that only one unrelated employee can be onsite at any given time. **Brady Lee** said he was aware and that he will comply with the regulation. **Heather Barnum** also asked clarification on if the applicant is allowed 16 students in addition to staff. **Eric Anderson** said yes, the applicant is allowed up to 16 pupils, up to 5 family members actively engaged in the home occupation, and one additional non-related employee onsite at one time.

Heather Barnum asked the applicant if the condition including the hours of operation were suitable, and if he will comply with only having a sign in his window and not on his property. **Brady Lee** said yes, the hours of operation are ok for his needs, and that he will comply with signage requirements.

Heather Barnum opened the public hearing at 7:23 p.m.

No comments were received.

Heather Barnum closed the public hearing at 7:23 p.m.

Rebecca Wayment said she feels it is an appropriate use. **Heather Barnum** said she feels the parking lots across the street may be an overflow possibility for parents, but that she would hate if that became a common occurrence. She asked that the applicant be aware of that concern.

Motion:

Rebecca Wayment made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the conditional use permit for a home occupation to teach tennis lessons as set forth in the staff report above, subject to all applicable codes, development standards and ordinances, and with the following conditions:

1. Lighting shall be designed, located and directed so as to eliminate glare and minimize reflection of light to neighboring properties;
2. The hours of operation are limited to 8 a.m. to 10 p.m.;
3. Any signs proposed for the project must comply with the Farmington City Sign Ordinance. The sign plan shall indicate the location, height, and appearance of the signs upon the site and the effects upon parking, ingress/egress, and adjacent properties. Such signs shall be compatible with the character of the neighborhood;
4. The applicant must obtain all other applicable permits for the operation of the conditional use including but not limited to a business license from Farmington City, all health department regulations and all applicable building codes;
5. The applicant may have five (5) family members related by blood, marriage, or adoption actively engaged in the home occupation, and no more than one (1) unrelated employee on-site at any given time as set forth in Section 11-35-030 of the Zoning Ordinance;
6. No more than 16 pupils are allowed to be instructed at any given time.

Connie Deianni seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. The site plan for this application shows parking removed from 650 West and to the rear of the dwelling.
2. The property is a large parcel and tennis courts in the rear yard of the property is the highest and best use.
3. Because the proposed use is removed from abutting residences and 650 West, it will have minimal impact in traffic, noise, etc.
4. The proposed use is complimentary to the regional park and gym, which is directly across 650 West.

Item #5. Paul Allen (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting conditional use permit approval for an accessory dwelling unit above a detached garage on 1.55 acres of property located at 307 South 1100 West in A (Agriculture) zone. (C-8-17)

Eric Anderson showed the applicant's property on the vicinity map. He explained the applicant already built the garage, an allowed use that conforms to all City standards. The conditional use permit that is before the City is for the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), which would be a dwelling unit located on the second floor above the garage. **David Petersen** said the City has received some emails regarding this item, as well as people contacting the City regarding alleged violations of zoning laws, including debris/junk on the property and a potential illegal renter in the basement. He said the City is reviewing the allegations. Staff talked with the City Attorney regarding how to move forward on this item tonight. The City Attorney suggested that the public hearing be held, but that the item be tabled to review alleged violations to see if any are related to this request.

Paul Allen, 307 S. 1100 W., said he does not have a renter in the basement, but does have a good friend living with him free of charge. He said this friend came upon some challenging times in his life so he allowed him to move in, but he has never received money from him. He said the ADU above the garage would be for his children and their families to stay in when they come to town to visit. He said he understands the back pasture is an eye sore, but that he built the garage so he can move equipment into the garage and clean up the backyard. He also said that he would not rent the ADU above the garage, but would use it strictly for family.

Heather Barnum opened the public hearing at 7:29 p.m.

Heather Barnum entered emails received from **Don and Cindy Hart** and **Greg Black** into the record.

Cheryl Farnsworth, 287 S. 1100 W., said she lives directly north of the property. She said shortly after the applicant started building the garage, she realized it was not a little garage, but was easily the size of his home. She feels he has a large home so there is no need to have anyone else living in the large garage. She said she bought their property so there would not be anyone behind them, and now they are looking at a large garage. She also said his back pasture has at least 12 vehicles located there. She is unsure how all of those will fit in the garage. She said the property is zoned agriculture; she feels he is using his property as a business and not as an agricultural use. She feels the City should not allow any renters into that space, and that his house is big enough for his family to stay in when they come to visit. She said she takes great pride in her yard and that she would appreciate if the applicant did too.

Greg Black, 321 S. 1100 W., said he lives in the property directly to the south. He said he already sent an email, which was entered into the record, but that he wanted to ensure the Commission received it and the photos. He said he knows Mr. Allen well having had family, friends, and himself work for his snow plow business. He said the applicant's friend has been there for 5 years. He said the zoning previously only allowed for a home to be located on at least a 2 ½ acre lot; however, he talked with all the neighbors about requesting it to be 1 acre lots. He said he was able to receive that, and eventually sold Mr. Allen's lot to its previous owner. He feels Mr. Allen's did not talk to any neighbors about building this garage, and that he feels the plan all along was to have a dwelling unit put in because of the balcony. He said the balcony looks directly into his and Don and Cindy Hart's backyards. He feels further review needs to be done by the City before approval takes place. He also said he taught his children to get married and move on to their own life; he does not see a reason Mr. Allen's family would need to stay in an ADU when there are 3-4 rooms located in his home.

David Horne, 297 S. 1150 W., said he lives directly west of this property. He said he is a new resident of Farmington, and that most of his questions have been answered. He asked what an accessory dwelling unit is and what limit and boundaries are associated with it. **David Petersen** said an ADU is located in a detached building, meets all the standards of an accessory building, and that the same family (anything related by blood, marriage, and adoption) occupying the single-family home can occupy the dwelling unit. He said it is used exclusively for family, and that no renter can live there.

Heather Barnum closed the public hearing at 7:38 p.m.

Bret Gallacher thanked those residents that came before the Commission. As per recommendation from the City Attorney, he feels this item should be tabled for more information regarding alleged violations.

Rebecca Wayment said she heard a couple concerns that she would like more information on. She said the applicant is allowed to build an accessory building, or garage; however, she has concerns about him running a business from his home. She feels that is a different concern than others that have been presented. She is concerned that the business may not be a permitted use, and that he cannot run it without approval. She expressed concerns that the dwelling unit could also be used as office space for the business. She said she is comfortable tabling the item to find answers to ensure the use is conforming. **David Petersen** said that concern can be further reviewed. **Heather Barnum** expressed concern on what more can be determined if the applicant says it will be used for a specific purpose, i.e. a place for his family to stay. **David Petersen** said the City will investigate, and he recommended the item be tabled. **Heather Barnum** said she feels tabling this item due to a lot of discussion regarding concerns regarding things that are not before the Commission did not seem reasonable; however, she feels tabling the item to investigate concerns with the use of the ADU is more convincing.

Motion:

Kent Hinckley made a motion that the Planning Commission table this recommendation for resolution of possible related concerns with this request and alleged code violations. **Alex Leeman** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Item #6. Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting conditional use permit approval for a water tank on 1.34 acres of property located at approximately 500 East and 200 North in an LR-F (Large Residential – Foothill) zone. (C-9-17)

Eric Anderson showed the aerial map of the location proposed for the upsized City water tank and the location of Jerry Preston's Residences at Farmington Hills Subdivision. He said the City is the

applicant and that the City is looking to upsize its current 100-year-old water tank. He said the current water tank does not have enough capacity, so it will be demolished and replaced with a 2 million gallon water tank. Additionally, The Spencer Reservoir Tank on Woodland Dr. is being abandoned and removed due to structural issues and its location on a fault line. **Eric Anderson** said the new upsized tank will also take on the capacity lost from the Spencer Reservoir Tank. He said public uses are listed as conditional uses in the LR zone.

Larry Famuliner, Farmington City's Water System Supervisor, said the City had a fault line study completed by AGECEC, which showed the proposed location is a favorable site for the upsized tank. He said the City has been looking for a suitable site for at least 10 years. The City reviewed multiple locations on the south side of the City, but did not have any success. He said everything with this location has come back positive. He said currently, there is more engineering being completed on the site; if the next opinion comes back and says the site is not favorable, the City will look elsewhere. He said there have been at least 3 engineers involved in this particular site, and it still seems it is suitable for the new tank. **Larry Famuliner** said the tank will cost approximately \$1 million, but will also have approximately \$100,000 in engineering fees. He said the City is ready to move forward, and is seeking conditional use permit approval in order to do so.

Kent Hinckley said **Larry Famuliner** indicated that there was a fault line study completed, as well as three engineers that have reviewed it. He asked if the additional engineers relied on the first fault line study. **Larry Famuliner** said the fault line study was first conducted to see if there was fault line located on the property before any tank talk could pursue. Now, geotech engineers are reviewing soils of the property, specifically where the tank will be sitting on in the ground to limit the possibility of the tank coming down in an earthquake. **Kent Hinckley** asked for clarification if three engineers are doing their own soils testing. **Larry Famuliner** clarified that there is an engineering firm over the entire project; that engineering firm has hired a geotech firm to collect soils data. **Kent Hinckley** asked if there is anyone reviewing the subcontracted geotech firm's findings. **Larry Famuliner** said he is unsure who will be reviewing the subcontracted geotech firm's findings besides the project engineer.

Kent Hinckley said he has concern that one geotech engineer is completing a study that will be given to the engineers of the tank and its placement without having a second review of the geotech engineers work. He is concerned that everyone, including the City, is relying on the work of the subcontracted geotech engineer's work. **Kent Hinckley** said during Jerry Preston's development's review, the City asked for a third party review of Jerry Preston's geotech engineer's report, which resulted in additional workings that appeared to strengthen the original geotech report. He said he feels it would be worth spending a little additional money to have a second review of the subcontracted geotech engineer's work to see if there is something that could strengthen the report.

Heather Barnum asked for more information on the subcontracted geotech engineer's report. **Larry Famuliner** said the engineering firm hired to design the tank and its placement has hired a geotech engineer; the geotech report will soon be completed. He said if the geotech report is not favorable, the City will not place the upsized water tank in that location. **Kent Hinckley** expressed concern that he has seen circumstances where buildings have failed as a result of varying findings in geotech reports. He feels spending additional money for another geotech engineer to review the results could provide the assurance the City needs to move forward. **Alex Leeman** pointed out that a second opinion does not insure nothing will go wrong with the water tank.

Rebecca Wayment said she feels the reason a third party review of Jerry Preston's geotech report was due to the fact the residents brought a University of Utah geologist that was opposed to the development. She said she feels the proposed location for the water tank falls into the location Jerry Preston was looking to build. She said she feels having Jerry Preston's geotech study that says the

property is ok to build, and the engineering firm is obtaining another geotech report, is sufficient information. **Rebecca Wayment** also added that she feels the engineering firm hired to design the tank and its placement is also aware of the differences in residential homes and water tanks and what it takes to engineer for a tank.

Alex Leeman pointed out that geotech engineers do not make recommendations on water tanks or the placement of a tank, but provide information on what soils types are located inside the hillside. A structural engineer will then design the tank based on what materials are found inside the hillside. **Rebecca Wayment** said once the current geotech engineer is completed with their report, there will have been two studies (one that was peer reviewed) that have looked inside the hillside to determine it is ok to build. She feels comfortable knowing that, and feels it seems like a reasonable location for the tank placement.

Larry Famuliner added the engineering firm hired to design the tank is Hansen, Allen & Luce, Inc. It is one of the foremost engineering firms in Utah for this type of project as they have designed hundreds of water tanks for City's across UT. **David Petersen** added that the firm has a great national reputation as well.

Heather Barnum opened the public hearing at 8:02 p.m.

No comments were received.

Heather Barnum closed the public hearing at 8:02 p.m.

Bret Gallacher asked for clarification on what the Commission is reviewing at this meeting. **Heather Barnum** said the Commission is voting on a conditional use permit that would allow a public use in the LR zone.

Kent Hinckley expressed concern that the renowned engineering firm will not be completing their own geotech study, but that the firm will be subcontracting the study to another geotech firm. He said there were three different entities assisting in Jerry Preston's development, which included the first geotech firm, a second geotech that reviewed the first study, and a third engineer and architect that designed the homes. He is concerned that what is being presented by the City tonight is that there will be one geotech firm reviewing the soils for the proposed location of the tank, without a second review, and then Hansen, Allen, & Luce will rely on that information in designing and building the tank.

David Petersen said with Jerry Preston's subdivision, Jerry Preston hired a geotech firm to assess the entire site, including the proposed site for the upsized water tank. Then, the City hired a consultant to review the geotech study to ensure there were no mistakes. **David Petersen** said two geotech engineers have already reviewed the site. After, a structural engineer took that information that was peer reviewed, and gave opinion on what was needed for the homes to stay on the mountain. **David Petersen** said now the City's tank structural engineer has reviewed the same peer reviewed geotech study on the same site, but provided recommendations on how to keep a 2 million gallon tank on the mountain. Additionally, Hansen, Allen, & Luce are obtaining a subcontracted geotech report on the same property. He said if another person is asked to review the geotech report, it would be similar to a third peer review. **Kent Hinckley** asked for confirmation that Jerry Preston's geotech study included the proposed location for the new tank. **Larry Famuliner** said he is unsure if all of the property was included in the geotech report as there have since been land swaps that have taken place with Jerry Preston. He pointed out that geotech engineers do not analyze every square yard of property, and that Jerry Preston owns south, west, and north of the proposed location so results should be the same for the proposed location of the tank.

Eric Anderson pulled up Jerry Preston's original GeoStrata geotechnical report, which included an aerial view of the boundaries that were studied. **Larry Famuliner** pointed out on the aerial view of the property that was included in the study that the proposed location for the water tank was in fact included in Jerry Preston's peer reviewed geotech study.

Rebecca Wayment said she feels the geotech studies have been satisfied in her mind. She feels since the City is liable, it will make the best decision for everyone, so if there are any concerns, the City will not be comfortable moving forward. **Bret Gallacher** said he is inclined to approve the item after seeing the proposed location for the water tank was included in Jerry Preston's geotech report.

Connie Deianni said she has the same concerns as **Kent Hinckley**, but since the proposed location was included in Jerry Preston's geotech report, she is more inclined to approve; however, she is still not completely comfortable with it. She expressed concern that houses can be built on the surrounding property, but that single-family homes are very different from a 2 million gallon tank of water. **Alex Leeman** clarified that the geotech report does not determine what can and cannot be built, but that is why there are structural engineers designing the tank and its placement. **Connie Deianni** asked why the conditional use permit is before the Commission at this time. **Alex Leeman** said the Commission's approval does not change the engineering on if it can or cannot be built there.

David Petersen suggested adding a condition to the motion that the approval is subject to being thoroughly vetted by the structural engineers.

Kent Hinckley said he was surprised Jerry Preston would include and pay for the proposed area for the tank in his geotech study. **Eric Anderson** said at the time the study was completed, the proposed location was still part of the project boundary since Jerry Preston didn't own most of the project boundary property at the time. **Kent Hinckley** asked that a condition be included in the motion that the property where the 2 million gallon water tank was in fact included in the study and peer review of that study done for the Residences at Farmington Hills subdivision. **Alex Leeman** showed where the property was included in the GeoStrata review. **Connie Deianni** said although it can be seen, what she feels **Kent Hinckley** is saying is that lets put the confirmation in writing as a condition or in the findings for approval. The commissioners agreed that none of them have any heartache requesting that confirmation be put into writing as a condition to the motion.

Larry Famuliner also added that once this project is completely designed, it will go to the State Engineers for final approval. He said that can be reviewed as the ultimate peer review. **Kent Hinckley** again expressed concern that even when it is presented to the State Engineers, they will rely on the geotech study completed by the subcontracted geotech firm. He said if there is a flaw in that original study, then there will be a problem.

Bret Gallacher asked why the Commission is reviewing this now and not after all the studies have been completed by the engineering firm that is designing the tank. **Eric Anderson** said the only thing the Commission is approving is the use. **Alex Leeman** added that the Commission is just approving the use based on the code, but that other standards and ordinance requirements will still need to be met. **Bret Gallacher** asked if this use is conditional, meaning it could not be approved. **Eric Anderson** said the use is not conditional on anything, but that conditions can be placed on the use to mitigate concerns.

David Petersen said that a few conditions to the motion could be included, as mentioned by **Kent Hinckley** and concerns that were brought up. He said a condition to the motion that could be included is that the engineering studies that are still being completed come back with the ok to move

forward, but that if the studies are not comfortable moving forward, the item will return to the Planning Commission. He also said a condition that could be included is confirmation that the proposed location for the tank was in fact covered in Jerry Preston's geotech report, and that staff will report the confirmation back to the Commission. **David Petersen** also said more information will be gathered on the subcontracted geotech study, as well as the name of the subcontracted geotech firm.

Motion:

Alex Leeman made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the conditional use subject to all applicable codes, development standards and ordinances, and with the following condition: staff will report back to the Planning Commission to verify that the tank site was within the geotechnical study completed for the Farmington Hills subdivision or that a second geotechnical review was engaged by the engineering company to verify the work that was prepared to evaluate the site. **Kent Hinckley** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. The proposed use of the particular location is necessary and desirable and provides a service which contributes to the general well-being of the community.
2. The proposed use is necessary in meeting the demand for water due to the growth of the City.
3. The proposed use complies with all regulations and conditions in the Farmington City Zoning Ordinance for this particular use;
4. The proposed use conforms to the goals, policies, and principles of the Comprehensive General Plan;
5. The proposed use is compatible with the character of the site, adjacent properties, surrounding neighborhoods and other existing development as it will be a much needed upgrade to the facilities that are currently existing in the area;
6. The location provides or will provide 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;
7. The proposed use is replacing the capacity for two similar facilities, one because it is undersized and one because it is structurally unsound and sits on a fault.

REORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

Motion:

Alex Leeman made a motion that the Planning Commission move Item #8 (Zone Text Amendment regarding block size and the Regulating Plan) to the new Item #7, Item #9a (Symphony Homes 700 S. street cross-section modification) to the new Item #8, and Item #7 (omnibus Zone Text Amendments) to the new Item #9. **Rebecca Wayment** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT

Item #7. Farmington City (Public Hearing, Continued from January 5, 2017) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation for Zone Text Amendment to Chapter 18 of the Zoning Ordinance including the Regulating Plan and related increase of block size in the OMU zone. (ZT-6-16)

David Petersen said the Planning Commission previously reviewed the charrette completed by Urban Design Associates (UDA), and recommendations were made regarding amendments to the Regulating Plan to match the charrette, increasing the block size, and recommendations regarding “big box” retailers. At the time, the Planning Commission recommended approval regarding the big box retailers, which was then approved by the City Council; however, the other two recommendations were held off for the time. The first item, the Regulating Plan, has been discussed with the City Council, and there is concern that the property included in the charrette could easily be enveloped by multi-family housing; however, the City Council wants to ensure the property remains a true mixed use district. **David Petersen** said staff had the idea to create a “land use concept” to give a soft green light to the mixed use aspect of the area; however, the City Attorney recommended the Planning Commission consider a Small Area Master Plan for the 220+ acres in the area to be adopted as an element of the General Plan. He said staff is working on completing that, but it will not be considered as part of the motion tonight. **Eric Anderson** suggested removing Item B from consideration of the motion, and vote solely on Item A with the corresponding findings (1-4), as shown in the staff report.

David Petersen said the City really likes the UDA plan, but does want to ensure there is a good mix of uses, and that it is not all one thing, like multi-family housing. He feels adopting the Small Area Master Plan will assist in guiding the uses as they come in for approval. **Kent Hinckley** agreed, he feels since there are so many different property owners for the 220+ acres, this will help the whole area fit well together.

Heather Barnum opened the public hearing at 8:48 p.m.

No comments were received.

Heather Barnum closed the public hearing at 8:48 p.m.

Kent Hinckley said he feels the block sizes were already thoroughly reviewed when it came before the Commission in January. He does not see any changes, and is comfortable moving forward on the item.

Motion:

Kent Hinckley made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed zone text amendments to the Regulating Plan and Section 11-18-040 as written in the staff report as items a) and b). **Connie Deianni** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. Amending the Regulating Plan and related block size prior to Project Master Plan gives the applicant confidence in their PMP moving forward without granting full approval and vesting to the project.
2. The regulating plan and related block size amendments are consistent with Chartwell Capital’s PMP application, which is currently under review by the City.
3. The Regulating Plan and related block size amendments are consistent with the intent of the OMU zone, and will allow for more efficient use of the interior of the blocks and will allow future redevelopment as economic and market pressures put demands for in-fill development.
4. Independent of Chartwell’s PMP, staff would be recommending the zone text amendments as they are consistent with the intent of the OMU zone and are highly

desirable because of the increase in efficient usage of the land and increased walkability for the district as a whole.

OTHER

Item #8. Miscellaneous a) Symphony Homes – 700 South Street Cross-Section Modification

Eric Anderson said this subdivision previously had soils concerns, and multiple layouts for the development have been presented to the Commission over time. Improvements have begun on the project; however, when construction for the road began, there was a survey error causing the improvements to be located 4' north of the designated location. The applicant is working with staff to rectify the problem. The applicant is requesting a modification to the street cross-section from 7 ½' to 3 ½', which would cause the park strip to be 3 ½'. The applicant needs a recommendation from the Planning Commission for City Council approval. **Eric Anderson** said the park strip width is not ideal; however, a 3 ½' park strip still gives public works a place to put the snow.

Alex Leeman asked if the north side park strip will also be skinnier. **Eric Anderson** said the 4' discrepancy is made up solely on the south side, so the only thing that will be different is the park strip on the south side. **Rebecca Wayment** asked if there will be sidewalk on both sides of 700 S. **Eric Anderson** said yes, both sides will still have sidewalks, but the south side would have a smaller park strip.

Chris Cave, 5160 S. 1500 W., Riverdale, representative from Reeve & Associates, said the discrepancy was a calibration error between the satellite and our GPS unit on the project. It was not discovered until after we went back to set property corners, and the property corners were too far south. We have been back and forth with Symphony Homes and staff on how to resolve it. Symphony feels the best solution is to reduce the park strip so the road way and excavation is not further disturbed as were there previous soils concerns that have been previously discussed. Reducing the park strip to 3 ½' will allow the current roadway to remain as is in lieu of having to shift it.

Rebecca Wayment asked if the road is going to be aligned, and if the sidewalk will be located in the same place. **Eric Anderson** said yes, the road will remain where it is supposed to be, and that 700 S. already has a slight shift in it.

David Petersen said the other option to consider is placing the sidewalk on the private lots with an easement over it. **Eric Anderson** said everything would remain the same; however, the sidewalk would be on someone's front lot. **Heather Barnum** asked if Symphony did not like that option. **David Petersen** said that option is not ideal for Symphony Homes because it would make the front of the lots feel smaller.

Connie Deianni asked if a 3 ½' park strip would allow for trees to be planted. **Eric Anderson** said it would be narrow, but smaller trees could be planted. **Connie Deianni** asked if a 3 ½' park strip is a hazard on a major artillery road. **Eric Anderson** said it is not ideal; however, a 3 ½' park strip is an adequate buffer from the road. He said he does not see any safety issues with it.

Bret Gallacher asked why the City is recommending the 3 ½' park strip solution. **Eric Anderson** said it is the simplest solution. **Kent Hinckley** said he is more inclined to have the sidewalk in someone's yard. **Eric Anderson** said doing so would require additional work with easements, and modifying the street cross-section is just simpler. **Heather Barnum** expressed concerns that those homes with a

sidewalk easement in their front yard may look odd. **Eric Anderson** said it may not be visually noticeable.

Rebecca Wayment said she would be more likely to have the sidewalk be placed in the front yard or to take 4' from the back of the lots. She said she feels most people do not drive by homes and think it has a small front yard, but that people notice small sidewalks and park strips. She also feels more comfortable having a wider park strip for safety reasons.

Alex Leeman expressed concern that making a decision like that could have a substantial impact on Symphony Homes. He feels before a decision like that were to be made, he would like to hear from Symphony Homes. **Kent Hinckley** said he feels Symphony could have the decision to take the 4' from the back or the front of their lots.

David Petersen said that for many years, park strips in the City were 4'. He said what is being proposed is only a half of a foot off. He said the east side of 700 S. has 4' park strip and sidewalk. He suggested matching the 5 Symphony Homes 4' park strip and sidewalk, which would result in a small variance that would need to come off the front or back of the lots. **Connie Deianni** expressed concern that the north side of 700 S. would look off with a 7 ½' park strip compared to the 4' park strip on the south side. **David Petersen** said most people do not look at both sides to compare when driving, but that they look at the side of the road they are driving. **Rebecca Wayment** said she likes this option the best. **Alex Leeman** asked if the applicant would have to come back for a 6" easement or setback. **David Petersen** said the rest of what the applicant would need to have done can be completed at staff level. **Alex Leeman** asked that the Commission hear which option the applicant prefers.

Chris Cave said he is able to represent Symphony Homes on this, and John Wheatley with Symphony Homes would be comfortable with the 4' sidewalk and park strip option. Symphony Homes requested 3 ½', but that they would be happy with 4' as well. **Heather Barnum** asked if the motion should read that the sidewalk and park strip needs to be the same measurement as the east side of 700 S. **David Petersen** suggested the motion state there will be a 4' sidewalk and park strip that will match the park strip and sidewalk to the east.

Connie Deianni expressed frustration that there has been a lot of discussion regarding a mistake that the City did not make, and that the City is asking to compromise the aesthetics and safety of the street so Symphony Homes is not negatively impacted. She is concerned that the City is being impacted in return, especially since a smaller park strip decreases safety. **David Petersen** said safety does not have anything to do with a wider park strip; all homes east of this subdivision have 4' park strips. He assured her it will blend nicely. He also pointed out that east of this portion of 700 S. has approximately 35' of asphalt, but this portion is closer to 28'. He said drivers go faster on wider asphalt, so having narrower asphalt will also help with safety.

Motion:

Alex Leeman made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve a street cross-section modification for 700 South within the Pheasant Hollow Subdivision in the following manner: that the park strip on the south side of the road be reduced to 4' and the sidewalk remain 4' to match the south side of road profile of 700 S. to the east of this particular area; Symphony Homes would have the option to either a 6" easement at the front of those lots, request a 6" variance on the back of those lots if necessary to make sure they are buildable, or dedicate 6" more of ROW. **Bret Gallacher** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings:

1. The proposed street cross-section modification will allow the applicant to move forward on their project with a minor modification.
2. The proposed modification will allow for snow removal and limited landscaping.
3. The proposed subdivision plat has not been recorded, therefore the change can be reflected on the recorded plat without having to amend the plat.

ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT

Item #7. Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation for miscellaneous Zone Text Amendments to Chapters 2, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 28, 31, and 32 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding: a) Amending Section 11-2-020, redefining both accessory and secondary dwelling units as requiring the property owner to live on-site; b) Amending Sections 11-10-020, 11-11-020/030, 11-13-020/030, 11-15-020/030, and 11-17-020/030 removing residential facilities for the handicapped from the list of conditional uses and making them a permitted use; c) Allowing for financial institutions to have drive-up windows through special use review in the mixed use district as set forth in Section 11-18-050(b); d) Updating Section 11-28-190 (Table 1) adding mixed use districts to the summary of permitted and conditional uses; e) Amending Section 11-28-200 regulating secondary dwelling units; f) Amending Section 11-31-040 designating the storm water official as the flood plain administrator; g) Amending Section 11-32-040 allowing for parking reductions to be approved by the Planning Commission as part of site plan approval. (ZT-2-17)

Eric Anderson and David Petersen reviewed each of the Zone Text Amendments, as listed below:

- a) This proposed change modified areas in the definition that were problematic, including removing the clause that a conditional use permit cannot be transferrable, specifically in the event the home sells.
- b) Under the current ordinance, a residential facility for the handicapped is listed as a conditional use; however, this is in violation of Federal Law. This change would move residential facilities for the handicapped to permitted uses.
- c) Mountain America Credit Union submitted an application in a mixed-use district; however, it was discovered that the use table does not specify financial institutions are allowed to have drive-thru windows. This change would allow financial institutions to have drive-thru windows in the OMU and GMU zone. In the TMU one, the intent of the zone is to be as walkable as possible, so drive-thru windows should be discouraged. Also, the ordinance stated drive-thru windows may be allowed with “special use review;” however, there is no definition for that phrase. It is amended to read, “special exception review.”
- d) In the use table for wireless telecommunication facilities, there is not a distinction for mixed use zones for commercial use, including OMU, RMU, GMU, etc. Currently the Commercial zone (C) on the use table covers the mixed use districts, but the proposed changes now offers more clarity. The other change is making towers less than 60’ a conditional use in lieu of a permitted use.
- e) Staff clarified that Item A was amending the definitions for Secondary Dwelling Units; however, this item is changing the actual standards. Currently, SDUs are allowed in the OTR zone, but only as a conditional use permit, which is not transferrable to a new property owner in the event the home sells. The proposed change allows the conditional use permit to run with the property. Additionally, Section 11-28-200 currently limits SDUs to the OTR zone; however, SDUs are already allowed through a conditional use review in other zones found in Chapter 10, 11, 13, and 17. There were some concerns with the intent of SDUs from commissioners. **David**

Petersen explained two family dwellings were previously allowed as a conditional use; however, it allowed property owners to turn properties into a duplex while living elsewhere. The City felt there was not pride in ownership. The City was concerned that getting rid of two family dwellings as a conditional use would be taking away property rights an owner had, so the City amended it to “secondary dwelling units” and required the property owner lives onsite. This change has brought positive reinvestment into old town Farmington, so the City Council felt it would be a good addition to other areas within the City.

- f) Currently, the Zoning Administrator (David Petersen) is the designated flood plain administrator by virtue of the ordinance. The Storm-water Official (Ken Klinker) is the staff expert on flood plain issues and already does a majority of the duties required. The proposed change would give him the authority as the official Flood Plain Administrator.
- g) Currently, an applicant has to go to the Board of Adjustments to obtain a “variance” for a reduction in parking; however, applicants typically know their parking needs better than the City. Also, the BOA typically reviews variances as a result of hardships, however, a parking reduction is not a variance. Staff feels this is something that should be addressed during site plan approval, which would be reviewed by the Planning Commission, and not the BOA.

Heather Barnum asked if the City is receiving many applicants for cell towers. She expressed concern that a DAS is a permitted use in the mixed use districts, and that towers less than 50’ are conditional uses. **Eric Anderson** said the City has only received a few such applications, because the technology is so new; however, the change is specifically for small cell networks in the mixed use districts. It would encourage smaller cell networks that are very low impact. He also pointed out that currently towers less than 60’ are permitted uses in the commercial zones, which is what has been applied to the mixed use districts. The proposed change is more stringent in that it is will now be a conditional use in mixed use districts.

Heather Barnum asked if Item C is a direct correlation to the Mountain America Credit Union discussion. **Eric Anderson** said staff has seen an application on the MACU, and that application made staff aware of the issue needing to be addressed, that being: when the ordinance was written, it was an oversight that financial institutions were not allowed a drive-thru; it should have been included. **Heather Barnum** asked if the proposed change would change where financial institutions are allowed. **Eric Anderson** said no, it does not change where the financial institutions are allowed, and the buildings would still have to conform to all other standards.

Heather Barnum opened the public hearing at 9:46 p.m.

Heather Barnum entered the email submitted by **Richard Haws** and **Scott Harwood** into the record. **David Petersen** said the email explained that Item C could be interpreted that any use with a subscript by it (the small 1) can have a drive-thru window through special review, and that everyone else can have a drive-thru window. It was suggested adding the wording to say that any use that does not have a subscript cannot have a drive-thru window. Staff feels comfortable including this recommendation.

David Horne, 297 S. 1100 W., wanted to clarify the nature of DAS cell networks have a significantly smaller footprint. He said a DAS is like what Vivint Wireless services is placing on the top of residential homes. He said a DAS can hardly be seen, and is the opposite of large towers.

Heather Barnum closed the public hearing at 9:51 p.m.

Heather Barnum said she would like to take the recommendation to strengthen Item C by including the additional wording regarding the subscript.

Motion:

Alex Leeman made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as set forth in the April 20, 2017 staff report, subject to all standards of the Farmington City ordinance and with the following condition: Item C will include the wording, “if the proposed use does not have a subscript 1, drive-thru windows are not permitted.” **Kent Hinckley** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings:

1. The intent of the secondary dwelling unit was to be similar to that of the accessory dwelling unit, which requires that the owner live on-site; this text amendment is bringing the ordinance into consistency with its original intent. The zone text amendment will also ensure that single family residential zones do not become proliferated with absentee apartment owners.
2. Moving residential facilities for the disabled from a conditional use to a permitted use in all zones where single family residential are permitted uses will bring the Zoning Ordinance into compliance with federal law, specifically the Fair Housing and American with Disabilities Acts.
3. Financial institutions are a desirable use in the mixed-use district, as they provide a necessary service, and are low-impact. In order to meet the needs of their clientele, financial institutions require drive-thru windows to function. Amending the use table in Chapter 18 is allowing for this type of use to realistically thrive in the mixed-use district. Additionally, moving the drive-thru windows for financial institutions to special exceptions instead of special use review provides a clear, established, and well-defined mechanism for Planning Commission review. Through the special exception review process, the City still has a degree of oversight in deciding where drive-thru windows are compatible with the intent of the mixed use district and where they are not.
4. Currently the mixed use zones are not defined under the wireless facility use table; staff has always interpreted these zones as falling under the C zone designation. This zone text amendment explicitly designates the mixed use zones independently of the C zone, and is context sensitive to the intent of the mixed use zones.
5. Secondary dwelling units are currently relegated to the OTR zone and the vesting granted through the conditional use permit are limited to the current property owner; this amendment updates the ordinance bringing it into conformity with the rest of Title 11 where secondary dwelling units are allowed as conditional uses.
6. The storm water official already does the majority of the work of the flood plain official; this amendment is codifying this and streamlining the flood plain approval process.
7. Having to go through a variance approval process by the Board of Adjustments for a parking reduction as currently constituted by Chapter 32 is onerous, particularly when the request is not a variance. Decisions about reductions of parking requirement should be made by the Planning Commission on a case-by-case basis when reviewing a site plan and/or conditional use permit application.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. Barnum', written over a horizontal line.

Heather Barnum
Chair, Farmington City Planning Commission