

FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION

June 25, 2020

ELECTRONIC AND IN PERSON MEETING

STUDY SESSION

Present: Chairman Roger Child, Vice Chairman Alex Leeman, Mike Plaizier, Larry Steinhorst, Greg Wall, Russ Workman, and Alternate Commissioner Inger Erickson. **Staff:** Community Development Director David Petersen, Recording Secretary Carly Rowe, Planning/GIS Specialist Shannon Hansell, Associate City Planner Meagan Booth, and Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Director Brigham Mellor. Rulon Homer was excused.

Miscellaneous Item: North Cottonwood Creek PUD (S-27-18)

Craig North of North Cottonwood Creek PUD subdivision, along with the builder for the property discussed building elevations and potential house plans with the Commission. This subdivision is going to be located at approximately 368 W State Street, just south of the Lagoon campground.

REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Roger Child, Vice Chairman Alex Leeman, Mike Plaizier, Larry Steinhorst, Greg Wall, Russ Workman, and Alternate Commissioner Inger Erickson. **Staff:** Community Development Director David Petersen, Recording Secretary Carly Rowe, Planning/GIS Specialist Shannon Hansell, Associate City Planner Meagan Booth, and Assistant City Manager/Economic Development Director Brigham Mellor. Rulon Homer was excused.

Chairperson Roger Child opened the meeting at 7:00 PM.

Item #1 Minutes

Alex Leeman made a motion to approve the minutes from May 21, 2020. **Mike Plaizier** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Item #2 City Council Report

The City Council approved the Phelps-Van Otten Plat Amendment as well as the Farmington Station Parkway preliminary plat and exception. The Project Master Plan (East) for North Farmington Station, containing 100+ acres was tabled until the next meeting, in order to hear both East and West as one collective application. Lastly, the City will undergo a property trade with the property owners of a home located on 1525 W, where Commerce Drive will go in.

SUBDIVISION

Item #3 Steve and Tammy Thomas (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting approval of a metes and bounds subdivision (lot split) of 0.55 acres of property located at 41 West State Street in the R-4 (Multiple Family Residential) zone.

The property owner desires to subdivide his property at 41 West State Street. The property is .55 acres (23,958 square feet). The minimum lot size in the R-4 zone is 10,000 square feet for each single-family or two-family dwelling, plus 4,000 square feet for each additional dwelling unit to a maximum of 4 dwelling units per building per lot.

The applicant is requesting approval to build a second single family home to the south of the existing single family home and create a separate lot for each dwelling. However in doing so, the proposed lot for the existing single-family home (Parcel A) is 8,593 square feet or 1,407 square feet less than the minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. Therefore, the applicant is seeking a special exception of this fixed dimension as per section 11-3-045 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Moreover, the southern lot (or Parcel B) will be a land locked parcel with no actual street frontage in violation the city ordinances unless the Planning Commission determines otherwise as per section 12-7-050 B which states in part, "Private streets shall not be permitted unless the Planning Commission finds that the most logical development of the land requires that lots be created which are served by a private street or other means of access, and makes such findings in writing with the reasons stated therein." Staff is recommending that the commission require an easement through Lot A in order to access Lot B to establish a buildable lot.

Steve Thomas, the applicant (65 W State St) had no further explanation on the background of the item but thanked the City for their efforts. **Roger Child** asked what the width would be of the access for Lot B. **Steve Thomas** replied that it is currently 16 feet and he is working with UDOT to extend the driveway to the road and widen to the fence line. **Roger Child** then asked what type of parking would be provided. **Steve Thomas** answered that they are working to put a car port in behind the current home so the occupant would essentially drive in and turn right to park in the cart port. **Dave Petersen** did include that the fire department will require at least 20 feet width for the driveway. **Greg Wall** questioned the existing shed; **Steve Thomas** stated that when the carport is built, the shed would be taken down. **Greg Wall** also addressed the public comment that was emailed to staff regarding a maintenance agreement, indicating that it was a wise idea.

Roger Child opened the public hearing at 7:27 PM.

(Email) Ali Avery (41 W State St) emailed comments that will be included at the end of the record.

Roger Child closed the public hearing at 7:27 PM.

MOTION

Greg Wall made a motion to move that the Planning Commission approve the proposed lot split at 41 West State Street and a special exception for the smaller lot size for Parcel A, subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances, and the following conditions:

1. The property owner will dedicate an access easement acceptable to the city for access to Lot B through Lot A as well as obtain UDOT approval.
2. The property owner will provide a survey from a licensed surveyor demonstrating all easements necessary for utilities, fire department access, including turnaround access if required, etc.
3. The applicant shall submit a site plan providing all utility locations and appropriate storm drainage facilities for the new lot.
4. The applicant must address all DRC Comments.
5. The Findlay parcel (Davis County Tax ID #07-028-0075) adjacent to the west boundary line of the lot split is 8,712 square feet in size, less than the minimum lot size for the R-4 zone. The applicant's subdivision plans shows a boundary adjustment with this property. Any such boundary adjustment shall not result in a land area less than the existing parcel size for the Findlay lot.
6. Enter into a maintenance agreement and record the agreement against the parcel(s) that will be lot A and B; regarding the access and utility easement that will pass over from A to B.

Larry Steinhorst seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. The property is zoned R-4 and the parcel is being divided for the purposes of building a single family home. This will match the character of the surrounding residences. Furthermore, the historic home built in 1898 on the property will be preserved.
2. The lot split is in accordance with the Farmington City General Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinances.

3. No undevelopable remnant parcels will remain in the lot split.
4. The existing lot widths of both parcels do not conform to the lot width standards in the R-4 zone. However, the proposed subdivision will not increase the extent of the non-conforming widths

OTHER BUSINESS

Alex Leeman made a motion to hear Item #5a prior to Item #4. Greg Wall seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Item #5a Tim and Jenny Pace (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a special exception to exceed the minimum driveway width for a proposed circular driveway at their home, located at 141 S Bonanza Rd in an AE (Agriculture Estates) zone. (M-4-20)

The applicant requests two curb cuts for a circular driveway totaling 41 feet 4 inches (20 feet 8 inches each). The City's ordinance states, "On lots with at least the minimum width required in the zone, one additional driveway may be permitted providing that the sum of the width of both driveways does not exceed the maximum widths specified in subsection A1 of this section". The parcel width is 106 feet, which allows one additional driveway per the ordinance. However, the sum of both driveways exceeds 30 feet; therefore, the applicant requests a special exception, to increase the width by 10 feet.

A major concern with widening a driveway is pedestrian safety: the wider the driveway the longer distance a pedestrian has to traverse, creating a larger conflict area between an automobile backing out and a pedestrian. In this case, the two driveways are separated by 49 feet creating a significant refuge between the two driveways. Another significant concern is largely aesthetic. Single-family residential neighborhoods typically have roadway side treatments that include curb, gutter, sidewalk and park strip. If larger driveways become too pervasive, the character of the neighborhood often changes. In this case, there is ample park strip not only on this lot but in the surrounding neighborhood as well.

Regarding the Special Exception, the 11-3-045 states; "Purpose: A special exception is an activity or use incidental to or in addition to a principal use permitted in a zoning district; or an adjustment to a fixed dimension standard permitted as an exception to the requirements of this title; or a transfer of development right (TDR), or rights, established because of blight which results in an additional lot, or lots, or a dwelling unit, or units; or an adaptive reuse of a building or structure eligible, or that may be eligible, for the National Register of Historic Places so long as the adaptive reuse does not compromise such eligibility. A special exception has less potential impact than a conditional use but still requires careful review of such factors as location, design, configuration and/or impacts to determine the desirability of authorizing its establishment on any given site. This section sets forth procedures for considering and approving special exceptions to the provisions of this title."

(Zoom) Tim and Jenny Pace, the applicants (141 S Bonanza Rd) had no additional information to add to the background information that was given.

Roger Child opened the public hearing at 7:35 PM.

No comments received.

Roger Child closed the public hearing at 7:35 PM.

MOTION

Greg Wall made a motion to move that the Planning Commission approve a special exception allowing an extension of an

existing driveway and associated curb cut up to an additional eleven (11) feet, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain a Farmington City Excavation Permit prior to construction.
2. The circular driveway shall be no less than six feet from any side property line and demonstrate this requirement on the site plan.

Mike Plaizier seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. The proposed driveway extension does not significantly increase safety issues.
2. There is a driveway adjacent to the proposed driveway however; there will be a significant refuge available for pedestrians between the driveways along this street.
3. Park strips are present in this neighborhood and the proposed extension would not significantly affect the current roadway side treatments.
4. The house currently sits on a dead end street allowing the circular driveway will be beneficial as a turn around.

PROJECT MASTER PLAN APPLICATION

Item #4 STACK Real Estate (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation for approval for the North Farmington Station West Project Master Plan (PMP), and accompanying development agreement, a mixed-use development, encompassing approximately 35 acres west of 1525 West Street, south of Haight Creek, and east of D.R.G.&W. trail (PMP-2-20).

Commissioner Russ Workman abstains from voting on this agenda item from STACK Real Estate due to personal interest.

In November of 2016, Chartwell Capital and the City contracted with Urban Design Associates (UDA) to conduct a planning charrette, which produced a conceptual master plan for the 220+ acres of property north of Shepard Creek, west of the UP tracks, east of the D&RGW trail, and south of Shepard Lane. The charrette process involved receiving input from a number of stakeholders, including 13 property owners within and adjacent to the project area, city staff, local elected officials and representatives from Chartwell Capital. The result was a master plan document, or sub-area master plan to the City's General Plan, intended to guide and inform the development of a future mixed-use office park.

The above referenced applicant, STACK Real Estate, is now proposing a more specific Project Master Plan (PMP) encompassing some 35 acres of the UDA master plan area for the reasons set forth in the findings below.

On Tuesday, June 2, 2020, Farmington City held an open house to receive citizen input regarding a proposed realignment to "Commerce Drive", which is the major north to South Street, intended to connect 950 North to Park Lane. The UDA plan shows the corridor for this principle street close to I-15 and the U.P. tracks. The proposed alignment is located further west at 1525 West. The North Farmington Station West PMP places the Commerce drive corridor in an alignment consistent with the information presented at the open house.

As referenced above, the property is zoned OMU, which zone does not allow residential uses. However, as per Section 11-18-140 of the Zoning Ordinance residential uses are possible in this zone.

An issue remains regarding the development agreement---that is, the proposed office to residential ratio set forth in paragraph 5.b. of the enclosed development agreement. Although the applicant is in favor of such a ratio, he maintains that due to the present uncertain office market he cannot fulfill this commitment right now. This topic will be discussed in further detail at the meeting.

Dave Petersen explained how building heights are measured in Farmington. On site plan reviews, the City will measure to the midpoint, which is 27 feet maximum for a single-family home on a flat lot; therefore, some single-family homes could be upwards to 30 to 40 feet at the pitch. When the applicant proposes 36 feet office buildings in the buffer area, it will not be significantly higher than some single family homes. He went on to say that, we will talk about the item tonight but we can continue the discussion next meeting on July 9, 2020 and combine the two PMP and Development Agreement(s).

Nathan Ricks (2801 N Thanksgiving Way #100, Lehi UT) said that they are prepared to combine both the West and East items to present to us at our next meeting. As for the comments received regarding building heights, he reiterates **Dave Petersen's** comments and then explains that there is 90 feet between the back of fence to the residential area(s) that will also act as a buffer. The other comment was regarding 36-foot townhomes extended to the Shepard interchange, and that would act as a better neighbor to the existing residential, STACK does prefer to keep some commercial there at the interchange. **Inger Erickson** asked about the architectural style, **Nathan Ricks** replied that they are working solely on land use right now but will be providing site plan approvals when it is time for residential. **Alex Leeman** asked about the strip near 950 north, and raised concern of how small that area is; he said a suggestion is possibly a backyard of a townhome versus wedging in a small commercial building. **Brigham Mellor** said the City is still working with UDOT on the right of way on this strip of land, so the area in discussion could change.

Alex Leeman went on to discuss concerns in paragraph 5b in the development agreement, this paragraph requires construction of the office buildings at the same time as residential. STACK Real Estate does have some concerns at this time about the office building, due to the current state of working-from-home to help relieve COVID-19. He then stated that he has been a part of this process for 6+ years, and the City has been looking to have a sustainable economic and tax base for the next 75+ years. One compromise he has brainstormed is perhaps allowing some residential prior to the office – and to develop the “yellow” area as residential since it is not as impactful and that would allow for a transition from the neighborhoods.

Beyond that, **Alex Leeman** said he likes the overall plan, he looks at them together and cannot wait to see the offices near the freeway and the “town square” area. Once the details are finalized, it will be a great addition to the City. **Nathan Ricks** replied that STACK is a long-game developer, they take on large products and traditionally they are office developers and they would like to have the flexibility to allow the market to tell them what to do first, office or residential. He said they are committed and setting aside 29 acres along the freeway for office use. **Alex Leeman** said he is concerned because if office is not there first (or soon after), it will be difficult to try explaining to residents that this is an office park versus a multi-family complex area. The greatest fear for those who sit on City Council, he said is that in 10+ years someone saying they do not want to do office anymore.

Roger Child opened the public hearing at 8:28 PM.

(Email) Heidi Herron (926 N 1875 W) emailed her comments and Dave Petersen read them in as part of the record and they will be included at the end of the record. Comments were addressed in discussion between commissioners and the developer.

(Zoom) Kyle Stowell (1764 W Burke Ln) said emotionally, he wants to oppose this project and there is still an element of disbelief of having a large-scale project near his home. However, he feels that he is here to ask on behalf of other residents to minimize density in the area. Like last meeting, he mentioned when the area was rezoned in 2011, that there would be a buffer, transition, and tiered approach from building heights. He asked for clarification on the distance from the D&RG trail fence to the east side of the rail trail. There is a gas line easement included in the distance. He thanked the developer for limiting the building heights to 36 feet or less along the western portion. His concern about the mixed residential area will be 4+ stories, and he opposes 4+ story buildings west of 1525 W. He also wanted to echo **Heidi Herron's** comments about Farmington losing a small-town feel. He ended with saying that he understands that

progress happens but he wants to minimize impact on those who live close by and wanting to keep his small-scale farm. In addition, he asks if the developer can keep the dark sky initiative, and look into minimizing the lighting, so it does not affect the residents.

City Councilmember, Shawn Beus (1727 W Clark Ln) stated that he wanted to attend tonight to hear the Commission's comments in comparison with the comments from City Council. He went on to explain by City Council tabled the item; essentially the City Council found some defects in the development agreement that did not meet statues and it was not executable and there was no other choice then tabling. He said all are on the same page concerning the developer's idea to minimize impact. The issue is to take into consideration some ways to buffer the area, and appreciated **Alex Leeman's** comments about the OMU zone. The City Council also would like to hear both East and West together as one item at their next meeting.

Roger Child closed the public hearing at 8:41 PM.

Dave Petersen commented on the requirements in chapter 18; buildings that front the local road can be three stories high. Not all stories are the same, though, that is why the City measures heights and not per story.

Trevor Evans (2801 N Thanksgiving Way #100, Lehi, UT) answered that the distance from the back of the fence line to the east, side of the trail is 40 feet, and they have taken an additional 50 feet from the gas line (totaling 90). From there, an additional 200 feet would be in the buffer area.

Greg Wall asked the developer if they have considered indicating on the plat that residents west of the proposed area have horses and that it is a permitted use in that area. **Nathan Ricks** said they have not done that before but it would be something that they could look into to satisfy the parties in the area. **Greg Wall** also asked if the townhomes were surface parked or would have a garage. **Nathan Ricks** said that they have not gotten into specifics of a site plan yet but would hope to have garages since they would be on the higher-end of value. **Greg Wall** asked with the height requirement of 36-foot to the ridgeline, do they envision three story homes and what type of roofs, pitched or flat. **Nathan Ricks** replied yes to three-story and that economically he thinks flat roofs do have a modern feel, but he is not near the design phase at this time. **Greg Wall** asked if they intend to collaborate with someone to subdivide and sell any land for the residential component, **Nathan Ricks** replied that their intent is to keep the area and allow STACK to develop. **Greg Wall** asked if they have done any multi-family development since they specialize in office buildings. **Nathan Ricks** said that currently they are working on multi-family along with office but previously they have stuck solely with office buildings. **Greg Wall** asked what they hope the ratio to be (office to residential), **Nathan Ricks** replies that they hope to let the market decide what they can build. He understands there are some concerns with that, and have heard it from staff as well. He said office-building parking lots are only about 10% full at this point and not positive on who will continue to work-from-home; his hope is that offices will make a comeback, but it will look different due to COVID-19. **Nathan Ricks** said the area in Lehi that they purchased, they started in 2006 and got through the recession in 2008, and since then have built 14 office buildings, and this is something that they will get through as well. **Greg Wall** questioned how many office buildings the developer anticipates. **Nathan Ricks** replied with 4-8 office buildings. **Greg Wall** said that the City would likely want a ratio (office to residential) because it is more concrete, he also questioned if they had a timeframe for closing. **Nathan Ricks** said they would be hoping to close on all areas of land in September. Their agenda anticipates having approvals before the end of July via City Council.

Roger Child stated his opinion on the development agreement, he said there should be residential development rights when the developer has a certain amount of square footage of office and the quality of that square footage; assembling the land is a benefit to the City. The developer should have the right to develop some of that land as residential from day one because of how much the developer is investing and how it will benefit the City. Secondly, he said that having the residential mixed use (residential, services, etc.) in the same area could be beneficial when it comes to finding

tenants who want to pre-lease. If the environment is created, then we can capture tenants before they want to go elsewhere.

Inger Erickson said she is glad about the developer wanting to see which way the market goes and base which component comes first. She said she also agrees with **Roger Child** and should develop what they feel is right, first. In addition, her feeling is that the market is dictating residential right now and she likes the comments from the residents that were received. She said there had been some developments on the East side that have been concerning to residents and she said she did not feel like anyone listened. She does not want the residents to feel that way and believes the residents should have a say in what the developer designs. **Dave Petersen** clarified that the homes going in this area would likely be high-rent and asked her opinion on any moderate-income housing in the area. **Inger Erickson** said that with the population growth, it would be something to consider. She said as far as moderate-income housing, it could work, depending on having an HOA and maintenance. She said she previously lived in a moderate-income housing area that was great looking and it now looks awful due to no maintenance; she said putting restrictions would help with moderate-income housing so it can maintain a high level of class. She said it appears when homes are closer together they seem to be those that are not well cared for. **Alex Leeman** said that it depends, actually and there are homes in his area that are on a great deal of land that are not cared for; he said every area is different. **Inger Erickson** wanted to say Daybreak is an exception, saying moderate housing near the million-dollar homes; and that HOA there is a game-changer there. **Roger Child** said that it is more so financing instead of design when it comes to moderate housing and you can do tasteful moderate housing on a budget.

Alex Leeman said that after doing some research, about 23 lots in his neighborhood all taxed at 55% paid roughly \$69,000 in property taxes last year (together). Whereas Cube Storage, paid about the same amount at full tax base; the storage space does not have as much as an impact as the neighborhood when it comes to roads, etc. He also mentioned one parcel he looked at Station Park, belonging to Hyatt Hotel, Old Navy etc. sits on 6 acres. Alone, they paid \$608,000 in property taxes. If the City fills in this empty area with only residential, it will essentially raise taxes because the City would not be able to afford to do any improvements. Commercial tax-base in the City is a necessity, the area the developer is looking at is a blank slate and typically, single-family homes are not located against the freeway. One of these office buildings that is proposed will bring in an estimated \$1 to \$2 million in property tax alone, if we have 5 to 6 put in, the City will be prepared for any tax increase for the next 50+ years. There is an important reason why the City has envisioned this; the correct long-term plan for Farmington is an office park. **Nathan Ricks** replied that as the developer, they had been looking at this area for the last 5 years and they want to bring the SMART community to Farmington. He mentioned that some communities that have refused commercial are now losing money.

MOTION

Alex Leeman made a motion to move that the Planning Commission continue the Public Hearing on July 9, 2020 where both East and West will be reviewed collectively.

Greg Wall seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

Item #5 Miscellaneous, correspondence, etc.

b. Other

ADJOURNMENT

Alex Leeman made a motion to adjourn at **9:41 PM**. **Inger Erickson** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Roger Child", is written above a horizontal line.

Roger Child, Planning Commission Chair

#3



Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Fwd: 41 West State Street

Meagan Booth <mbooth@farmington.utah.gov>
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Tue, Jun 23, 2020 at 11:03 AM

Please hold on to these comments for the record for tomorrow night.

Meagan Mullen Booth
Associate Planner
Office: 801-939-9220
Cell: 385-270-7567



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ali Avery** <alia@nscity.org>
Date: Tue, Jun 23, 2020 at 9:42 AM
Subject: RE: 41 West State Street
To: Meagan Booth <mbooth@farmington.utah.gov>

Hi Meagan,

Thanks for directing me to the packet online. I have a couple of comments on the proposal:

1. I think the access easement also needs to include a maintenance agreement in the event that they sell off one of the lots. The maintenance agreement should include driveway maintenance in addition to any utilities that would pass through Lot A unless it's within a new PUE.
2. Does there need to be a fire turnaround on the rear lot since the home will be further than 150 feet from the street?

What do you think the odds of the Planning Commission granting the exception are?

Thanks,

Ali Avery

Long Range Planner

City of North Salt Lake

10 East Center Street

North Salt Lake UT 84054

801-335-8729



From: Meagan Booth [mailto:mbooth@farmington.utah.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 7:47 AM

To: Ali Avery <alia@nslcity.org>

Subject: Re: 41 West State Street

Hi Ali,

I hope this email finds you well. The staff report and attachments should be on the website this morning. Please let me know if you have any questions. Hopefully the report will answer your questions.

Meag

On Mon, Jun 22, 2020, 8:18 PM Ali Avery <alia@nslcity.org> wrote:

Hi Meagan,

Apparently my landlords are wanting to divide the lot that I live on at 41 West State Street. Do they have a plat or drawing of any kind showing how they intend to split it or is it just a legal description? I assume they are asking for a flag lot? Is that allowed in Farmington? Just wondering how this is going to affect me.

Thanks,

Ali Avery

Long Range Planner

City of North Salt Lake

801-335-8729

alia@nslcity.org



Item #4

Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

PMP For Stack Real Estate

heidi herron <hjherron@yahoo.com>

Thu, Jun 25, 2020 at 1:42 PM

Reply-To: heidi herron <hjherron@yahoo.com>

To: "rchild@farmington.utah.gov" <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>, "aleeman@farmington.utah.gov" <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>, "rhommer@farmington.utah.gov" <rhommer@farmington.utah.gov>, "rworkman@farmington.utah.gov" <rworkman@farmington.utah.gov>, "mplaizier@farmington.utah.gov" <mplaizier@farmington.utah.gov>, "gwall@farmington.utah.gov" <gwall@farmington.utah.gov>, "lsteinhorst@farmington.utah.gov" <lsteinhorst@farmington.utah.gov>, "ierickson@farmington.utah.gov" <ierickson@farmington.utah.gov>, "crowe@farmington.utah.gov" <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>
Cc: David Petersen <dpetersen@farmington.utah.gov>

I plan on being on the zoom call for tonight, but thought it easier to send my comments for the meeting regarding the West PMP through e-mail since my zoom had a few issues last time (on my phones end).

With the North Station Phase I Development agreement that was agreed to earlier this year the buildings against the rail trail and thus closest to the large single family homes on the west were modified from their original desire of three stories to two stories. The developer worked with neighborhood and the city to help create a tiered approach to these buildings where the two story units were near the homes and the larger connections of units and three stories were closer to the freeway.

In the city council notes it says "Doug Anderson noted that as discussed in the work session, because this is the first project in the area it is critical that it look good. He said it will set the tone for future surrounding development."

This is that future development. I believe that the people of Farmington should have the same transition from three story buildings to two stories as the homes by the last approved development did. I would GREATLY prefer the heights come down from 36'. However, the ultimate look and feel of transitioning from 5 story+ office buildings to 3 story+ office buildings and then 3 story townhomes does not then transition down to single family homes without looking and feeling off. The heights of the tallest single family home may hit that height, but it still looks like a single family home. A Three story townhome doesn't look or feel anything like a single family home. The compromise to me is instead of us getting single family homes behind us, is that they are allowed townhomes, but instead of them getting three stories they have a requirement that they can't be more than two stories against the rail trail. That is a HUGE area to not have anything under 3 stories and isn't a transition at all from large single family homes to the large business park with Apartments and Town Homes.

When this was originally rezoned I was told to be grateful, because with the original zoning I may have ended up with Apartments behind my house. It sounds like I still might but with tons of traffic, commercial area and other business related buildings as well. As a neighborhood in Farmington, we would like to blend with this new area and not have an us versus them feel.

I noticed on the city's comments it states "without the requirements of this PMP it allows for 3 story buildings without the height restrictions". That is true. It is also true that the developer is asking for residential in an area where it isn't approved. That is a HUGE giveaway to them. I believe we should get something in return. They want 3 story townhomes in a city that is getting inundated with them. They aren't compromising on what they want, the fact that they could do worse is not a good argument for giving away so much. PLEASE require they at least are required 2 story

homes(townhomes/condos..) on the far west side of this development, which abuts the trail, as we did the last developer.

Lastly, there is a strip of hospitality on the west side that runs all the way next to 950 North. I would ask that strip to the west not be allowed and have the yellow run all the way to 950 north. The vagueness of hospitality leaves it too open. To have a fast food restaurant or gas station right there next to the residential area is definitely not a transition, also this is right where the lanes start restricting back down to residential roads. It also would dramatically decrease the value of the homes abutting it. I understand it is a busy road, but the yellow that they want on that skinnier west strip can extend to 950 North without taking away from all of the other areas the city is allowing.

Thank you for your time.

Heidi Herron
926 N 1875 W
Farmington, UT 84025
801-499-6826