

FARMINGTON CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION

SEPTEMBER 3, 2020

**ELECTRONIC AND IN PERSON MEETING**

---

**STUDY SESSION**

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

---

**REGULAR SESSION**

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

Roger Child opened the meeting at 7:05 PM.

**Item #1 Minutes**

Rulon Homer made a motion to approve the minutes from August 6, 2020. Alex Leeman seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

**Item #2 City Council Report**

Dave Petersen reported. He said the City Council will turn the Park and Main project back over to the Planning Commission to handle the unresolved issues. The City Council likes the one connection to Main Street, the garages to the back, and the protection of the hillside. For Chestnut Farms, the applicant felt blindsided and asked the City Council to table the vote so the applicant could talk further with Staff. The City Council did not hold the public hearing that night. Petersen said Chestnut Farms Preliminary Plat and Final Plat will come back to the Planning Commission. Greg Wall questioned the yield plan. Petersen said the yield plan showed how many lots were possible using the Planned Unit Development (PUD), but the City can still decide the number of lots.

Alex Leeman made a motion to hear item #4 prior to item #3 due to length of the item. Russ Workman seconded the motion.

**CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS**

**Item #4 Andrew and Andrea Gooch (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting conditional use approval to exceed the minimum driveway width on 0.30 acre of property located at 473 S 950 W in the AE (Agriculture Estates) zone. (C-7-20)**

The applicant requests to exceed the maximum allowed curb cut width by five feet to access their third garage bay and parking pad. This request would increase the driveway width from 30 feet to 35 feet. They do still need to obtain a Farmington City excavation permit and submit a site plan to the City, addressing storm water and grading concerns related to the driveway expansion. It is not significantly increasing any safety issues. Staff has received a concern from a neighbor, who had storm water that entered into their back yard.

(Zoom) The contractor (CWT Construction) indicated that they do want to go 36 feet 8 inches instead of the listed 35 feet. They have poured a curb to minimize the storm water going onto the neighbor's property.

**Roger Child** opened and closed the Public Hearing at 7:20 PM due to no comments received via the meeting.

(Email) was received and will be included at the end of this record.

## MOTION

**Russ Workman** made a motion that the Planning Commission approve a conditional use permit allowing an extension of an existing driveway and associated curb cut up to an additional 6 feet 8 inches, 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 applicant must reflect the change on the site plan and address all storm water and grading concerns related thereto.

**Rulon Homer** 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.

## SUBDIVISION/ZONING AMENDMENTS

### Item #3 Teton Investment Holdings LLC/CW Home (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting Preliminary PUD Master Plan approval and Subdivision Schematic Plan for The Station Planned Unit Development (PUD) consisting of 50 lots on 10.17 acres of property located in the R (Residential) and LR (Large Residential) zones at approximately 850 N Lagoon Drive. (S-12-20)

**Dave Petersen** presented this item. He said over two years ago that the City Council and Planning Commission wanted this zoned R (Residential) in order to not allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU). The proposal now is more dense than a R Zone usually is because of Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs), but it may be worth it to reserve residential parcels for non-residential uses. The schematic plan now compared to the one 1.5 years ago is 20 dwelling units less because of the wetlands, and lot sizes remaining basically the same. The lot width increased in the current plan. Sidewalk is on one side of the street, as it was before. They went from seven dead-end, non-conforming streets to none. The open space is arguably more because the wetland space will remain open. There is connection to the property to the north to allow access in case those property owners want to develop in the future.

**Petersen** said he would like the Planning Commission to consider tabling this because there are still some details to be worked out. The landscape plan needs to be looked at by the Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee (SPARC). The building elevations on the corner lots need to be reviewed. The three homes against Main Street need to compliment and fit in there. The landscaping transition from the two office parcels to the west also needs to be good. Also, Staff would like to push this to the City Council to hold a Public Hearing for Preliminary PUD Master Plan in order for the developer to get much-needed input while the project is still being reviewed by the SPARC. It is also including no access from Lagoon Drive to the subdivision.

Timeline—Before The Station PUD (Previous Actions by the City)			
Application/Request	Result	By	Date
General Plan Amendment Map and Text (MP-3-03)	○ Recommendation by Planning Commission	PC	5/13/04
	○ Approved by City Council	CC	7/7/04
Chapter 19 (CMU) of the Zoning Ordinance enacted (ZT-6-04)	○ Recommendation by Planning Commission	PC	11/11/04
	○ Approved by City Council	CC	12/1/04
East Park Lane Small Area Master Plan (MP-1-18)	○ Recommendation by the Planning Commission	PC	3/8/18
	○ Approved by City Council	CC	4/17/18
East Park Lane Phase II [and III] Rezone and Schematic Plan (Z-10-18 and S-26-18)	○ East side of Lagoon Dr rezoned to R	PC	Rec. 1/10/19
	○ West side of Lagoon Dr rezoned to CMU	CC	Approved 2/5/19
	○ Land adjacent to SR 106 remains LR		
	○ Arrange a TDR to transfer residential density from the west to the east		
○ Schematic Plan Approved			
East Park Lane Phase II Subdivision (S-26-18)	○ Preliminary Plat Approved for 2 lots W of Lagoon Dr	PC	4/18/19
	○ Final Plat Approved for 2 lots W of Lagoon Dr	PC	2/20/20
The Station PUD (S-12-20)	○ ?		

Schematic Plan Comparison Table										
Schematic Plan	Acres	DU*	DU/Acre	Avg. Lot Size sf	Avg. Lot Width (feet)	Side-walks One Side of Street	Nonconforming dead-end streets	Open Space	Set-Backs **	Connections to Main Street & to the north
East Park Lane “Phase III” 2/5/19 (S-26-18)	10.17	70	6.9	4,918	56.0	Yes	7	Less	Same	1   0
The Station 9/3/20 (S-12-20)	10.17	50	4.9	4,892	57.6	Yes	0	More	Same	1   1
* Note: A wetland delineation prepared after Feb. 2019 resulted in a loss of 20 lots on-site. ** Setbacks---Front: 20’; Side: 5’; Rear: 15’; Side Corner: 10’.										

**Question from Staff:** Are the major elements of the subdivision schematic plan (and the Preliminary PUD Master Plan) for The Station consistent with the schematic plan previously approved for East Park Lane “Phase III?”

**Darlene Carter** (1222 W Legacy Crossing Blvd., Centerville, Utah) on behalf of CW Development Group addressed the Commission to present the Schematic and Preliminary Plat. She appreciates Staff feedback that has been given over the last 90 days. Active adults and growing families would be attracted to their development with two different lots sizes.

The wider lots would accommodate a three-car garage. Smaller lots with little yard maintenance are in demand. They would like to consider the commercial use on the other side and have no homes facing Lagoon Drive. There is a 14-foot landscaping buffer on the rear of the properties. They studied the Fairways at Oakridge, and they have offered elements of that in their plan. Amenities include a dedicated space for a pickle ball court and tot lot. Sidewalks are throughout the community, as well as street lights and tree landscaping. A turn for firetrucks was added due to a Public Works recommendation. The community will be under Covenants Codes and Restrictions (CCRs) and Home Owners Association (HOA) to maintain all the common areas, amenity spaces, and exterior along Lagoon Drive.

**Inger Erickson** asked about the garages being closer to the street than the front door, if there are any ramblers, and if any yards have room for swing sets. **Carter** said the front setback is 20 feet for the garage, which does protrude out. There are plans with everything on the main floor, plus a bonus room upstairs. All the lots are 40 or 60 feet wide, with a 15 foot rear setback. There is also a playset in the community. There is 10 feet between each of the homes at the narrowest.

**Greg Wall** asked if fenced-in areas are maintained by the HOA. **Carter** replied that only the common areas are.

**Roger Child** asked questions about the hammerhead and sidewalk only on one side of the road with no park strip. It directly abuts the curb and gutter. **Carter** said that they consulted with Staff and Public Works about this. **Child** said the standard road section allows for a park strip between the road and sidewalk so there is room for the snowplowed snow not to block the sidewalk. He would like to see things shifted to allow for sidewalks on both sides of the road or at least for park strips. He said the TDRs have not been solidified yet, although he is personally in favor of that. This proposal is an efficient layout and he likes the architecture. The cul-de-sac to the farthest north will reserve a right-of-way in case of future development. He questioned if the future path of Lagoon Drive is planned to go through wetlands.

**Inger Erickson** said each home is on about 0.08 of an acre, and asked if there was a location with similar lot sizes that has been developed so that Commissioners could drive by and take a look at them. **Carter** said there are a variety of lot sizes, but the average lot size is 0.08 for only those 10 homes there on 850 North. There are other lots that are larger. Similar projects include Eaglewood Village in North Salt Lake, Cherry Heights north of Cherry Hill, and a node in Sunset Equestrian Estates in West Kaysville.

**Greg Wall** mentioned the street name, that he initially read it as “Devil Lane” instead of “Devi Lane.” He suggested it be Debi Court instead.

**Alex Leeman** said he really likes the idea overall. He wants to make sure there is enough screening on the backyard treatments that back on to Lagoon Drive. He suggested having something in the CC&Rs that prohibit gates along that street so that people don’t back boats into their backyards there. He asked that they brainstorm other development names that don’t include the word “Station,” as there are a lot of developments in Farmington with the same word in them. **Carter** said they are open to changing the name.

**Inger Erickson** asked about naming the roads in the development after historic names in the area, as many homes there are over 100 years old. **Carter** said they would consider this.

**Roger Child opened the Public Hearing at 8:07 PM.**

**(Zoom) Lori Conover** (469 Quail Run Rd., Farmington) said she liked the idea of street names honoring the history of the City. She said it seemed like there were a lot of units crammed into a small space. She would like to see bigger lots. She said she is blindsided by the houses on Main Street. She said looking at the back and side of a house is not blending into Main Street, and she was disappointed. She wants to try to preserve Main Street.

**(Zoom) Laurel Cahoon** (877 N Main St., Farmington) said her property is surrounded on three sides by this project. She likes that there are three rather than four houses on the area near her home. She is concerned about the property line

being properly identified on the north of her property. She would like the proposed homes there to be pushed a bit further north, and not to have a street there as originally planned directly to the north of her property. She is concerned about the accessibility and traffic on Main Street. She is afraid it will get too congested.

(In Person) **Doug Wood** (823 N Main St., Farmington) said that 400 feet of his property borders this project. He feels he is being blocked off from future development and would like a stubbed road. He would like to see big and small houses interspersed together, as well as a significant fence to block the backyards from his property.

(In Person) **Eric Astend** (1033 N Main St., Farmington) said he lives half a mile north of this project. He said very small lots on Main Street don't help them blend in with what is existing there. He said he feels for the Wood family, who will be gaining 11 neighbors all at once. He would like to see a sidewalk on Main Street. He is concerned with the small lots and wants to see more public space like a family park in light of the wetlands in the area. He wants a walking trail between Shephard and Park Lane to connect into other trail networks.

(In Person) **Jeff Erickson** (1307 Meadowbrook Court, Farmington) said he wants to have Main Street remain iconic aesthetically.

(Email) **Howard Hess** (947 Main St) emailed comments and they will be included at the end of the record.

**Roger Child closed the Public Hearing at 8:26 PM.**

**Russ Workman** asked Staff to respond to **Doug Wood** regarding access to his property. **Petersen** said access to the Wood property makes sense and could easily be done. **Meagan Booth** mentioned a switch of the smaller lots moved to the west side and swap those densities, blending density from the road in, as is typical with trends. **Petersen** said areas on the periphery are important for the Planning Commission to address. He would like to visit other projects done by the developer to see how the garages feel. In some cases it can feel fine, as other architectural features of the home balance it out. He likes the straight lines and pitches of the rooves in the architecture proposed.

**Alex Leeman** spoke as well, noting that almost all the homes in Fairways have a garage that extends out. He prefers the Fairway look to the Kestrel look. He would like to see the two lots on Main Street be reconfigured so a driveway can be opened on to Main Street. **Petersen** said there is a way to have the home front the interior local road, but the sides facing Main Street can have pleasing architectural features that blend in well. **Leeman** said it is important to have a variety of home types in Farmington. He feels comfortable moving this proposal on.

**Darlene Carter** addressed the Commission. She would like to figure out a way to have the homes on Main Street without having their driveways coming on to Main Street. It could be addressed with landscaping and dressing up the sides of the home that face Main Street. She agreed to look at switching the densities of the homes along Lagoon Drive, as well as intermixing the lot sizes. She wants to preserve enough space in a driveway to park a car. She noted snow storage areas in the proposal, and that the developer had increased road widths from what was originally planned. She wants time to do due diligence to address the stub road to the Wood property.

**Greg Wall** asked if the 14-foot landscaped strip along Lagoon Dr. would be maintained by the HOA. **Carter** said yes. The landscaping fence is proposed to be of high quality and a dark brown.

**Inger Erickson** commented on the large amount of open space in the Fairways projects, and doesn't feel this development has enough. She noted that the developer has dropped the number of lots that they could have done and has been good at listening to Staff.

**Inger Erickson** commented on the narrow streets. **Roger Child** answered that the narrower the road, the safer it is because it forces people to slow down.

**Russ Workman** asked if it's appropriate to have a "pre-vote" about sending this on to the City Council for their input before it is submitted to SPARC and the Planning Commission committee.

**Alex Leeman** likes the idea of both Planning Commissioners and City Councilmembers sitting on the SPARC so it can be determined if there is buy-in from both bodies before it goes to the City Council.

**Darlene Carter** likes the idea of more feedback.

**Greg Wall** said **Doug Wood's** comments of a road stubbing south make sense, as well as adding another lot in order to offset that stub. He would like to blend the lots sizes.

## MOTION

**Alex Leeman** made a motion that the Planning Commission **table** consideration of a recommendation for Preliminary PUD Master Plan/Subdivision Schematic Plan approval to allow time for the following:

1. City Council to hold a public hearing regarding the Preliminary PUD Master Plan/Subdivision Schematic Plan and provide an answer to the following question: "Are the major elements of the subdivision schematic plan (and the Preliminary PUD Master Plan) for The Station consistent with the schematic plan previously approved for East Park Lane "Phase III?" and if so, submit the plans back to the Planning Commission and allow them to complete their recommendation;
2. The City's Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee (SPARC), including three members of the Planning Commission and members of the City Council, must review the landscape plan and building elevations for the project and provide recommendations to the Developer and the Commission. The meeting(s) shall include the developer and/or his representatives.

**Larry Steinhorst** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

## ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS

### Item #5 Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation to amend the Foothill Development Standards in Chapter 30 of the Zoning Ordinance. (ZT-14-20)

**Booth** presented this agenda item, with Farmington City as the applicant. A comparative study was done between Centerville and Farmington. She said they would like to study this further and compare it to a few other cities before implementation. There are aesthetic qualities to be further considered before Staff can recommend an amendment to the Foothill Development Standards in Chapter 30 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Roger Child** opened and closed the Public Hearing at 9:01 PM due to no comments received.

(Email) **Jayson Love** emailed comments that will be included in the record. He has purchased a lot hidden from view, and would like the ordinance not to apply to existing homes, but rather apply to new homes.

**Greg Wall** asked if that would be hard to apply to homes not visible from main arteries.

**Dave Petersen** replied regarding Centerville's ordinance, which is geared towards colors for retaining walls, fences, etc. Bright white is not desirable, where taupe would be better. They may want to look at other cities such as Draper.

## MOTION

**Greg Wall** made a motion to **table** the changes to the Foothill Development Standards set forth in Chapter 30 of the Zoning Ordinance to further Staff research.

**Alex Leeman** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

**Item #6 Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation to amend the Site Development Standards of the Zoning Ordinance regarding reciprocal access. (ZT-15-20)**

**Booth** presented this agenda item, which was suggested by City Manager **Shane Pace**. The request is to recommend an amendment to 11-7-070: J of the Zoning Ordinance requiring reciprocal access, which is a way to establish a legal right to use shared areas between two or more property owners in order to provide necessary ingress and egress. It is something the City doesn't have, while most municipalities do have an ordinance like this on the books. It will provide for a continuous flow of traffic from one parking lot to another across easements.

**Inger Erickson** questioned the piece of land near the hair salon on Shepard and Main. **Meagan Booth** said this does not apply to that area, and mentioned the Cook Property as an example between the townhomes and proposed hotel on Farmington Station Parkway. It would apply to only new developments, not existing, to be done at the expense of the applicant. **Petersen** said they will watch for what to do if a neighboring property owner requests recourse for loss of parking spaces.

**Roger Child** opened and closed the Public Hearing at 9:13 PM due to no comments.

**MOTION**

**Larry Steinhorst** made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the enclosed changes to the Site Development Standards set forth in Chapter 7 of the Zoning Ordinance and as outlined in the attached ordinance.

**Rulon Homer** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

**Findings for Approval:**

1. Reciprocal Access is a way to establish a legal right to use shared areas between two or more property owners, providing necessary egress and ingress, and is a necessary change in the ordinance.
2. The amendment would support consistency between Farmington zoning ordinance and other local municipalities.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**Item #7 Miscellaneous, Correspondence, etc.**

- a. Accessory Building Heights – Staff will make this a special exception up to a certain amount (10 or 20 percent deviation) instead of a Conditional Use.
- b. A group wants to develop the bench in South East Farmington and wants to meet with the Planning Commission for input on foothill development, or possibly a planning exercise charrette as commissioners are discouraged from meeting ex parte in small groups.
- c. **Greg Wall, Inger Erickson and Larry Steinhorst** have volunteered to be on the proposed committee along with SPARC to review subdivisions such as The Station PUD, Park and Main and future townhomes.
- d. Other

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Rulon Homer** made a motion to adjourn at 9:21 PM. **Russ Workman** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Roger Child". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

**Roger Child**, Planning Commission Chair



Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

---

## comments on Park Lane East phase III - zoning & preliminary plat

---

Howard Hess <hhess@xmission.com>

Wed, Sep 2, 2020 at 3:14 PM

To: David Petersen <dpetersen@farmington.utah.gov>, crowe@farmington.utah.gov, mbooth@farmington.utah.gov

David:

I spoke with Meagan on the phone for a few minutes Monday afternoon. She mentioned that you wrote the staff report pertaining to this matter and as such I should address my comments to you. I hope you will consider and discuss with the Planning Commission and WDG/Colin Wright.

Meagan also suggested that Carly would ensure that a copy of my comments would be sent to Planning Commission members.

I'm also going to make another pitch for the idea that WDG and the LDS church undertake a land swap for their adjacent properties to accommodate the LDS Chapel site to be on Main St. A church building on Main St. would be preferred to small residential lots. Additionally, homes more distant from the noise of traffic on Main St. would be more desirable to homeowners.

Thanks for your consideration

Howard Hess

---

 **850 N Main\_notes to Planning Commission.pdf**  
65K

2 September 2020

David Petersen  
Community Development Director  
Farmington City Corp.  
160 S Main  
Farmington, UT 84025

**RE: Schematic Plan & Preliminary PUD Master Plan Approval (850 N. Lagoon Dr) – WDG/CW Home**

Mr. Petersen:

**I submit these comments for your consideration and that of your staff and the Planning Commission.**

Plans and schematics submitted by WDG/CW Home, that will be considered by the Planning Commission during their September 3, 2020 meeting, show several improvements from previous iterations, from my perspective. These changes are significant and are appreciated. Including:

- Single family residences. All multi-family structures are eliminated.
- Improved street locations and alignment.

**ZONING closest to Main St. (SR 106)**

At least one modification/variation, however, represents a serious diminishment from previous plans. All previous schematics included larger lots fronting Main St. (SR 106). This stipulation was important to you and both the Planning Commission and City Council. Phil Holland agreed to this condition and was incorporated in the previous decisions by the Planning Commission and Council.

It is critical to the character and consistency of North Main St. that this remains a corridor consisting of larger homes and lots. Further, it is important that homes on these lots face Main St. and not be permitted to back to Main St. The appearance of Main St is important to the character and heritage of the city. To support this point is the meeting you held with area residents and property owners a couple of years ago to float the notion of a zoning change in this area to something similar to the OTR (Original Town Residential) zone.

Allowing small lots and homes to back to Main St. violates the opportunity and desire to preserve the character and heritage of Farmington. Further, and of equal or greater importance, is the ideal of fairness and equity to uphold the appearance and value of existing homeowners adjacent to this proposed development and along Main St. **I request that lots adjacent to Main St to remain LR (Large Residential).**

## **ROAD Intersecting to Main St. (SR 106)**

The submitted preliminary plat shows 900 North connecting to and intersecting Main St. (SR 106). This intersecting location is problematic in that the site distance to the north is too limited and presents a safety concern. Traffic on Main St. (SR 106) in this area is heavy, especially during commute times and at other times when flow on I-15 and HWY-89 is restricted. Southbound traffic on Main St., as well as traffic on 900 North turning onto Main St., will have insufficient site distance, and thus reduced reaction time, with at intersection at this location. **A much-improved choice would be to have 850 North be the intersecting street to Main St.**

## **STREET alignment to consider future development and tie-ins**

Please consider these factors:

- Lagoon Dr (North) future extension to tie-in with 700 West. This includes the opportunity to provide a parkway pedestrian path that would extend from Park Lane to Shepard Lane and **provide safe access to existing city park and Knowlton Elementary School.**
- Abbie Road future extension to the north (future LDS chapel site and development of Rodney & Jon Hess family property and the future east/west street approximately 1000 North)

## **Spring Creek source springs – mediation and improvement to open/public space**

A significant portion of this 10-acre parcel (approximately two acres) is shown and “wet land” and open space. The main source springs of Spring Creek are within this area. With reasonable engineering and effort this area can be improved and become an important and valued part of this neighborhood. The springs can be isolated and proper drainage (open creek and buried drains) installed resulting in a great reduction in the area with standing water. In past years much of this currently wet area was dry enough to harvest grass hay and certainly provided nice pasture grass.

This area could contain features including: small pond, open stream, walking paths, and turf areas.

As I assume this area will be owned and maintained by the future Homeowner’s Association. As such the developer and Farmington City should be willing and interested to ensure this area is an enjoyable asset and not a boggy wet area that increases in size without appropriate drainage.

## **Conventional Subdivision vs. PUD**

My strong preference is that this development be a conventional subdivision with underlying LR or R zoning. A development with small lots and private streets is less attractive than

conventional subdivisions with minimum 8,000/10,000 sq. ft. lots and publicly maintained streets. Less attractive aesthetically and economically.

WDG has over the past years, included as an example of what they intend and envision this development to be - The Fairways at Oakridge. The Fairways at Oakridge is an attractive and well-maintained development. Gary Wright should be proud of this work. The Fairways at Oakridge continues to be an area of lovely homes and public space and I'm certain the residents are great people and assets to the community. If this proposed development was of the quality of The Fairways at Oakridge, I would be very pleased. As proposed, however, I think it falls well short.

Best regards,

Howard Hess



4

Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

---

## Gooch 473 s 950 w (Creekside Manor)

3 messages

---

**Emily Sommer** <emmysommer@icloud.com>  
To: crowe@farmington.utah.gov

Fri, Aug 28, 2020 at 10:51 AM

Hello City Planners,

I live at 918 west 500 s, it's next to the Gooch's new residence. My backyard is their south side yard.

My concerns for the property is focused on water runoff.

As of now the rain from the downspouts has flooded my backyard. So I'm hoping the city has a solution going forward.

Additional concerns:

It appears 75% of their property is covered by cement and house. Is there enough dirt left to absorb the water?

The proposed cement/RV pad is 2ft higher than my yard level. Is there a railing planned? Also, will the cement be tilted away from my yard?

The house is exactly 10 ft from the property line. Is there a buffer zone or can they place cement right to the line? My concern is when we place a fence along our backyard that the cement is on their side.

Thank you,  
Emily Sommer  
Farmington Resident 19 years

I plan on attending the meeting in person.

---

**Carly Rowe** <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>  
To: Emily Sommer <emmysommer@icloud.com>

Fri, Aug 28, 2020 at 12:45 PM

Hi Emily,  
Thank you for your email. I will include this for the Commissioners to review on Thursday's meeting.

Thanks!  
Carly Rowe - Farmington City  
Planning & Zoning, Recording  
and Code Enforcement Secretary  
801-939-9215



[Quoted text hidden]

---

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

Fri, Aug 28, 2020 at 12:46 PM

Carly Rowe - Farmington City  
Planning & Zoning, Recording  
and Code Enforcement Secretary



5

Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

---

## Farmington Foothill Zoning Revisions

3 messages

---

**Jayson Love** <jaylove15@gmail.com>  
To: Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Wed, Sep 2, 2020 at 7:47 AM

Dear Farmington City Planning Commission Members,

My name is Jayson Love and we have recently sold our Farmington home of 6 years and purchased a lot in the foothill overlay zone to build a new home.

I am writing with concern for the proposed change to the foothill zoning provisions. I am not able to attend the meeting on Thursday but would like to convey some concerns.

It appears that the reason for making the zone change is to match more closely with the Centerville provisions for their hillside overlay zone.

Their code regarding this matter reads as follows: 1. The design of buildings proposed for construction in the Hillside Overlay Zone is **encouraged** to be visually compatible with the natural beauty of the foothills and canyon areas. The use of building material in colors that will blend harmoniously with the natural setting is **suggested**. 2. The Planning Commission may review the design and comment on the specified exterior materials and colors for all structures **other than single-family dwellings**...

The proposed change in Farmington reads much more strict than the Centerville ordinance by stating: "... the colors of main buildings, fences and accessory structures **shall** blend in harmoniously with the landscape".

We have purchased one of the few remaining lots in the established foothills area north of farmington canyon. We are in the middle of having home construction plans developed. The style of the home being designed does not necessarily lend itself to a color selection that is completely "harmonious with the landscape" though some parts of it likely will be. To my knowledge, none of the previous homes in the area have been held to any such standard.

The lot we are building on is generally hidden from view from main street and I-15. Thus I feel that if the intent of the zone change is to preserve the look of the foothills from viewpoints below, having this apply to less visible lots is unnecessary.

With the background above, I ask that the planning commission consider the following:

1. There are instances where only a few lots remain in well established subdivisions. Requiring this zone change to apply to existing lots in existing developments would not be impactful since none of the surrounding homes were required to meet this standard.
2. Lots that are in the foothills but are more or less hidden from view from the main transportation corridors would not necessarily make an impact if this provision were to be in force for those types of lots.
3. If the purpose for making the change is to more closely align with Centerville's standards, it is suggested that Farmington consider making a revision that is not more strict than Centervilles, but perhaps, equal to it.

I would encourage the planning commission to consider a revised provision that applies this to homes in new developments only and not to existing lots in well established subdivisions. Or possibly even taking the stance of encouraging colors harmonious to the landscape but letting staff evaluate if the specific lot is in obvious view on the foothills. Foothill areas South of Farmington Canyon, particularly nearer the Centerville border are much more visible and perhaps the area the planning commission has in mind when considering this provision. It seems that applying this to areas North of the canyon would have little impact since there is very little land left to be developed.

I appreciate your attention to these concerns.

--

**Jayson Love**

---

Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Wed, Sep 2, 2020 at 11:30 AM

To: Jayson Love <jaylove15@gmail.com>

Hi Jayson,

Thank you for your email. I will ensure that all Planning Commissioners and Staff receive a copy for the meeting and that it will be included with the record.

Thank you,

Carly Rowe, Farmington City

Planning/Zoning, Recording & Code Enforcement Secretary

Phone: 801-939-9215 - Email: [crowe@farmington.utah.gov](mailto:crowe@farmington.utah.gov)



[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jayson Love** <jaylove15@gmail.com>

Wed, Sep 2, 2020 at 4:43 PM

To: Carly Rowe <[crowe@farmington.utah.gov](mailto:crowe@farmington.utah.gov)>

Thanks Carly!

[Quoted text hidden]

--

**Jayson Love**