

**CITY OF OREM  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 5, 2014**

The following items are discussed in these minutes:

**KNOWLTON AFFORDABLE SENIOR HOUSING – APPROVED**  
**RESIDENCES AT MONTE VISTA – CONTINUED**  
**UNIVERSITY PLACE OFFICE BUILDING – APPROVED**  
**PROMENADE APARTMENTS – APPROVED**  
**ZOA – SECTIONS 22-11-1 & 22-11-2 PD ZONE – RECOMMENDED APPROVAL**  
**UNIVERSITY PLACE REZONE – RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

**STUDY SESSION**

**PLACE –** Orem City Main Conference Room

**At 3:30 p.m.** Chair Moulton called the Study Session to order.

**Those present:** Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, Michael Walker, and Derek Whetten, Planning Commission members; Bill D. Bell, Director; Jason W. Bench, Planning Director; David R. Stroud, City Planner; Clinton Spencer, GIS Planner; Sam Kelly, City Engineer; Cliff Peterson, Private Development Engineer; Paul Goodrich, Transportation Engineer; Steve Earl, Legal Counsel; David Spencer, City Council Liaison and Loriann Merritt, Minutes Secretary

**Those excused:** None

The Commission and staff briefly reviewed agenda items and minutes from January 22, 2013 meeting and adjourned at 4:25 p.m. to the City Council Chambers for the regular meeting.

**REGULAR MEETING**

**PLACE -** Orem City Council Chambers

**At 4:30 p.m.** Chair Moulton called the Planning Commission meeting to order and asked Vice Chair Walker, Planning Commission member, to offer the invocation.

**Those present:** Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, Michael Walker, and Derek Whetten, Planning Commission members; Bill D. Bell, Director; Jason W. Bench, Planning Director; David R. Stroud, City Planner; Clinton Spencer, GIS Planner; Sam Kelly, City Engineer; Paul Goodrich, Transportation Engineer; Steve Earl, Legal Counsel; and Loriann Merritt, Minutes Secretary

**Those excused:** None

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 3.1** as follows:

**AGENDA ITEM 3.1** is a request by Brian Knowlton to approve the site plan of **KNOWLTON GENERAL FOUR-PLEX** at 562 North Main Street in the R8 Affordable Senior Housing (ASH) overlay zone.

**Staff Presentation:** Mr. Spencer said currently, there are two vacant single family lots where the proposed buildings will be built. The applicant proposes to construct two (2) new four (4) unit residential complexes (one per single family lot) for senior housing provided for in the Orem City Ordinance 22-12-7. Currently, the property is vacant. The ASH overlay zone allows for higher densities specifically for affordable senior housing. These types of developments are intended for citizens 60 years and older whose incomes fall under the 80% threshold of the median income for the Orem-Provo area. Maximum rents are established to

## “Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”

ensure that the dwellings qualify as affordable housing for the above mentioned group. An annual report from the property owner is required before January 15 of each year with detailed information to verify compliance with occupancy requirements. The City may ask for additional information at their discretion including receipts, statements, resident tax returns and rental agreements to demonstrate compliance.



The proposed buildings contain four (4) units and are 6,994 square feet. The proposed units are approximately 1,748 square feet and include a basement. Each unit is accessed by an outside door as well as through the garages. Only one (1) exterior door is allowed per building elevation side and is shown on the plans. The proposed buildings are twenty-three (23) feet tall. Finishing material for the buildings is two-tone stucco (light and dark) with window and garage door openings.

As per code requirements for affordable senior housing 1.5 parking stalls are required per unit. The applicant has provided two (2) stalls per unit including the garages and a tandem parking stall behind each garage which satisfy the covered parking requirement. A total of sixteen (16) stalls are provided.

Although no fencing is required, existing fencing encloses the property on the north, east and south sides of the project and will remain as is.

The overall landscape plan complies with applicable City Codes. As part of the required landscaping sixteen (16) new trees will be planted along with several shrubs and grass areas as shown on the landscaping plan.

**Recommendation:** Based on the compliance with the ordinance requirements as outlined above staff recommends the Planning Commission approve this request.

Chair Moulton asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Mr. Spencer.

When no one did, Chair Moulton invited the applicant to come forward. Eric Jensen introduced himself.

Mr. Jensen noted he was from Ogden, Utah and had been involved in other similar projects. There is a need for affordable housing especially with the elderly. This will meet that need and fit in the neighborhood.

Chair Moulton asked if the other developments he was involved with had similar parking. Mr. Jensen indicated he was a planner for Ogden City for many years. He left being a planner to join this company and this has been a very successful product. The tandem parking stall behind each garage has a stall in front, and has been done in other projects, like in the Avenues in Salt Lake City. This type of occupant will be a single occupant that might not even have a car. It is a very practical application.

Ms. Larsen asked said some of the units have two bedroom units. If a couple lives there, there could be four people in the unit if you count their children. Mr. Jensen said these units are designed for older people and not families. From a practical standpoint there will only be 1-2 cars per unit. He added that Knowlton General will manage the four-plexes.

Mr. Whetten asked about trash cans. Mr. Jensen indicated the trash can is in the garage and will be rolled out to the curb.

Chair Moulton opened the public hearing and invited those from the audience who had come to speak to this item to come forward to the microphone.

Blake Hart, Orem, said he lives near this property. He is surrounded by apartments and the City continues to build apartments. These types of units bring in transients and he is opposed to this. He is not looking forward to having more apartments and the type of people they attract.

## **“Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”**

Tyson Andrews, Orem, said he had asked the City to allow him to change his home to a duplex and the City said no and now they are allowing this. There are lots of cars that will park on the street and people who live in apartments are always moving. He has lived in the neighborhood many years and does not know any of his neighbors. The average age of the neighborhood is in the 30's and having older people will not fit.

Tito Alomia, Orem, said he lives near this property. He is against this being built. Currently there is too much traffic and adding these units to all the apartments that are already there will create more traffic which is unhealthy for children.

Ms. Jeffreys asked where the many apartments are located. Mr. Alomia pointed out the apartments which were to the north and east of this development. Ms. Jeffreys said that along Main Street there are single family homes. Mr. Alomia said the City has not allowed big complexes in the past because of traffic concerns.

Chair Moulton closed the public hearing and asked if the Planning Commission had any more questions for the applicant or staff.

Ms. Buxton suggested reviewing the purpose of ASH zone. Mr. Spencer indicated it is a half mile section on each side of State Street. This area is designed to be close to the necessary facilities that will be helpful to seniors. These units are low impact sites, can only have one access, cannot look like a four-plex and must resemble a single family home. Mr. Earl added that the Housing Authority of Utah County approached the City and indicated they could not provide enough affordable housing for their long list. They wanted a way to encourage private developers to work with them to provide the needed housing. They are required to have the same standards that the Housing Authority has and they are limited to no more than three occupants. The rent is capped and is based on income and so they will not be able to stack people into the units. Staff went on a tour of some of the units in the area and found they are one bedroom units. Some of the attractive elements of this type of housing are that the residents are quiet people, no children and they do not generate a lot of traffic. These types of units are relatively low impact on neighborhoods. Apartments generally have transient tenants, but these tenants tend to stay a long time and the waiting list for these type of units is very long.

Chair Moulton asked Mr. Goodrich if he had any idea how many trips per day there are for a senior housing scenario. Mr. Goodrich said that single family residences have up to six vehicles with jobs, school activities and adding an accessory apartment, which could add two more cars for that location adding up to a lot of cars and trips. These units are typically low impact and not the typical four-plex.

Ms. Buxton said it is important for the City to have an affordable housing option for this age group. They will not drive much and will not be as transient as the current apartment occupants. They will be grounded and a great addition to the neighborhood. Having a mix of young and old will be a benefit to the neighborhood.

Ms. Jeffreys said the discussion has centered on single people occupying the units, but the floor plans show multiple bedrooms. Mr. Jensen said sometimes in this unit they will get a sister and brother living together and sometimes tenants want a spare bedroom for guests, hobbies, etc.

Ms. Buxton noted the washer and dryer are located in the basement. Mr. Jensen said they are in the process of redesigning the units to bring them upstairs.

Mr. Iglesias inquired if the residents are not husband and wife, but a relative or friend how is it determined if they qualify to live there. Mr. Jensen said they monitor the income of the occupants. If they have children come and live with them, their income would have to be included. Generally, children will not live with them, but are encouraged to help out without living there.

Mr. Jensen said there is a lease agreement and the tenant must give tangible proof of their income. The company will respond to complaints or inquiries of neighbors. Mr. Earl said the city ordinance requires

## **“Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”**

that the owner must provide the City with information if a neighbor comes to the City with a viable complaint.

Vice Chair Walker asked what the terms of the contract are. Mr. Jensen said their tenants usually are long term, but they are residential and so it is a one year contract.

Mr. Whetten asked if there is anything in the application that is outside of zoning and requires a separate approval. Mr. Spencer indicated that as it goes through the review committee and projects can only go to the Planning Commission when they meet the minimum requirements.

Ms. Jeffreys said she has already seen a couple of these. They look good and are filling a need in the City.

The neighbors raised the same questions again from the audience and so Mr. Earl answered their concerns. Mr. Earl indicated that the City Council approved the ASH overlay zone, which is located all along State Street. He noted there was a public hearing in 2012, however the entire City was not sent out notices. It was posted in the newspaper. The City Council considered the effect that these type of developments would have on neighboring property. They believed this would not have a negative impact on neighboring properties. The Planning Commission cannot deny this, because the City Council by applying this zone has said this type of use is okay. The Planning Commission is limited in their roll in what they can do. If there is a concern about the zone or feelings that the zone should be revoked, that would have to be taken to the City Council. The purpose of this item coming before the Planning Commission is to determine if the request complies with the ASH overlay zone. If they find it does comply, they are required to approve it. The neighbors are informed for a couple of reason. First, it is required by state law and second it is to let neighbors know what is going on. Then they can ask questions and be informed. Going to the City Council would be too late to stop this particular one, but the City Council could revoke the zone for the rest of the areas in the City. Because this applicant has submitted an application under the current zone, they are vested and have a right to proceed under the ordinance as it exists today. Mr. Earl indicated he would be willing to talk to the neighbors after the meeting.

Chair Moulton called for a motion on this item.

**Planning Commission Action:** Ms. Jeffreys said she is satisfied that the Planning Commission has found this request complies with all applicable City codes. She then moved to approve the site plan of Knowlton General affordable senior housing project at 562 and 576 North Main Street. Mr. Iglesias seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, Michael Walker and Derek Whetten. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 3.2** as follows:

**AGENDA ITEM 3.2** is a request by Ernie Willmore to approve the site plan of **RESIDENCES AT MONTE VISTA** at 920 North State Street.

**Planning Commission Action:** Chair Moulton moved to continue this item until February 19, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Whetten seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, Michael Walker and Derek Whetten. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 3.3** as follows:

**AGENDA ITEM 3.3** is a request by Woodbury Corporation to approve the site plan of the **UNIVERSITY PLACE OFFICE BUILDING** at 555 East University Parkway.

**Staff Presentation:** The City Council recently rezoned the University Mall property to the PD-34 for the purpose of revitalizing the regional shopping center into a mixed use development. The applicant envisions new retail, office, and residential as components of a redeveloped University Mall. The first phase of this

## “Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”

redevelopment is the construction of an office building along University Parkway located immediately east of Jared’s/Texas Roadhouse.

### Development Standards

- The proposed height will be 84 feet to the mechanical screen and 77 feet to the top of the parapet. The maximum height permitted is 180 feet. The proposed building contains five stories.
- The minimum setback to University Parkway future BRT curb alignment is 20 feet. The south wall of the office building will be 36 feet from the future curb.
- Landscaping will be located along University Parkway and consist of lawn, trees, and shrubs. Planter boxes will be located adjacent to the building as in the north parking lot end islands.
- The architectural style of the building must be similar to elevations contained in Appendix BB. The proposed building elevations will be constructed of glass and metal which is in harmony with Appendix BB and the PD-34 text as it pertains to permitted materials.
- The existing parking lot south of Macy’s will be developed as a one-level sub-grade structure with a new parking deck on the surface. 302 parking spaces will be located on the sub-grade level. Available parking is calculated from all Woodbury property in the University Mall development.



**Recommendation:** Based on compliance with the PD-34 zone standards, staff recommends the Planning Commission approve this request.

Chair Moulton asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Mr. Stroud.

Chair Moulton invited the applicant to come forward. Kris Longson introduced himself.

Ms. Larsen asked if the Mall will charge for parking in the parking structure. Mr. Longson said there will not be a charge. He noted there will be ample parking with the underground parking. The lower levels of the structure will be retail and there will be three floors of office.

Ms. Jeffreys asked if the design of the building will fit in with what is already there. Mr. Longson noted that there are plans to change over the next few months. There will be some change in tenants and some exterior changes to the current mall.

Chair Moulton opened the public hearing and invited those from the audience who had come to speak to this item to come forward to the microphone.

When no one came forward, Chair Moulton closed the public hearing and asked if the Planning Commission had any more questions for the applicant or staff.

When none did, he called for a motion on this item.

**Planning Commission Action:** Ms. Buxton said she is satisfied that the Planning Commission has found this request complies with all applicable City codes. She then moved to approve the site plan of University Place Office building at 555 East University Parkway. Ms. Larsen seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, Michael Walker and Derek Whetten. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Whetten asked if there is a time frame for when things are started and concluded. Mr. Longson said they are trying to start construction in April/May on the parking structure. The parking needs to be done by

## “Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”

2014 Christmas season. The office structure will be under construction and hopefully be done by summer/fall 2015.

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 3.4** as follows:

**AGENDA ITEM 3.4** is a request by Sean Clark to approve the site plan of **PROMENADE PLACE APARTMENTS** at 877 South Geneva Road.

**Staff Presentation:** The PD-33 zone was established to provide a location of transit oriented development (TOD). A TOD is a development characterized by a mix of uses within walking distance of a transit station. The PD-33 zone allows residential and commercial to be approved with connectivity between the two as well as to the Frontrunner stop. The primary requirement of buildings in the PD-33 zone is that they be located on the perimeter of the development with parking generally on the interior. The proposed site plan meets this requirement.



The applicant proposes construction of four residential buildings and a clubhouse. The total number of units is 120 with a total of 432 bedrooms. Each unit shall not exceed occupancy of one family or four unrelated individuals. An item of discussion for the Planning Commission is the proposed elevations, which contain aluminum.

According to the Code, the exterior elevations must be constructed of brick, stone, stucco, block, glass, wood or a combination of those items. The Code states sheet metal shall be prohibited except for soffit, fascia, and trim.

### **Development Standards**

- The clubhouse height is 30 feet high and the residential buildings are 62 feet high. The maximum height permitted is 72 feet.
- The buildings along Geneva Road must be setback a minimum of 20 feet and they are proposed to be at this setback dimension.
- Landscaping will be located along the perimeter of the development. There is no minimum percentage required.
- Parking is required at the rate of 0.65 stalls per bedroom which requires 281 stalls, which is the total number on site. The grade level of each building will be parking with the units then constructed above the parking, which is known as pedestal parking.
- Dumpsters have been provided and will be enclosed by similar materials as the main structures.
- Access will be provided from Geneva Road. Additional future connections will be made when development to the north and east is constructed.
- Density is proposed at 35 units an acre and the PD-33 ordinance requires a minimum of 20 units per acre.

**Recommendation:** Based on compliance with the PD-33 standards, staff recommends the Planning Commission approve this request with the condition that the elevations be revised to eliminate the aluminum panels.

Chair Moulton asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Mr. Stroud.

Chair Moulton said there are 281 parking stall, which is the exact amount. Mr. Stroud said the site is developed. There is no requirement for landscaping in this zone, due to the nature of the TOD. There is landscaping along Geneva Road and the entire perimeter of the development. There is a clubhouse and some recreation opportunities.

Vice-Chair Walker asked if the cement fiber board similar to wood siding. Mr. Stroud said it comes in planks. It can be colored and is very durable.

## **“Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”**

Mr. Stroud noted that the applicant originally wanted a second access, but UDOT did not want another access onto Geneva Road. In the future as the surrounding property develops, it will connect through the other parcels.

Chair Moulton invited the applicants to come forward. Ken Harris and Brian Gabler introduced themselves.

Ms. Buxton asked about the landscaping, Mr. Harris said it will be a high quality landscape project. There are a couple of berms for water retention, which will probably be grass. There will be a lot of trees and shrubs. There will be small planting areas in front of the buildings. Mr. Gabler noted the City has a landscaping plan. Vice Chair Walker asked if city staff will be able to count the number of trees and shrubs for the site. Mr. Stroud said the applicant will be bonded for the certain amounts of trees and bushes.

Ms. Larsen said the only access into the property was a crowned drive, she asked what that is. Mr. Gabler said a crowned drive reflects the drainage on a drive. Ms. Larsen asked if the City is alright with only one entrance. Mr. Stroud said yes. All fire codes are met with one access. If they did not meet fire code they would have another entrance.

Ms. Larsen said there were 120 units with up to four people each and could be 600 people using one access. Mr. Stroud said that not all units will have four bedrooms.

Chair Moulton opened the public hearing and invited those from the audience who had come to speak to this item to come forward to the microphone.

Lanae Morrill, Orem, said her property is directly north of this development. She asked about the anticipated traffic flow. Mr. Goodrich said a traffic analysis was done when the entire zone was approved. The traffic will definitely increase. There will be other changes in the area. There are plans for a future interchange at 800 South and traffic signal on Geneva Road at 800 South. Ms. Morrill asked about the timing for the traffic light. Mr. Goodrich said sometime between now and when the interchange happens there will need to be a traffic signal at 800 South. Ms. Morrill said the neighbors were under the understanding that when Geneva Road was dug up the light would be installed. Mr. Goodrich said the installation of the light depends on the timing of the TOD zone's development. UDOT will be the one who determines the timing of the installation of light. Mr. Goodrich noted that UVU has plans to expand their property, which will add additional traffic. Mr. Whetten said the only ingress/egress is off of Geneva Road. He wondered if this will be a problem getting out of there. Mr. Goodrich said that at different times of the day it will be difficult to get out. The biggest problem they may have in peak hour traffic is getting out of their own development. Looking at the concept plan of the zone, this is a piece of the puzzle.

Lori Smith, Orem, asked about a time frame of construction and if the applicant is aware of the springs onsite.

Chair Moulton closed the public hearing and asked if the Planning Commission had any more questions for the applicant or staff.

Mr. Harris said they had done a lot of student housing in Provo and Rexburg. During peak traffic times students will be in class and they do not usually take cars to class. There will not be as much traffic moving in and out of this type of complex. Mr. Stroud said that this is not a student housing development only.

Chair Moulton called for a motion on this item.

**Planning Commission Action:** Mr. Whetten said he is satisfied that the Planning Commission has found this request complies with all applicable City codes. He then moved to approve the site plan of Promenade Place Apartments with 120 units at 877 South Geneva Road. Ms. Jeffreys seconded the motion. Those

## “Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”

voting aye: Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, Michael Walker and Derek Whetten. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 3.5** as follows:

**AGENDA ITEM 3.5** is a request by Development Services to recommend the City Council amend **SECTIONS 22-11-1 AND 22-11-2 PERTAINING TO PD ZONES** of the Orem City Code.

**Staff Presentation:** Mr. Stroud said within the last year, the City has received and approved three requests for high density housing along State Street. This has caused concern for how much residential is appropriate in this corridor. High density housing along State Street does provide a population base to patronize local businesses but it also removes property from the commercial zoning designation.

The City will soon request an RFP (Request for Proposal) for a study of State Street to determine the long-term vision. In the time between the study and potential adoption of the study, staff has proposed changes to the PD zone requirements.

The major change to the PD zone requirements is to prevent any PD zone that contains residential units within 500 feet of State Street. This could change depending on the outcome of the State Street study, but in the interim, the Code will reflect no new PD zones with a residential component along the State Street corridor. However, PD zones with residential uses can still be proposed elsewhere in the City.

### **Advantages**

- Provides time to study and implement a State Street plan
- Code can be amended in the future should residential PD zones be deemed appropriate along State Street
- Commercial property along State Street must remain commercial

### **Disadvantages**

- Eliminates future population bases close to commercial services and transit. However, once the study is completed, the PD ordinance will be revisited.

**Recommendation:** Based on compliance with the Orem General Plan and the Orem City Code and the advantages outlined above, staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend approval of this request to the City Council.

### **22-11-1. Purpose and Applicability.**

1. The purpose of Planned Development (PD) zones is to provide flexibility in the City's zoning scheme in order to allow for unique, innovative and well-planned developments that would not be possible under one of the City's existing zoning classifications. PD zones are not intended for use in situations where a proposed development is reasonably feasible under one of the City's existing zoning classifications ~~or in situations where the primary purpose is to obtain a relaxation of standards applicable to similar types of development in other zones.~~

### **22-11-2. Applicability.**

2. PD zones are intended for use primarily ~~in the following situations:~~  
~~High density student housing projects near UVSC;~~  
~~Mixed use projects along State Street and University Parkway;~~  
where no existing zoning classification is both sufficiently permissive to allow uses that would be suitable on the property and sufficiently restrictive to protect the character and quality of neighboring properties. Examples of this type of situation may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Mixed-use developments;
- b. Townhouse or other high-density residential developments;

**“Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”**

\_\_\_\_\_ c. Where a few uses in an existing zone (such as the C2 zone) would be appropriate on a particular parcel of property, but the remainder of the uses in that zone would not be appropriate;

\_\_\_\_\_ d. Where the setbacks, building height limits or other standards of an existing zone are not necessary for the protection of neighboring properties or the general welfare of the City because of the proximity of a parcel of property to a particular landscape feature such as a cliff or a hillside where there would be no negative impact from a relaxation of such standards; and

\_\_\_\_\_ e. Where additional setbacks or other buffers are needed to protect neighboring properties from uses to be employed on a parcel of property.

3. The City Council finds that State Street is a vital commercial corridor within the City and the City intends to conduct an intensive study and evaluation of State Street in 2014 to determine among other things, what types of uses are appropriate on State Street, ways to promote redevelopment along State Street, ways to attract new business and enhance the economic viability of the State Street corridor, the extent to which residential uses should be allowed on State Street, measures that can be taken to enhance the visual appeal of State Street, and ways to enhance transportation circulation and walkability. The City Council finds that it is in the best interest of the City to not allow any new PD zones for residential development along State Street pending the outcome of the State Street study and the City Council’s evaluation of said study. Therefore, effective February 5, 2014, and notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, no new application will be accepted for the creation of a PD zone that allows residential units within five hundred feet (500’) of State Street. This prohibition shall remain in effect until modification of this section by the City Council. However, the current intent of the City Council is that this prohibition will be temporary and the City Council intends to reevaluate the appropriateness of residential PD zones along State Street after completion of the State Street study. Nothing herein shall prohibit the City Council from considering and approving a PD zone allowing residential dwellings along State Street where the application for the creation of such PD zone was received prior to February 5, 2014.

4. Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent an amendment to an existing PD zone.

**22-11-2. Reserved.**

~~4. \_\_\_\_\_ PD zones shall not be created for residential development except in the following situations:  
Subsections 1 and 2 above;~~

~~Residential development that is significantly different in design, layout or characteristics from the type of residential development allowed under existing zoning classifications. PD zones will not be available merely to increase density or to relax development requirements normally applicable to similar types of residential development in existing residential zones.~~

~~Parcels that are unsuitable for either single family dwellings or PRDs due to the location or topography of the land.~~

Chair Moulton asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Mr. Stroud.

Ms. Buxton asked where the City goes to find someone to do the study. Mr. Stroud said they can advertise in planning magazines/journals, national websites, large regional planning firm may specialize in this type of thing. This is not something a local person could handle.

Ms. Larsen asked how far off of State Street does the study go, Mr. Stroud said it would be 500 feet on each side of State Street.

Vice-Chair Walker said that it is good for the city to step back and look at the areas to study them for a year and revisit after the study.

Chair Moulton opened the public hearing and invited those from the audience who had come to speak to this item to come forward to the microphone.

## **“Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”**

Jim Fawcett, Orem, suggested looking at all three major corridors: State Street, University Parkway and 800 North. If the City just looks at State Street it will push all development to the other two and have a great impact on them.

Mr. Bell indicated that the PD zone will still be allowed in the City. The only PD that will not be allowed is the high density residential developments in the specified areas. Ms. Larsen asked what the difference is between high and low density. Mr. Stroud said low density is the R8 zone, which are 3.5 units per acre. The PRD zone has about seven units per acre, which allows attached housing. Seven units per acre could be the beginning of higher density. It used to be that staff thought 16 units per acre was high density; now high density is 30-35 units per acre. Mr. Earl said that the General Plan identifies high density as starting at 8 units per acre and 5-7 units per acre is medium density. Ms. Jeffreys asked what the square footage would be. Mr. Stroud said that Promenade Place is 35 units per acre; an acre is 43,560 square feet. He noted in a neighborhood that is about 8000 square feet lots, 5-6 neighbors is about an acre. Mr. Bench said that Peach Haven, which is south of Ms. Jeffreys home is seven units per acre.

Ms. Larsen asked if this should include Geneva Road and the housing around UVU and the new TOD zone. Mr. Stroud indicated the north of Geneva is industrial. The City has a separate study slated for Geneva Road in the future with the new Lakeview connector road. Geneva Road is meant to handle a lot of traffic. Mr. Stroud then added the City Council will still have the option of denying rezone requests.

Vice Chair Walker asked if the study will take into account the connecting streets or just State Street. Mr. Stroud said it will be just State Street, however the study will take into account some of the uses on both State Street and the cross streets. Mr. Bench added the consultant will be requested to look citywide as far as the overall high density projects vs. apartments, condos, single family homes to see what Orem has compared to other cities and to see what the ultimate build out could be. This will help the City determine what the plan should be in the future for high density housing.

Chair Moulton closed the public hearing and asked if the Planning Commission had any more questions for the applicant or staff.

Mr. Whetten said he sees a lot of value in the study. He hoped there would be a public discourse after the study to make sure the citizens have opportunities to contribute. He noted that any change in the PD zone ought to reflect what is being studied and the study should reflect what the concerns are. In other words it should be limited to what is included in the study and not include other things.

Mr. Whetten left the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

Ms. Buxton asked if it really matters if the study covers more than the outline. Mr. Bench said the focus of the RFP will be on State Street. The consultant will look at commercial, retail, office, and high density housing on State Street. There will be a small component that will look citywide, but the main focus will be on State Street.

Vice Chair Walker asked if this will shut down development on State Street and force the development to go other places. Mr. Stroud said the City Council will have the opportunity to say yes or no just as it does now. There are still places that are appropriate for a PD zone of high density housing within the City.

Mr. Earl said the focus of the study is going to be on how the City can attract more commercial development to State Street. The study will not come back and say that commercial should be limited. The City does not want to limit the commercial PD zones that will encourage commercial development. The focus is to limit the residential.

Mr. Iglesias said it is important to do what is necessary to attract business to the City and this study will be a big plus.

Staff presented three options for the study. They invited the Planning Commission to recommend one to the City Council.

**“Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”**

1. Eliminate high density residential entirely from PD zones along key transportation corridors in the city, namely 800 North, Center Street, State Street and University Parkway.
2. Eliminate high density residential along the State Street corridor and continue to allow along other key corridors in the city (for example, University Parkway, 800 North, Center Street).
3. Continue status quo and “self-police” the placement of high density residential projects along the noted corridors.

After some discussion, the Planning Commission decided to support Option 1.

Ms. Jeffreys asked how this would affect anyone that currently has an open project. Mr. Stroud said if there is a current application it is okay.

Chair Moulton called for a motion on this item.

**Planning Commission Action:** Chair Moulton moved to recommend the City Council amend Sections 22-11-1 and 22-11-2 pertaining to the purpose and applicability of planned development zones in the City of Orem with the recommendation that the City Council also consider eliminating High density housing along University Parkway, 800 North and State Street. Ms. Buxton seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, and Michael Walker. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 4.1** as follows:

**AGENDA ITEM 4.1** is a request by Woodbury Corporation to recommend the City Council amend **ARTICLE 22-5-3(A) AND THE ZONING MAP OF OREM CITY FOR PROPERTY AT 747 EAST 1000 SOUTH BY CHANGING THE ZONE FROM C2 TO PD-34.**

**Staff Presentation:** The applicant requests a rezone of 0.29 acres to the PD-34 zone. This parcel was not included in the December 2013 Woodbury University Mall rezone request as the owners and Woodbury had not finalized the purchase of the property. The applicant has now contracted to purchase the property and request the property be rezoned to the PD-34 zone.



**Advantages**

- Allows full-site development/redevelopment

**Disadvantages**

- None identified

**Recommendation:** Based on compliance with the Orem General Plan and the Orem City Code and the advantages outlined above, staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Moulton asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Mr. Stroud.

Chair Moulton invited the applicant to come forward. Kris Longson introduced himself.

Chair Moulton opened the public hearing and invited those from the audience who had come to speak to this item to come forward to the microphone.

When no one came forward, Chair Moulton closed the public hearing and asked if the Planning Commission had any more questions for the applicant or staff.

Mr. Stroud showed the Planning Commission the notification boundary for this item.

**“Planning Commission minutes for February 5, 2014”**

Vice Chair Walker asked if all property of the Mall is now under contract. Mr. Longson said there are a few homes that are not in the zone. They own most of the homes in the north east part of the Mall property. He noted they held a neighborhood meeting and 15 people showed up. They answered their questions.

Chair Moulton called for a motion on this item.

**Planning Commission Action:** Vice Chair Walker said he is satisfied that the Planning Commission has found this request complies with all applicable City codes. He then moved to recommend the City Council amend Section 22-5-3(A) and the zoning map of the city of Orem by rezoning property located generally at 757 East 1000 South from the C2 zone to the PD-34 zone. Chair Moulton seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, and Michael Walker. The motion passed unanimously.

**MINUTES:** The Planning Commission reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting. Chair Moulton then called for a motion to approve the minutes of June 5, 2013. Ms. Larsen moved to approve the meeting minutes for January 22, 2013. Ms. Jeffreys seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, and Michael Walker. The motion passed unanimously.

**ADJOURN**

Chair Moulton called for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Jeffreys moved to adjourn. Ms. Buxton seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Becky Buxton, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, David Moulton, and Michael Walker. The motion passed unanimously.

**Adjourn: 6:11 p.m.**

---

Jason Bench  
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: February 19, 2014