Provo City Planning Commission

Report of Action

October 14, 2020

ITEM 2 D. R. Horton, Inc. requests Concept Plan approval for a townhome development, located at 1920 S 500 W in a proposed Low Density Residential (LDR) zone. Lakewood Neighborhood. Aaron Ardmore (801) 852-6404 PLCP20190188

The following action was taken by the Planning Commission on the above described item at its regular meeting of October 14, 2020:

CONTINUED

On a vote of 8:0, the Planning Commission continued the above noted application to October 28th, 2020.

Motion By: Brian Henrie
Second By: Ally Jones
Votes in Favor of Motion: Brian Henrie, Laurie Urquiaga, Dave Anderson, Ally Jones, Daniel Gonzales, Lisa Jensen, Deborah Jensen, Robert Knudsen
Dave Anderson was present as Chair.

- New findings stated as basis of action taken by the Planning Commission or recommendation to the Municipal Council; Planning Commission determination <u>is not generally consistent</u> with the Staff analysis and determination.

RELATED ACTIONS

The Planning Commission also continued the related Rezone (PLRZ20190182) at the October 14th hearing.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

- Has been proffered by the applicant and should be part of the zone change approval.

STAFF PRESENTATION

The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts of the case and the Staff's analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

CITY DEPARTMENTAL ISSUES

- There are remaining issues from the Coordinator Review Committee (CRC) review that need to be resolved.
- Important issues raised by other departments – addressed in Staff Report to Planning Commission

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING DATE

- A neighborhood meeting was held on 9/10/2020.

NEIGHBORHOOD AND PUBLIC COMMENT

- The Neighborhood Chair was not present or did not address the Planning Commission during the hearing.

CONCERNS RAISED BY PUBLIC

Any comments received prior to completion of the Staff Report are addressed in the Staff Report to the Planning Commission. Key issues raised in written comments received subsequent to the Staff Report or public comment during the public hearing included the following:

- Lack of egress points, bringing more traffic through the neighborhood.
- Parking overflowing into adjacent neighborhoods.
- The property sits in a high-water table, a lot of fill needed.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Key points addressed in the applicant's presentation to the Planning Commission included the following:

- Krisel Travis gave an overview of the company DR Horton and different developments and experiences they have had in the State and Country. She then gave an overview of this proposed project, including a proposed Development Agreement addressing Public Works issues, rights-of-way, and open space allowances.
- In response to questions raised by the Planning Commission, Krisel stated that garbage pickup would be done with cans and a private service. Also in response to questions, she stated that the site would need about two to three feet of fill dirt, that the elevations presented can have more architectural variety, and that a trail on the north of the property as a buffer did not make the most sense.
- Krisel stated that the plan for the Lakeview Parkway improvements includes a public sidewalk off the road, maintained open space, and an open fence design for safety for the residents.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- Deborah Jensen noted that the site plan seems to have a lot of impervious surfaces which gives her concerns about design, livability, and stormwater. She said that the site has too many units and had questions regarding the garbage collection. The zone makes sense to her, but that she agrees with staff that there is not enough open space.
- Daniel Gonzales would like to see the open space more dispersed around the development, especially as a buffer to the neighborhood on the north.
- Brian Henrie stated the site is out of context for the area, trying to fit too much on the property. He likes the private roads but hoped that the building designs would address the street better. He asked staff if the proposal meets applicable codes or not. Mr. Henrie said he is supportive of the developer installing and maintaining the City property around the project if the other issues can be worked out.
- Lisa Jensen asked about phasing, the difference between public and private roads, and differences between the current and previous site plans. Ms. Jensen stated concerns with parking and a “barracks” feel for the housing, that it is too imposing on the single-family detached to the north.
- Laurie Urquiaga stated that the proposal is too packed in and does not fit in well with adjacent developments and does not make a smooth transition. She would like to see more variety on the site and asked the applicant on pricing to determine how important the additional eleven units were to the project.
- Dave Anderson asked the developer for details on the right-of-way improvements, wondered about the accuracy of the parking counts, and noted an absence of pedestrian connectivity through the site. He also thought that the proximity to I-15 and future commercial help to increase the density on this lot, but hopes for more variety in housing types.

FINDINGS / BASIS OF PLANNING COMMISSION DETERMINATION

The Planning Commission identified the following findings as the basis of this decision or recommendation:

- The Planning Commission thought that due to the differences of interpretation on open spaces and elements in the Development Agreement shown by the applicant, that the item should be continued to allow staff and the applicant to work on remaining issues noted by the staff report, specifically with the open space requirement, unit count, and right-of-way improvements.

Planning Commission Chair

Director of Development Services

See Key Land Use Policies of the Provo City General Plan, applicable Titles of the Provo City Code, and the Staff Report to the Planning Commission for further detailed information. The Staff Report is a part of the record of the decision of this item. Where findings of the Planning Commission differ from findings of Staff, those will be noted in this Report of Action.

Legislative items are noted with an asterisk (*) and require legislative action by the Municipal Council following a public hearing; the Planning Commission provides an advisory recommendation to the Municipal Council following a public hearing.

Administrative decisions of the Planning Commission (items not marked with an asterisk) **may be appealed** by submitting an application/notice of appeal, with the required application and noticing fees to the Community and Neighborhood Services Department, 330 West 100 South, Provo, Utah, **within fourteen (14) calendar days of the Planning Commission's decision** (Provo City office hours are Monday through Thursday, 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.).

BUILDING PERMITS MUST BE OBTAINED BEFORE CONSTRUCTION BEGINS