Provo City Planning Commission

Report of Action

October 28, 2020

*ITEM 1 D. R. Horton, Inc. requests a Zone Change from A1.20 to the Low Density Residential (LDR) zone for approximately 18 acres, located at 1920 S 500 W. Lakewood Neighborhood. Aaron Ardmore (801) 852-6404 aardmore@provo.org PLRZ20190182

The following action was taken by the Planning Commission on the above described item at its regular meeting of October 28th, 2020:

POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION

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

Motion By: Deborah Jensen
Second By: Laurie Urquiaga
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.

- Includes facts of the case, analysis, conclusions and recommendations outlined in the Staff Report, with any changes noted; Planning Commission determination is generally consistent with the Staff analysis and determination.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION FOR PROPERTY TO BE REZONED
The property to be rezoned to the LDR Zone is described in the attached Exhibit A.

RELATED ACTIONS
The Planning Commission also approved the related Concept Plan (PLCP20190188) at the October 28th 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. Planning Staff gave an overview of the staff report, including changes from the last hearing and what changed the recommendation. David Day spoke to Public Works issues with traffic.

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 present and did 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:

- In response to questions raised by the Planning Commission, Krisel Travis stated that parking in their townhome projects is always in high demand and that the HOA enforces parking in the garage units. Also in response to questions, she stated that the site would most likely be built out in about two years.
- Krisel stated support to look into the Planning Commissions requests of removing some parking stalls along the streets and near the pickleball court to add more landscaping.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- Lisa Jensen clarified the difference in the number of units in the concept plan and who will maintain the open spaces. She stated she appreciated the width of the alleys for vehicles and that landscaping should help break up the pavement. She also suggested that the majority of traffic should go out on 500 West access.
- Deborah Jensen asked the applicant why the parking count was so high and if the HOA will restrict rentals. She also stated her preference for a narrower alley and that a discussion with the Fire Chief would be beneficial to reduce road widths.
- Brian Henrie discussed options for reducing parking and enhancing landscaping in the project. He also would prefer a narrower alley width and wondered if a different, more permeable driveway treatment. He appreciated the neighborhood connection and did not think that is a valid concern.
- Laurie asked about the width of the driveways and thought the density seemed appropriate considering the long-term plan for the area but did have concerns that the extra parking could bring over-occupancy.
- Dave Anderson likes the excess parking but thought breaking it up with trees would be beneficial.
- Ally Jones noted that the plan and zone seem to meet codes and should be approved.
- The Planning Commission noted in the motion that they would *encourage* that four parallel spaces be removed along the private drive and two be removed adjacent to the pickleball court and be replaced with landscaping.

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