

**PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF ST. GEORGE
WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH
August 28, 2018**

PRESENT: Chairman Nathan Fisher
Commissioner Roger Nelson
Commissioner Dannielle Larkin
Commissioner Summer Barry
Commissioner David Brager
Commissioner Don Buehner
Council Member Joe Bowcutt

CITY STAFF: Assistant Public Works Director Wes Jenkins
Planning & Zoning Manager John Willis
Assistant City Attorney Victoria Hales
Planner II Ray Snyder
Development Office Supervisor Karen Roundy

EXCUSED: Commissioner Todd Staheli

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Fisher called the meeting to order at 5:13 pm.
Commissioner Buehner led the flag salute.

1. **ZONE CHANGES (ZC)**

Consider a zone change from R-1-10, Mining and Grazing, Atkinville PD-C, and Atkinville PD-R to PD-C on approximately 190.05 acres, PD-TNZ on approximately 875.03 acres, PD-TNZ Resort on approximately 147.88 acres, PD-Agriculture on approximately 25.77 acres and Open Space on approximately 98.27 acres. The project is called “Desert Color” and is located at approximately north of the Utah – Arizona state line, east of the I-15 freeway, south of the Southern Parkway and west of River Road. Case No. 02018-ZC-026 (Staff – John Willis) (Note – a public hearing was held and closed on August 21, 2018 for this item.)

John Willis presented the following:

We have a new deviation chart that we can review as we have worked through that before and can touch on any changes from the last meeting. We also have new graphics to show the garages and other design items as requested.

Chair Fisher suggested going through the list once and then referencing the list as we progress through the project with any additional graphics. For future reference, redline format for booklets such as this would be more beneficial than highlighted sections. I would recommend that change for City Council and for any additional meetings we have on this project.

John Willis stated that any text in black meets current code. Any text with a different color varies from the code. I will work through the chart and invite the applicant up for parts of the chart to explain more.

Chair Fisher noted that changes such as 25% rather than 50% residential is a large change and is something I feel should be vetted at this stage. Items such as that, you as the applicant, need to be prepared to explained in a manner that is more clear and concise than the booklet.

Do we have the detail now to see how the TNZ area will look within each pod, or do we see it later? The language needs to be clear enough that it cannot be abused down the road. I don't want to be locked into language that doesn't have detail.

John Willis said this is the framework that will set the stage for all future applications. The applicant and staff have worked on this for some time now, and any approval should be able to be reviewed by staff to make sure that future applications meet the intent of this approval. There is a development agreement that needs to be approved prior to Council approval.

Victoria Hales added that all additional information will need to be reviewed by staff before an approval. There is a zoning plan, development agreement, and preliminary plat that all need to be ready before Council.

Chair Fisher said that his concern is that some of what the commissioners have reviewed is outdated and is too much to digest.

John Willis said the language and concepts are the same; the details are being tweaked.

Chair Fisher said we can work through this but pushing things off to City Council is a concern.

Victoria Hales said you can make calls as yes or no on the details and give us direction so that staff can make the changes prior to Council. Staff will ensure that your comments are heard and addressed.

Councilman Bowcutt asked if changes in this project will affect the city as a whole.

John Willis said the proposals in this are for this this area only. Other areas of the city will need to comply with the TNZ ordinance.

Commissioner Brager suggested we go through the items and check off the quick ones that have no issues and then focus on the items have more to discuss.

John Willis presented item 1 on the chart. This proposal will allow apartments and commercial in the same area horizontally rather than vertically. We don't want commercial areas to be overrun with residential. We want the area to be mixed use.

Chair Fisher said it needs to read 1-7A for the exhibit. What are the limitations to mixed use? What percentages are required and what limitations are established?

Brooke Cole said item 35 is the cross reference; page 67 is the where the restrictions are.

John Willis added there is a 50% requirement for commercial.

Chair Fisher clarified that the square footage for the footprints has to be at least 50% commercial?

John Willis said yes, and this is only in the overlay only. Any attached or commercial product would need to be reviewed because it is a PD but it would be allowed. The elevations are what you would review.

Commissioner Larkin said a horizontal mix does seem like a good idea.

Chair Fisher said the hesitation is that there are mixed use that have had problems meeting the commercial and really just wanted more residential.

Commissioner Brager proposed a 25% residential requirement.

Chair Fisher said being able to utilize the ground level will automatically give them more residential than what would happen in our traditional mixed use. Maybe the mixed use is too strict in current code.

Brooke Cole said you need the units to support the commercial. 50% of the footprint would still need to be commercial.

Chair Fisher expressed concerns that the commercial will be squeezed out like it has been in Little Valley.

Commissioner Larkin added that the commercial was squeezed out because of sprawl and limited density.

John Willis explained that the mixed use is limited to the orange overlay. Staff was initially concerned with this proposal which is why the area is limited to an overlay and why the 50% footprint was established. If they want residential only then the plan needs to be revised. You're going to see height in this mixed use area and then the resort area. The commercial and mixed use and then the resort area will feather towards the lower densities.

Chair Fisher said a four story residential building next to a single story flower shop is a concern to me. The commercial isn't as desirable in a horizontal as it is in vertical.

John Willis agreed that horizontal is more tricky to make functional than vertical.

Victoria Hales counseled there is language to prevent a single story building being next to a four story building. Snippets of the code were presented such as: attached buildings must share design standards or detached buildings must be integrated through scale and appearance. You may request that language is added that buildings are to match in scale and proportion regardless of attachment.

John Willis added that it is addressed on page 15 as well.

Chair Fisher asked if that language is strong enough for staff.

John Willis said it does give staff some leverage and then the proposal would have to come to Commission and Council for approval.

Brooke Cole suggested changing the language to say *all structures* rather than stating attached and detached.

Victoria Hales said all structures, attached and detached, and comply with 4.1 of the design manual and form code for the TNZ.

Chair Fisher asked why the language allowing this in all PD-C and not just the overlay.

John Willis said there is a section in the code that allows for mixed use in the C-4 that they also want in the PD-C.

John Willis presented item 2 on the chart. This allows for more of a mix in the NG. You may end up with more single family in the NE and more mix in the NG.

Chair Fisher expressed concern that there needs to be a distinction between a single family lot and pad product.

John Willis presented item 3 on the chart.

Chair Fisher asked why 800'?

Brooke Cole explained that 800' is about a block length and there should be something on every block.

John Willis presented item 4 on the chart.

Chair Fisher asked if a pad product would qualify?

John Willis said it would have to be a lot.

John Willis presented item 5 on the chart.

Chair Fisher asked what the product type would be.

John Willis said there is a variety of product types for nightly rentals. A mix will be required. This acreage is about the same as the Green Valley area and will have a mixture.

Chair Fisher noted that we required one manager for Bloomington.

John Willis said that was a requirement.

Brooke Cole said 15-25% of detached is typical demand. There is a note in the book to have the whole resort managed by one company.

John Willis presented item 6 on the chart. This would allow for community gardens and farmer's markets in this area.

Commissioner Barry asked if community gardens would be permitted elsewhere.

Brooke Cole said there could be community gardens but not on a commercial scale. This is more geared towards a co-op.

John Willis presented item 7 on the chart.

Victoria Hales noted that this will need to be reviewed by the City's Water Department.

John Willis presented item 8 on the chart. The property would be private with a public easement. Councilman Bowcutt asked if 5' is a minimum throughout.

John Willis said yes, 5' minimum or larger.

Commissioner Brager asked if the sidewalk is lost with a trail.

John Willis said sidewalk or trail but at least one.

Chair Fisher said the trail can be only 5' but isn't the intention that the trail is larger?

Brooke Cole said the trail is for yellow line and red line. Everything else will be sidewalk.

Commissioner Barry said that shows a bike lane and golf cart lane.

Councilman Bowcutt said the cross section says 4' pedestrian.

Commissioner Nelson said the pedestrians can use the whole strip and not just that little area.

Brooke Cole said there is really 12' to walk on because it is 4' sidewalk and 8' trail.

Victoria Hales said the discussion is 5' sidewalk always regardless of the additional area. The language and cross section need to match.

Chair Fisher asked if the language is in the text or only on the cross sections.

John Willis said it is only illustrated in the cross section.

Councilman Bowcutt said he doesn't want a 4' sidewalk built and a trail that isn't built for years and years.

John Willis said the cross section is a 12' trail or 5' sidewalk. There is no way to do just the 4'.

John Willis presented item 9 on the chart.

Chair Fisher said there is parking that fronts Horseman Park and there is parking that is set in. I prefer the inset.

Commissioner Barry asked if the 15' setback remains if inset.

Brooke Cole said yes.

Bob Hermandson said the design really depends on scale. There are times you can buffer your project and there are times you just don't have the space to do so.

Victoria Hales noted you can limit frontage.

John Willis explained Silkwood park has a drive aisle and one row of parking that is more of what you are looking for. Running a parking lot down the center of the park may limit your ball fields or larger complexes but can work for a neighborhood park. Maybe there can be a limitation to 30% frontage being parking or 70'. They are also required to berm and put up a wall to screen.

Chair Fisher said adding 30% or 70' whichever is less to the language will suffice.

Victoria Hales asked if double fronting matches code.

John Willis said that meets current code.

Brooke Cole said the placement talks about parking behind buildings but not parking lots down below.

John Willis said the code requires a 25' setback for a building or parking area. They are requesting 15' for residential.

Chair Fisher noted that the civic space does not count as amenity, does it?

John Willis said it does count for both civic space and amenity. The code references the short term rental ordinance that requires amenity. Both civic area and amenity are required.

Brooke Cole said page 22, paragraph 1 does say each area will be prominently anchored by amenity.

Victoria Hales said short term rental language needs to be added to page 22.

Commissioner Barry said page 61 says no civic space minimum is established.

Brooke Cole presented more on item 9 and item 10 on the chart. Daybreak is the only example of a TNZ in the state of Utah.

Chair Fisher said the graphics are skewed so it is hard to tell the percentages.

Brooke Cole said 40% is what is typical in Daybreak and a good compromise. We want to encourage that you aren't seeing cars parked in the drive all the time.

Victoria Hales noted that in the example many of the other garages are in the back or behind. Is there is a standard in Daybreak to limit fronting garages. If you are granted the 40% facade, can all houses in the neighborhood be built out that way. What are the limiting factors in the code?

Brooke Cole said not all houses fit that design. There are some lots where a garage won't fit.

Chair Fisher clarified that the products will limit themselves per you and the market but the code will allow for all to be front loading.

Brooke Cole noted that all homes in the example are front loading until you get to the alley access lots.

Commissioner Barry asked if every neighborhood has 35-100' lot widths. Are there lot width variables throughout the subdivisions so you can't build all the same thing?

Brooke Cole said the lot widths would be block to block.

Commissioner Brager said looking at the big picture would be a good way to get us back on track. What was the goal of all of this?

Commissioner Larkin said the goal is walkability and a community feel. We want a front porch community feel in this area. I want to see in the language that front loaded garages are limited so we don't have the feel of cars being in the front yard.

Victoria Hales said this is between a typical R-1-10 with snout garage, and the TNZ with most garages in the back. They are requesting a reduced front setback with a garage pushed back.

continued discussion on setbacks and limitations on product types

Brooke Cole noted you can't get a two car garage on certain frontages. Looking at Daybreak there was an unwritten rule of 40%.

Commissioner Brager stated the whole idea was to have the parking behind. Why this?

Brooke Cole said the driveways are a factor and affordability is a factor.

Chair Fisher said the issue here is what do we want to accomplish here? Are we wanting to push the garages in the back or are we okay with a mix of products regardless of garage placement?

Commissioner Barry asked if Daybreak looks at each house.

Brooke Cole said there is a committee that reviews each home so that two homes don't have the same facades as neighbors.

Chair Fisher asked if we're okay with this throughout the whole project.

consensus of no - limitations required for front loading garages

Councilman Bowcutt said there is no problem with one block of front loaders, and then a block of multi-story, and then a block of commercial. My idea of TNZ was that there is a mix of everything.

Victoria Hales said current code is 25' and $\frac{1}{3}$ front facade as garage. The request is 15' setback and 40% facade as garage.

continued discussion

Commissioner Nelson asked why not just throw out a percentage of front load garages and limit the project.

John Willis said a number to limit the 40% is possible but not necessarily the front loading.

Victoria Hales agreed that the language should be tied to the facade percentage and not to front loading.

John Willis noted that there is also a preliminary plat on the agenda tonight that shows you the variety of lot widths that will help with the facade percentage discussion.

Brooke Cole added this is for those in between lots.

John Willis asked if you can limit the products per lot widths.

Brooke Cole said that is possible.

Chair Fisher said he doesn't think a percentage limitation will negatively impact a developer.

Commissioner Buehner said the whole idea is the walkability. If we give it the density but then put cars out front, that isn't painting the picture we want. We're better off protecting the TNZ than we are adding exceptions to ruin what we want. I'm all for exceptions as long as they still meet the intent of the TNZ.

Brooke Cole asked if the increase from 33 to 40% is the issue or the 10' reduction in setback.

Commissioner Buehner said the traditional feel is the hold up.

Commissioner Barry said her hang up is the reduced setback.

Commissioner Larkin said the original proposal is what we initially held onto and getting away from that is troublesome.

Brooke Cole said if it is one or the other, I would prefer to be granted the 40% facade.

Commissioner Larkin said on page 77 there is a garage set very far back and is what we want.

Chair Fisher said if you're capping the 40% facade allowance we should give them both.

Brooke Cole said 15-20% of 40% facade should work when looking at the plat that we've laid out. *consensus 15%* within the plat can be 40% and 15' setback

Recess at 7:39 pm

Resumed 7:49 pm

Brooke Cole presented item 17 on the chart. The request has been modified to 1/6th instead of 1/8th. We would also notate that tunnels are not permitted and would include a graphic excluding them.

Commissioner Brager asked if 8' in any direction would make more sense.

Commissioner Barry said it needs to be at least 8' deep for it to be usable.

Brooke Cole said an 8' minimum in either direction would be agreeable.

John Willis said what we're trying to eliminate is a walkway to the front door. A useable space, oriented to the street, is what is desired.

Commissioner Brager said 8' minimum with width always being equal or wider than depth. The minimum is still 80 square feet.

continued discussion on porch requirements

Commissioner Barry said there is a difference between an entry and a porch.

Commissioner Brager posed the question if a 100' facade has an 8' x 15' porch, is that sufficient.

Commissioner Nelson said the idea here is the look and approachability of the neighborhood.

Chair Fisher noted the issue per the developer is the larger home with a porch that is too large and my thought is that the issue is for smaller homes where it isn't feasible. If you can get the feel with an 11' wide on one home why not get that on another home?

Commissioner Larkin

Commissioner Buehner returned at 8:08 pm.

Brooke Cole said you could leave $\frac{1}{3}$ in NG and $\frac{1}{6}$ in NE with an 8' minimum.

Commissioner Nelson said $\frac{1}{5}$ across the board with an 8' minimum in either direction is my suggestion.

disagreement for smaller lots

Chair Fisher said the fraction should apply to certain facade widths.

Brooke Cole said the NG works to about 60' and then you jump to NE. The NE doesn't allow lots less than 50'.

Commissioner Larkin said NE as $\frac{1}{5}$ and then NG $\frac{1}{3}$ and both with the 8' minimum.

Brooke Cole said 65' $\frac{1}{3}$ and anything less at $\frac{1}{5}$.

Chair Fisher said that still doesn't work. It should be $\frac{1}{3}$ or 20' whichever is less for length and a depth of 8' minimum.

Discussion - wrap around porch - wrap does not count in calculation

Discussion - corner lots are not required porch on two facades - only the primary front

John Willis presented items 11 and 12 on the chart.

Brooke Cole said this is for guest parking on street within 300' of residential and 500' of commercial.

Victoria Hales asked if two commercial buildings are next to each other, how do you prevent double counting for stalls. You cannot double count.

John Willis said striping the stalls will account for that. Staff would need to verify.

Commissioner Larkin asked about residential and commercial sharing parking.

John Willis said that is not part of this request. The parking would go with whatever use is presented first.

Chair Fisher said there is a potential issue with adjacent landowners essentially taking parking from the neighbors just because that user is there first. Maybe up to 500' so long as it fronts common ownership.

Brooke Cole noted that for commercial properties, adjacent and contiguous frontage works. For residential, 300' should accomplish what we're looking for.

John Willis noted items 13-15 are standard in the code. Item 16 is okay with our public works department. Item 18 is for the TNZ only. Item 19 increases the accessory structure height to 20'. Item 20 may require discussion.

Victoria Hales asked how that is monitored.

Brooke Cole said the HOA will monitor.

John Willis said a plat note and standard deed restriction stating owner occupied can be required. There is also a parking requirement.

Victoria Hales asked if a carriage house counts towards the overall project unit count.

Brooke Cole said the size is too small for it to count on the density.

John Willis said there are standards in the booklet and example photos.

John Willis presented item 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 (cross reference item 9), 26 and 27.

Commissioner Barry asked on item 28 if the NE will allow an accessory structure will allow 0 setback. Do these conflict?

John Willis said they do not conflict.

Brooke Cole said page 43 would not allow a 0 lot line in the NE.

John Willis clarified that eliminates Z lots in the NE.

John Willis said item 29 on the chart is to eliminate any language creating a maximum lot size.

Item 30 on the chart is essentially the C-4 mixed use in a PD zone.

Councilman Bowcutt asked why private streets are listed.

John Willis said it is typically a drive aisle and not a street. That language can be removed. Item 31 and 32 is a cross reference.

Brooke Cole inserted that on page 16 there are parking lots that front the public street and buildings that orient the internal drives.

Chair Fisher noted item 9 only addressed civic spaces.

John Willis said it is a remnant code section.

Brooke Cole added this is for the commercial section only.

John Willis explained there are two areas. There is a town center type area and a big box type area.

continued discussion

Chair Fisher said the language for commercial zones and parking lots is that they have to, in order to minimize frontage parking, follow the diagram as a model.

John Willis presented items 32 - 40.

Victoria Hales raised questions about double fronting.

discussion on parking

Chair Fisher noted that on number 8 on the diagram the parking needs to be flipped.

John Willis presented item 42. If privately owned, the extra plants are okay. If the landscape strip is being dedicated to the city it needs to meet city standard.

John Willis presented item 43. There are two (2) 40' monument A signs being requested. There is one (1) 50' monument B being requested. Monument signs C-E are also being requested. There is also a request for a 20x20 temporary sign to be located in three areas (one at a time). They are also requesting that each pad is permitted signage (letter F). They are also requesting 25% front facade coverage instead of 20%. Another request is that this entire area is one commercial area so signage can be located anywhere on the premises and would not constitute an off-premise sign.

discussion on signs

Commissioner Nelson asked if lighting has been addressed.

Brooke Cole said the lighting is designed to not have much bleed over.

John Willis asked if the signage can shine down rather than shining up.

Brooke Cole said downlighting makes it appear to float. Uplighting is a better appeal.

John Willis said maybe different standards in commercial and residential. Residential can be halo or downlighting only, commercial can be architectural with no bleeding.

John Willis added that there is also an amendment to Atkinville to remove this area from that plan and put it in the Desert Color plan. You have now reviewed the zoning book and neighborhood 4a. Part of the development agreement has outlined that the PD amendment and preliminary plat be reviewed at the same time.

Commissioner Brager posed a question on item 1 of the chart. Are we sticking with 50%? A smaller number like 25% seems more reasonable.

discussion on percentage

John Willis said coming back for deviations on this will be difficult because there is a development agreement associated with the overall project.

consensus - no issue with 50%

John Willis presented neighborhood 4a. There will be NE and NG lots. The units and forms will be accounted for with each submittal. This is 123 units over 29 acres.

Chair Fisher noted there isn't a feathering to separate the NE and NG.

John Willis said there is a separation with the red line. The dimensions will need to be added to any future plats so that staff can better monitor code compliance.

There is a code section that allows a reduction in porch sizes for multi-family if there are findings and it is approved by council.

Victoria Hales said the proposal most likely cannot pass the first finding outlined in the code. A condition will need to be that all elevations will need to be modified to meet the requests made tonight.

Brooke Cole said elevations and dimensions can be submitted to staff.

Elevations 1A/1B are options for a tri-plex project with alleys and rear garages.

Elevation 2 has been modified from the previous submission

Chair Fisher noted elevation 2 only has one relief area.

Commissioner Larkin said the rear elevation is more attractive than the front elevation.

Elevations 3A/3B are options for that product type.

Elevation 4

Elevations 5A/5B are options for that product type.

Elevations 6A/6B/6C are options for that product type.

Elevation 7 is for the single family product types to be expected.

There is a 5% requirement for civic space. The proposal meets that minimum requirement. There are some conditions in the staff report: development agreement, side elevation facing public street; the front facade to wrap around side facade, use table to be addressed prior to council, and residential form ratios to be addressed.

Commissioner Barry made comments regarding east/west design to alleviate energy consumption.

Commissioner Larkin expressed concern on Elevation 2 - Mews Townhomes. The front facade should look more like the rear facade. The other elevations seem to meet the standards we've established.

Commissioner Brager said Elevation 5A - Lighthouse Townhomes isn't appealing either.

John Willis asked if changing the materials and slope of the porch would help.

Commissioner Larkin said it would. The rear elevation looks better than the front.

Commissioner Nelson asked if the windows on the front could pop out.

Victoria Hales ask that the applicant be able to submit new elevations to staff prior to Council.

agreed

continued discussion

Commissioner Brager said Elevation 5A could use more articulation.

Victoria Hales counseled that the following legal conditions be included in a motion: the acreage is to be removed from the Atkinville zone plan and added to this zone plan, all submission documentation is to be reviewed and integrated into the overall package before being presented to City Council, the development agreement, zone plan, and preliminary plat must conform and match, all items must be complete before going to Council, no item may stand alone. All conditions listed in the staff report are to be complied with. The sign plan must also agreed upon.

All changes discussed tonight will have to conform across all applications. You can adopt any discussion for items 1 - 43 and then staff comments and legal counsel.

MOTION: Commissioner Nelson made a motion to recommend approval including all comments in regards to items 1-43 in the zone change detail spreadsheet, comments from legal and comments from staff. The elevations are approved with the exception of Elevation 2 Mews and Elevation 5a Lighthouse which need modifications in accordance with discussion held tonight.

SECOND: Commissioner Larkin

Chair - remove lighthouse

okay

AYES (5)

Commissioner Nelson

Commissioner Larkin

Chair Fisher

Commissioner Buehner

Commissioner Barry

NAYS (1)

Commissioner Brager

Motion carries.

2. **PRELIMINARY PLATS (PP)**

Consider a one hundred twenty-three (123) lot residential preliminary plat subdivision for “Desert Color” located south of the Southern Parkway and east of I-15 at approximately 900 West and 4700 South. The property is zoned PD-R (Planned Development Residential). The representative is Bob Hermandson, Bush and Gudgeon Case No. 2018-PP-040 (Staff – Wes Jenkins)

John Willis presented the item with no comments.

Victoria Hales noted the plat must be altered to match discussions held tonight and cannot go forward to city council without the zone plan and development agreement.

MOTION: Commissioner Larkin made a motion to recommend approval and incorporate staff comments.

SECOND: Commissioner Nelson

AYES (6)

Commissioner Nelson

Commissioner Larkin

Chair Fisher

Commissioner Buehner
Commissioner Barry
Commissioner Brager
NAYS (0)
Motion

ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Buehner made a motion to adjourn.
SECOND: Commissioner Nelson
Meeting adjourned at 10:56 pm.