

FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
February 04, 2021
ELECTRONIC MEETING

STUDY SESSION

Present: Vice Chair Rulon Homer, Commissioners Greg Wall, Larry Steinhorst, John David Mortensen and Mike Plaizier.

Staff: Community Development Director David Petersen, Planning/GIS Specialist Shannon Hansell and Planning/Recording Secretary Carly Rowe. **Excused:** Chairman Alex Leeman and Commissioner Erin Christensen.

Planning/GIS Specialist **Shannon Hansell** addressed the Commission regarding Teton Investment Holdings LLC's The Rose Planned Unit Development (PUD). It is located north of Park Lane and west of Main Street. It is a single-family home development with 50 units. The Commission has asked the developer to mix lot sizes among the development instead of having them in demarked areas as originally proposed. Staff is suggesting other changes to the preliminary plat. On the south of the development, the suggestion is to make an access easement so the neighbor, the Woods, has the ability to develop in the future. It will be between Lots 307 and 308. There was discussion on whether the sidewalk on the east side leading to Main Street should be on the north or south side of the road. Staff wants to make sure that it is really clear that the internal cul-de-sac on Evelyn Lane will eventually go through, even going so far as to add an approximately three-foot dead-end street. This has been added as a condition. A temporary turn-around is noted with dotted lines.

Commissioner **Greg Wall** asked about the "suped up driveway" that should not look like a through street connecting Main Street to Lagoon Drive. Community Development Director **David Petersen** said he should ask about that in the regular meeting. **Wall** said last time the Commission asked for a sidewalk along the north-south street on the south end between Lots 312 and 313. The developer had said in the past that they didn't have four feet for the sidewalk.

Hansell addressed the Commission regarding the Farmington OrthoStar medical offices agenda item. It is a proposal for two lots that the Auto Spa was considering a few months ago. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the site plan because the use fits well in the mixed use and GMU zone. It is a more walkable use for the parcel that provides jobs. The people in the Avenues like the idea of medical office space. There are two buildings being proposed. Staff proposed removing the on-street parking along Clark Lane and Park Lane, as the site already has enough parking otherwise. **Petersen** said there are no interior landscaping requirements for the parking lot.

REGULAR SESSION

Present: Vice Chair Rulon Homer, Commissioners Greg Wall, Larry Steinhorst, John David Mortensen and Mike Plaizier.

Staff: Community Development Director David Petersen, Planning/GIS Specialist Shannon Hansell and Planning/Recording Secretary Carly Rowe. **Excused:** Chairman Alex Leeman and Commissioner Erin Christensen.

Rulon Homer opened the meeting at 7:00 PM.

Item #1 Minutes

Larry Steinhorst made a motion to approve the minutes from January 21, 2021. **Mike Plaizier** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Item #2 City Council Report

Community Development Director **David Petersen** updated the Commission on the proceedings of the February 2, 2021, City Council meeting. He noted that eight people in five households moved to appeal the Commission's decision about the Accessory Dwelling Unit Conditional Use to the Council. When it came to the Commission, it was proposed as a flat roof. The applicant, Brian Palmer, provided the Council with a hand sketch showing a pitched roof above the garage. The Council voted to deny the appeal, and voted to modify the Commission's decision for a flat roof according to the

applicant's sketch, leaving the rest to the Staff to approve. The outside skin should match the outside of the existing home. Two or three members of the public phoned in to participate. In old business, Cook Lane by the Brighton Homes townhomes is running into problems with the Army Corps of Engineers approving the road going through wetlands (i.e. Shepard Creek).

SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

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

Planning/GIS Specialist **Shannon Hansell** presented this agenda item, consideration of a preliminary plat. The project is part of the East Park Lane Small Area Master Plan, which was approved by the City Council in 2018. The master plan includes commercial and office mixed use development, with residential aspects. A Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Agreement to move all residential to the east side of Lagoon Drive is in the process of being recorded, and applicable zoning for the area was approved in 2019. In February 2020, the East Park Lane Phase II subdivision was approved for the commercial site. The East Park Lane Phase III subdivision was introduced in 2018 and included 70 dwelling units. In response, the Planning Commission and City Council suggested lower density residential units, and The Rose PUD was introduced. The Rose PUD is a residential development of 50 single-family homes. During Schematic and Preliminary PUD processes, the Rose PUD lowered the density, removed dead-end streets and provided open space, future trail connections, and accommodations for neighboring property owners (with conditions provided today). The Preliminary PUD Master Plan and Subdivision Schematic Plan for The Rose PUD was approved on November 5, 2020, by the City Council. The differences between the preliminary plan and the schematic plan seen earlier include Woodrose Lane, a private lane that used to be a hammerhead and now goes all the way through. Conditions and changes suggested tonight include to move open space access easement by 850 North Street to between Lots 307 and 308 to create better access to neighboring properties. Utilities must be stubbed to it. The sidewalk accessing Main Street should be moved to the south, with a curb return on the internal cul-de-sac.

Petersen said a different group associated with this developer owns the triangle piece mentioned in Condition 4. He said the Woods next door may not need that triangular piece of property anymore, as they once thought they might in order to get four homes on two acres.

Jeff Allen, developer with CW Urban and applicant (1222 Legacy Crossing Blvd. Ste 6, Centerville, Utah) addressed the Council. He agrees with all the conditions of approval. However, they do not control the triangle piece south of Lot 301.

Commissioner **Larry Steinhorst** commented that Lot 340 notes a 5 foot wide public access to Evelyn Street. On the south side of that lot between Lots 340 and 341 is a sidewalk with open space. He asked what the intent of that public access is and if it is redundant with the other open space. **Allen** answered that the City Council had asked to install a walkway around the wetlands area. To accommodate that request, they opened an easement on Lot 340. **Petersen** said that as a compromise, a note can be put on the final plat that in the event there is a walkway wetland open space area, the City Council has the option to use that as part of a walkway.

Wall asked if there could be a 4 foot sidewalk on either side of the north-south street between Lots 313 and 332. **Allen** said they were not able to accommodate any sidewalk there. **Wall** asked if there could be a sign noting "local traffic only," or "private driveway," or stamped concrete apron to make it look less like a road. **Allen** said a sign is great and depending on the storm drain, the apron may be an option to slow traffic. **Wall** said he is worried about lighting where there is no sidewalk for pedestrians. **Allen** said there is a mixture of private and public streets in the development. Public streets include 900 North, Evelyn Street, and 850 North. He said he is not opposed to putting lighting on Woodrose Lane. The front of the homes could have lighting packages on that narrow road. He said he could entertain street lights if the Commission requests. **Wall** said maybe it would be good to have one on the north end and one on

the south end, as he prefers lights in highly residential areas. **Allen** said that is appropriate. **Petersen** said he doesn't care either way if there is lighting, as he prefers the night sky. Commissioner **Mike Plaizier** said he doesn't have a strong feeling either way. Commissioner **John David Mortensen** said he prefers lights and he likes **Wall's** suggestion.

MOTION

Greg Wall made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the Preliminary Plat for The Rose PUD, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following conditions:

1. Open Space between Lots 307 and 308 should be access easement/future private street to Wood property
2. Shift this access easement in Condition 1 east to accommodate better development on Wood property between Lots 307 and 308
3. Utilities should be stubbed to the Wood property
4. Triangle piece south of Lot 301, abutting Lagoon Dr., should be fee title (access easement already), if necessary, to Wood property
5. Curb return should be clearly shown for future through-road at cul-de-sac on Evelyn Street
6. Flip Open Space sidewalk by Lot 310 and 309 to South to connect to current sidewalk and to help with snow storage, could jog the sidewalk to avoid property at 837 N Main Street
7. Must follow all conditions of schematic and preliminary master plan approval
8. Must meet all requirements of the Development Review Committee (DRC), including the City Engineer
9. Note on the final plat regarding the easement near the wetlands that in the event there is a walkway around the wetland open space area, the City Council has the option to use the easement as part of that walkway
10. Developer to work with the City Engineer to install a sign or treatments at the north and south end of Woodrose Drive for traffic calming and to make it safer for pedestrians
11. Street lights added at the north and south end of Woodrose Drive

Findings for Approval:

1. With adherence to conditions from DRC, the Rose PUD offers helpful accommodations to neighboring property owners for future development.
2. The Rose PUD Preliminary Plat follows the Schematic Plan and Preliminary PUD Master Plan, and agrees with all findings attached to those plans.

Larry Steinhorst seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Item #4 E & H Land / Adam J. Watts (Public Hearing) – Request to consider schematic Subdivision and Site Plan application(s) for the proposed Farmington OrthoStar medical offices, located at Clark Lane/Park Lane (1.72 acres) in the GMU (General Mixed Use) zone. (S-1-21 & SP-1-21)

Hansell presented this agenda item. The Farmington OrthoStar Subdivision is a proposal for two small office buildings on a triangular parcel at the convergence of Park Lane and Clark Lane. Earlier proposals for this site included car washes, which the Planning Commission and City Council, supported by public comment, determined were not the best use for Farmington's mixed use areas. Now, the developer proposes office space, and has chosen to follow the Chapter 18 ordinance on Mixed Use Development. Reciprocal access to areas east of this project must be considered and should be noted on the final plat. There should also be a bike lane on Clark Lane. Condition #3—meeting the siting requirements of Chapter 18 and shifting the lot line to the west—is more of a suggestion in order to cover more of the frontage on Clark Lane. **Petersen** said he thinks it best to leave the condition there for now. **Hansell** said there is sufficient parking onsite that would make on-street parking unnecessary.

Wall asked about the southwest parking space with 4 feet of landscaping strip and if there was a landscaping requirement. **Petersen** said the City does not have a landscaping requirement in mixed use areas. **Hansell** said Staff will

recommend removing the on-street parking from the drawing to try to discourage parking on Park Lane. **Petersen** said the City hasn't painted the gutter red or added another lane in order to enforce anything stricter. It does not meet the warrants to do that now, but likely will in the future. Public Works and the City Engineer definitely don't want on-street parking to be shown as parking in this plan. The City does not own the Right of Way proposed to connect Park lane to Clark lane, and will have to work with the land owner to acquire it in the future.

Adam Watts, applicant, addressed the Commission. He has spent a lot of time with Staff and the neighbors on Clark Lane. They are sensitive to what the residents hope to see here. They have done past commercial projects he hopes the Commission will take note of.

Rulon Homer opened the public hearing at 7:40 PM.

Ray Seely wants to see the detention basin more "attractive," like at Cherry Hill instead of the U of U. He asked if the road to Clark and Park is at the end of the "green space" or if it is further west? Will landscaping with trees along Clark Lane be part of the Development Agreement with the City? He wondered where the best location is for the bike lane. Comparing this to previous developments, he said this looks nice. Since the offices will be closed on weekends and nights, it will not likely cause traffic problems for the neighbors. As for parking lots, he hates the credit union's bright orange neon lights, as they remind him of Las Vegas. He prefers them to be away from the local homeowners.

Hillary Hallows (1190 W Clark Lane, Farmington, Utah) spoke with the developer today and echoed what **Seely** said. This is more favorable. Her only concerns are the way the parking lot is a straight shot from Park to Clark. She hopes it is not used as a short cut in the future. She is also concerned about the bike lane and how it will affect parking on Clark for residential purposes. As for landscaping, she is asking what it will look like at this stage.

Holly Abel (1163 W Henry Ave, Farmington, Utah) said she had similar questions and hopes to get answers to all of them. She asked about the "grassy berm" that she noticed in another plan more on the East side, and wondered if that would happen here on the Clark Lane side so residents don't look straight out on a parking lot. Overall, she is pleased with this proposal.

Rulon Homer closed the public hearing at 7:50 PM.

Hansell said the landscaping plan and lighting will be addressed in the final review portion of the process. **Petersen** said the City will require good landscaping for the detention basin. He said the City had no input on the detention basin by the U of U. As far as the landscaping along Clark Lane, he would recommend a 3-foot tall screen wall as per Chapter 18 of the Zoning Ordinance along the parking area to screen headlights. There is enough room for the bike path in the asphalt on the north side of Clark lane for now. The plan to connect Clark and Park Lane will be detailed in the future. There may be a bike path on the south side of Clark lane in the future as well, and it won't affect parking or traffic for locals. He thinks there will be a median in the future on Park lane so it is not a straight shot from Park Lane to Clark Lane. The requirement for lights is they must be directed directly to the parking lot with no bleed.

Wall asked if people in these medical offices would be under anesthesia, as the ordinance would then require a covered portico for ambulance services. **Watts** said that is not anticipated. He has a physical therapist and orthopedic group that are both excited about this location. It will be check-ups and visits. **Wall** asked about the landscaped peninsulas to break up a long run of parking spaces. **Watts** said he is amenable to look into that as long as there is enough parking onsite. However, he hopes not to lose any parking stalls. **Wall** would want heavier landscaping on the south. **Petersen** said the 3-foot "screen wall" should be sufficient to screen the headlights. McDonald's in the area has something that looks tasteful.

MOTION

Greg Wall made a motion That the Planning Commission approve the Schematic Site Plan and recommend the City Council approve the Subdivision Schematic Plan for the Farmington OrthoStar Subdivision, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards, with supplemental information including the vicinity map, subdivision schematic plan and site plan, and the following conditions:

1. Reciprocal access to parcels east of this is necessary.
2. A bike lane should be added on Clark Lane.
3. To meet the siting requirements of Chapter 18, the lot line must shift to the west.
4. Any remaining DRC comments, including from the City Engineer, must be addressed.
5. Parking along Park and Clark Lanes is not explicitly denied; however the current parking area is sufficient to meet the requirements of the code. The City strongly suggests removing street parking from the Subdivision Schematic and Site Plan prior to Preliminary Plat and Design Development Review.
6. A 3-foot tall screen wall be added on the south side of the parking lot with the proposal of the materials to be submitted to the City for approval.
7. Heavier landscaping be installed on the south side of the parking lot because of the higher density residential across the street.

Findings for Approval:

1. The use of office and professional space in the mixed use zones supports the goals of the General Mixed Use (GMU) zone, promoting higher density, walkability and economic stability.
2. The OrthoStar subdivision is consistent with the General Plan because it provides an attractive, healthy, and pleasant living environment.
3. The office use would not be detrimental to neighboring residential uses, as there would be very little noise and light pollution.
4. Because the buildings front Park Lane, traffic would be less likely to leak over to Clark Lane, which currently experiences less traffic.
5. The subdivision provides the City with an opportunity to construct an increasingly necessary connection from Park Lane to Clark Lane.
6. The development allows for pedestrian usability as it provides a connection from Park Lane to Clark Lane, with sidewalks to be installed along both frontages.
7. The site plan follows the Chapter 18 Mixed Use ordinance, thereby removing the need for a "sub"-PMP (Project Master Plan) as part of the larger North Station Master Plan.

Mike Plaizier seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved

ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT

Item #5 Farmington City (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation to amend the zoning ordinance to require developers of multi-family and attached dwelling units to set aside a certain percentage of their developments as affordable housing, or to pay a fee in lieu. (ZT-1-21) [Note: Information regarding this agenda item will be presented at the meeting].

Petersen said Staff is not prepared to move forward with this agenda item. He recommends to continue the public hearing to the February 18, 2021, meeting.

Larry Steinhorst made a motion that the Planning Commission continue the meeting on February 18, 2021. **Mike Plaizier** seconded, which was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

Item #6 Miscellaneous, Correspondence, etc.

Petersen presented items mentioned during the affordable housing study session on December 10, 2020. Some of the information was also presented during a January City Council meeting.

In 2018, Farmington had 6,433 households; of those, 926 were 80 percent or lower of median household family income. That is 14.4 percent of the total. The gap is 221 housing units short of needed affordable housing, according to the State. Farmington did a projection through build out showing a total of 12,740 households would be in the City 29 years from now. If the same assumptions hold true, the affordable housing stock would be 1,835 units. The gap would be 1,330 additional affordable housing units that would be needed by 2050. Those numbers will likely change.

Going forward and to fill the gap, the City would need to approve 17 percent of all new housing as affordable units. Staff thinks that the mixed use center “donut” area of Farmington will have an additional 4,886 units there at build out. That is a majority of the expected future development through 2050. Just outside the center “donut” will be 1,421 new detached single family. Another 747 units are expected in regular subdivisions. Infill lots may be 674 new units. Farmington is really three cities in one: single-family housing, mixed-use areas, and Lagoon.

The funding sources to help fill the 1,330-unit gap include Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funds, ADUs, and tax credit projects. There is \$1 million in the RDA fund currently. There should be between \$7 million to \$10 million in the fund in the future considering the two Community Reinvestment Areas (CRAs) and a third likely to be approved in the future. This may not be enough to fill the gap. There is more bang for the buck that comes from renter-occupied affordable housing units, with the City subsidizing \$18,000 per unit. Owner-occupied affordable housing units would cost the City \$85,000 per unit conservatively to subsidize.

ADUs don’t pack a huge punch. The ADU ordinance was put in place in 2002. Between then and 2018, only 14 ADUs were put in place, less than one a year. That may be picking up in pace. The State Legislature has three bills going on about affordable housing. One is that ADUs will be a permitted use, no longer a conditional use. Farmington is already doing that. If the legislation passes, the Planning Commission will no longer review them. Another bill would require bonuses for affordable housing. The State is trying to make it easy to find affordable housing. However, ADUs are not guaranteed to be affordable, depending on the amount of rent the owner charges.

Wall said that is a good idea. He doesn’t feel it is a problem on the planning side, but instead on the building side because there are strict firewalls and separate unit requirements. **Petersen** said the State is thinking of relaxing those. He said identifying illegal apartments in the City may help fill that affordable housing shortfall. **Petersen** said if the City doesn’t have an affordable housing program in place, the State will withhold transportation funds. He wants to make sure the City can show an effort to make up the shortfall.

Tax credit projects could help fund affordable housing as well without much help from the City. The City can help incentivize projects by donating land or RDA seed money. Davis County has only 1,000 Section 8 housing vouchers.

The City Council considered policy questions including providing owner-occupied affordable housing in addition to renter-occupied. There are pros and cons to this. If the owner sells for a reduced price in order to keep the unit affordable, the City would help pay the shortfall. **Plaizier** said a deed restriction for up to 99 years can help owners build equity in the affordable housing unit, but not have a windfall. He said the younger generation likes the mobility of renting rather than owning a home.

Wall said he would rather see two- and three-bedroom affordable housing units than studio apartments. **Petersen** said if a developer pays a fee in lieu of providing affordable housing units in their development, that money would go toward affordable housing somewhere else or another program.

Petersen said one option to consider is using the city's zoning ordinance/police power to provide additional lots to developers in exchange for affordable housing instead of open space. The City has almost met its open space goals.

Wall said this would be using the same strategy the City used to get open space to instead get affordable housing.

Petersen said that before 1999, a hypothetical parcel would get a standard 20 lots of 10,000 square feet each. After 1999, the same land would only yield 12 lots of 20,000 square feet. The 1999 landmark open space ordinance cut zoning in half. To get the 20 lots back, 15 percent open space would have to be provided with smaller lots of 8,500 square feet. The 20 lots could also be obtained if the owner paid a fee in lieu, which the City spent on parks or trails elsewhere. Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) were also used to get open space. **Petersen** said it has been worth it for what the City got out of it, which was done without raising densities or taxing people. Farmington is one of few communities that has ever done something like this.

Petersen noted that City Councilman **Brett Anderson** wants to make sure future attempts at affordable housing are incentive-based. The City Council wants something simple. He thinks in the single-family area, the City keeps the open space rules on deck, which may trump affordable housing. This could be used in places where it is critical to preserve open space. There are also plans to streamline the PUD.

Wall asked if the City could have a different standard apply to the "donut hole" than the donut. He said it would be tricky to quantify the bonus in places with the form-based code. He wanted to know if there would be a way to maintain and upkeep the owner-occupied housing that is subsidized by RDA funds and deed restricted. **Petersen** said that hasn't been walked through yet.

ADJOURNMENT

Greg Wall made a motion to adjourn at 8:50 PM. **Mike Plaizier** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.



Rulon Homer, Vice Chair