



**PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION**
Tuesday, March 28, 2017
6:00 p.m.

Commissioners in Attendance: Genevieve Baker, Michael Clay, Karen Ellingson, Michael Farrer and Brad Mertz

Commissioners Excused: Carl Clyde and Frank Young

Staff in Attendance: Glen Goins, Community Development Director
Laura Thompson, City Planner
Lisa Bullock, Executive Assistant

Council Representative: Rick Child

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Mertz called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Commissioner Clay moved to approve Commissioner Mertz as the temporary chairman of tonight's meeting in Chairman Young's absence. Commissioner Farrer seconded the motion. The vote to appoint Commissioner Mertz as temporary chairman was unanimous.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Mertz asked if there were any corrections to the agenda. There were no changes to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 10, 2017

Chairman asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. There was one change to the minutes — a period needs to be added to the end of a sentence.

CONSENT AGENDA

Brad Morgan seeking preliminary approval for The Village on 4th subdivision and multi-family project located at approximately 550 West 400 South in the RMF-2 zone and the R2-Residential Single/Two-family in the WF-1 Westfields Overlay zone.

Commissioner Baker asked for clarification on the traffic study and the adding of a traffic light in the future. She asked if they would continue with the road as it currently is and then add the items in the traffic study in the future. Director Goins briefly explained the study is to predict the impact of the entire development. It may require further study to get a traffic light installed in that area. Director Goins referred the questions to Planner Thompson who was not in the room at the time.

Chairman Mertz asked what the acronyms LOS and LOSF meant on the traffic study. LOS is the acronym for Level of Service. Level of Service C is acceptable, D is somewhat acceptable and F is failure. Chairman Mertz said that in the conclusions on the traffic study it states that without the traffic light, the intersection will continue to run at an LOSF (level of service failure). The study indicates putting the traffic light in at some level of the development. The developers would like to work with UDOT to get the traffic light installed; however, there is not a current agreement with UDOT for the traffic light. The road is owned by UDOT so the City has little control over it.

Karen asked if the development does go in and the traffic light is not installed at the intersection, would the area allow for the traffic flow.

Commissioner Clay said that the level of service would depend on the timing of the traffic light and the geometry of the intersection.

Commissioner Baker asked if there was a timeframe for the rollout of the different phases. This will need to be addressed by the applicant.

Director Goins explained that if the development creates a lower level of service for the traffic flow it doesn't have to improve the whole system to an "A" rating, but it does have to address the declared impact from the study. Once the area is developed and if the intersection is still at an "F" rating, the City would approach UDOT and request them to study the intersection. The traffic light may eventually be put in, but the study might accelerate the timeframe as to when it is put in.

Howard Nelson seeking approval for the Nelson Subdivision, a minor 3-lot development located at 1425 East Center in the R1-10 Single-Family Residential zone.

No questions were asked by the Planning Commissioners.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DDD&B Investment Springville LLC seeking a Zone Map Amendment from the L-IM Light Industrial Manufacturing zone to the H-IM Heavy Industrial Manufacturing zone for property located at 245 West 1600 South.

No questions were asked by the Planning Commissioners.

RD Development Group seeking amendments to Title 11 of the Springville Development Code to allow for single-family detached homes that are located on a shared driveway in the Westfields and Lakeside Overlay zones.

No questions were asked by the Planning Commissioners

Jeff & Michelle Brotherson seeking a General Plan Land Use Map and Official Zone Map amendment from Medium Density and the R2 Single/Two-Family Residential zone to Medium-High Density and the RMF-2 Residential Multi-Family zone on property located at 724 & 748 West 550 South.

No questions were asked by the Planning Commissioners

ADMINISTRATIVE SESSION

Public comment may be accepted at the discretion of the chairman

No items.

With nothing further to discuss, Commissioner Clay moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Farrer seconded the motion. The vote to close the meeting was unanimous.

Chairman Mertz adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m.



**PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION
Tuesday, March 28, 2017
6:15 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Mertz called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Clay asked if there were any corrections to the agenda. There were no changes to the agenda.

Commissioner Clay moved to approve the agenda as written. Commissioner Farrer seconded the motion. The vote to approve the agenda was unanimous.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 10, 2017

Chairman Mertz asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. There were no changes to the minutes.

Commissioner Clay moved to approve the agenda as written. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. The vote to approve the agenda was unanimous.

CONSENT AGENDA

Brad Morgan seeking preliminary approval for The Village on 4th subdivision and multi-family project located at approximately 550 West 400 South in the RMF-2 zone and the R2-Residential Single/Two-family in the WF-1 Westfields Overlay zone.

No discussion.

Howard Nelson seeking approval for the Nelson Subdivision, a minor 3-lot development located at 1425 East Center in the R1-10 Single-Family Residential zone.

No discussion.

Commissioner Clay moved to approve both of the Consent Agenda items. Commissioner Farrer seconded the motion. The vote to approve the Consent Agenda items was unanimous.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DDD&B Investment Springville LLC seeking a Zone Map Amendment from the L-IM Light Industrial Manufacturing zone to the H-IM Heavy Industrial Manufacturing zone for property located at 245 West 1600 South.

Director Goins explained the request to the Planning Commissioners. This is a zone map amendment request. The current zoning designation on 3.16 acres at 245 West 1600 South is Light Industrial Manufacturing with the proposal to amend to Heavy Manufacturing. The proposal is to introduce the ability to expand animal processing on the site inside of the existing building on the property. The proposal does not include any building expansion or additions. The property is on 1600 South which is slated to become a major arterial street by the recently passed Mountainlands Associate of Government's impact study/transportation designation, as well as the City's transportation study. Additional residential and commercial sites will be going in this area in the future.

One of the main areas the City looks at in zone amendment requests is how it complies with the City's General Plan. All of the land in this area is currently in a Light Industrial Manufacturing zone with a pocket of highway commercial to the north and north of that pocket is single family residential in the R1-10 zone. The General Plan Land Use mirrors what the City is seeing in the zoning. The classification for light industrial is industrial manufacturing or IM. This classification also allows for heavy manufacturing. In this regard, the proposal complies with the General Plan Land Use Plan. One of the objectives of the General Plan is to locate industrial uses near major arterials with easy access to the interstate and rail. Originally, 1600 South was not intended to be major arterial at the time the General Plan was written, but that is part of the consideration. If the proposed zone change is allowed, the additional use, allowing for animal slaughter on site would also be allowed.

Given the consideration of the General Plan, Staff's recommendation is to approve, with no conditions.

At this time there are questions regarding what the intent of the property is. The City does not specifically look at site plans or request building designs at this state of the process because we cannot require any building specific information at the time of a zoning change.

At this time, there have been no public comments.

Commissioner Baker asked what the other heavy manufacturing uses could be in that area. Planner Thompson looked at both zones and they are very similar. The only difference is when you look at both zones the heavy manufacturing allows for more raw materials and the storage of the materials outdoors than the light manufacturing zone does.

The biggest difference between the two zones is that the heavy manufacturing allows for a greater outdoor influence and processes.

Commissioner Baker asked if it would be better to allow for the slaughtering in the light industrial zone. Director Goins responded by stating it has to do with storing animals on the outside. With the light manufacturing zone, there is only so much you can do indoors.

Director Goins reviewed some of the uses in the heavy manufacturing zone such as half-way houses, paint and body shops and repair services. Multi-use storage and pharmacy related businesses are not allowed in this zone and restaurants become a conditional use.

Director Goins reviewed the definitions for heavy and light manufacturing with the Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Baker asked about the gravel pit that is currently in that area. Planner Thompson said the gravel pit was grandfathered into the light manufacturing zone when the zone changed in that area.

Commissioner Ellingson is concerned about the noise and smell from the proposed and that it would be across the street from highway commercial. She asked if allowing this zone change would make it more difficult to develop that area into highway commercial for restaurants, stores, etc. Director Goins responded by saying “yes, it would.” These types of issues would be reviewed when a site plan is submitted to the City.

Commissioner Baker asked about the highway changing. Director Goins explained that there would be an addition of an interchange at 1600 South. What the City does not have an answer on at this time is which method would be used to extend 1600 South to the east to connect with Mapleton. No plans have been adopted at this time.

Commissioner Farrer asked about the Nebo School District bus yard, the tractor business at the corner and the three businesses behind the Nebo School District. Director Goins responded by saying he did not have the answer as to what the usages of the businesses are.

Commissioner Farrer asked if the proposed project would be like the meat business on 400 South and 400 West. Director Goins responded by saying he hadn't seen any plans for the project, but the intent is to change the zone and not determine the use of the property at this time. If the zone is changed, it would allow for outdoor storage of animals. In discussions with the applicant, it is Director Goins' understanding that the intent of the applicant is to keep the animals outside for a brief period each day and then they will be brought into the facility and processed there. The intent is not to have permanent, exterior storage.

Chairman Mertz asked if the City is at the low-end or high-end of heavy manufacturing. Director Goins responded by saying that we are at the low-end.

Commissioner Baker asked about percentage of land use for light manufacturing. Director Goins said he couldn't speculate at this time. Director Goins will look into this further.

Commissioner Clay asked about spot zoning and if this project would be considered spot zoning. Director Goins responded by saying it is at the Planning Commission and City Council's discretion to determine if this zone is at this parcel at this time. Director Goins stated that this project is not spot zoning and meets the General Plan designation, which is the City's future intent. When boundary usages come into play, the Planning Commission and City Council set the tone for future requests.

Commissioner Baker asked where the nearest heavy manufacturing is in this area. Planner Thompson responded by saying it is Springville City's Waste Water Treatment Plant.

Chairman Mertz asked if the applicant, Mr. Darrel Smith, was present.

Mr. Brett Smith and Mr. Michael Smith addressed the Planning Commission. The business, Dale T. Smith and Sons Meat Packing, is a family business that was started in the mid-1950s.

Mr. Smith showed a presentation to the Planning Commission.

Dale T. Smith and Sons Meat Packing originated in Draper in the 1950s. At the facility in Draper, approximately 200 animals are processed each day, primarily beef. He introduced the founders of the business and showed photos of the original facilities in Draper as well as current photos of the Draper facilities.

The applicant stated the company would like a smaller property for a custom shop and briefly showed the process.

In 1990, the company started doing business with Stouffers and continues to do so. Due to the demands of Stouffers, the company became a grinder and then sends the bulk combos to the Stouffers business in Springville. Last year 13 million pounds of pre-ground beef was sent to Stouffers in Springville last year.

About a year and a half ago, the applicant purchased Gary's Meat in Payson that has 16 employees. At that facility they process beef, lamb and wild game. The smaller facility in Payson is what the applicant

The applicant would like to build a manufacturing business with trucks going in and out with live animals in the trucks. The site will not store the animals or be a feed lot. This site will be the final destination site. The intent is to have the proposed facility be a multi-species facility.

The applicant purchased the property from the Hardy family about 23 years ago when the Hardy family stopped processing at the facility. The facility is now used by the applicant to do the grinding for Stouffers, but they have outgrown the facility and are now doing the grinding at a facility in North Salt Lake. The applicant needs a facility to harvest, process and deliver from to locations all over the United States.

The applicant would make the site appealing and have a store where the community can purchase fresh meat. The applicant would like the facility to be a full harvest and processing plant. The company has sites in Salt Lake County, Davis County and Utah County.

Chairman Mertz asked if the Planning Commissioners had any questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Baker asked if the applicant had any concerns about the lack of direct highway access and asked what the applicant's plans are to transport their product to and from the facility. Mike Smith responded by saying that the best access to the freeway is by Walmart. Currently what access is now available would be adequate. This will not be a high-volume facility. Mr. Smith then showed the path the trucks would use to and from the facility. It would be about four to six semi-trucks going in and out of the facility per week.

Chairman Mertz asked if the smell will be an issue with the property as it was in the past at the Draper facility. Darrell Smith responded by explaining the process at the Payson facility and said they wash the corrals daily and do not have a lot of animals standing outside each day and the smell is minimized because the animals are processed each day. There is very little complaints about the Payson facility. Several people come in to the plant to purchase the products and bring their wild game into the facility for processing.

The smell at the Draper facility years ago was mainly the manure. There could be some incidental manure smell because there will be live stock on site for a brief time; however, the company has taken extra measures and precautions on their cleaning schedules and the site is cleaned frequently. The company continues to look at ways to minimize the odors. There would be no feed lots on this site because all of the feed lots are now in Idaho.

Director Goins explained that the applicants are considering a land lease of the entire western side of the property for a completely different light industrial manufacturing use so they wouldn't be able to encompass the entire property and asked the applicant to explain the other use to the Planning Commissioners.

Brett Smith explained that the barn that is on the property will be leased for other uses. The agreement is for one year. There is a good possibility that the growth will happen fast enough that the applicant may need to terminate the lease to create a bigger facility to accommodate the applicant's company.

Chairman Mertz opened a Public Hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Ryan Johnston
251 West 1600 South

Mr. Johnston has property to the west of the proposed zone change/facility and they purchased the property from the Smith family. They were not made aware of the zone change. They have questions about the light manufacturing zone and how the zone change will affect their business

and others in that area Mr. Johnston asked if this would be a spot zone only. Mr. Johnston stated that there is very little light manufacturing areas in Springville and the area they are currently in is one of the few.

Mr. Johnston stated that his property has all of the drainage for 1600 South to the highway. It is his understanding that some detention ponds are to be built in the area. His property is basically a detention pond for everything to the north of his property.

Mr. Johnston is concerned about the heavy traffic on 1600 South and how much the traffic backs up on the road. He is concerned that if the area becomes a heavy industrial area, the traffic will become an even bigger problem.

Chairman Mertz explained the City's process and the General Plan. The General Plan can change as it did several years ago. The City has declared future zoning in this area. Nothing would change the applicant's property with the requested zone change, other than the property next to it would have the opportunity to use it for additional uses.

Brad Nusink
1785 South State (highway 51)

Mr. Nusink has a lot of similar concerns as Mr. Johnston and how the zone change would affect his property. He is not against the zone change, but is concerned about the usage and the amount of usage. He worked in the meat industry for 20 plus years and understands the processes. He asked what Springville's future plans are. He is also the water master for Big Hollow Irrigation Company and one of their irrigation ditches runs directly under the Smith's facilities and it runs across their property to the fields north for irrigation. He asked what the Smith's plan is to keep the blood, manure, etc., from going into the irrigation ditches. Another concern is the heavy trucks breaking the irrigation pipes. He feels these issues need to be addressed.

Chairman Mertz responded by saying these issues would be addressed when a site plan is submitted by the applicant and addressed by Springville City to ensure it follows City Code and ordinances.

Mr. Nusink is also concerned about the storage of cattle and the safety and control of the cattle the Smith family brings in.

Helina Carter Thomas
12765 Spring Lake, Utah

Ms. Thomas is a real estate agent that represents Mr. Nusink and several other clients in that area. She is not in favor of the zone change because in working with Springville City, it was determined this would be a residential and commercial area. She feels it would be difficult to have a residential area next to a heavy manufacturing area.

Ms. Thomas was on the Utah County Planning Commission for five years and she feels that spot zoning is not a good thing. She stated that Senate Bill 277 was passed through the Legislature

and they have got the bonding in place for the future expansion of the road to the freeway in that area. In talking with UDOT recently, they are scheduled to start the studies of that area next year. She sees the area as being a great area for commercial property and feels that putting heavy manufacturing in the area would not be the best use of the property.

Chairman Mertz asked if the applicant had anything further to address. The applicant did not have any further comments.

Commissioner Clay moved to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. The vote to close the public hearing was unanimous.

Commissioner Clay asked what the public notice requirements are and what Springville City does to fulfill those requirements. Director Goins responded by saying that there is a public notice requirement that the City fulfills the required public notice requirements. Springville City posts the notification on the State website, Springville City's website and the bulletin board at Springville City's Civic Center. For this project, the posting met those requirements.

Commissioner Ellingson asked if notification letters were sent to business or property owners. Director Goins responded by saying that letters are not mailed directly to any property owners. When required, a large sign is posted on the property.

Commissioner Ellingson feels the use would be better if it was more interiorly located and not across the street from highway commercial. She feels the heavy manufacturing is not complimentary to the highway commercial zone.

Commissioner Baker stated she has similar concerns as Commissioner Ellingson. She is aware there are heavy manufacturing uses in that zone that have been grandfathered in, but with 1600 South being slated to be a major arterial road, it may not be the best location for this area. She has concerns about the access to the proposed facility right now until the road and freeway ramp is completed in 2022. She is concerned about the heavy traffic in that area and that the property is across the street from highway commercial property.

Commissioner Clay feels it is a perfectly fine use for the land, but shares the concerns about the freeway access and heavy industry being in that area. He feels that heavy manufacturing being across the street from highway commercial will make the commercial highway property harder to sell.

Commissioner Farrer agrees with the other Planning Commissioners. He feels Springville City needs to be concerned about the lack of business.

Commissioner Baker said the lack of heavy industrial in Springville is a concern because there are not a lot of places where that type of industry is allowed.

Director Goins talked about the heavy industrial and spot zoning, but stated that this particular zone change is not spot zoning.

Chairman Mertz feels Springville City needs to support local business and promoting it. The Smith's business supports a major employer in Springville City and it does support the General Use Plan. The General Plan does recognize that industrial uses are in the industrial park and along 1600 South or the State Road.

Commissioner Farrer moved to approve the DDD&B Investment Springville LLC seeking a Zone Map Amendment from the L-IM Light Industrial Manufacturing zone to the H-IM Heavy Industrial Manufacturing zone for property located at 245 West 1600 South and Chairman Mertz seconded the motion.

Planning Commissioners Votes

Commissioner Ellingson - no
Commissioner Baker – no
Chairman Mertz - yes
Commissioner Clay - no
Commissioner Farrer – yes

The motion was denied.

RD Development Group seeking amendments to Title 11 of the Springville Development Code to allow for single-family detached homes that are located on a shared driveway in the Westfields and Lakeside Overlay zones.

Planner Thompson reviewed the request with the Planning Commissioners. The request is to adopt standards that would allow for single-family detached homes on a shared driveway and would only be allowed in the Westfields and Lakeside Overlay Zones as part of the density bonus housing mix. Planner Thompson showed a slide of what the project would look like.

The reasons we have this clarification is because typically, throughout the zoning ordinances and regulations each lot must have frontage on a public street, but this project would be different in that requirement as the frontage would be on a shared driveway.

Commissioner Clay asked if we already have this type of structure in Camelot Village. Planner Thompson responded by saying that we do and that Camelot Village was originally developed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD), but since that time the ordinance has been repealed.

Planner Thompson showed the Planning Commissioners the Camelot Village subdivision on the screen and showed the common driveways.

The applicant is proposing 2,700 square foot minimum lot with 45 feet of frontage. Camelot Village has approximately 4,000 square foot lots.

Commissioner Ellingson asked about how the lot sizes are determined. Planner Thompson asked that this question be referred to the applicant.

A minimum, single-family lot in the RMF-2 zone has 60 feet of frontage and 7,000 square feet of lot area.

The setbacks for this project would be on the edge of the driveway due to the property lines being to the center of the driveway. Typically a setback is measured from the property line. The applicant is proposing a 10 foot setback from the edge of the driveway. This does not allow for much parking space on the driveway. A minimum parking stall is 20 feet in length.

The side setbacks for this project would be the same as any other product setbacks. The rear yard setbacks would be 10 feet and allow for a rear porch, etc., to project five feet into the setback. Currently a single-family 10,000 square foot lot, a deck, porch or patio covering can project 10 feet into the 30 foot rear yard setback as long as the porch is not enclosed.

Commissioner Clay commented that a lot of seniors like living in these types of homes because they are smaller lots, have a shared driveway that is plowed by the home owners association, etc.

Commissioner Baker asked about the configurations on page five of the proposal and if it was all for a single family lot. Planner Thompson responded by saying that everything that is in blue is referring to this project. Commissioner Baker asked what the rear setbacks are for a townhome. Planner Thompson replied that for townhomes it is 30 feet, which is listed on page four of the proposal. Planner Thompson said that if the parking is located 20 feet behind the front setback of the dwelling or rear loaded it can be 15 foot front yard setback, which is required in the Westfields.

Planner Thompson reviewed some of the applicant's proposal with the Planning Commissioners:

Under the purpose and intent, under 1B it states — providing a broad range of housing including suburban and residence apartments, townhouses and shared driveways with a single-family detached throughout the area.

Under paragraph two — within single-family detached neighborhoods located on a shared driveway, within the Westfields and Lakeside Overlay Zone areas, units adjacent to the public street shall have architectural features and elements on the public street, facing side, typically required on front façade such as wainscoting, masonry or fiber cement board and/or fiber cement board from the top of the foundation to the roof.

Planner Thompson stated that the above is only allowed in the overlay areas with a density bonus. This is only permitted in an RMF1 and RMF2 zone if you participate in the density bonus program.

Utility equipment such as HVAC units, utility meters, etc. shall not be located on the public strip street side of a shared-driveway, single-family detached unit.

Minimum performance standards that apply to everything, whether you have a density bonus or not in the Westfields — no garage shall occupy more 40% of the total building

frontage. This measurement does not apply to garages facing on a carriage way, shared driveway, or setback at least 20% from the front of the house or that are side loaded.

With any lot that has street front with frontage of 60 feet or less that includes a carriage way, all required parking shall be at accessed from the carriage way. The required parking shall be setback a minimum of five feet from the rear property line except where single-family detached units are located on a shared driveway.

Commissioner Baker asked questions about required parking. Planner Thompson explained that they will have less than 60 feet of frontage and parking does not have to be from the rear property line because their access is the common driveway.

Paragraph F — all walls which face a public street must contain at least 25% of the wall space and windows or doors, however, on homes that have side-loaded garages or are located on a shared driveway all lots which face a public street must contain 20% of the walls space and windows or doors.

Primary entrances shall face the public street and the sidewalk, except for shared driveway single-family detached homes and shall substitute enhanced architectural treatments on the street facing side facades.

Page 12 refers to the density bonus criteria. Under the building mix, for row houses there is a 3% density bonus that is awarded for developments where over 50% of the multi-family dwellings are row houses. There is a density bonus for variations in the front elevations. The applicant included a density bonus of 5% being awarded for mixed residential density developments where a minimum of 30% of the units are shared driveway single-family detached homes.

Commissioner Baker asked for clarification on the density bonuses. Planner Thompson explained that the applicant would receive a density bonus for using the product and then it would give them more density bonus. This is the same for townhomes, but there is only a 3% density bonus for 50%.

Chairman Mertz asked for the representatives of RD Development to approach the podium to address the Planning Commission.

Dave Morten of RD Development reviewed the project with the Planning Commissioners. This project has been patterned after Camelot Village. Due to a market study they have done, they think it will support the lower-priced, detached product and will provide additional variety in the area.

A couple of the things the applicant added to the project (on page six) that states that utility equipment, utility meters, etc. shall not be located on the public street side of the shared driveway. The intent is to make it look as nice as possible. The goal is to provide a nice

community. The applicant feels there is a very strong market for this type of a product especially for retired couples and individuals and young, married couples.

The applicant showed the Planning Commissioners a virtual walk through on the screen to show them what the project will look like.

Commissioner Ellingson asked what the largest size of home will be on a lot. The applicant responded by saying it will be around 1,800 square feet. The average size lot will be around 1,500 to 1,600 square feet. There will be no basements.

Commissioner Ellingson asked how it would affect the maximum sized dwelling if the setbacks were larger than 10 feet. The applicant responded by saying it would affect the possibility of being able to put this type of product in the area.

Joe Garrington of RD Development presented a virtual street view of the project to the Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Clay asked what the length was between the buildings/homes and the fences. The applicant said the front setback is 10 feet from the end of the driveway to the front of the garage and the side setbacks are five feet. The corner sides are 15 from the back of the sidewalk.

Commissioner Clay asked if there is a home owners association for this project. The applicant responded by saying that yes there is.

Chairman Mertz asked if the garages are two car garages, which the applicant responded by saying "yes. There are two garages."

Commissioner Mertz asked about public parking. The public parking will be on the street.

Chairman Mertz opened a Public Hearing.

There were no comments in the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Clay moved to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion. The vote to close the Public Hearing was unanimous.

Chairman Mertz asked the Planning Commissioners for their feedback on the project.

Commissioner Farrer had no issues with the project.

Commissioner Clay is concerned about offering the conditional density bonus for the shared driveway. He feels they are getting less density with the product and a less attractive product on the street view. Commissioner Clay would be in favor of it without the density bonus.

Commissioner Baker agrees with Commission Clay regarding the density bonus. She has concerns around the lot size and the setbacks. She would like to see other examples or studies in

what other communities have done. She likes the idea of the project and it does provide variety for less-expensive, smaller homes, but she has concerns around recommending it without knowing what other communities have done.

Commissioner Ellingson is concerned about the setbacks and the lot sizes.

Chairman Mertz likes the product and the lower-cost options; however, he has the same concerns as the other Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Baker said there are homes in the Historic District that are on 5,000 square foot lots with a shared driveway and the door facing the street with side-loaded garages. She feels these lots are quite small and has concerns that the lot sizes of the proposed project are even smaller.

Director Goins responded to Commissioner Baker's response by saying the staff had the same questions. The unit type is attached to multi-family with no green space in between. The staff looked at it not as a single-family detached, but as a multi-family with some space in between that allows light to come in.

Commissioner Baker asked if other areas were looked at that have these types of sites. Director Goins responded by saying they looked at a site in Colorado that was like the proposed project.

Commissioner Baker asked if this discussion could be continued after reviewing this type of project in other communities.

Chairman Mertz broke down the concerns with the project:

- All are in favor of the product
- All are in favor of the streets improvements
- Set backs are a concern
- The density bonuses are a concern
- The lot size is a concern

Commissioner Mertz asked the Planning Commissioners if it was a lower density bonus if they would be more in favor of the project.

- Commissioner Clay does not want to give a density bonus.
- Commissioner Farrer does not have an issue with the density bonus.

Commissioner Baker asked if the density bonuses are instead of having multi-family and if there is a density bonus for having a single-family home instead of multi-family. Commissioner Mertz answered "no." Commissioner Clay stated that the purpose of the overlay is to get the additional density bonus.

Commissioner Baker is concerned that from the side view, the homes look like row houses. She is willing to go with a row house density of 3%. Chairman Mertz agrees with Commissioner Baker.

Commissioner Clay does not like the 3%. He does not want to give a density bonus for a product that is less valuable for the community and feels that aesthetically it doesn't offer as much to the City a streetscape. He then explained why seniors would like the product and not having a big yard to deal with. Commissioner Mertz stated there are people who would like the product

Commissioner Clay asked the applicant if the lot size goes up will the applicant withdraw. The applicant responded by saying "No and they are willing to work with the City."

There was discussion among the Planning Commissioners about lot sizes and setbacks. The applicant said they could make a 3,500 square foot lot work.

Commissioner Baker expressed concern about parking on the driveway or the street. In Camelot there is not enough space to park a car in the driveway.

Commissioner Baker is concerned about the rear setbacks. Planner Thompson said that for a row-house and townhome rear setback is 30 feet.

Commissioner Baker would like to see the numbers and more information on other projects.

Setbacks

The Planning Commissioners would like to increase the lot size to 3,500 square feet and are comfortable with the following setbacks:

- Commissioner Baker — 20 rear setback
- Commissioner Mertz — 15 rear setback
- Commissioner Farrer — 15 rear setback
- Commissioner Clay — 15 rear setback
- Commissioner Ellingson — 15 rear setback

Density Bonus

- Commissioner Farrer — good with the 3% density bonus
- Chairman Mertz — good with the 3% density bonus
- Commissioner Baker — no density bonus (changed to 3% further in the discussion)
- Commissioner Clay — no density bonus
- Commissioner Ellingson — no comment was made

The applicant said the heading for the density bonus is building mix which is why they are requesting the density bonus because they are increasing the variety of buildings in the project. The applicant and the Planning Commissioners reviewed the density bonus and why the applicant asked for it. Director Goins explained some of the reasons for this unique product.

Commissioner Baker moved to approve the RD Development Group seeking amendments to Title 11 of the Springville Development Code to allow for single-family detached homes that are located on a shared driveway in the Westfields and Lakeside Overlay zones with the following changes:

- Under building mix, shared driveway, single-family detached mix would be a density bonus of 3% which will be awarded for developments where over 30% of multi-family dwellings are shared driveway, single-family detached.
- The rear yard for single-family, detached located with a shared driveway within the Westfields and Lakeside Overlay Zone areas to be 15 feet in RMF1 and 15 feet in RMF2.
- The minimum lot requirements where single-family detached located with a shared driveway within the Westfields and Lakeside Overlay Zone areas of 3,500 feet in RMF1 and 3,500 in RMF2.

Commissioner Farrer seconded the motion.

Planning Commissioner Votes

Commissioner Farrer – yes

Commissioner Clay – yes

Chairman Mertz – yes

Commissioner Baker – yes

Commissioner Ellingson — yes

Jeff & Michelle Brotherson seeking a General Plan Land Use Map and Official Zone Map amendment from Medium Density and the R2 Single/Two-Family Residential zone to Medium-High Density and the RMF-2 Residential Multi-Family zone on property located at 724 & 748 West 550 South.

Director Goins reviewed the request to amend 4.8 acres in the General Plan Amendment from medium density to medium-high density. The property is currently vacant and contains commercial property across the street to the west with two properties between the subject property and the rezoned property by Brad Morgan to the east. Staff would consider that property for a zone change in the future. The applicant approached the property owner to the east and invited them to participate in this request, but they denied the offer.

The staff are in support of the zone change.

The second part of the request is a two-part zone amendment from RMF1 to RMF2 as well as a zone amendment to the Westfields Overlay map designation to exclude one of the properties. An RMF2 cannot be requested in the Westfields Overlay.

Commissioner Baker asked why the applicant needs the zone to be changed to an RMF-2. Director Goins explained that the reasons the applicant would like the change is consistency with the other land zoning designations in the past and it is consistent with the block of properties, meaning where there is an RMF2 along the same lateral line that acknowledges the higher intensity uses to the north that the property borders and is partially commercially zoned. The applicant would also like the R2 buffer to the south is also proliferated, meaning that buffer we

allowed to exist and recognized in the Brad Morgan property exists here will remain and is already developed with residential property. The buffers will remain the same for both requests of the applicant. This property will also help direct some of the heavy traffic in that area.

Commissioner Baker asked what the homes were across the street and to the south. The homes are designated R2 — there is one single-family home and two twin homes. Commissioner Baker asked about access on to 750 South and Director Goins said this would be an option.

Director Goins stated that with this request, we are recognizing the linear buffer, recognizing the low density to the south and the border issue in establishing the buffers of what the future 400 South intensity would be as that spills south. There is commercial boundary to the north. The staff is comfortable with this request due to the size of the property. The setbacks will remain and a corner lot with a different setback will not allow a lot of expansion. If you take the size of both properties and put just multi-family on them you could maybe fit five lots if you maximize the lot, but when you start introducing the side yard, rear and front setbacks it minimizes what you can build on the lots. Due to the small amount of lots that can be put on the property, the staff is comfortable with approving the request.

Chairman Mertz asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Baker asked if there is was anyway to have two twin homes on the property without taking it out of the overlay. Director Goins answered by saying “no”. This project is not large enough to take advantage of the density bonus.

The applicant, Mr. Jeff Brotherson, addressed the Planning Commissioners. Mr. Brotherson has been waiting for some clarity as to what will be happening with the property in that area.

Chairman Mertz opened a Public Hearing.

Lorette Kaouck
749 West 550 South

Ms. Kaouck would like the area to remain residential. There are concerns about the traffic and that the area remains residential. Her concern is with the traffic. She is good with the applicant’s proposal.

Commissioner Baker moved to close the Public Hearing. Commissioner Clay seconded the motion. The vote to close the Public Hearing was unanimous.

Commissioner Mertz asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Baker does not support spot zoning and would like the property to remain as an RMF2.

Commissioner Ellingson is not in favor of taking it out of the Westfields Overlay.

The applicant addressed the Planning Commission by stating that the RMF2 is going to be the buffer zone on the south size of the street. The whole block is eventually going to be RMF2 or commercial. The buffer zone and part of the RMF2 plan was to leave that small area (light brown area on the map) as the buffer zone. Mr. Brotherson is not changing that zone.

Commissioner Baker stated the request will not affect the traffic much.

Commissioner Farrer moved to approve Jeff & Michelle Brotherson seeking a General Plan Land Use Map and Official Zone Map amendment from Medium Density and the R2 Single/Two-Family Residential zone to Medium-High Density. Chairman Mertz seconded the motion.

Planning Commissioner Votes

Commissioner Farrer — yes
Commissioner Baker — no
Commissioner Ellingson — no
Commissioner Clay — yes
Chairman Mertz — yes

Commissioner Clay moved to approve for the amendment of the General Plan Land Use Map from Medium Density Residential to Medium- High Residential for the properties located at 724 & 748 West 550 South. Commissioner Farrer seconded the motion.

Planning Commissioners Votes

Chairman Farrer — yes
Chairman Clay — yes
Chairman Mertz — yes
Chairman Baker — no
Chairman Ellingson — no

ADMINISTRATIVE SESSION

Public comment may be accepted at the discretion of the chairman

No items.

With nothing further to discuss, Commissioner Clay moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion.

Chairman Mertz adjourned the meeting at 8:43 p.m.