

**FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION**

March 07, 2024

WORK SESSION Present: Chair John David Mortensen; Vice Chair Frank Adams; Commissioners Tyler Turner, Samuel Barlow, Joey Hansen, Kristen Sherlock, and George (Tony) Kalakis; Alternate Commissioner Spencer Klein; Community Development Director David Petersen; Assistant Director/City Planner Lyle Gibson; City Planner/GIS Specialist Shannon Hansell; and Planning Secretary Carly Rowe. **Excused:** Alternate Commissioner Brian Shepherd.

The Work Session initiated at 6:00 pm. Chair **John David Mortensen** conducted training on motions. Staff is the suggesting body; the Planning Commission is the recommending body; and the City Council is the approving body. In reality, Staff is the experts, and the Planning Commission weighs in. Staff prepares suggested motions; conditions based on background, City ordinances, and conversations with the applicant; findings as they did the research; and supplemental information. In his experience, the Commission approves the suggested motions 90% or more of the time. Occasionally the Commission tables the motion. Rarely does the Commission deny. For a sensitive agenda item, Staff may provide several options. Many times, the Commission will spend time to revise, eliminate, or add conditions.

If there is no second to a motion, it doesn't pass. After discussion, another motion can be taken. If it is a straight-forward motion, such as to adjourn, individual voting is not necessary. If it is a sensitive issue, voting will take place individually. Aside from the Chair, anyone can make a motion, and it is good for new Commissioners to try. Commissioners should follow slight variations of Roberts Rules of Order.

Assistant Director/City Planner **Lyle Gibson** said Staff tries not to bring things to the Commission that aren't ready. However, having a commission full of people with different backgrounds and opinions often helps get things to the finish line with better results. Community Development Director **David Petersen** said sometimes Staff wants to test an application's wings, so they want a public hearing on the Commission level, at which time they prefer a Commission motion to table so Staff can tie up the more technical things. Commissioner **Frank Adams** said if Commissioners need help understanding something, Staff is quick to respond to emails and calls.

Petersen conducted a training on Historic Preservation. The original townsite stretches from 400 West to the bench, and 600 North to 200 South. This is Farmington's "bread and butter" with a lot of historic homes, which Chapter 39 calls "contributing properties." There are two levels of historical preservation. The first is a home that is at least 50 years old with two more criteria: architectural and other things. It could qualify for the National Historic Register of Historic Places. If it qualifies or is on the National Register, and retains its status as a contributing property, remodels can qualify for substantial state and national tax credits. Being on the National Register doesn't prevent the owner from demolishing the home or doing major alterations that can render it ineligible. It is an honorary designation that is very important.

The next level is a landmark district, a local designation for an individual building or a whole district of homes. Major repairs, alterations, additions, relocations, and demolitions require a Certificate of Appropriateness (CA) from the seven-member Farmington City Historic Preservation Commission. This can be daunting, especially for a demolition. The four-block West State Street Clark Historic District became a national district in the 1990s, and the local landmark district was adopted in 2009.

The Main Street Historic District 200 South to Park Lane became a national historic district in 2011. Two years ago, there was a proposal to turn it into a local landmark district. It has 100 properties, with 60 contributing properties. The Historic Commission held a meeting and an open house. They followed the ordinance and found it met the criteria for a local landmark district. In September, the City Council held a public hearing, with very little turnout even after Staff had canvassed opinions door-to-door. Many landowners were undecided, with two to three against it and a handful for it. After another public hearing months later, still there was little turnout. Usually a big turnout means there are a lot of people against the item in question.

The City Council directed a zone text change in Chapter 39, which took up all October. It was back on the Council's agenda with inclusion of the enabling ordinance in December. At that point, the Council received a dozen emails asking why the City wasn't getting resident input. Admittedly, telling Americans what to do with their property gets controversial. So, the Council put the brakes on it and held a series of neighborhood meetings. Everyone was invited Jan. 22, 2024, where the Original Townsite Residential (OTR) zone was explained. The Farmington City Block is awkward at 500 feet square. Some lots are 247 feet deep and 60 feet wide, a large lot that is almost a football field deep. Farmington received a grant for these 218 acres/48 blocks to have an infill ordinance in order to address the "no man's land" in the middle of these lots. The old zoning involved a mix of 1960s zones such as Multiple-Family Residential (R-2)/Large Residential (LR) applied almost as an afterthought. This zoning was cumbersome for people to develop. While there were 192 lots that conformed with the width of 85 feet, there were 230 nonconforming lots with an average width of 74 feet and 14,000 square feet. These were large lots. This meant there were 70 acres left to be developed in the Old Town, which presented significant infill opportunities.

After some infill development attempts in the 1990s, residents were becoming vocal in opposition, as evidenced in a 2002 meeting. Specifically, residents expressed opposition to duplexes, absentee owners, and flag lots. What made this area of Farmington unique was the historic homes didn't have visible garages designed front and center. Almost 30% of the existing homes had no garages at all. Only 11% had garages projecting past the front door of the home, as many were detached and/or setback from the home. That is why downtown is different from other neighborhoods. Another unique feature was that there were very few two-story homes, as 76% were one-story homes. For 77% of the homes, there were dominant front porches. Post 1960, those porch features fell out of favor. Now three-car garages are the norm in other neighborhoods. In the 1990s, vinyl fences were big, but Old Town did not have any vinyl fences.

After the OTR was adopted, they mistakenly thought they were in a historic district. Staff had to educate people about what the OTR zone actually was. There is a lot of flexibility in the OTR zone because of the wacky lot sizes. For example, setbacks can be deviated from by a maximum of 15 feet. Design standards for garages, fences, roofs, etc. were enacted.

The first OTR zone was adopted in the Rock Church district, a neighborhood that became strong allies going forward. Results of the OTR zone were stability and reinvestment. Farmington Elementary was the second most walked-to school in the district. These benefits were shared with residents during the Jan. 22, 2024, meeting. The aim is to preserve the look and feel of Main Street without a heavy government hand.

In the proposed landmark district, there really are two distinct areas with different needs. South Main is south of State Street and has a predominant underlying zone of R-4 and Multiple-Family Residential (R-8) rather than OTR. Staff felt it best to have a separate meeting for this group on Jan. 29, 2024. The "Southerners" are those owning the seven lots south of State Street, and they really don't want the historic landmark district because they are already preserving their homes well and they don't want government telling them what to do. Staff explained that the landmark district is to protect their current homes when other people may own their land in the future. There are two types of property rights: one for the individual, and one that protects you from what your neighbor may do to you. Staff informed residents about the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Chapter 27, which is undergoing some changes currently. This spells out that if a historic home is preserved, it allows a lot of flexibility for additional development such as duplexes.

Petersen said Farmington's Main Street is like no other, especially considering neighboring cities like Bountiful and Kaysville. It is more like a New England Main Street with clusters of stuff. Alternatives are no landmark district (Option A), or a landmark district with two different options (Option B and C). The first agenda item tonight is in the OTR zone, and they are asking for a PUD, which allows them flexibility. Usually an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) has to be in the back, but the applicant is asking for flexibility to have an ADU in the front. The benefit for the City is preserving a historic home. Access needs to be provided to the back lot, and the garage should not be front and center. Access has to be 20 feet wide.

REGULAR SESSION Present: Chair John David Mortensen; Vice Chair Frank Adams; Commissioners Tyler Turner, Samuel Barlow, Joey Hansen, Kristen Sherlock, and George (Tony) Kalakis; Alternate Commissioner Spencer Klein; Community Development Director David Petersen; Assistant Director/City Planner Lyle Gibson; City Planner/GIS Specialist Shannon Hansell; and Planning Secretary Carly Rowe. **Excused:** Alternate Commissioner Brian Shepherd.

Chair **John David Mortensen** opened the meeting at 07:02 pm.

SUBDIVISION / PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT & REZONE APPLICATION(S) – public hearings

Item #1 – Nathan & Anna May – Applicants are requesting a recommendation for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) Master Plan for the Sycamore Lane PUD at 59 S. 300 W. The PUD would allow the construction of a new home on the east side of the property while maintaining the historic home as an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in its current location in front of the new home. The property includes 0.31 acres in the OTR (Original Townsite Residential) zone. (S-3-24)

Community Development Director **David Petersen** introduced this agenda item. The subject property is 0.31 acres. The proposed plan consists of a new home to the east of the existing historic home. The historic home has an addition which is planned to be removed, but the applicant is preserving the historically significant part of the home and plans to use it as an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). ADUs are a permitted use in the OTR zone, but not in the front yard; this is the reason the applicant has applied for a PUD. To justify this flexibility, the applicant has agreed to enter into a Development Agreement (DA) to preserve the existing historic dwelling. It will help preserve the ambiance of the street

and the existing trees. In order to get the flexibility to do that, the applicant needs the PUD approved. The three-car garage would be behind the historic ADU and difficult to see from the street. The ADU will have its own place to park.

The applicant also owns a 10,000 square foot landlocked lot behind the proposed site of the new home. The rare legally nonconforming lot predates the ordinance, and therefore could have a single-family lot on it in the future if there is access to it. There is 15 feet from the side of both the existing home and proposed home and the lot boundary, but the Fire Department wants 20 feet of width. **Petersen** said the proposed home could be shimmed to one side to make way for access. This was reviewed with the City Attorney, who encouraged figuring this out sooner than later in consideration of the back lot. Another option is to combine the two lots into one, but that would cause the loss of a legal lot, which is major.

Applicant **Anna May** (791 S. Rice Rd., Farmington, Utah) purchased the property 20 years ago, and she and her husband, **Nathan May**, lived there for 15 years. They have been researching this proposal for years and have been in talks with neighbors regarding preserving the current home and gaining access to the back lot. They want to preserve the sycamore trees and red brick portion of the historic home. They would love to have access to the back, but right now are hoping to use it for gardening or animals. They want to keep the back lot for future posterity. They designed the new home particularly so you could see the porch from the street.

Commissioner **Kristen Sherlock** asked if there are plans to combine or separate the two lots in the future. The applicant(s) said not right now, as they hope to use it for their fruit trees and small animals. They would like to have access eventually.

Vice Chair **Frank Adams** said that before recommending this to the City Council, the Commission needs to find things to be true, which includes adjacent lots. Right now, it may not be an issue to have no access to that back lot, but it could be in the future. This could cause future litigation if it is not handled now.

Chair **John David Mortensen** opened the public meeting at 07:22 PM.

Greg Smith (94 W. State Street, Farmington, Utah) grew up in the house south of this property. His parents reside there, raising sheep over the years, and said nothing will happen in regard to easements until their "names are on headstones." However, he supports the ideas the **Mays** have.

Chair **John David Mortensen** closed the public meeting at 07:24 PM.

Commissioner **Tyler Turner** asked if the new home could be right against the property line to the north with zero clearance. **Petersen** said they could do a zero-lot line but they couldn't have any doors or windows on those sides. He also suggested some ideas regarding easements and landscaping with a minor redesign (moving the home), but it would move the porch to behind the current home/future ADU. He said the **Smiths** could get eight or maybe nine units on their property, and could even get a bonus of one or two units if they put a PUD overlay over all three parcels and give up an easement to the **Mays**. **Turner** said he loves the look from the street.

Assistant Director/City Planner **Lyle Gibson** said a zero-lot line could be allowed, but then there would be a problem with the building code if it was not 5 feet off the property line. **Petersen** said the City Attorney agrees with **Adams**, and it would be dicey to access the back of the lot by going from the north of the existing home, then shifting to the south of the new home, even if 20 feet were available to the south. This is an opportunity to rectify the situation. The Development Review Committee (DRC) has looked at this, and the Fire Department is part of the DRC. **Adams** said if the Fire Department allowed parking in the 15 feet to the south, they would probably not want any parking there.

Commissioner **Samuel Barlow** is in favor of the ADU, but the new house many need to be redesigned to solve the access issue. **Petersen** said lot coverage requirements are met with this proposal using the flexibility of the PUD. The ADU is subordinate in height and size to the main structure, which would be the proposed new home.

Commissioner **Joey Hansen** asked the timeline on this project. Applicant **Nathan May** answered that they would like to start construction as soon as they can secure financing. Both he and his wife have lived in Farmington for 40 years, and owned the home for 20 years. He has already paid his architect for drawings and engineering, and he is hesitant to amend them. There is currently 10 feet between the existing house and the tree. The Fire Department said an "S" shaped driveway would be too tight of a curve for them, so that is not an option. They are trying to preserve the tree, and digging a basement may compromise the trees. Therefore, the proposed new home does not have a basement. They have been exploring these possibilities for a decade; however, they have never considered access from the back of the house.

Mortensen loves the proposed project as well, as it represents something the City will see more and more of as infill lots get developed. The challenge is the applicant is asking to do something that is not allowed by ordinance. It can be allowed if the Commission recommends a PUD. The Commission has a responsibility to the ordinances as written as well as to the City to not kick the problem down the road. The applicant needs additional time to talk with Staff and the Fire Department about options.

Barlow said another option is for the applicant to consider the existing historic home the primary dwelling, and then they could build an ADU in the back that is subordinate in size and height to it. They have the right to do that right now. **Adams** said access to the back lot will enhance the value of that lot, so it is worth the time and money to solve this now. **Petersen** said if the lots were combined into one, they would lose the entitlement for another lot on which to build. Losing that lot is like losing \$250,000, which would be questioned by their heirs.

Sherlock said she understands the City’s position that they need a plan for infilling. She likewise understands the applicants’ desire to build their dream home. She also understands maintaining value for the heirs. As a Realtor, she is trying to figure out how to make this work for all three positions. Therefore, she is in favor of tabling this to get more time to figure it out. A rash, quick decision may not be wise.

Mortensen said there are three options. One is to recommend the City Council approve, which would move the item on to the Council. Another is to recommend that the Council deny this. The third option is to table it to give the applicant time to work through creative brainstorm and come back in as few as two weeks.

MOTION

Tyler Turner made a motion that the Planning Commission table this agenda item for continuous vetting and working with the City to find other ways to make this work for the applicant.

Kristen Sherlock seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Chair John David Mortensen | X Aye ___Nay |
| Vice Chair Frank Adams | X Aye ___Nay |
| Commissioner Tyler Turner | X Aye ___Nay |
| Commissioner Joey Hansen | X Aye ___Nay |
| Commissioner Kristen Sherlock | X Aye ___Nay |
| Commissioner George Kalakis | X Aye ___Nay |
| Commissioner Samuel Barlow | X Aye ___Nay |

Item #2 – NPE2024 LLC – Applicant is requesting a recommendation to rezone the property at 1926 W. 950 N. from the A (Agriculture) district to the LR (Large Residential) zoning district and recommendation of a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) Master Plan and Schematic Subdivision Plan for the Ericksen Subdivision (NPE2024 LLC) consisting of four lots on 2.51 acres. (S-9-23)

Gibson presented this agenda item. This is a discretionary item for the Commission to consider. The subject property consists of 2.5 acres accessed from 950 North Street (North Station Lane). This property is somewhat isolated in that it is bordered by Haight Creek and the Haight Creek Trail to the west and north, with the Denver and Rio Grande Western (D&RGW) Rail Trail on the east and a pipeline easement within the east side of the property as well. Homes on the other side of the street are separated by a large Right of Way (ROW) and do not front 950 North. This went on sale a few months back and there have been a lot of ideas of how to develop the property. Staff recommends single-family development here, but feels there needs to flexibility due to the shape of the property.

Under the current zoning designation, further development of the property is not feasible. The requested zoning would match the zoning directly to the north and west of the site and, in the opinion of Staff, permits use of the property consistent with the current General Plan designation in the area. The rezone would be required in order to accommodate the requested PUD subdivision.

The applicant has provided a yield plan indicating the potential of five lots in the LR zone, but is looking to create only four (the existing house + three new lots). The existing detached garage would become part of the largest lot (Lot 4) on the north portion of the property, which would be accessed via a flag stem drive as a flag lot. This new drive leading back to Lot 4 would also be the means of access for the southeastern lot (Lot 3) with a shared access easement.

While the large single-family home lots are within the allowed density of the requested zone and meet the dimensional standards allowed per Chapter 11-12, the PUD is necessary for the consideration of the following elements: flag lot allowance, flexibility in setbacks, fencing placement, sidewalk and ROW design.

Per Farmington City Municipal Code (FMC) 11-27-010, the purpose of the PUD is “...to promote flexibility in site design, to achieve, for example, the clustering of buildings, the mixture of housing types, and the combining of housing with supplementary uses such as commercial centers, business parks or other multiple use centers, etc. This chapter is also intended to promote better design of residential developments through the use of design professionals. It is further intended that a planned unit development will provide for more open space, more public amenities, and the preservation of natural features such as floodplains and steep slopes that would not be possible under traditional development techniques...”

This rezone request and consideration of preliminary PUD and schematic subdivision is the first step in the process to permitting the extra lots. The Planning Commission is tasked with making a recommendation to the City Council regarding the request, and the Council would make a final determination. If these first items are approved, the preliminary plat and final PUD master plan would return to the Planning Commission for review at a future date.

11-27-070: PRELIMINARY PUD MASTER PLAN REVIEW BY PLANNING COMMISSION:

The Planning Commission shall review the application for approval of a planned unit development designation and the preliminary PUD Master Plan at a public hearing. The Planning Commission shall either recommend the City Council approve the application and plan as presented, recommend the City Council approve it subject to certain conditions, table the application pending receipt of required materials, data, studies and information, or recommend the City Council disapprove it. Any recommendation for approval of the preliminary PUD Master Plan shall be made only after the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

- A. Layout: The proposed layout will provide a more pleasant and attractive living environment than a conventional development established under the strict applications of the provisions of the underlying zones. The Planning Commission shall consider the architectural design of the buildings and their relationship on the site and their relationship to development beyond the boundaries of the proposed planned unit development. The Planning Commission shall consider the landscaping and screening as related to the several uses within the proposed planned unit development and as a means of its integration into its surroundings.
- B. Consideration of Adjacent Property: The proposed planned unit development will create no detriment to property adjacent to the planned unit development and to this end the Planning Commission may require that the uses of least intensity or greatest compatibility be arranged around the boundaries of the project. The Planning Commission may require that yard and height requirements for the adjacent zone apply on the periphery of the planned unit development.
- C. Efficient Use of Land: The proposed planned unit development will provide more efficient use of the land and more usable open space than a conventional development permitted in the underlying zone. The Planning Commission shall consider the residential density of the proposed development and its distribution.
- D. Compensation for Increased Density: (N/A – no increase in density)
- E. Hazards Not Increased; Recommendations: Any variation allowed from the development standards of the underlying zone will not increase hazards to the health, safety or general welfare of the residents of the proposed planned unit development. Based on its action on the preliminary PUD Master Plan, the Planning Commission shall make recommendations to the City Council. A recommendation for approval of the preliminary PUD Master Plan shall also include a list of recommendations for deviation from the requirements of the underlying zone requirements.

Typically a PUD will include common open space, however per [FMC 11-27-120 \(G\) \(2\) c](#). Waiver: “The City may waive all or a portion of the ten percent (10%) open space requirement consistent with the standards set forth in this chapter. Any development receiving a waiver shall not qualify for a density bonus.” As this subdivision is not looking for a density bonus, it is eligible for consideration of this waiver.

The following has been included for reference in consideration of the proposed lot sizes and setbacks identified in the schematic plat. The PUD allows the City to approve deviations from these standards.

Lot Size: Follows conventional allowance per [11-12-070 \(C\)](#).

Lot width: Follows conventional allowance per [11-12-090 \(C\)](#).

Setbacks: Lot 1 has standard front and rear setbacks, but the applicant is seeking to reduce the side yards to 8 feet each (instead of the typical 10 feet).

Lot 2 has a standard front yard setback. The applicant is seeking permission to have side yard setbacks of 8 feet (instead of 10 feet) each and a reduced rear yard setback. Most of the rear yard is set back at 30 feet. However due to the shape of the lot to account for access into the existing garage that will remain, the east side of the rear yard reduces to approximately 8 feet.

Lot 3 is seeking variation from conventional setbacks. They intent to face the building west, as it will be accessed from the shared drive. This would have a 20 foot setback on the west side, and 10 feet on the south side against the public street. They are also seeking a 20 foot setback against the trail; there may be further encumbrance to this side of the property due to pipeline easements.

Lot 4 is the flag lot. It has a standard 25 foot front yard only in front of the existing building with a 30 foot yard on the east and 10 foot yards on the north and west.

Reference ordinances:

TI-12-070 (C):

SUBDIVISION YIELD PLAN DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

| <i>Zone</i> | <i>Lot Area</i> | <i>Lot Width</i> | |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------|
| | | <i>Interior</i> | <i>Corner</i> |
| LR (Large residential) | 10,000 square feet | 85 feet | 95 feet |

TI-12-090:

C. Lot Width at Building Line: The minimum lot width at the building line for main buildings within a conservation subdivision shall be seventy-five feet (75'), except in the R and LR Zones the minimum lot width shall be sixty feet (60').

Yard/Setback Requirements FMC TI-TI-050:

- Front: 25'
- Side: 10', total 22'
- Side Corner: 20'
- Rear: 30'

Sidewalk: Currently the street improvements stop at the back of curb on this property. Typically, with a subdivision, the property owner/developer will dedicate any remaining ROW needed based on the applicable street designation, then ensure all ROW improvements are in place. Staff has requested that standard improvements be installed including a park strip and sidewalk behind curb along with the undergrounding of overhead utilities, which per FMC 12-8 are done by the developer.

The applicant has expressed concerns with the standard approach, as there is an existing retaining wall behind the curb along the west side of the property as well as mature ash trees. The applicant hopes to keep at least part of the existing retaining wall in place near the existing driveway and is asking to bring the sidewalk further into the property with a standard park strip and walk that then veers northward around the trees until it returns to typical sidewalk on Lot 3. The sidewalk outside of the actual ROW would have a public access easement over it. The Staff is divided about what is the right method, so they are interested in the Commission's recommendation.

Fencing: The standard for fencing along a public ROW is to have a 4 foot tall fence starting 8 feet from the property line. Per FMC 11-28-140, the height and distance may be modified upon finding that it will not adversely affect the safety of pedestrians nor obstruct the view of or impact the safety of vehicular traffic, or adversely affect adjacent properties. The applicant is proposing a concrete panel fence up to 8 feet in height around the perimeter of Lot 3 and along the east side of the property against the Rail Trail corridor. Other fencing is indicated on the C1.0 drawing included in the Staff Report.

Gibson said the standard sidewalk would have a 5-foot park strip and 6-foot sidewalk section immediately next to the lot line. A larger collector or arterial road may have wider park strips and sidewalks. In this area, there is a lot of new construction with a new trail that has been put in. There are wetland areas near here where the sidewalk has been brought to the back of the curb without a park strip. The PUD allows for things that are atypical. The typical setback is 25 feet, but the applicant is asking for that to be reduced down to 10 feet.

Applicant **Jared Ericksen** (1926 W. 950 N., Farmington, Utah) addressed the Commission. He lives in the existing home on the property. The potential owner of Lot 3 is flexible. **Ericksen** was fortunate to come into possession of this property. He appreciates the privacy and room to build on a larger lot. He grew up on the same street as the people planning to purchase Lot 3. In some spots, the trail is about 2 or more feet higher than his property. The 8-foot fence would be for privacy. A commercial property is across the street. The fence is pre-fabricated concrete and will hold up well against the wind.

Gibson said the typical fence in a front yard cannot exceed 4 feet in height. But the Zoning Administrator can determine any deviations due to traffic or pedestrian visibility issues. Anything over 7 feet tall requires a building permit, so an 8-foot fence would be a deviation.

Chair **John David Mortensen** opened the public meeting at 08:27 PM.

Ken Stuart (950 N., Farmington, Utah) owns all the property to the west and north of this. He thinks a single-family subdivision is a great idea. He has some concerns about a discrepancy between the warranty deed and west property line. So the property line on the north end between himself and **Ericksen** is in question. Another concern is where the sidewalk ends demarks the property line. It may be a recording error and there is no easement to the north of that.

Chair **John David Mortensen** closed the public meeting at 08:33 PM.

Gibson said the north boundary may need to be investigated, but an approval of the number of lots and general layout would still be acceptable at this point. There is still preliminary and final plat to go through, so there is time to resolve the boundary question. **Sherlock** said she is fine with the rezone, but she would like clarification on the fence height near the shared driveway. She would prefer a continuous sidewalk for ease of pedestrian use instead of a jutting one.

Mortensen said the rezone makes sense in this area. Driving 950 recently, he noticed that the angle in the southwest corner is significant. The jog for the sidewalk would have to be significant to not take out the trees or retaining wall. On the west side of the property going from the existing sidewalk to what would be the new sidewalk would be an abrupt change in elevation. The sidewalk would be to the north of the current retaining wall. **Ericksen** said the existing white fence would go away with the sale of Lot 1. The main reason for the sidewalk is the trees. There is so much traffic on the road, and the trees block traffic. The driveway for Lot 1 has not been determined yet. It could be on east side of Lot 1. He would rather have a sidewalk in further than closer to the curb, especially where the configuration is asphalt, curb, then sidewalk (without a park strip) for the safety of his own children. Having the trees adds to the value of the lots, even if the sidewalk has to come further into private property. Commissioners would like the fence lowered near the driveway shared by Lot 3 and Lot 4 for pedestrian safety reasons.

Barlow asked if there is a sidewalk difference because this is the Kaysville/Farmington line. He is fine with Lot 3 coming closer. He is torn on the pre-fabricated wall/fence, as it is a busy thoroughfare. Perhaps a traffic expert can look into visibility and curve issues there. **Petersen** said it is hard to find a front yard fence that looks good over 4 feet tall. **Ericksen** said it is a front yard to a private lane. From the curb to the fence would be 11 feet. **Sherlock** said it may not be a busy street now, but it will become one in the future.

MOTION

Tyler Turner made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the rezone of the property to the LR zoning district, Preliminary PUD Master Plan and Schematic Subdivision plan for the proposed Ericksen Subdivision with the proposed lot layout, setbacks, and fencing subject to all other applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances with the following **conditions and/or alterations 1-7:**

1. A letter confirming the location and size of the pipeline easement from the easement holder be provided to the City to ensure it is properly accounted for on the plat.
2. The sidewalk design may be as shown on the plans provided to the City Council.
3. The sidewalk shall be extended to connect to the Rail Trail to the east.
4. The applicant must meet all requirements of the City's DRC (Development Review Committee).
5. Fence length, placement, and height to be fully identified in subsequent steps. Fence placement may not be in front yard of Lot 3. Fence may be precast concrete panel wall.
6. Fencing/walls shall not impede on clear view areas to ensure traffic and pedestrian safety.
7. Applicant shall return to Planning Commission at Preliminary Plat with a proposed path to resolution pertaining to any property boundary in dispute.

Findings 1-5:

1. The single-family development is consistent with the General Land Use Plan and other development near this location while accommodating lots on a triangular-shaped property.
2. The applicant is not seeking additional lots.
3. The PUD helps facilitate lots on a triangular-shaped piece of property and limits curb cuts onto 950 North Street with the Flag Lot configuration.
4. The scale of development doesn't support or justifies common spaces.
5. The City already owns the property for the Haight Creek Trail to the west.

Supplemental Information 1-3:

1. Vicinity map and Site Photos
2. Subdivision Yield Plan of the property.
3. Schematic Subdivision / Preliminary PUD Plan.

Joey Hansen seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Chair John David Mortensen | X Aye ___Nay |
| Vice Chair Frank Adams | X Aye ___Nay |
| Commissioner Tyler Turner | X Aye ___Nay |
| Commissioner Joey Hansen | X Aye ___Nay |
| Commissioner Kristen Sherlock | X Aye ___Nay |
| Commissioner George Kalakis | X Aye ___Nay |

Commissioner Samuel Barlow

X Aye ____Nay

OTHER BUSINESS

Item #3 – Miscellaneous, correspondence, etc.

a) Minutes Approval from February 22, 2024

- **Joey Hansen** made a motion to approve the minutes from February 22, 2024. **George Kalakis** seconded the motion.

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Chair John David Mortensen | X Aye ____Nay |
| Vice Chair Frank Adams | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner Tyler Turner | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner Joey Hansen | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner Kristen Sherlock | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner George Kalakis | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner Samuel Barlow | X Aye ____Nay |

b) Other

- **Petersen** finished his Historic Preservation discussion started in the Work Session. At the Feb. 5, 2024, meeting, Staff came to the “Southerners” with a compromise that a Certificate of Appropriateness (CA) would only be needed for relocations and demolitions. Some demolitions on Main Street would totally affect the feel of it. The Southerners wanted Option A (no landmark district) no matter what, and were surprised with the compromise. Meanwhile, the “Northerners” want it to stay the way it is. The big deal for Lagoon was that in order to get a second dwelling, you need a parcel that is at least 20,000 square feet in a PUD situation. 25 parcels along the west side of Main Street meet this size requirement. This was appealing to Lagoon, who could see if they demolished the old home, they could not get a second dwelling. The PUD would help them, so they were fine with Option B. A few weeks later, some City Councilmembers said they were uncomfortable having alterations and additions off the table (regarding CAs). One City Councilmember was fine with not needing a CA for repairs. Staff will probably offer a hybrid as the final language. The Historic Preservation Commission was not comfortable with the negotiations, saying there was no need for them if so many things were taken off the table. Granted, demolitions are rare. Staff agreed to give a mailing to affected residents when it is on the Commission agenda again, which could be on the next meeting.

Previously the Commission had talked about forming a subcommittee to discuss streamlining the PUD, but **Petersen** said even a small PUDs can be complex. A parcel size threshold was being debated, along with the possibility that the Commission may be included if and when deemed appropriate.

ADJOURNMENT

Sherlock motioned to adjourn at 09:26 pm. **Hansen** seconded the motion.

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Chair John David Mortensen | X Aye ____Nay |
| Vice Chair Frank Adams | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner Tyler Turner | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner Joey Hansen | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner Kristen Sherlock | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner George Kalakis | X Aye ____Nay |
| Commissioner Samuel Barlow | X Aye ____Nay |



John David Mortensen, Chair