

**FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION**

June 06, 2024

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

6:00 PM WORK SESSION: Community Development Director **Dave Petersen** discussed the subdivision ordinance and process. During the 2023 Legislative Session, cities were required to simplify their subdivision process by December of 2023. It took away any privilege of city councils and instead put burden on staffs and planning commissions. Much did not change for Farmington. A schematic plan for a single-family subdivision is now optional when it used to be required and accompanied by a public hearing at both the Commission and Council level. Much review was left with the Development Review Committee (DRC). After schematic, preliminary plat was handled by Staff because it is an administrative act without a public hearing. All the heavy lifting occurs at preliminary plat. Cities were reduced to four reviews total. The City Council and Planning Commission are much more involved in legislative actions.

Now, schematic is like it was before, with public hearings at both the Commission and Council levels. The preliminary plat level of review is discretionary and can be done by Staff. Depending on how simple it is, the Commission can delegate to Staff. Before 1999, typical subdivisions in Farmington were half-acre lots and a minimum of 10,000 square feet. Residents then had high expectations without a high budget. The new minimum lot size became one acre and 20,000 square feet in the Large Residential (LR) zone. However, a smaller lot size could be granted if open space and trails were given. This tactic worked, and zoning powers were successfully used to create open space and trails. Now, Project Master Plans (PMPs) are usually accompanied by Development Agreements (DAs) so that any deviation from zoning is accounted for.

Tonight’s agenda includes two legislative acts. One is the applicant that is requesting an Agriculture Planned (AP) zone in order to sell cars from his land on 650 West. The next is the Jack in the Box proposal that would require a rezone. Farmington doesn’t have a lot of room for future huge subdivisions anymore.

A subdivision by metes and bounds is also an option in Farmington. This separates a lot into two lots. Any greater than two lots, Farmington requires a plat. There are both platted and unplatted subdivisions. Platted subdivisions have every lot surveyed and tied to a monument. Most property in Farmington is in platted subdivisions. The rest of the parcels like in downtown Farmington are unplatted subdivisions that are not part of a subdivision plat. A lot of property in Central Farmington, along State Route 106, and down into Centerville is unplatted. Now, Staff reviews lot splits and the Commission is not part of the process as it used to be. Plat amendments are allowed to change boundaries, and goes to the City Council. The Commission is no longer involved in those.

In January, Staff considered allowing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) to be owner occupied. A subcommittee was set up to explore this, and they have held one meeting with a second scheduled for June 10, 2024. Four of the Commissioners present are on the subcommittee. Right now, detached ADUs are a permitted use given certain setbacks, but the owner has to live on site. The subcommittee is exploring the possibility of allowing detached ADU for-sale units. The question is what the setbacks should be. Staff is considering a Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (DADU) parcel that has to meet the 10,000 square feet lot requirements as well as placement in consideration of the single-family home. That way, an applicant could come in after building an ADU and request a lot split so the ADU is on its own parcel. Setbacks from property lines are dictated by building code. The entire Commission will review this at an upcoming meeting. Commissioner **Kristen Sherlock** said this proposal is a little out of the box, and the Commission should be involved in the decisions of how it is being run.

Staff handles an unplatted metes-and-bounds subdivision. City Council handles platted subdivisions. **Petersen** would like to see the Commission handle both, maybe even with a public hearing. The property owner has two ways to avoid a public hearing for a plat amendment. One is a signature from every property owner on a petition. The state has allowed an alternative that if something is mailed to every property owner and there is no reply within a 10-day window, the amendment would be granted. However, if there is even one protest, a public hearing must be held.

Petersen would like the Commission to take on the DADU. Commissioner **Frank Adams** said he would like to see them all at least initially, as Farmington is in uncharted territory. He might change his mind after a few years. **Petersen** said the Commission only approved eight or nine detached ADUs in the first 18 years. However, in the last two to three years, ADU applications have increased quite a bit. They may become routine after a while.

Petersen said the subcommittee may be able to present the DADU concept to the Commission at their June 20, 2024, meeting. The DADU would allow two lots within a standard lot, and one lot may have no frontage, occurring primarily in the metes and bounds plat amendment process. State law says the city land use authority should approve plat amendments, and the Council has never designated who the land use authority is for plat amendments. Plat amendments can be dicey, and he hopes the Council designates the Commission as the land use authority for plat amendments for simple lot splits.

The DRC is made up of representatives from the fire department, Central Davis Sewer, both water districts (Benchland and Weber Basin), city engineer, planning, storm water, and public works. They have 14 days to make their reviews, usually before it comes to the Commission. It is a necessary vetting process of technical recommendations. **Petersen** said family sizes have dropped, which will allow ample utility coverage even if many DADUs are approved in the near future. Family sizes are now half of what the Sewer District plans for. Recent efforts to conserve water have decreased secondary water use. Streets are also below usage estimates.

The State has put clamps on cities to review things faster in order to help facilitate affordable housing. Since they haven't put a clamp down on special districts (Central Davis Sewer and Weber Basin Water) yet, Farmington has to urge them to do their own approvals quickly. Cities typically do not build city streets; developers do. Cities maintain the streets. Developers are a vital cog to making cities happen. Impact fees help pay for additional services required by new growth. Building permits cannot be issued early. It would be premature to split a lot if an ADU won't fit on the new lot.

Regarding Agenda Item #1 **Fred Cooper** rezone to Agriculture Planned (AP) District for auto sales, Commissioners said they got emails from neighbors. **Petersen** said the previous landowner was a car enthusiast who has now died. There is an accessory building, but it needs to be accessory to the use of the land. **Cooper** bought the land. There was supposed to be a small apartment in the barn. The buildings are metal. Everything inside the building will be sold. The City Council will hear this item next. The former landowner was technically in violation for paving the front and side yards seven to eight years ago, but the City has not taken enforcement action yet. This is an opportune time to get the landowner to clean up the lot, as it has too high a percentage of paving. Farmington has standards to deal with small car dealerships that could be applied in this situation. **Adams** said this application does not seem to meet AP District requirements of having a professionally prepared packet, and he is not sure who the applicant is.

Commissioners think he is dealing with high-end vehicles, and there is a threshold of how many cars can be on site. The Utah State Tax Commission may get involved if he turns over too many vehicles per year. Conditions for approval or implication of denial based on code violations would be inappropriate, but it should be discussed in the regular meeting. Merit should be considered separate from code violation issues.

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

Chair **John David Mortensen** opened the meeting at 7:03 pm.

ZONING APPLICATIONS / DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT – Public Hearings

Item #1 – Fred Cooper – Applicant is requesting a consideration of a rezone for their property to include the Agricultural Planned (AP) District overlay and an accompanying Development Agreement (DA) for requested auto sales use and related activity, located at 153 S. 650 W. (Z-5-24)

Community Development Director **David Petersen** presented this item. The subject property at southeast corner of 150 South (Kennard Lane) and 650 West currently includes two large garage buildings on site and a large paved area surrounding the buildings. It is currently zoned Agriculture Estates (AE). The buildings have been used for storage of personal vehicles and equipment. The family of the applicant owns the property where he hopes to be able to sell cars from. The applicant has indicated that no changes to the property are needed and vehicles would remain inside the existing buildings.

Typically, the agricultural zones only allow business activity as it relates to agricultural activity such as farming or a home occupation. As this is not a farm and no one lives on site, a business cannot be approved at this address under

the existing zoning. Rather than rezone the property to a commercial type zone, which would permit the desired activity, the AP district was a suggested route to allow the City to consider the requested use in a narrow and specific fashion. The AP district is established in [Chapter 27B](#) of the City's zoning ordinance. While the AP District regulations contemplate new construction and development, this site is not expecting a change in its physical character, rather what use takes place in the existing buildings.

Last year, Davis County wanted to do their Western Sports Park and proposed a building that was too high for their agriculture zoning. Staff considered rezoning the area mixed use, which would allow any of the allowed uses on that site. The County Commission didn't want that, so Farmington Staff considered other options including an overlay zone done by legislative act and a DA that detailed deviations from the underlying zone. This is how the AP District got its start in Farmington.

Petersen said this application is similar in that the applicants want a use that is not in the underlying zone. They have applied for an AP zone in order to sell cars on a limited basis inside the current buildings. The zoning ordinance already has standards for small car dealerships, but it is for commercial districts instead of agriculture districts. Lot coverage in the AP district is 25%, with the City approving any extra coverage. Deviation from standards called for in the underlying zone include: architecture, landscaping, deliveries, storage, hours of operation, and signage.

Per 11-27B-030 (E), the Planning Commission would make a recommendation in favor of the AP District provided that it finds that the facts submitted with the application(s) and presented at the public meetings establish that:

1. *The development is compatible with and will enhance the community as a whole as well as the immediately surrounding neighborhoods and existing property uses. To the extent that there is a commercial component, the applicant adequately demonstrates sustainable financial viability and provides adequate assurance of sustainability.*
2. *That the uses proposed will not be detrimental to present and anticipated surrounding uses as determined by the City.*
3. *The streets proposed are suitable and adequate to carry anticipated traffic, and increased densities will not generate traffic in such amounts as to overload, compromise the safety of, or diminish the existing residential or other nature of the street network outside the AP District in a detrimental or adverse way.*
4. *Any exception from standard ordinance requirements is documented as required herein, warranted by the design and amenities incorporated into the final plan and enhances the purposes of the underlying zone and community as a whole.*
5. *The AP District is in conformance with the City General Land Use plan.*
6. *Existing or proposed utility services are adequate for the uses proposed.*

The Planning Commission is tasked with making a recommendation to the City Council, who will have the final say in whether or not the request is to be approved or denied. This is a legislative decision.

Applicants **Andrew** and **Fred Cooper** (1284 Hidden Quail Cove, Farmington, Utah). **A. Cooper** is the seller of cars and he indicates that he is a fan of hobby-selling cars. Without a license, he cannot sell more than six vehicles every six months, per the State regarding registration and titling. No additional structures would be added, and there would be no changes to the site as is. There is nothing visible to the public. No cars would be out front (only inside). He would be selling via KSL and appointment only. (This is similar to how the business is currently functioning.) He just wanted to sell some vehicles while going to school. Since he hit his quota, he wanted to sell a few more and become official. He only wants to obtain a license so he can sell through the State. He indicated that nothing would change in relation to the building; he would have a sign that is required by State and a little more volume than the six cars he has sold before. The building is currently being used to store cars. The only thing that would change is a banner will be placed on the garage, and he would be able to sell a higher volume of cars per year. **F. Cooper** said there are upwards of 13 cars right now being stored inside with room for potentially five more, for a total of 18 at any one time. **F. Cooper** then said that **A. Cooper**, his son, would be sure to keep the property clean, as they received a notice two weeks ago regarding weeds. He would be required to keep it clean at all times. The applicants did go around to neighbors explaining their pending application.

Adams said he has seen four different names on the documentation: **Fred, Andrew, Jennifer, and Jeff Cooper**. He wondered who the real applicant is. **F. Cooper** said those four individuals are members of a trust. **Adams** said the trustee should be the applicant. **F. Cooper** said he could be the sole applicant. **A. Cooper** said he intends to apply for a business license with the City to sell cars. **Adams** asked how the applicant would meet the code to enhance the community as a whole, including surrounded properties. **A. Cooper** said there are no negative downsides to immediate neighbors, and the business would share the love of cars with the community while providing them with good deals on cars. Landscaping on the north side admittedly needs improved.

Adams said the General Development Plan (GDP) requires that plans be prepared by licensed, certified professionals such as an architect, landscape architect, planner, engineer, surveyor, etc. He guesses this application was not prepared by any licensed professionals. **A. Cooper** said he works at a real estate brokerage among many licensed professionals, and he used their software's to prepare the application.

Chair John David Mortensen opened the public hearing at 7:30 PM.

*The Planning Commission received two email petitions regarding this item that will be included at the end of the minutes; they were from **Madison Hood** and **Brian Hendricks**.*

Mark Clark (110 S. Horizon Drive, Farmington, Utah) said he wanted to thank the applicants for introducing themselves. He is a businessman who relocated to this area because he loved the agricultural setting and residential community. He is not a fan of mixed-use and this is going down a trail of diverse mixed-use that would impact traffic, especially during school and when the ball fields are being used. It is already difficult to get egress there. Beyond this, he said they did clean up the property very nicely last week and it has enhanced the neighborhood. However, the applicant did use a tractor over someone else's property and dumped into the retention pond. Overall, he is against the use itself and it should be taken down entirely.

Michelle Bennett (590 W. Kennard, Farmington, Utah) said she lives immediately to the east of the property in question. She moved to this home shortly under one year ago, assuming this was a limited-use building. She really likes the residential feel. However, her deck does face the garage and she would feel limited in her yard overlooking a dealership. Her home was the driveway in which said tractor went over and left marks.

Matthew Caldwell (205 S. Horizon Drive, Farmington, Utah) said he lives southeast of the site. He is concerned with the precedence this continues to set, as the adjacent property has a tennis academy. During the summer months in the evening, there are 15 cars parking up and down the street, many double-parked. It makes it difficult for the residents to access their own properties. This would also set a precedent for the developers who proposed putting a commercial space north of this neighborhood. 650 West is already a busy street with the gym, tennis academy, Ascent Academy, and the High School. He is already concerned with the current impact; people use their neighborhood to do U-turns etc. Also, he is concerned with the dumping into the retention pond, which is serviced by his Homeowner's Association (HOA). Therefore, his neighborhood pays for debris removal. He is against allowing this, not because he is against the **Coopers** or their hobby, but because it is against the agriculture zoning.

Rob Archibald (563 W. Peak View Lane, Farmington, Utah) indicated that he was not visited as noted in the submittal. He does realize that the applicants, who have been good neighbors, may keep their promises etc., but he is concerned with the future of the property after it is rezoned for commercial uses. It would open the door to future businesses that may not be as good of neighbors.

Brian Hendricks (527 W. Vista Lane, Farmington, Utah) said he also sent an email. He does not want a used car dealership in his neighborhood, as it sets a bad precedent.

Chair John David Mortensen closed the public hearing at 7:39 PM. He explained that the Planning Commission is not the approving body, rather it is the City Council. The Commission recommends things to the City Council. The Planning Commission today has three options for this: recommend approval, recommend denial with conditions, or table so the applicant can address concerns or Commission feedback.

Sherlock said the use doesn't seem to suite the current zoning, which has been in place for a very long time. It was originally a farm that has been pieced off multiple times. She predicts that Farmington is going to see a lot more of this in the future, seeing buildings that don't seem to make sense anymore. **A. Cooper** said if they were selling the cars on the street where transactions are observable, it is much different than in an enclosed building. **Sherlock** said that this is a great building, great business idea, etc., but maybe it is not the best location for the business itself. She feels for the applicant, who is in a very difficult spot trying to find a creative use for existing buildings.

Turner said that he does believe in property rights and with the requesting of the rezone, but it does set a precedent much like the neighbors say. He is concerned with the future use as well when this is potentially sold. **Turner** also said he understands he is hoping to follow State compliance and he appreciates it, but it's not the best for this location.

Adams said that this code section is very complex and procedurally expensive. The applicant has not put their best foot forward. He prefers a more robust application that addresses how this would have a positive effect on the neighborhood, such as substantial landscaping. **Adams** also said the application is missing the parking stalls, landscaping plans, ingress/egress, etc. It is an incomplete application that needs more substance if it is brought back in the future. He suggests looking at Davis County's application for the Western Sports Park. Commissioners are driven by the code, not their personal feelings.

Mortensen said there are some inconsistencies and lack of information in the current application. He is hearing a lot based on merit as well.

MOTION

Frank Adams moved to **deny** the application on the basis it is:

1. Procedurally deficient, and does not meet the requirements of the code in a number of respects previously outlined.
2. On the merits, it does not demonstrate how it will enhance the community or surrounding neighborhood.
3. The applicant is not the appropriate applicant, and it should be the legal entity that owns the property, which should be the trustee. That is an easy fix if the applicant were to bring it back.

Tyler Turner seconded the motion, which was unanimously agreed upon.

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

*Unanimous 7-0 voting to recommend denial; this will move to the City Council.

Item #2 – Mike Williamson (FSC Development LLC) – Applicant is requesting a recommendation to amend the North Farmington Station Project Master Plan (PMP), and supplemental Development Agreement (DA) for the same, to allow for drive-through facilities within the 17.6-acre project south of Burke Lane, east of Innovator Drive, west of Maker Way, and north of 550 North. The applicant also submitted a concept plan for a restaurant with a drive-through window on a 0.88-acre property located at the southeast corner of Burke Lane and Innovator Drive. (PMP-2-24).

Petersen presented this item. The property is located south of Burke Lane, east of Innovator Drive, west of Maker Way, and north of 550 North. The applicant also submitted a concept plan for a restaurant with a drive-through window on a 0.88-acre property located on the southeast corner of Burke Lane and Innovator Drive. The whole project is 17.6 acres. In order to deviate from the underlying zone, which a drive-through window does, they have to have a total of 25 acres. In 2020, when the applicant first entered into an agreement with Farmington, it included two parcels, which puts them over the 25-acre edge. They have the ability to ask for deviation under Section 140 in the Mixed-Use zone. Amending is a legislative act. They previously submitted a concept plan and now need a narrative including a transportation analysis, storm water drainage, graphic details, etc. The list is quite long. The applicant may not want this item tabled at this point, as they are looking for conceptual approval. The Development Review Committee (DRC) chose not to review this at this point, suggesting the applicant run it by the Commission.

Chris McCandless (9071 S. 1300 W., Suite 210, West Jordan, Utah), with CW Management Corporation, is representing the applicant tonight. He indicated that this is the last piece of their project next to Sego townhomes and they are committed to commercial on this corner piece. The Lifetime gym is supposed to go vertical soon as well. They are proposing a Jack in the Box restaurant on this property and they are excited to get this going. However, they wish it was done at the time of the Master Plan.

Chair John David Mortensen opened the public hearing at 8:04 PM.

Potential buyer **Preston Miller** (312 E. South Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah) said with Weber State University (WSU) going in across the street, they think that Jack and the Box would be perfect. WSU must have shared parking with this specific parcel per their Development Agreement. The property was originally zoned for a sit-down restaurant, but it is too small of a parcel for that, particularly for parking reasons. It is a right-in and right-out only there, so a gas station/convenience store is not ideal. He said the fact that the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) is placing medians in the area is indicative of the fact that they anticipate a lot of traffic there.

Chair John David Mortensen closed the public hearing at 8:06 PM.

Mortensen asked **Petersen** about crossing on Innovator (two lanes in each direction, and an additional raised landscape median), and Burke (including bike lanes). Maker Way is one lane each direction with a lot of bulb-outs and limited landscaped medians. There is a lighted crosswalk intersection with buttons for pedestrians to cross all four lanes between WSU and the site in question.

Adams said he would prefer no fast food with a drive-through there, and would prefer a sit-down restaurant instead. He wants to see a more robust and detailed application before it is forwarded to the City Council. **Turner** asked **Petersen** if it is a review or approval. To clarify, **Petersen** said it would be a recommendation for Council to review because they have not submitted a full PMP application. **Sherlock** asked **Petersen** the layout of the four corners right there. (i.e. the townhomes, mixed medical buildings, etc.) The northeast corner is Wasatch residential. Everything is pushed to the corner, and the office building is three stories. Evergreen residential is four stories. Therefore, the Jack in the Box would be surrounded by tall buildings.

Barlow asked how the lease works. **Miller** buys the land and then they are the preferred developer, building to suit for Jack in the Box. They just completed one on Antelope Drive in Syracuse.

Adams asked if they own it; he said no, they are under contract. They are going for others that are not already at Station Park. **Sherlock** asked if the site plan provided is legitimate. He said no; once they submit formally, it would look better.

Mortensen said he appreciates the process that the applicant is going through. The principle, he said, is a risk. While this is only conceptual, there is a reason they ask for a full application, DA, etc. **Mortensen** wants the public to have all of the information up front. He said this location is not consistent compared to the buildings around it, but it is a prime-corner location. Either route that is taken in regard to the three motions that were provided in the packet would require more public hearings.

FIRST MOTION:

Tyler Turner made a motion that the Planning Commission **recommend** the City Council **review** the request to amend the North Farmington Station Project Master Plan (PMP) and supplemental Development Agreement to allow for drive-through facilities, subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards, ordinances, and the following:

1. The PMP and DA must be limited to the 0.88-acre property and is subject to the entire process set forth in Section 11-18-140 of the Zoning Ordinance, including the required public hearings, and legislative discretion enabled by this Section regarding alternative development standards.
2. Suggested that the applicant come up with potentially a higher-end facility to put on this parcel.

Findings 1-2:

1. Sub-paragraph 2.k. of the North Farmington Station states: "It is anticipated that the detailed uses of the Property and additional alternative development standards may be finalized with the approvals of final site plans and/or permits to be issued by the City and as part of the approval process of the further land use applications. To the extent such approvals require the approval of additional alternative development standards, such standards shall not be approved without a public hearing before the Planning Commission and City Council and final approval from the City Council."
2. In addition to the drive-up window, the concept plan does not meet other regulations of the underlying zone, including but not limited to, building siting requirements, etc. If the concept is approved as integrated into a PMP, the above condition will allow the City to identify all alternative development standards for this smaller PMP area.

Supplemental Information

1. Vicinity map.
2. Information from the applicant including 1) a narrative; 2) a "conceptual site plan" showing a configuration of a fast-food restaurant with a drive-up window at the southeast corner of Burke Lane and Innovator Drive; and 3) A Supplemental Development Agreement for The North Farmington Station with FSC Development, October 5, 2021.

George Kalakis seconded the motion.

Chair John David Mortensen	___Aye ___X___Nay
Vice Chair Frank Adams	___Aye ___X___Nay
Commissioner George Kalakis	X___Aye ___Nay
Commissioner Joey Hansen	X___Aye ___Nay
Commissioner Kristen Sherlock	___Aye ___X___Nay
Commissioner Tyler Turner	X___Aye ___Nay
Commissioner Samuel Barlow	___Aye ___X___Nay

**This motion did not pass; a new motion is below.*

NEW MOTION:

Frank Adams made a motion that the Planning Commission **recommend** the City Council **deny** the request to amend the North Farmington Station Project Master Plan (PMP) and supplemental Development Agreement amendment.

Findings 1-5:

1. The application is for a PMP, but the applicant did not submit a PMP as per Section 11-18-080 of the Zoning Ordinance. And regarding the concept plan, which was included with the submittal but not applied for, in addition to the drive-up window, the concept plan does not meet other regulations of the underlying zone, including but not limited to building siting requirements, etc.
2. Although the applicant requested specific text, the agenda item did not include another development agreement as an amendment to the existing DA for Planning Commission consideration.
3. Not enough information was provided as to whether or not allowing drive-up windows as part of the entire 17.6-acre existing PMP area is a good decision.
4. The 0.88-acre parcel is at the prominent/conspicuous corner of two primary streets (one a major collector, the other a minor arterial). A "fast-food restaurant" at this location is not consistent with a recent decision by the City to remove

financial intuitions as an allowed use in most commercial zones due in part, because small footprint, one-story buildings with drive-up windows and relatively large parking areas started to dominate and consume land in high profile area-- when the purpose of the General Plan and zoning ordinance is to limit these types of uses in the mixed-use zones, especially on high profile sites.

- 5. Suggested that the applicant come up with potentially a higher-end facility to put on this parcel.

Kristen Sherlock seconded the motion, which was unanimously agreed upon.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

Item #3 – Miscellaneous, correspondence, etc.

- a. **Minutes from Planning Commission May 9, 2024:** Tyler Turner would like to add "A 4-foot fence will keep children out just as well as a 6-foot fence" on page 4; and motioned to approve the minutes with that addition. **Joey Hansen** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

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

- b. **City Council Report from May 21, 2024:** Petersen reported on the code text change for the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Chapter 39 was approved and adopted, with a carve out of those zoned R-4 & R-8. The Charlotte DA was tabled. (The applicant wanted to remove the requirement to build commercial prior to residential). Third party building inspectors were approved, and the Light Manufacturing and Business (LM&B) sign package was approved. The Sycamore Lane PUD, conservation easement for the new fire station, and STACK Development street vacation were all approved as well.

ADJOURNMENT

Tyler Turner motioned to adjourn at 8:54pm.

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



John David Mortensen, Chair



Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Farmington rezone

Madison Hood <madisonhood@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 5, 2024 at 6:41 PM

To: "crowe@farmington.utah.gov" <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Hi! I am a resident at 559 west Kennard lane in Farmington. I will not be able to attend the rezone meeting tomorrow but wanted to ensure my voice and husbands voice was heard- we highly disagree with the rezone for a used car shop and this hugely weakens are neighborhood with heavy traffic- drop in house prices and not to mention the safety of my child. This is not appropriate in our neighborhood and I would greatly appreciate for this to not occur. We admire Farmington and this action would force us to move- we chose this neighborhood because it was that- a neighborhood. Please respect us as residents and wanting to remain residents

All my gratitude and appreciation

Madison Hood and Tanner Wolfe



Carly Rowe <crowe@farmington.utah.gov>

Planning Commission Notice of Public Hearing

Brian Hendricks <bdhendricks@gmail.com>
To: crowe@farmington.utah.gov

Fri, May 31, 2024 at 12:04 PM

Hi,

I wanted to comment on the following item planned for the Planning Commission meeting on June 6th.

1. Consideration for a recommendation for a Development Agreement, as well as an application for the Agricultural Planned District overlay zone for requested auto sales use and related activity, located at 153 S. 650 W. (Z-5-24)

This is a residential area, I absolutely do not support rezoning it for a used car lot. This will ruin the neighborhood area.

Thanks
Brian