

SANTA CLARA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, March 8, 2016
MINUTES

SANTA CLARA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION met for a meeting on Tuesday, March 8 2016, at 6:00 PM in the Santa Clara Town Hall located at 2603 Santa Clara Drive, Santa Clara, Utah.

Present:

Curtis Jensen (Chair), Jason Lindsey, Marv Wilson, Leina Mathis, Michael Day

Absent: Todd Jacobsen, Adam Butterfield, James Call

City Staff:

Jarett Waite: City Council
 Corey Bundy: Building Official
 Bob Nichol森: City Planner
 Todd Olsen: City Engineer

Audience:

Mill Nelson, Dan Nelson, RJ Hughes, Mike Eagar, Gilmer Hendrig, Debbie McPherson, Nathan Muno, Jacqueline Lerner, Jeff Lerner, Donna Stafford, Bud Stafford, Jill McArthur, Douglas McArthur, Patrick Manning, Kyle Hafen, Joe Platt, Jerri Howell, Jonathon Howell, Jeremy Call, Dennis Frei, Kent Frei, Randy Shaw, Lindsey Howard, Chris Howard, Steve Lang, Eric Drake, Ben Healmann, Shane Mylroie, Thad Anderson, Heather Anderson, Allen Hall, Jared Bates, Phillip Gubler, Ryker Radley, Crystal Hagemn, Keith Gubler, Robert Spendlove, Peggy Leavitt, Barbara Renauf, Jack Renauf, Thad Johnson, Ed Coombs, Brian Trittle, Gary Lamph

1. **Call to Order:** Curtis Jensen called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM
 Welcome Leina Mathis as new member for Planning Commission as an alternate member.
2. **Opening Ceremony:** Jason Lindsey led the Pledge of Allegiance and Invocation.
3. **Communications and Appearances**

A. General Citizen Communications

None.

4. **Working Agenda**

Curtis Jensen: Is there anything in tonight's agenda that needs modification?

Corey Bundy: Yes, Item 4B-1 will be tabled until the April 2016 meeting. This is a variance request of a gazebo built in violation of side yard setbacks at 3288 Red Rock Drive, Joseph LaFontaine.

4A. Public Hearings:

1. Hearing to receive public input for request of zone change of Sycamore Condos, located at Gates Lane and Clary Hills Drive. Split Rock Holdings & Kyle Hafen, Applicant.

Bob Nichol森: The short term rental request will not be heard tonight and will come before Planning Commission at a later time. The staff report for this issue is as follows:

Applicant: Split Rock Development Group, Patrick Manning & Kyle Hafen, reps.

General Plan: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Acres: 9.89 acres

Project location: South end of Gates Lane on the south side of Clary Hills Drive

Total # of Units: 73 units (seven 10-plex style condominium units with lockout unit w/in the main dwelling unit)

Purpose for requesting the PD-Residential Zone: To allow for a 73 unit condominium project on 9.89 acres which translates to a density of 7.3 dwelling units per acre, not considering the proposed lockout units which would further divide a main or “mother” unit into additional dwelling units. Note that the Density Bonus criteria must be met in order to have a density over 8 units / acre. In addition, the applicant is requesting approval to use the proposed dwelling units for short-term rental purpose, which use is listed in the PD-Residential zone as a Conditional Use. Also, the applicant proposes to create sub-units (i.e., lockout units) within each of the main dwelling units. The lockout unit could be sold separately from the rest of the unit, creating a more affordable one or two room unit within the “mother” unit. The applicant states each unit could have 3 lockout units thereby having a total of 219 lockout or ‘sub-units’ in the project (73 mother units X 3 lockout units per mother unit = 219).

Parking: The base requirement is 2 parking spaces per unit, however the lockout units create the potential for additional parking demand. The goal is to set a parking requirement that meets the typical of average demand. Neither excess parking nor inadequate parking is desired. **Staff recommends an initial parking requirement of 3 spaces per mother dwelling unit for the first phase of the project (i.e., 1-2 buildings) and then based on actual parking demand adjust the parking requirement for the project as needed, either increased parking or a parking reduction.** The site plan shows 23 underground parking spaces within each building’s basement parking garage. Seven buildings X 23 parking spaces = 161 total spaces within the basement parking areas. In addition to the basement parking garages, the site plan shows one surface parking lot with 18 spaces for a total of 179 identified parking spaces in the plan submittal. If the estimated minimum parking demand stays at 3 spaces per unit, then 219 parking spaces will be required. Since the site plan only shows 179 spaces at this point, that represents a deficit of 40 parking spaces.

However, as mentioned above the parking requirement could be adjusted either up or down depending on the actual experience with phase 1.

Short-term Rental Use / Conditional Use Permit Request: The main requirements in the zoning code for short-term rentals are 1) the property owners written approval that short-term use is proposed, 2) that a local Property Management company is managing the property, 3) that recreational amenities are provided for guest use sufficient for the size of the project, and 4) the project obtains a city business license for the short-term rental use, and pays the required transient room taxes. The Planning Commission must determine if the proposed amenities are adequate for the size of the project.

The amenities proposed for the project include a clubhouse and 2 swimming pools located behind the clubhouse.

Density & Density Bonus criteria: The project proposes 73 main dwelling units in seven 10-plexes plus 3 single detached units on 9.89 acres which equals a density of 7.3 density unit's / acre. If the "lockout" units are included the total unit count could be as high as 219 lockout units (73 'mother' units X 3 lockouts / mother unit). However it is doubtful that all potential lockout units will be sold separately but rather some of the main dwelling units (i.e., mother unit) will be sold as one unit. Since the project density with lockout units included will exceed 8 dwelling units / acre, the project must meet the Density Bonus criteria.

Density Bonus criteria: The proposed building design incorporates balconies/decks with landscaping, varied roof lines and other features which provide architectural interest. The exterior materials appear to be stone / masonry with significant portions of windows. All four sides appear to be finished with similar materials. A detailed landscape plan has not been provided but the perspective view shows boulders and shrubs around the building(s). The project amenities include a clubhouse and 2 pools according to the concept site plan. Based on the concept plans provided it appears the project merits some degree of density bonus.

Building Height: The Zoning Code states the height limit is 35' or as approved by the City Council upon considering the Planning Commission's recommendation. The applicants have not provided a detail building elevation to determine the building height, or otherwise stated what the proposed building height will be. The Planning Commission should know the proposed building height prior to a recommendation to the City Council.

Common Open Space: The Zoning Code requires a minimum of 30% of the project area to be in useable open space. A landscape plan is also required as part of the PD-Residential zone submittal requirements. The developer has yet to provide the landscape plan.

Planning Commission Action: The PC may take action on the re-zone request after the public hearing is concluded, or may table the request until a landscape plan and building height information is provided. It is possible that the applicants will have the above information available at the PC meeting.

Curtis Jensen: What is the purpose for tonight's appearance?

Bob Nichol森: To request a zone change from R-1-10/RA to Planned Development Residential, with the density bonus request for the project being over 8 units per acre.

Jason Lindsey: With regards to the lockout units, how will they be sold?

Bob Nichol森: The applicant would be better to address that, but it is my understanding it is a one bedroom unit. The main units would be subdivided into the one bedroom units.

Curtis Jensen: It seems there are some unknown variables with the parking for this project, but with all the new developments in that area, what are City concerns over traffic?

Bob Nichol森: Traffic does not seem to be a major issue.

-Public discontent-

Bob Nichol森: Obviously, there are other opinions for that question. The parking issue is a bit of an unknown, but staff is recommending 3 parking spaces per unit for the first phase of the project and adjust as necessary at later times.

Curtis Jensen: The traffic getting to the project seems to be the bigger issue. This is going to be a rental situation with a larger amounts of vehicles.

Corey Bundy: When City Council and staff looked at this and if it were to be fully developed, there is a roundabout nearby the Sycamores Subdivision development and there is a low water crossing that is proposed and would come up towards Chapel Street. The low water crossing would help allow an additional access.

Curtis Jensen: How would the roundabout be accessed?

Bob Nichol森: There is a dirt road at the water tank that will be relocated and it would come further up the hill.

Corey Bundy: The County has discussed helping to improve the area and pave those areas which are nearby the shooting range area. It would make it a much more usable road. There have also been efforts to work with biking groups about create activities there and create easier access to trailheads.

Curtis Jensen: Is this road that is seen on the map the existing road or is it a new road?

Public comment: The roundabout is not existing yet.

Bob Nichol森: Correct.

Curtis Jensen: Thank you. However, in order to keep order with the public hearing, let's make sure to keep the current comments to staff, then we will move to public. Is this something that is reflective for Santa Clara City?

Bob Nichol森: I am not sure if this type of issue has ever come up before, but so far this has not been a concern. The building is attractive looking and could meet the bonus density requirements with the exterior designs.

Michael Day: It is definitely a challenging and unique situation to figure out where the units can be split. But the parking issue should be addressed at the beginning and address what the maximum parking could be. I agree with the recommendation for the "test" for the first phase and then make adjustments thereafter.

Bob Nichol森: Staff is suggesting a 3 parking space requirement. If lock out units are present that would make the parking demand grow. If we set a level at Phase 1, then the other phases would follow suit. We do not want to create over parking nor under parking and therein lies the challenge.

Curtis Jensen: What is the other existing project you mentioned previously?

Bob Nichol森: The Inn at Entrada as well across the street from that project.

Marv Wilson: What does the General Plan show?

Bob Nichol森: The General Plan is Medium Density Residential and the zoning is R-1-10.

Marv Wilson: My main concern is that this is quite a leap from Medium Density Residential to multiple story condos.

Curtis Jensen: What is the City's interest in this matter? Is there a need or desire for diversity in this type of project? Is it being as a welcomed project or a cautious one?

Bob Nichol森: Both. It could be a good thing for Santa Clara to have this type of resort. There has not been a lot of discussion that I am aware of for a formal City opinion. This is the first level for such a project with the public meetings, hearings and discussion.

Curtis Jensen: This is quite a step for the City as well as being unique.

Bob Nichol森: When the applicant came to the Technical Review Committee, it was suggested that this project be a concept that would cater to the biking community.

Patrick Manning: I am with Split Rock. To clarify some of the questions brought up, the height of the buildings will be 35 feet. As for the lockout units, when it was brought to the Technical Review Committee, it was brought to their attention there could be a density and parking issue. We are actively looking ways to solve those problems as well as keeping the open spaces and that is why we want to go with subsurface parking. We have also been speaking with the BLM about keeping some the trails there.

Potentially, there could be 16-22 lockout units that will eliminate any parking issues. That has been changed from the original 33 lockout units and the number will probably be closer to the 16 units and not the higher numbers. There are also ways that over parking can be minimized and create moratoriums on vehicles allowed per unit.

This property was zoned PD up to a year ago and the owner we purchased it from, requested a down grade on the zoning which is why were are the current density requirements.

When our group first purchased the property, no definite plans were made at that point as what to do with the property. During the process of looking to see what the project could be, we have looked at extensively what could be best suited for the area.

Curtis Jensen: In looking at the architectural drawings, the first floor is for parking?

Patrick Manning: Yes. It is the subsurface parking area.

Curtis Jensen: Are there four units on the second floor that would be sold?

Patrick Manning: There could be six on the first floor and six on the second floor. We are no longer going to proceed with the original eight units. It makes it look too much like a hotel room.

Curtis Jensen: There would be units like the others on the third floor?

Patrick Manning: That is correct.

Curtis Jensen: Can you explain the concept of these units? How are the units sold?

Patrick Manning: It is not meant to be another Green Valley Resort, where the property owner of the unit can use their own property management company, but a self-branded, not hotel logo and will look like Santa Clara surrounding properties and probably be run off a Marriott reservation center. Anyone that owns a unit has to be part of that reservation program and management would be done the same way.

If a unit were to be purchased as a three-bedroom lockout unit, it could be rented out as a one-bedroom unit and then a two-bedroom unit from the hotel operator. The reason of petitioning to sell the lockout units is referring backing to 2007 and 2008. But this will be a high end project but affordable. We have seen at the Entrada project, the renters being people that only need a one or two bedroom unit and not a four-bedroom

Curtis Jensen: Where would the initial phase be located?

Patrick Manning: The two buildings that are closest to the new road.

Curtis Jensen: What about traffic?

Patrick Manning: There will be construction traffic and there will be a staging area further back to not impend existing traffic. I have been in contact with the person doing the excavation on the Sycamores project and the construction staging area will not be close to Clary Hills Drive. We are going to be trying to hide vehicles and hide parking surfaces. We are not looking to have parking be a major focal point.

Curtis Jensen: What about the fact if there are large groups such as family events or reunions?

Patrick Manning: That is always a problem and one of the reasons we agreed to a trial project, is to work on ideas to solve those kinds of problems. By working with the BLM and with other property we own, we can create parking there and solve these issues another way.

Curtis Jensen: You have shown bike trails, ATV trails and other trails, what is the extent with those things? Are they going to be paved?

Patrick Manning: Not necessarily. They may be hiking trails or mountain bike trails. We are not sure yet of how extensive this will be integrated. It will serve people that are coming down with a purpose trip. We are looking to have a type of a pro shop within the project, something similar to what is at golf courses, but for biking type activities.

Leina Mathis: With this project catering to outdoor enthusiasts, what about the traveling equipment that accompanies those travelers? Is there going to be a larger area that can house those large type trailers? And then where will the Pro shop be?

Patrick Manning: As for the trailers, we have a property that can house trailers and the storage of them and are not sure yet where the pro shop will be yet. Maybe one of the units can be used for administrative offices and a downstairs pro shop. There is also a property next door to this can be used for similar things.

Curtis Jensen: This matter is opened up for the Public Hearing portion. I would like to keep this organized with the public comments coming forward and to avoid a longer meeting, please keep the comments efficient, respectful, original and not repeated.

Richard (RJ) Hughes: What about the lockout units? At the same time, you mentioned this not a hearing about rentals? What is the difference between that and short term rentals?

Curtis Jensen: It is going to be a condo project, but have the right to have rentals that could be for two days or longer.

Michael Day: It is not being requested to be approved as short term rentals yet, as it can be a possible use in the future. The concept of lockout units is that it would be rented out as individual units. It could be a future likely use. If the applicant at some point chooses to proceed with short term rentals, then they come back to request that use and obtain approval.

Richard (RJ) Hughes: With this zoning change, will they be able to have the lockout units?

Curtis Jensen: A zone change is a permitted use for the property. The details of the development come forth within the plat and from working with City staff about those details. A zone change takes into the consideration of future uses.

Michael Day: They are proposed to be equipped and used as lockout units. It does not mean the unit owners are planning to use it as a short term rental situation.

Bob Nichol森: They would then need to apply for a Conditional Use Permit. The zone change would potentially allow that as a use.

Curtis Jensen: Would that include a public hearing?

Bob Nichol森: It could be, but it would be up to the Planning Commission discretion.

Richard (RJ) Hughes: For the record, I am opposed to vacation rentals.

Michael Day: Where do you live?

Richard (RJ) Hughes: On Hamblin Drive.

Jeff Lerner: I live in the Hills at Santa Clara and own multiple lots there. If this is approved, it will open a Pandora's Box.

Curtis Jensen: Is your concern about the density?

Jeff Lerner: Yes. I want to say that I am appreciative of the Planning Commission members taking all issues in consideration and weighing the impact with such a level headed approach. The RV's, trailers, and ATV's are going to be around the project and along with that traffic, the noise from them will be an issue.

Terry Howell: I live near this development and we as a community are not known for this kind of project. The surrounding schools will see high turnovers because of these kind of projects and kids do not do well when they have to be relocated several times into different areas.

This does not fit within Santa Clara history. I think it fits more into an area that is out skirts of a larger community. The length of stays involved are temporary. The trails are also a concern as well as the parking as a beginning problem, and not a problem to address at a later time.

Doug McArthur: Currently with traffic as it is, we wait from 5-20 cars before being able to cross that section of the road. Why do we want to make the problem worse? What about fire safety? Will the fire engines be able to reach those properties at 35 in height?

Brian Trittle: I live on Ridgeview Drive and am also the field manager for the BLM. I came here tonight because of the invite. I wanted to clarify some things. The BLM is aware of this development because of the high school bike championships and they have been looking for a place to hold the race.

The Santa Clara trails were considered to be a favorite and since communicated with the owner of the property that is east of Gates Lane for a parking area and discussions continued. The planners became aware of the possible development. It was described at that time as a vacation rental development. We are not in the business of approval of businesses such as this, and it is a City issue. The public lands we have can be traded or sold. But as far as the BLM is concerned, this is a City issue.

It is my understanding and it is a concern I have as a Santa Clara City resident, that if there are 30 units at one project, it would need proper ingress and egress opening for emergency services.

Eric Drake: I live in the Hills areas. I have a question of the future county plans about the byway. Will that still happen sometime?

Corey Bundy: Yes, it is on the list of future developments.

Eric Drake: One of the descriptions the developer gave regarding this project, was that this complex would access into the south hills area, but if the corridor gets developed, it will make an apartment complex right in the middle of the city.

Corey Bundy: There is a lot of land on each side of the corridor.

Eric Drake: So everything east of that development would be dead center of everything. As a resident, I do not feel it fits in with what Santa Clara has.

Corey Bundy: The environmental study that was done by the BLM for the south hills area has restricted a lot of the growth and the City is looking to amend the General Plan to allow more of recreational and not residential.

Dennis Frei: I believe the reason of why the City is allowing these types of projects to come in is because money is the driving force. But with regards to traffic, with our fruit stand on Santa Clara Drive, it is a mess right now with current traffic. When I went to the last meeting, it at first said there could only be 99 units and now the density is being changed without another access road.

Those bridges that are in place right now will not be able to handle more traffic. Those bridges need to be better supported for higher amounts of traffic. I would also like see a stop light by the fruit stand at that corner. We need a way to stop some of that heavy traffic for safety concerns.

Heather Johnson: I live in the hills area and have the same concerns of those previously addressed. If the proposal would go through, would the bike trails be public or private? It would change everything about Santa Clara and the uniqueness. It will no longer be a rural or farming community to live in. There is also concerns for the kids going to bus stops and with that increased traffic, it will be more dangerous.

Randy Shaw: With some of these complexes that are in St. George, look how they are not being maintained as the years go on. I am the only home on Gates Lane currently and there is so much dirt and grit in the air, and this project will make it so much worse. The landscape will also be ruined.

This is one of the only communities that has its own architectural design and what values do we want to have Santa Clara City to have or do we want to change it forever?

Bud Stafford: As a longtime resident, over the years, we have gone to great lengths to keep it a bedroom community and do not want these kind of larger developments.

Phillip Gubler: We own property adjacent to this development and agree with what Eric Drake said to a certain extent and where he talked about how the western corridor will push things back and make this subdivision in the middle, but also think these kinds of projects will continue back. At some point, all of those big developments will eventually become vacation rentals. I do not want to have a view to look down to condos. I want to look at the natural beauty. I do not like the idea of a high density project and should be just left as homes.

I also have concerns about property values and how hard it will be sell one of our lots with something like this next door. I will not have a chance to visit with neighbors with this type of community I also do not like the thought of the potential noise.

What about pedestrian traffic increases? With more pedestrians around, and when it is dark, there could be accidents. We as residents, are asking that please listen to the citizens rather than just make an immediate decision.

Kyle Hafen: I work with the developer and wanted to mention a few years ago about the opposition of the Hills subdivision. But look at it now. Change is hard. The Sycamores development is adding sidewalks and that should help with some of the concerns for pedestrians. We are also working on a traffic study to see what kind of impact there will be.

Our objective is to yes, have people bring their vehicles down, but to park them and walk the streets of Santa Clara City. As far as parking, there will be parking regulations in place to curb over parking. We don't want people to be upset with us not having everything in place yet. We want and encourage feedback as well as those concerns. Before a plan is defined, we want to explore any concerns and opposition. We are not asking for something that does not fall within the General Plan.

Deborah McPhearson: Being a resident in the hills area, but with the prior questions of about pedestrians and horses, where are we seeing the people come from? Who is it using the land? Is it local residents or travelers?

Corey Bundy: Both.

Deborah McPhearson: So how and why would local people need to be pushed aside in order to accommodate the travelers and their vehicles that will be there for parking?

Mike Yeager: Years ago, I attended a planning meeting similar to this where they were wanting to install a four lane highway. Thankfully, they did not allow it and the dynamics were not changed. As residents, we like to know our neighbors. We want to keep it at a simpler kind of thing in this area.

Curtis Jensen: If there is something else that the public would like to say that has not been repeated, please come forward.

Jack Renauf: I live on Summerwood Circle and have a couple of questions. What are the reasons of why we would do this? The builder property that bought property and would want to make a profit and to change the zoning, it would make more of a profit for the builder. We need to weigh a possible tax base increase versus the negative impact it will have for nearby residents.

Nate Munro: as a resident of the heights, I am not nearby this area but my opinion is that the traffic concerns are everywhere. Green Valley or Entrada as an analogy for this project does not allow for a comparison. When the vision was first proposed for this project, it has been intended for a closed community. The developer will want to do it right. The Inn at Entrada is an enjoyable community and well done. Santa Clara needs this kind of revision.

Jonathon Howell: This project is not wanted no matter how good the design is or who does it. We want it left as is.

Ed Coombs: I live on Hamblin Drive. With regards about the pro shop, it sounds like it will have commercial space therein as well. What will happen to the river way with the possible trash and runoff from everything? The erosion that could happen will affect everything too. There will still be cattle and the farm smells that accompany it, and those kinds of polished kind of condos will not match up together.

Ben Hagaman: There needs to be a look into what kind of crime could happen.

Joe Platt: I am with Split Rock and would like to thank everyone for their well thought out comments. We came to the meeting to listen and will consider all the opinions offered tonight.

Curtis Jensen: We will now close the public hearing for this matter and move to item 4B-2 for the General Business section of this matter.

4B. General Business

2. Recommendation to City Council for a zone change of Sycamore Condos, located at Gates Lane and Clary Hills Drive.

Curtis Jensen: We as the Planning Commission, value everyone's opinion and love this community. Change is coming. Something unique is here though. Blocking growth will stop the changes that come. The issues that are concerning and affect the community are safety, infrastructure, and aesthetics. As Planning Commission members, we make recommendations for or against a project. The City Council makes the final decision.

Marv Wilson: At one time, this property was a PUD. When did it switch back to R1-10-RA zone?

Corey Bundy: It was rezoned around 2005 or 2006.

Marv Wilson: It was made a PUD at that time?

Michael Day: Was it part of the south hills area master plan?

Corey Bundy: It was part of the Ridge Pointe Subdivision. It is now the Hills at Santa Clara. This parcel was tentatively planned for townhomes prior to the economic slowdown. The bridge and things already there, were there when it was originally Ridge Pointe.

Marv Wilson: When did it change back?

Corey Bundy: One year ago; in 2015.

Curtis Jensen: What are our options for tonight?

Bob Nicholzen: You can make a recommendation for approval, table the issue pending further discussion or denial.

Michael Day: I will make a recommendation at the end of my comment and have a number of concerns. There is lack of detail and if there were more information to be brought back at a later time, we could re-examine it. I am concerned about how many units there will be. A landscape plan is also needed to be included with aesthetics and

the bonus density requirements we have. The parking is a concern as well without the expanded detail and plan. I do not see the connection to the General Plan. It is not consistent with the area.

Curtis Jensen: Before we proceed to a motion, I would like to ask the Planning Commission members for any other comments.

Leina Mathis: I have mixed emotions on this project and there is a short term rental project there that was proposed and that was denied. Traffic and parking are definite issues.

Jason Lindsey: The number of units are a problem for me. It is a high density project and it does not match the General Plan.

Marv Wilson: I as well have mixed emotions. I am for property rights but it does not connect with the General Plan. I also have heard a lot of demeaning comments about condos or townhomes. But the surrounding townhomes in Santa Clara are quiet neighbors. I am leaning to be against the project.

Michael Day: Something will come there at some point, but this may not be the project to be there. I will make the motion for this matter to City Council for denial.

Motion to recommend to the City Council for denial of a zone change for the proposed Sycamore Condos, which would be located at Gates Lane and Clary Hills Drive.

Made by: Michael Day, Seconded by: Jason Lindsey

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried.

4. Working Agenda

4A. Public Hearings:

- 2. Hearing to receive public input for request of zone change of Snow Canyon Townhomes, located at Lava Cove Drive and Little League Drive. Kent Frei, Applicant. Allen Hall, Rosenberg & Associates, representing.**

Bob Nichol森:

The staff report is as follows:

General Plan: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Acres: 1.83 acres

Project location: NE corner of Lava Cove Drive and Little League Drive

Total # of Units: 16 units (four 4-plex style townhomes)

Purpose for requesting the PD-Residential Zone: To allow for 16 unit townhome project on 1.83 acres which translates to a density of 8.7 dwelling units per acre. Note that the Density Bonus criteria must be met in order to have a density over 8 units / acre.

Common Open Space Requirement: The Zoning code requires that 30% of the project area be developed as useable open space. A landscape plan is required as part of the PD-Residential zone plan submittal requirements. The applicant's site plan states that 56% of the project area will be landscaped open space.

Parking Requirement: The code requires a minimum of 2 parking spaces per unit so 16 units will require 32 parking spaces, 16 of which must be covered spaces. The site plan does not show the location of the covered parking spaces, but the application states that each unit will have a 2 car garage.

Density Bonus Requirements: The Density Bonus criteria may allow for a density in excess of 8 d.u. /acre up to a maximum of 12 du/acre. As of this writing (2/29/16) staff has not received an architectural rendering of the units and therefore cannot comment on the density bonus compliance.

PC Action: The PC can take action on the rezone request after the Public hearing is concluded, but the item should be tabled if an architectural rendering of the buildings is not provided. The architectural rendering is required in order to determine whether the density bonus standards are met. The applicant is requesting a density of 8.7 du/ acre, which represents a density bonus of 0.7 units/acre, and although not a significant density increase, the building design should be known before the PC makes a recommendation to the City Council.

Curtis Jensen: This is a unique part of the property and the project. There is a need within the community to create and require this kind of development.

Kent Frei: More of an effort has been put into the front of the units as the back is not visible. The project backs up to the hill. Economics are a factor but there is not really a need to improve the back portion of this project.

Curtis Jensen: Is the price structure going to be attractive to people in this areas?

Kent Frei: It will be under \$200,000 and it is great price range for starter homes with not many in this price range available. It will be \$75,000 under a single family home for the same amount of square footage like we are offering.

Michael Day: There is a playground shown as an amenity, but what will be done with the leg area that goes towards the east?

Kent Frei: It will probably be desert or natural landscape. Perhaps with support from neighbors around, we might be able to create semi-private pickle-ball court that belongs to the home owner association and those owners. As a townhome project, this will blend well with the surrounding areas, but as a single family home project, people are not necessarily wanting homes on those corner areas.

Jason Lindsey: What about the private rear areas? Or will it be fenced yards?

Kent Frei: People would be able to enclose their rear yards as they see fit, but there will also be common areas that belong to the home association.

Curtis Jensen: Seeing no further comment, we will close the Public Hearing and move to the General Business Item for this item.

4B. General Business

3. Recommendation to City council for a zone change of Snow Canyon Townhomes, located at Lava Cove Drive and Little League Drive.

Michael Day: I will make a motion to recommend approval for Snow Canyon Townhomes and include the bonus density be awarded for the appearance and aesthetics.

Motion to recommend to the City Council for approval of a zone change of Snow Canyon Townhomes, located at Lava Cove Drive and Little League Drive.

Made by: Michael Day, Seconded by: Jason Lindsey

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried

4B. General Business

4. Recommendation to City Council for Final Plat, Tuscany at Cliffrose, Phase 2- Santa Clara Development, Applicant. Allen Hall, Rosenberg & Associates, representing.

Corey Bundy: The project is as follows:

Zone: PD Residential

Acres: 3.75 acres in phase 2

Project Engineer: Alan Hall, PE with Rosenberg Associates

Project location: Project bounded by 400 East Street on the west, Tuscany Drive on the south, Hamblin Parkway on the north, and other phases of the project on the east side.

Number of units: 40 townhome units (ten 4-plexes)

Public streets throughout the project.

Request: Approval of Phase 2 of Tuscany at Cliffrose (phase 2 of 5 phases total)

Staff Comments: This is phase 2 of a 5 phase project, and the plat is in order, with the City requesting a 15' wide public trail easement in the NE corner of this phase near Hamblin Parkway. Alan Hall, project engineer indicated that the trail easement can be provided. Ten buildings with 4 townhome units in each building are proposed in this phase. Staff recommends approval.

With regards to the trail easement, in the corner by Hamblin Drive, the developer will provide an easement. Paradise Village, Phase 6 has a trail that goes along the bottom of the development. The proposed trail will continue along to Hamblin Drive. That trail is on the Master Trail Plan.

This used to be a Trophy Homes project and they would do each building as a phase and then record. The City is very pleased that Kent Frei has opted to have the remaining lots in this project included as one phase and developed at one time. All of the curb, gutter and sidewalk are already in.

Curtis Jensen: Does the entrance come from Bella Vista Drive?

Corey Bundy: The bottom loop is Tuscany Drive and loops comes back out. It is pretty much a big circle.

Michael Day: What is the property to the south side?

Corey Bundy: It has no connection to this project and is owned by Brent Ence, I believe.

Kent Frei: I do have a concern about the trail. It is easy to give me an easement because I am the property owner. However, at one point, the association might need to create walls or at the least create a gate between the walls. I would like to see if perhaps the City would put in the walls.

Corey Bundy: Brad Hays has indicated with that easement, he would be willing to put in the gate and wall for the easement. This would help accommodate the trail.

Micheal Day: I would make a motion to approve this matter and add that City Council possibly consider an alignment of the easement that is adjacent to the next property. This would be for a future trail.

Motion to recommend to the City Council for approval of Final Plat for Tuscany at Cliffrose, Phase 2.

Made by: Michael Day, Seconded by: Marv Wilson

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried

4B. General Business

5. Recommendation to City Council for Final Plat, The Hills at Santa Clara, Phase 2B – Santa Clara Development, Applicant. Allen Hall, representing.

Bob Nichol森: this is the Final Plat for this project and the staff report is as follows:

The Hills at Santa Clara, phase 2B is a 20 lot single family subdivision in an R-1-10/RA Mixed Lot Size zone located south of the Santa Clara River and west of The Hills Phase 1, in the western portion of the city. The subdivision is located on the hillside which begins just south of the Santa Clara River. All of the proposed lots in this phase are larger than 10,000 sq. ft.

Applicant: Shooks Run, LLC (Eric Sampson)

Project Engineer: Rosenberg Associates, Allan Hall, PE Geotechnical

Engineer: Geotechnical Testing Services Inc.

Number of Lots & Total Area: 20 lots on 6.69 acres in phase 2B; the preliminary plat had 21 lots but one lot has been removed on the west boundary adjacent to the Jimmie Rosenbruch property. 68 lots on 23.4 acres in the entire prelim plat (2.9 lots per acre for the entire prelim plat in phases 1 thru 2B). All streets within the subdivision are public streets.

There needs to be a stub road to the Rosenbruch property on the west side of Phase 2B. The stub road was previously shown on the south side of lot 207, and staff feels the road should be shown as part of this final plat.

Staff recommends approval of the Final Plat for The Hills, phase 2B, **subject to the above comment regarding the stub road to the west.**

Michael Day: As the road to the west will be stubbed in for future development, will any of that become additional phases for this development?

Bob Nichol森: I am not sure because that property owner would need to sell or develop that area.

Michael Day: The developer of phase 2B will end up with a 1-lot space that is not part of anything yet. Is that correct?

Allen Hall: Yes. There is a wash that goes through there and in order to fully improve the lot, the wash would need to be filled and once that were to happen, it will come back as another phase.

Marv Wilson: What about the flag lot?

Bob Nichol森: It will need to be specifically accepted within the motion.

Dan Nelson: There is supposed to be about 120-150 feet in frontage for access and poses no problem.

Marv Wilson: I will make a motion to approve this matter subject to the road being added and accept the flag lot within the phase.

Motion to recommend to the City Council for approval of Final Plat for Final Plat, The Hills at Santa Clara, Phase 2B.

Made by: Marv Wilson, Seconded by: Jason Lindsey

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried

4B. General Business

6. Recommendation to City Council for an Amended Final Plat, Paradise Village at Zion, Phase 5-Merrill Properties, Applicant. Jared Bates, Rosenberg & Associates, representing.

Corey Bundy: The only change there has been with this Final Plat is there will be four 4-plex buildings and the end building will be a duplex. This is the only change and staff recommends approval.

Motion to recommend to the City Council for approval of Final Plat for Final Plat, The Hills at Santa Clara, Phase 2B.

Made by: Leina Mathis, Seconded by: Michael Day

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried

5. Discussion Items

None.

6. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve Planning Commission minutes from February 9, 2016

Made by: Jason Lindsey, Seconded by: Marv Wilson

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried.

7. Adjournment

8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted;

Melodie B. Hayes,
March 8, 2016

Melodie B. Hayes

Melodie B. Hayes, Recording Secretary