

SANTA CLARA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, October 11, 2016
MINUTES

SANTA CLARA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION met for a meeting on Tuesday, October 11, 2016, at 6:00 PM in the Santa Clara Town Hall located at 2603 Santa Clara Drive, Santa Clara, Utah.

Present:

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

Absent: Adam Butterfield, James Call, Todd Jacobsen

City Staff:

Ed Dickie: City Manager
 Corey Bundy: Community Development Director
 Bob Nichol森: City Planner
 Devin Snow: Assistant City Attorney

Audience: Taylor Prisbey, Cindy Frei, Lance Rigby, Steven Beesely, Ludell Hutchings, Ryan Cowley, Ann Evans, Robert Smith, Tyler Meyers, Shandon Gubler, Dyle Bond, Jared Bates, Ben Willits, Steve Cottam, Wes Davis, Bruce Belmont, Scott Smoot, Denise Smoot, Keith Gubler, Neal Smith, Mari Purdy, Jared Purdy, Kyle Hafen, Shad Johnsen

1. **Call to Order:** Curtis Jensen called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM
2. **Opening Ceremony:** Marv Wilson led the Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Comments (Invocation.).
3. **Communications and Appearances**

A. General Citizen Communications
None.

4. Working Agenda

A. Public Hearings:

1. **Public Hearing to receive input for a zone change from R-1-10/Planned Development Residential (PDR) to Planned Development Residential with Short-Term Rentals (PDR-short term) on a 22.52 acre parcel located at Rachel Drive and North Town Road, proposed to be named Villas at Snow Canyon. Bella Sol 15; Applicant, Ben Willits; Representing.**

Bob Nicholzen: The staff report is as follows:

Current Zone: PD Residential & R-1-10

General Plan designation: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Acres: 22.52 acres

Applicant: Robert Smith.

Representative: Ben Willits.

Project location: West of Rachel Drive and north of North Town Road, also adjacent to the proposed Hamblin Parkway to the west.

Number of units: 95 units

Density: 4.2 du/ac

PD-Residential Zone Request: The applicant proposes 95 two-story townhome units in a twin-home and single unit arrangement on the 22.5 acre site. There are 66 twin homes and 29 single detached units, all with attached 2-car garages. The request includes approval for short-term rentals.

Exterior Materials: The exterior materials include stucco, with stone accents and tile roofs.

Project Amenities: The project proposes a clubhouse with two pools with a concrete deck around the pools. A lawn area is planned around the pools with a half-court basketball play area near the pool / clubhouse.

Traffic Access: All interior roads will be public and conform to the city's public street standards. The project is bounded on three sides by existing or proposed public streets, and the project proposes solid block walls around the perimeter of the project; units will back against the exterior streets and have access to the units from an interior loop road which will have two ingress/egress points -- one on North Town Road and the other on Rachel Drive. The proposed serpentine perimeter wall should be setback from the sidewalk at least ten feet (10') to allow for landscaping between the sidewalk and privacy wall. Based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 95 townhomes are estimated to generate 556 total trips per day based on a trip rate of 5.86 trips per unit per day. (Note: that going and returning are counted as two trips) If the units are used primarily as vacation rentals then the expected trip generation rate would be less due to many of the units not being occupied on a full time basis.

Short-term /vacation rentals: The applicants propose that all units be approved for short term rental use (i.e., 29 days or less). The site plan shows each unit has a 2-car attached garage, but no other guest parking spaces. The zoning code states that the Planning Commission may approve on-street parking to meet the parking requirement when all units are designated for short term rental use. Otherwise the guest parking requirement is 1 space per 2 guest bedrooms. Besides the parking requirement, the main requirement for short-term rentals is the need for adequate amenities.

The Planning Commission is asked to determine what is an adequate level of amenities, and the current standard to date (e.g., Paradise Village at Zion) is a pool with clubhouse and a small playground area as a minimum amount of

amenities. Note that this project proposes a similar amenity package, with a clubhouse, 2 pools, a lawn area and a half-court basketball court.

Also, there is proposed an area for RV and boat parking located on the north side of the proposed Hamblin Parkway.

Staff Recommendation: The zone change request is in conformance with the General Plan. Short-term rentals are approved for the adjoining project which has not created neighborhood problems to staff's knowledge.

Jason Lindsey: What are the additional guest parking requirements in the adjoining Paradise Village at Zion development? Have you seen any parking problems within that complex?

Corey Bundy: For Paradise Village at Zion, there is a north and south parking area, with about ten spaces total and parking in front of the clubhouse which is designed for additional parking needs. Parking has not been a problem even with the construction going on and being out there daily, there has not been a parking problem.

Bob Nicholson: There is guest parking at this proposed development, but there also are two-car garages and driveways.

Ben Willits: I am representing for this project. Parking is always an issue and because of the nature where this project sits and the future Hamblin Parkway where it will be, there will be approximately 2 acres of this project that are lost for buildings, but will be able to be used for parking.

There will be four parking spaces per unit with the garages and driveways without using the street for additional parking. We are open to adding perpendicular parking spaces as needed. Density is within the zoning allowance for the City regulations.

Curtis Jensen: What will the construction schedule be?

Ben Willits: To start off, we will be starting construction in the center of the project with the pool, clubhouse, landscape and the first set of units and the main entrance. The second section that is started will be the units around the loop and the third section will do the last leg of the loop of the units.

Curtis Jensen: Where is the off-site/RV parking?

Ben Willits: That will be at the Hamblin Parkway and perhaps some overflow parking at the development.

Leina Mathis: What about an HOA?

Ben Willits: There will be a single HOA for the development.

Tyler Myers: We like the model that Paradise Village at Zion has done and we will follow the same similar HOA requirements as that project.

Curtis Jensen: We will now open the Public Hearing for comments.

Ann Evans: What is the start date for the project?

Ben Willits: Nothing definite yet. It depends on the process with the City.

Ann Evans: When will Hamblin Parkway begin?

Corey Bundy: It could be 15-30 years before anything is started.

Dyle Bond: I am wondering what the advantage for the City is to have more short-term rentals rather than single family dwellings. There will not be any permanent residents. Santa Clara City should not be considered a nightly rental city?

Bob Nicholzen: It is hard to know how many units will be a nightly rental home rather than a main home or a second home for an owner. The ordinance has been passed and the area is more appropriate for this kind of project.

Shandon Gubler: As a resident of Santa Clara, I think this will benefit the community and will bring people to Santa Clara and money and revenue brought into the City.

Herb Basso: Vacation rentals are a good benefit to the City if they are zoned right and done right. Tax benefits are a good thing for the City and our city gets that sales tax which benefits our community.

It is a nice community that is a high quality and low-profile type of project. It has no high profile buildings that are tall. This will not have a burden on school systems because the guests go home after the weekend. Paradise Village at Zion is open access for public as needed.

Curtis Jensen: We will now proceed to the General Business item for this issue.

B. General Business:

1. **Recommendation to City Council for a zone change from R-1-10/Planned Development Residential (PDR) to Planned Development Residential with Short-Term Rentals (PDR-short term) on a 22.52 acre parcel located at Rachel Drive and North Town Road, proposed to be named Villas at Snow Canyon.**

Marv Wilson: This is a good fit for this property, but do have a question about the future parkway and the availability of crossing to get to the parking area.

Jason Lindsey: In all fairness, we should make the additional parking requirements the same as was done Paradise Village at Zion. If we require one developer to do something, then we need to consistent with others.

Corey Bundy: They did provide the additional parking areas at the time they did their Preliminary Plat.

Curtis Jensen: That can be added into the motion of recommendation to City Council. If we are ready to make that motion, we can proceed.

Motion to recommendation approval to City Council able a zone change from R-1-0/Planned Development (PDR) to Planned Development Residential with Short-Term Rentals (PDR-short term) on a 22.52 acre parcel located at Rachel Drive and North Town Road, proposed to be named Villas at Snow Canyon. A condition that would apply if the research of additional parking requirements from Paradise Village at Zion to make the parking requirements the same. And complies completely with the short-rem rental ordinance.

Made by: Jason Lindsey, Seconded by: Marv Wilson
Voting Aye: All
Voting Nay: None
Motion Carried.

A. Public Hearings:

- 2. Public Hearing to receive input for a Zone Change from Planned Development Residential (PDR) to Planned Development Residential with Short-Term Rentals (PDR-short term) on a 9.06 acre parcel, located at North Town Road and 400 East, proposed to be named Ocotillo Springs. Scott Group, LLC; Applicant, Jared Bates with Rosenberg & Associates; Representing.**

Corey Bundy: The staff report is as follows:

Zone: PD Residential

General Plan designation: Medium Density Residential (MDR)

Acres: 9.06 acres

Applicant: Scott Group LLC, Lance Rigby, representative.

Project Engineer: Jared Bates, PE with Rosenberg Associates.

Project location: Project borders 400 East Street and North Town Road, and also adjacent to the proposed Hamblin Parkway. Tuscany at Cliffrose is located to the south, and Paradise Village at Zion to the east along with the Jehovah Witness's Kingdom Hall.

Number of units: 84 units

Amended PD-Residential Zone Request: The applicant proposes 84 two-story townhome units in 18 buildings on the 9.06 acre site. There are 12 four-plexes, and 6 six-plexes proposed all with attached 2-car garages. The request includes approval for short-term rentals and also approval for a density bonus for the proposed 9.27 du/acre density.

Unit Size and Exterior Materials: Units range in size from 2,357 square feet for 3-bedroom/3 bath units to 3,075 square feet for the 4/5 bedroom & 4.5 bath units. All units have an attached 2-car garage. Exterior materials include tile roof, 2 tone stucco colors with band and pop out features, and also 3' of stone along the front of the units, and 2' along the side of the units.

Project Amenities: The project proposes a 5,800 square foot pool with a 20' concrete deck around the pool. A clubhouse with restrooms is planned near the pool with a small playground area near the clubhouse. In addition to the pool and clubhouse, a volleyball court and two tennis/pickle ball courts are proposed near the Northeast corner of the project. An HOA will be formed to maintain the common areas and all landscaping.

Traffic Access: All interior roads will be public and conform to the city's public street standards. The project is bounded on three sides by existing or proposed public streets, and the project proposes solid block walls around the perimeter of the project; units will back against the exterior streets and have access to the units from an interior loop road which will have two ingress/egress points -- one on North Town Road and the other on 400 East Street. Based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 84 townhomes are estimated to generate 492 total trips per day based on a trip rate of 5.86 trips per unit per day. (Note that going and returning are counted as two trips)

If the units are used primarily as vacation rentals then the expected trip generation rate would be less due to many of the units not being occupied on a full time basis. Both 400 East Street and the proposed Hamblin Parkway are

intended to be major collector or arterial streets, and will be capable of accommodating the projected traffic from the proposed 84 units.

Short-term / vacation rentals: The applicants propose that all units be approved for short term rental use (i.e., 29 days or less). The site plan shows 96 guest parking spaces to meet the parking requirement in the code of 1 space per 2 guest bedrooms. There are a total of 264 parking spaces proposed including 168 spaces in the 2-car garages, and 96 uncovered guest parking spaces. Besides the parking requirement, the main requirement for short-term rentals is the need for adequate amenities.

The Planning Commission is asked to determine what is an adequate level of amenities, and the current standard to date (e.g., Paradise Village at Zion) is a pool with clubhouse and a small playground area as a minimum amount of amenities. Note that this project proposes a pool, clubhouse, small playground area, and a volleyball court and two tennis/pickle ball courts.

Density Bonus standards: Density over 8 du/acre must comply with the Density Bonus provisions contained in section 17.68.105 of the Santa Clara City Zoning Code. Under “Building Design & Materials” the requirement is for variations in roof height, variations in building footprint, varied earth-tone colors and textures, and features which create visual interest such as balconies, patios, and roof overhang. Exterior materials shall consist of brick, stone or stucco.

On the front elevation, and also on the street-side elevation for corner lots, stucco shall not exceed 50% of the wall area, not including the windows. On the proposed buildings, garage doors are a major part of the front façade and therefore stucco is considerably less than 50% of the front exterior. There is some variation in roof height with gables perpendicular to main roof area. However all 18 buildings appear to have the same height and roof lines. The 6-plex buildings are particularly plain looking and should add features that increase visual interest such as decks or balconies. The standards also state that, “Each unit should have some form of private outdoor space in the form of balconies or patios”. It is not clear how this standard is met.

The Landscape Plan shows a well landscaped project generally meeting the intent of the Density Bonus standards. The project amenities which include a pool, clubhouse, small playground area, and a volleyball court plus two tennis or pickle ball courts seems in line with the prevailing standard for project amenities and generally meets the Density Bonus intent for amenities.

Staff Recommendation: The zone change request is in conformance with the General Plan. Short-term rentals are approved for the adjoining project which has not created neighborhood problems to staff’s knowledge. The PC should discuss with the applicant and his designer ways to increase the visual interest of the 18 proposed buildings. Those ways include greater variation in roof lines, and providing balconies or decks, or similar features to the buildings.

Jason Lindsey: I am wondering about the roof lines on this project.

Jared Bates: I am with Rosenberg & Associates and am representing this project, but Steve Beesely can address roof line questions.

Steve Beesely: The front gable is lower than what is shown and there are dormers in the area. The patios are covered and are almost a trellis, we were not really sure of what staff would like to see.

Marv Wilson: Staff had mentioned perhaps installing balconies. Is that a possibility?

Steve Beesley: We had discussed wanting to get rid of garages and only have carports, but the City did not want carports. The plan in place includes garages for parking, if balconies were in place, there would be loss of bedrooms and unit square footage.

Bob Nichol森: So the patios are covered?

Steve Beesely: Yes. They are a typical trellis with slates and shading above. In place with concrete. Perhaps hardy board will be used. We had originally had asphalt tiles in place, but that has since changed to tile roofs to meet the requirement.

Jason Lindsey: I like the idea of hardy board to be used.

Lance Rigby: Hardy board is generally more expensive, but it last much longer and looks good in holding up.

Jason Lindsey: The roof changes should be considered and be more appealing. The elevations for this project are good and attractive, but we don't want to see it look like row housing. The advantage you have is that your elevations are being shown at this time.

Curtis Jensen: Some types of row housing could almost be a personal taste thing. Balconies could also be equally as interesting. But at the same time, visual aesthetics for a project are almost borderline and should be addressed.

Corey Bundy: Is the trellis in the rear setback?

Steve Beesely: It is within the interior rear setback and the trellis is open. The project will be managed by one HOA company. There is also plenty of rear parking for RV's.

Curtis Jensen: Bob, what about any visual impacts?

Bob Nichol森: We typically do not see hardy board, but there does not necessarily need to be stucco on every building. With the information provided, it does technically meet the covered patio requirements.

Curtis Jensen: Is there anyone from the audience that would like to be heard for this matter?

Steve Cottam: I live across the street in Ivins and I have comments regarding this. I appreciate the developers' efforts and the City noticing those that live in Ivins. I do have a request of no balconies so that it does not overlook into our yards across the street. Those areas across the street are also residentially zoned. Those balconies will look down into the neighboring properties. The pickle ball courts if moved to the west side would be incredibly noisy.

Ludell Hutchings: I am a neighbor to Steve Cottam and am neighboring this project. I have a concern over lighting. If the lighting is not low, it would impact us greatly. 400 East does not have a street light at that intersection and it works well for the night sky lighting that there is in Ivins.

Corey Bundy: Any street lights would need to be installed, but Santa Clara City is very sensitive about night sky lighting for the Ivins residents. We have put lights in that point to the ground as well as LED lighting and those things will be addressed at the Preliminary Plat.

Michael Day: Ivins City is sensitive about the night sky and therefore how do we deal with the lighting along 400 East since one side is Santa Clara City and one side is Ivins City?

Corey Bundy: The City Council will take recommendations from the Planning Commission on lighting and public safety within the Preliminary Plat for any project. On the other side of things, the City really does not want a public safety issue and does not want completely dark streets.

Bob Nicholzen: The type of lighting would be considered as to be sensitive to surrounding neighbors.

Shad Johnsen: I live at the corner of 800 South and 400 East in Ivins and am the second house in as shown on the aerial map. I like the planning that has gone into this project, but do have a question regarding a perimeter wall that would be around the project and how tall?

Corey Bundy: Yes and it will be six feet?

Shad Johnsen: Will it be around 400 East and is there a gate?

Corey Bundy: Yes, except at the entrance and no gate.

Shad Johnsen: Is there future plans for any kind of stop light at 800 South?

Corey Bundy: I have not heard one being purposed currently.

Shad Johnsen: What about the short-term rental usage?

Corey Bundy: It is hard to say when rentals come in and out. It could be during a week or a weekend. It depends on when the homeowner would want to rent their home out within this project.

Shad Johnsen: Will 400 East be widened by the Tuscan development?

Michael Day: My comments to the Ivins City residents is there any concern over the design and look being presented?

Steve Cottam: The buildings with a flat roof and not nice looking. However, single level homes with pitches in roofs would be ideal and less intrusive.

Corey Bundy: Yes.

Curtis Jensen: We will close the Public Hearing and move to the General Business section for this item.

B. General Business:

- 2. Recommendation to City Council for Zone Change from Planned Development Residential (PDR) to Planned Development Residential with Short Term Rentals (PDR-short term), and consider a Density Bonus request, proposed to be named Ocotillo Springs, on a 9.06 acre parcel, located at North Town Road and 400 East.**

Jason Lindsey: I have a comment about the easement in the northeast corner. Does it need to be abandoned?

Jared Bates: There is a sewer easement there and we will relocate it. The soils in that corner are not suitable and that is also why there is no building there.

Marv Wilson: How about the storm water and off sites?

Jared Bates: Ivins City says that water is manageable in that area. We will assume the water will collect in the road and reroute it at the low point and along the back curve.

Jason Lindsey: Does the developer put in the street light?

Corey Bundy: Yes.

Marv Wilson: An Ivins City resident suggested the parking lot be moved to the west, which I think now is a good idea.

Curtis Jensen: If we are ready for a motion, lets' proceed.

Michael Day: I will make a motion with a comments, I keep wondering if this what is being envisioned as Santa Clara being a short term rental community in this area. But I do realize there is a General Plan in place and as long as there is compliance with the General Plan, then there should be allowances for the projects presented. I will make a motion to recommend approval of this to City Council along with some additional requirements of the City Council inquire into the aesthetics aspect is further for the bonus density; such as roof line and an extreme sensitivity to the lighting issue for surrounding neighbors. There will also need to be consistency with the short term rental requirements and compliance

Motion to recommendation approval to City Council for Zone Change from Planned Development Residential (PDR) to Planned Development Residential with Short Term Rentals (PDR-short term), and consider a Density Bonus request, proposed to be named Ocotillo Springs, on a 9.06 acre parcel, located at North Town Road and 400 East. The approval also includes lighting concerns be addressed, compliance with the ordinance requirements for short term rental and any further research is completed for bonus density requirements and aesthetics.

Made by: Michael Day, Seconded by: Jason Lindsey

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried.

A. Public Hearings:

- 3. Public Hearing to receive input for a General Plan Amendment from Main Street Commercial to Mixed Use Residential on a 2.09 acre parcel located on Lava Flow Drive. SITLA; applicant, Wes Davis; Representing.**

Bob Nichol森: The staff report is as follows:

Applicant: State Trust Lands Administration (SITLA)

Representative: Kyle Pasley, SITLA and Wes Davis, buyer

Background: The City has received an application from Utah State Trust Lands Administration and Mr. Wes Davis, property agent, to amend the City General Plan Land Use Map by changing the land use designation from Main Street Commercial to Mixed Use Residential on approximately 2.09 acres located on the SW corner of Santa Clara Drive and Lava Flow Drive (wraps around the small restaurant). The applicant proposes to have the City General Plan and later the zoning changed to allow for a mixed use project which includes both residential and commercial buildings.

This request was originally considered by the PC in December of 2015. The PC at that time recommended denial of the request. The City Council recommended a neighborhood meeting to discuss land use options for the property and at that time, Mr. Kyle Pasley, with SITLA offered to have a study done by a land use planning consultant to study and recommend potential uses for the ten acre property owned by SITLA (8 acres on the east side of Lava Flow Drive and 2 acres are located on the west side of Lava Flow Drive). That study was completed in June of this year by the IBI Group which is a planning and engineering firm. The report provides four development alternatives for the entire ten acres. Mr. Kyle Pasley, SITLA staff representative will review those four alternatives at the PC meeting.

While the suggested alternatives vary significantly for the 8 acres on the east side of Lava Flow Drive, for the 2 acre parcel on the west side of Lava Flow Drive, three of the four alternatives suggest residential development. The applicant intends to develop townhomes or apartments on the property fronting Lava Flow Drive and proposes one or two commercial buildings for the property which fronts Santa Clara Drive (approximately a half acre).

The purpose of the City General Plan is to be a rough blueprint for future development; to conceptually layout the city where various land uses can be located which make sense for traffic flow and compatibility with other land uses. Most of the commercial land area within Santa Clara city is located near the east end of Santa Clara Drive (near the border with St George City), and around the new Harmons store at the corner of Rachel Drive and Pioneer Parkway. Some additional commercial area is proposed within the Santa Clara Historic District along Santa Clara Drive.

Details related to the proposed residential & commercial project would come with a rezoning request since zoning is typically the stage at where proposed project details are brought forth and considered. The General Plan is a conceptual layout of proposed land uses as determined through a planning process ultimately approved by the City Council. However the applicant has a conceptual layout for the project along with conceptual building elevation sketches which he may want to show to the PC and interested neighbors.

Mixed use does envision residential and commercial within that zone. Retail commercial probably would not be successful in that area based upon the studies that SITLA has done.

Kyle Paisley: As a representative for SITLA, I would like to give a slide show presentation for this project and concept ideas. This particular piece of property has a beneficiary of Utah State University. In the early 1990's, the beneficiaries wanted to have more control of those lands.

Our obligations are to report to a board of directors, but no other governmental jurisdictions and need to make the most money we can for that beneficiary. WE have tried over the last several years to be a good neighbors and look at to think how can we best serve our obligation to the beneficiary and also mesh in with Santa Clara City's needs and wants.

The property that is before the Planning commission tonight is the parcel behind the restaurant that is on the corner of Lava Flow Drive and Santa Clara Drive. The traffic studies have shown it is low for commercial and its' visibility and access is less than desirable for commercial and retail functions. There are some grading constraints. There also has been marketing studies done heavily for commercial developing by various groups, but comes back with the result as not really marketable for commercial uses. We want it to be pleasing aesthetically as a gateway to Santa Clara City and enhance existing areas and economic development.

Option #1- It could include a boutique, art & dining spaces with scattering of retail options and are smaller businesses which would mimic the historic design of the area. The pros for this is it could generate traffic and creates a sense of community and place. The cons would be very little market to establish this kind of use and

attracting people to that area. It would also depend on existing traffic and has the potential to kill any existing businesses.

Option #2- Would be one big park and civic use and open space. Maybe a theater or amphitheater. The restaurant existing would be exempt from this or any plan because it is sold and is owned separately. A pro for this option would be its' attractiveness to the City and a big con would be who would pay for such a project to go in and maintain as well as land cost? Downsizing to open space is not really an option for us for profits.

Option #3- This would be residential based for long term housing with various uses and possibilities. It would include amenities. A pro would be that it creates a population mass and achieves our financial goals and obligations. It would have guidelines to adhere to and we are aware of that. That would be considered a con for this option.

Option #4- Is a cultural village and mix of commercial that would include an arts project; such as a live theatre group. It creates a focal point for the city and gives identity to the entrance of the city and will help the historic business to thrive and continue without strict residential properties. A con would be to find a permanent arts theatre group to be there and there would need to be tax increases to help pay for the lands.

Our recommendation is to use option three, which is the all residential. However, option four would be the best suited and preferred for all parties and the most creative and useful for all aspects.

Curtis Jensen: What is the flexibility for price considerations?

Kyle Paisley: Our obligation is full market value and that is done through appraisal. If the adjoining property had some value, it could be considered for the SITLA property. We do not want to be partnership with develops, but basically to sell the parcel off for a development.

Michael Day: It is nice to see the proposals, but for tonight, the topic before us is a General Plan amendment

Curtis Jensen: You are saying the change to the General Plan for this would benefit the City?

Kyle Paisley: Yes.

Jason Lindsey: The plans show residential, but it will not be all residential, correct? Also what about the pan handle section?

Kyle Paisley: Yes. That would probably be landscaping and parking; whereas that would make more sense.

Curtis Jensen: We welcome any public comment at this time.

Bruce Belmont: What about the parcel where the restaurant is at on the corner?

Kyle Paisley: That has been sold to a private party and probably not in the mindset to be required.

Bruce Belmont: I was in opposition of the December 2015 idea of the residential proposal. I am now very pleased with the effort that has been put to re-design and show some viable options.

Jared Purdy: My comments and questions would be if Santa Clara City has limits for any commercial. At the same time, would like the City not short sight any future efforts for this area. Sometime in the future, we will need that area for commercial as we are very limited what commercial zones are around.

It backs up to R-1-10 properties and zoned areas and does need to have some kind of a buffer into transitioning areas. If re-designate the zoning, then we cannot change it back.

Mari Purdy: Are the plans the same for development with small parks or BBQ areas? I do not really see young families wanting to live on the corner because of places to roam.

Kyle Paisley: This is not a concrete plan and it will be the same as before for the time being and we will work with the city for the best option. We first want to create the area and develop from there.

Michael Day: This is an entrance to Santa Clara City and do you think SITLA would mind to extend the historic district into this area?

Kyle Paisley: Absolutely. A use for SITLA and drawing traffic to the area is good and if making it a historic district zoned area and making it work, we would do that.

Curtis Jensen: If there is no further comments, we will close the Public Hearing and move to the General Business section for this item.

B. General Business:

1. Recommendation to City Council for a General Plan Amendment from Main Street Commercial to Mixed Use Residential on a 2.09 acre parcel located on Lava Flow Drive.

Marv Wilson: My first choice was to table this issue to research it further, but having heard the presentation and am fine with the recommendation for this parcel.

Jason Lindsey: In the staff report narrative, it says to develop townhomes or apartments. I am not in favor of apartments, but in favor of townhomes. I am in favor of the General Plan amendment. I would also prefer no types of college housing, but single family residences.

Michael Day: To include this in a historic district for zoning could be an advisory recommendation to the City Council.

Bruce Belmont: I would really like to see a recommendation to include the options presented to include with the General Plan amendment and not include anything further and change the whole corner and not just one parcel.

Marv Wilson: We would need to do that at a different meeting because there is only the one parcel before us and it would need to be noticed properly.

Curtis Jensen: There can also be other options that come forth.

Motion to recommend approval to City Council of a General Plan Amendment from Main Street Commercial to Mixed Use Residential on a 2.09 acre parcel located on Lava Flow Drive with an additional recommendation of using the plans as presented for directions to go forward and then include the 8 acres of SITLA property across the street.

Made by: Marv Wilson, Seconded by: Jason Lindsey

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried.

B. General Business:

4. Recommendation to City Council for Final Plat Amendment for Wendell Gubler Subdivision, located at Truman Drive and Gubler Drive.

Bob Nicholzen: The staff report is as follows:

This is an amended final plat for a 2-lot subdivision in an R-1-10 zone. The amendment includes a lot line adjustment between the two lots, and a reduction in the size of lot 1.

Applicant: Wendell Gubler, property owner

Project Engineer: Rosenberg Associates

The amended 2-lot subdivision proposes to adjust the boundary line between lots 1 & 2, and also reduces the size of Lot #1. Lot #1 will still be large – 1.07 acres, and lot #2 will be 0.65 acres with frontage on Gubler Drive. Lot #2 has 28’ of frontage on Gubler Drive, and also access via a private drive from Truman Drive.

Assuming Mr. Gubler owns both lots, or has a written consent from other owner(s) to amend the plat, then the PC may act on the request without a public hearing. No public hearing is needed as long as all owners within the plat consent to the amendment.

Jared Bates: This is a split off of the developable area.

Marv Wilson: Is the existing house back further?

Corey Bundy: Yes.

Curtis Jensen: Are we ready for a motion?

Motion to recommend approval to City Council for Final Plat Amendment for Wendell Gubler Subdivision, located at Truman Drive and Gubler Drive.

Made by: Michael Day, Seconded by: Marv Wilson

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried.

B. General Business:

5. Request review of Conditional Use Permit, located at Village Rock Pit; north of Pioneer Parkway and Rachel Drive, JP Excavating; Applicant, Melissa Scott; representing.

Corey Bundy: JP Excavating Company was approved in 2013 to operate a gravel pit called the Village Rock gravel pit, which is located on the north side of Pioneer Parkway, and just west of the Entrada development. In 2014 an additional nearby area was added to the gravel pit operation.

On December 8, 2015, their Conditional Use Permit (CUP) was reviewed and renewed for continued operation. JP Excavating is requesting review and renewal of the CUP to continue their operation at this site. The

applicant wants continue as in the past with no crushing on site and watering of the access road to minimize dust. Last year, the Planning Commission asked if there had been any problems associated with this gravel operation and Corey Bundy stated no.

It would be appropriate for the Planning commission to again review and inquire about any problems noted in the past year, particularly any dust problems that have arisen from the gravel operation.

The only request has been to keep site cleaned up and minimal tracking onto Pioneer Parkway and that has continuing to be done.

Curtis Jensen: The City is fine with the renewal request?

Corey Bundy: Yes.

Michael Day: They are not planning to expand?

Taylor Prisbey: I am with JP Excavating and there is not any expansion and the same thing will be done as before.

Marv Wilson: The map does appear that excavation has happened outside. As long as it stays in the agreed area, then I think it is fine.

Corey Bundy: That aerial map is from 2013, but there is not any other expansions of the project.

Curtis Jensen: Who monitors this?

Corey Bundy: I do.

Curtis Jensen: Is it accessed off Pioneer Parkway, and does it conform to the Conditional Use Permit regulations?

Corey Bundy: Yes, it accessed off Pioneer Parkway and JP Excavating main that tracking. Yes, it does meet the requirements for a Conditional Use Permit.

Curtis Jensen: Are we ready for a motion?

Michael Day: I will make a motion that this matter be approved a one year extension for the renewal of a Conditional Use Permit for JP Excavating, located at Village Rock Pit; north of Pioneer Parkway and Rachel Drive.

Motion to approve of Conditional Use Permit, located at Village Rock Pit; north of Pioneer Parkway and Rachel Drive.

Made by: Michael Day, Seconded by: Marv Wilson

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried.

5. Discussion Items

A. Review of GIS mapping for south hills area showing slopes and area that can be considered developable space; Marv Wilson presenting.

Marv Wilson: All of the Planning commission members received emails with a link for GIS mapping for the South Hills area. I created the link in order to give everyone the ability to show percentage slopes the percentage of open space in the area. Our ordinance says 40 percent needs to be open space.

The URL link has the ability to show everything with colors that show the different areas. It also shows where projects could be built on what cannot.

Michael Day: Did the results surprise you after looking at the site in person?

Marv Wilson: No. You are also able to change the colors to better distinguish the different spots. Some of the harder areas to build on is actually private property and not BLM.

6. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve Planning Commission minutes from September 13, 2016

Made by: Michael Day, Seconded by: Jason Lindsey

Voting Aye: All

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried.

7. Adjournment

8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted;

Melodie B. Hayes,
October 11, 2016

Melodie B. Hayes

Melodie B. Hayes, Recording Secretary