

1 **Bountiful City Planning Commission**

2 **Approved Minutes**

3 **June 2, 2020**

4  
5 *This meeting was viewed by Planning Commission members, staff and residents via video conference*  
6 *meeting (Zoom) and in person.*

7  
8 Present: Chair Sean Monson; Vice Chair Jesse Bell; Planning Commission Members – Sam Bawden,  
9 Jim Clark, Lynn Jacobs and Sharon Spratley; Councilwoman Kendalyn Harris; City  
10 Attorney Clint Drake; City Engineer Lloyd Cheney; Planning Director Francisco Astorga;  
11 City Planner Curtis Poole and Recording Secretary Darlene Baetz

12  
13 **1. Welcome and Introductions.**

14  
15 Chair Monson opened the meeting at 6:32 pm and welcomed all those present.

16  
17 **2. Approval of the minutes for May 5, 2020.**

18  
19 Commissioner Spratley made a motion to approve the minutes for April 7, 2020 with two  
20 corrections. First correction is on Page 4 and Paragraph 5 should read “*Staff recommends that the*  
21 *Planning Commission forward to the City Council ~~and~~ a positive recommendation...*” Second  
22 correction is on Page 13 and Paragraph 4 should read “*Commissioner Jacobs ....with the ~~one~~ three*  
23 *(3) conditions outlined by staff.*” Commissioner Clark seconded the motion.

24  
25 Voting passed 6-0 with Commission members Bawden, Bell, Clark, Jacobs, and Spratley voting  
26 aye. With Councilwoman Harris abstaining

27  
28 **3. *APPLICATION WITHDRAWN* - Consider approval of a Variance – Setback for front yard –**  
29 **building a two-car garage, located at 1337 S Orchard Dr, Alison Neville and William Wilson,**  
30 **applicant.**

31  
32 **4. PUBLIC HEARING – Consider approval of a Variance - Allow construction of a single-**  
33 **family dwelling on slopes 30% or greater, located at 2955 S Maple Cove Ln, Charles Dickson,**  
34 **applicant.**

35  
36 Charles Dickson was present. Curtis Poole presented the staff report.

37  
38 Mr. Poole stated the applicant has requested to build the driveway in the slope greater than 30%  
39 with the home is to be built in the slopes less than 30%. He discussed the state requirements to  
40 meet a variance if they were to build the driveway in the slopes greater than 30%:

- 41  
42 1. If the property owner builds closer to Maple Cove they would be on the steeper slopes  
43 and would need to remove a significant amount of trees.  
44 2. The Planning Commission has granted approvals with other properties in this same area.  
45 3. The proposed retaining walls will not be greater than 10 feet with this variance. Any  
46 additional retaining walls over 10 feet would require an additional variance and retaining  
47 walls under would require an additional building permit.  
48 4. The intention of the City is to have the properties developed. This would allow this  
49 property owner to build on their land.  
50  
51

1 Based on analysis of the required criteria from State law included in the findings in the staff report  
2 and the materials submitted by the Application, Staff recommends the Planning Commission grant  
3 the requested Variance related to encroachments on slopes greater than thirty (30) percent with the  
4 following conditions:

- 5  
6 1. The Applicant will continue to work with City Staff to ensure the final plans submitted will  
7 meet the standards for building in the R-F Zone, in particular the impact of retaining walls and  
8 building on slopes greater than thirty (30) percent should be minimal.  
9 2. In addition to a building permit, the Applicant shall apply for a separate permit for any retaining  
10 walls taller than four (4) feet not exceeding ten (10) feet.

11  
12 Commissioner Bawden asked for verification of the minimized cut of the driveway Is there a  
13 concern for both driveways side by side off the cul-de-sac. Mr. Poole stated Planning does not have  
14 any concern. Mr. Cheney noted the Fire Marshall will review the building permit. He stated that  
15 having the Fire Marshall's approval is standard for driveways over 150 feet.

16  
17 Mr. Poole stated this lot is part of the original Deer Hollow Subdivision.

18  
19 Chair Monson opened and closed the **PUBLIC HEARING** at 6:53 without comment.

20  
21 Staff received two (2) concerns received into the Planning Office just prior to the meeting. One  
22 from Mr. Canon that was in opposition of construction at this site and one from Mr. Kilpack was  
23 concerned about possible erosion but has reviewed the staff report and is now in favor of the project

24  
25 Mr. Dickson thanked the Commission members and staff for hearing this item. He wanted to work  
26 with the land and to have the least impact to the property.

27  
28 Mr. Cheney stated that the house could be moved a little bit to the North East but the driveway  
29 would still not be able to minimize building in the 30% slopes.

30  
31 ***Councilwoman Harris was excused from the meeting on Zoom.***

32  
33 Commissioner Spratley made a motion of approval to the Variance at 2955 South Maple Cove Lane  
34 with the five criteria met and the two (2) conditions outlined by staff. Commissioner Clark  
35 seconded the motion.

36  
37 Voting passed 6-0 with Commission members Bawden, Bell, Clark, Jacobs, Monson and Spratley  
38 voting aye.

- 39  
40 **5. PUBLIC HEARING – Consider forwarding a recommendation to the City Council - City**  
41 **Power Lofts Rezone of General Commercial (C-G) to Mixed Use Residential (MXD-R),**  
42 **located at 189 South 200 West, Brian Knowlton representing Hepworth Investment Group**  
43 **LLC, applicant.**

44  
45 Brian Knowlton was present. Francisco Astorga presented the staff report.

46  
47 The applicant has submitted a Zone Map Amendment Request for the site on the corner of 200  
48 West and 200 South. The request is to amend the zoning designation of this property consisting of

1 approximately one half (1/2) acre from General Commercial (C-G) to Mixed Use Residential  
2 (MXD-R). Surrounding uses are of a commercial, industrial, and residential nature along 200 West  
3 and residential along 200 South.

4  
5 Mr. Astorga discussed:

6  
7 Site Characteristics which included the typical site zoned MXD shall encompass at least five (5)  
8 acres; however, smaller projects that demonstrate outstanding characteristics may also be  
9 considered. Sites zoned MXD should be adjacent to major automobile and public transit corridors,  
10 and should have direct access to both. The subject site is less than five (5) acres, and is adjacent to  
11 major automobile corridor (200 West) and is within two (2) blocks of Main Street, a public transit  
12 corridor.

13  
14 Sub-Zone Standards which included percentages based on the total square footage of floor area  
15 within a project and include areas within a structure (floors of a building) and areas on the surface  
16 of the land (sidewalks, parks, etc.) Parking, landscaping, and similar ancillary uses are calculated on  
17 a pro-rated basis for each use category.

18  
19 MXD-R 50% - 75% sq ft in residential uses - Applicant has requested this zone.

20  
21 Applicant proposes the MXD-R designation with the majority being residential. The ground level  
22 is proposed to be a commercial use consisting of 1,434 square feet and the exterior plaza area  
23 consisting of 3,699 square feet which equates to 27%. The residential component adds up to 13,761  
24 square feet which equates to 73%.

25  
26 Default Setbacks & Height Limitations – Mr. Astorga discussed the setbacks and the parameters  
27 that staff starts with in the code.

28

29	Default Standards		Proposal
30	Minimum building setback	30 feet	20 feet from 200 West and 200 South
31	Maximum building setback	50 feet	55 feet from north property line (side)
32	Minimum building separation	20 feet	Not applicable, one building onsite
33	Maximum building separation	40 feet	Not applicable, one building onsite
34	Minimum building height	20 feet	To comply with default building height
35	Maximum building height	35 feet	To comply with default building height

36

37 Development Characteristic

38  
39 Uses may be mixed within a building or within an overall development, or both. However, the City  
40 encourages mixing uses within a building as much as possible. The proposal complies with this  
41 mixed-use provision. Developments within an MXD zone shall exhibit urban characteristics such  
42 as Wide sidewalks, Street trees and street furniture, Community gathering spaces, Shared parking,  
43 Integrated public transit (where available and/or anticipated) and Diverse and distinctive design  
44 features.

45  
46 The proposal incorporates most listed urban characteristics. The applicant is not requesting a  
47 parking reduction and will be meeting the parking requirements from the code. Because this is a  
48 small parcel, the staff does not find that a pedestrian study is required.

1  
2 Mr. Astorga discussed the site plan, elevations and the options for types of commercial businesses.

3  
4 The proposal is generally consistent with the overall goals and policies of the General Plan for the  
5 area. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the request, hold the required public  
6 hearing, and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council based on the findings of fact  
7 found throughout this staff report and the drafted ordinance.

8  
9 Chair Monson asked for verification of the flexibility to these policies that the Commission has.  
10 Mr. Astorga stated that the Master Development plan has flexibility towards setback, height and  
11 parking requirements which is tied to the legislative zone change process.

12  
13 Commissioner Jacobs asked about the cross walk across 200 West that was asked about in the email  
14 from Krissy Gilmore. There was discussion from the Commission members about the possibility of  
15 adding a crosswalk near the Maverick. Mr. Cheney stated the process for crosswalk approval  
16 would go thru the Traffic Safety Committee and a recommendation would be passed on to the City  
17 Council.

18  
19 Chair Monson opened the **PUBLIC HEARING** at 7:30 p.m.

20  
21 Kort Delost resides at 310 S 750 E. Mr. Delost asked for verification on the parking arrangements.  
22 Mr. Astorga stated the developer has met the requirements for the parking and will assign and  
23 manage the parking for the commercial units.

24  
25 *Councilwoman Harris arrived at the meeting in person.*

26  
27 Sharman Smoot owns the property east of the proposed zone change at 166 West 200 South. Mr.  
28 Smoot discussed the history of this parcel and that it was previously owned by Mrs. Sessions. He  
29 stated his approval for this project.

30  
31 Ryan Stuart resides at 360 N 100 E. Mr. Stuart noted the developer didn't ask for any increase in  
32 height or changes and stated his approval for this project.

33  
34 Chair Monson closed the **PUBLIC HEARING** at 7:40 p.m.

35  
36 Mr. Astorga noted there was a comment from the Power Department about the name of the project.  
37 Mr. Knowlton discussed the decision of the name of the project and that it could be changed if  
38 necessary but wanted to give a name that complemented the Power Department next door.

39  
40 Commissioner Bell complemented the developer on the look of the project.

41 Commissioner Bawden stated how pleased he was with how the developer stayed within the  
42 setbacks.

43  
44 Ms. Spratley stated how pleased she is with the project but is concerned about the direction of this  
45 small zone changes and setting a precedence. Mr. Astorga doesn't believe that it will but would  
46 like to have more discussion with the Planning Commission members at a later date to see what  
47 direction the City should go.  
48

1 Commissioner Jacobs made a motion to forward a recommendation to City Council of approval for  
2 the - City Power Lofts Rezone of General Commercial (C-G) to Mixed Use Residential (MXD-R),  
3 located at 189 South 200 West outlined by staff. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion.  
4

5 Voting passed 7-0 with Commission members Bawden, Bell, Clark, Harris, Jacobs, Monson, and  
6 Spratley voting aye.  
7

8 **6. Consider forwarding a recommendation to the City Council – Stone Creek Estates**  
9 **Subdivision – Phase 3 Preliminary Subdivision consisting of 9 Single Family lots, located at**  
10 **1589 E Bountiful Blvd, Brock Johnston, applicant.**  
11

12 Brock Johnston was present. Lloyd Cheney presented the staff report.  
13

14 Rainey Homes is requesting Final Approval of the third phase of the Stone Creek Estates  
15 Subdivision. The original overall development plan was reviewed by the Planning Commission and  
16 given preliminary approval by the City Council in September, 2017. Phases 1 and 2 were given  
17 final approval in May 2018, with construction occurring in 2018 and 2019. As currently proposed,  
18 the third phase will construct the cul-de-sac on the north side of Bountiful Blvd which was  
19 identified as the fourth and final phase of the original subdivision phasing plan. Rainey has not  
20 purchased the eastern-most portion of the Keller property which was originally indicated as the  
21 third phase of the development, and is thereby requesting the revised phasing plan.  
22

23 Mr. Cheney discussed due to the grading which is required to construct the entrance to the cul-de-  
24 sac from Bountiful Blvd, access for Lot 301 will be limited to the eastern portion of the Bountiful  
25 Blvd side. Lot 308 should only be restricted to access from the cul-de-sac to avoid conflicts with  
26 traffic on Bountiful Blvd. Access to the building pad on Lot 302 will be challenging because of the  
27 cut slope created by the grading required to construct the roadway.  
28

29 Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation for final approval  
30 of Phase 3 of the Stone Creek Estates Subdivision to the City Council with the following seven (7)  
31 conditions:  
32

- 33 1. Complete redline corrections for minor issues on the plat, including the identification of  
34 building pad locations.
- 35 2. Provide a current title report.
- 36 3. Complete any minor redline corrections on the construction drawings.
- 37 4. Pay the Storm Water Impact Fee of \$2,100 per acre.
- 38 5. Prepare a SWPPP, obtain all necessary storm water permits, and post a storm water bond as  
39 required by City Ordinance.
- 40 6. Post the required Bond for the construction of public improvements and pay the fees as  
41 determined by the City Engineer.
- 42 7. Enter into a Development Improvement Agreement.  
43

44 Mr. Cheney stated the set of plans has a correction from the Phase 4 numbering to Phase 3  
45 numbering.  
46

47 Mr. Johnston discussed the issue of the access for the properties that is needed for the completion of  
48 the new Phase 4. He has been working with the property owners and is trying to help facilitate a

1 needed easement. Rainey Homes still has the intent to donate land along the Stone Creek bed that  
2 will be dedicated to the City for additional trails use.

3  
4 Commissioner Spratley made a motion to forward a recommendation to City Council of approval  
5 for the final Subdivision of Stone Creek Estates Phase 3 with the seven (7) conditions outlined by  
6 staff. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion.

7  
8 Voting passed 7-0 with Commission members Bawden, Bell, Clark, Harris, Jacobs, Monson, and  
9 Spratley voting aye.

10  
11 **7. Consider forwarding a recommendation to the City Council – Renaissance Pad 16 (Lot 12)**  
12 **Final Architectural & Site Plan Review of a 30 unit building, located at 1771 S Renaissance**  
13 **Towne Drive, Bruce Broadhead/Brian Knowlton/Randy Beyer, applicant.**

14  
15 Bruce Broadhead and Brian Knowlton were present. Francisco Astorga presented the staff report.

16  
17 The applicant has updated the landscaping and building façade material.

18  
19 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City  
20 Council of the Renaissance Towne Centre Pad Site 16 (Lot 12) Final Architectural and Site Plan  
21 Review for the proposed 30 unit Multi-Family Residential development subject to the following  
22 condition:

- 23  
24 1. Complete any and all redline corrections.

25  
26 Commissioner Bell appreciated the attention for the revisions on the site plan on the placement of  
27 the walk ways, plaza area, landscaping and table and benches.

28  
29 Commissioner Bell made a motion to forward a recommendation to City Council of approval for  
30 the Final Architectural & Site Plan Review of a 30 unit building, located at 1771 S Renaissance  
31 Towne Drive with the one (1) condition outlined by staff. Commissioner Jacobs seconded the  
32 motion.

33  
34 Voting passed 7-0 with Commission members Bawden, Bell, Clark, Harris, Jacobs, Monson, and  
35 Spratley voting aye.

36  
37 **8. Consider approval in *written form* of a Conditional Use Permit for Cottages on Main - 22**  
38 **single-family dwellings, located at 1295 N Main Street.**

39  
40 Commissioner Spratley made a motion to approve the written form for the Conditional Use Permit  
41 of Cottage on Main – 22 single-family dwellings, located at 1295 N Main St with the correction of  
42 the address. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion.

43  
44 Voting passed 7-0 with Commission members Bawden, Bell, Clark, Harris, Jacobs, Monson and  
45 Spratley voting aye.

46  
47 **9. WORK SESSION – Potential changes to the standards of the Hospital Zone.**  
48

1            *Commissioner Clark made a disclosure that he lives adjacent to the Hospital zone.*

2  
3            Curtis Poole showed a presentation to the Planning Commission members.

- 4  
5            1. Discussed the current properties in the Hospital zone in Bountiful including the large number of  
6            vacant offices. Combined properties in the Hospital zone have approximately 1200 employees.  
7            The hospital has plans to expand both services and property.  
8            2. Compared other cities that are equal in size to Bountiful, including Murray, Layton,  
9  
10            a. Murray is similar to Bountiful in size and population. The city does not have a separate  
11            hospital zone but has a commercial zone.  
12            b. Logan has a regional hospital and has a hospital overlay.  
13            c. Layton does not have a separate hospital zone. The city has a commercial zone and is  
14            based on a conditional use.  
15            d. Provo has a health care zone and is smaller in size than Bountiful. The city does have a  
16            increase in height of buildings.  
17  
18            3. Discussed four (4) options for the current Bountiful Hospital zone.  
19            a. No Changes  
20            b. Keep the Hospital Zone Designation with no changes to boundaries. Change Uses and  
21            Standards with the zone. Add uses that would be compatible to the other businesses.  
22            c. Eliminate the Hospital Zone Designation – this might increase the height approvals.  
23            d. Combination of Option a and b – leaving the zone intact and allow the uses to remain as  
24            is with an overlay and would be able to entertain other options.  
25

26            Commissioner Clark asked if staff knew why the medical offices have been moving outside of the  
27            Hospital zone. Mr. Poole stated the visibility and options available in the commercial zone. The  
28            Hospital zone is more restrictive with the type of businesses allowed in this zone.  
29

30            Commissioner Jacobs discussed the amount of traffic needed in the Hospital zone is high. Before  
31            any changes are made to the code, the City should think about how these changes will affect any  
32            expansions to the current businesses. He would like to see more flexibility in this zone.  
33

34            Councilwoman Harris stated the commercial zone has signage that is more visible than the Hospital  
35            zone.  
36

37            Dr. Ward and Ms. Ward stated they would like to see more of a professional zone which would give  
38            the zone more flexibility allowing professional businesses with possible restaurants. There is a  
39            signage limitation for the Hospital zone that is affecting the businesses leasing space. Currently  
40            there is more technology for the production of signs and the look of them.  
41

42            Mr. Poole stated that any changes made for this zone can be made to the uses and/or standards.  
43

44            Commission Bell wants the City to look at what this area should be in the future. Believes this zone  
45            has great opportunity and the City should make sure that we take the time for these changes.  
46            Maybe we should allow the market to dictate the flexibility of the business.  
47

48            Mr. Astorga would like to propose that we move forward with an amendment to the signage for the



1 Hospital zone. This would allow staff the time to continue forward with the next step for the  
2 designation and requirements for this zone. The Commission agreed with this course of action.  
3

4 **10. Director's report, review of pending applications and miscellaneous business.**  
5

6 Mr. Astorga reported the next Planning Commission will be on July 7, 2020.  
7

8  
9 Chairman Monson ascertained there were no other items to discuss. The meeting was adjourned at  
10 9:15 p.m.  
11

12   
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 Sean Monson  
Planning Commission Chairman