

Approved Minutes of the
BOUNTIFUL CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 16, 2021

Present:	Commission Chair	Sean Monson
	Commission Members	Jesse Bell, Jim Clark, Lynn Jacobs (vice-chair), Sharon Spratley, and Councilwoman Kendalyn Harris
	City Attorney	Clinton Drake
	City Engineer	Lloyd Cheney
	Planning Director	Francisco Astorga
	City Planner	Curtis Poole
	Recording Secretary	Darlene Baetz
Excused:	Commission Member	Sam Bawden

1. Welcome.

Chair Monson opened the meeting at 6:30 pm and welcomed all those present.

2. Approval of the minutes for March 2, 2021

MOTION: Commissioner Spratley made a motion to approve the minutes for March 2, 2021 as written. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

3. ROE Apartments – Site plan review for ROE Apartments located at 1350 South 200 West, Hank Nelson, applicant – City Planner Curtis Poole

Hank Nelson was present. City Planner Curtis Poole presented the item.

City Planner Poole indicated that the applicant requests a site plan approval to construct a two-family (duplex) development. Except for a few properties, most properties in this neighborhood are multi-family. Bountiful City code requires site plan review for all multi-family developments.

City Planner Poole indicated that the proposed plans met all setbacks and landscaping. The plans show a two-story building at approximately twenty-six feet (26') and is a mix of cementitious siding (Hardie Board) and stucco. Each of the units would be oriented toward 200 West.

Comments from Bountiful Power were made in a Development Review meeting of a utility pole located inside the northwest corner of the property that would provide service to this development and the existing apartments to the west and requested a ten-foot (10') wide rear yard easement and five (5') side yard easement to be recorded at the County.

City Planner Poole recommended the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to City Council with the following five (5) conditions outlined:

1. Complete all redline corrections.
2. Grant and record utility easements requested by Bountiful Light and Power.
3. Provide elevations and resolve any concerns regarding drainage to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

4. Pay fees and post an acceptable bond in the amount determined by the City Engineer.
5. Sign a Public Improvement Development Agreement.

Mr. Nelson thanked City Planner Poole for all his help with this project.

MOTION: Commissioner Spratley made a motion to forward a recommendation to City Council
Commission Jacobs seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

4. **Continuation - Renaissance Towne Centre – Ordinance Amendment to the current adopted Development Plan (Zoning Map Amendment), Bruce Broadhead, applicant - *Planning Director Francisco Astorga***
 - a. **Public Hearing**
 - b. **Action: Continue the item to the March 16, 2021 meeting, staff requested.**

Bruce Broadhead and Roy Bartee, representing Renaissance Towne Centre were present. Planning Director Francisco Astorga presented the item.

Planning Director Astorga stated this item was a request from the applicant to clarify and clean up the current ordinance. This includes an increase of overall square footage, increase building height of certain buildings, code language clarification, and to change the conceptual photographs/images affecting potential architectural design. He presented a condensed table of proposed changes for the development of this property noting that mixed-use does not necessarily mean a mandatory commercial/retail component.

Planning Director Astorga indicated the following:

- Lot 1, 6 and 7 are already existing buildings.
- Lot 8 is currently approved as a commercial/office building at 2 stories with a maximum height of 42'. Applicant requested an additional 14' in height. Staff recommended an increase to 48' in height which would accommodate a 3-story building.
- Lot 9 is under construction and almost completed.
- Lot 10 is currently approved as a commercial/office building with a maximum of 60' in height. Applicant requested an increase in height to 65'. Staff recommended no change in the approved height.
- Lot 11 is currently approved as a residential/commercial/office building at 8 stories with a maximum height of 110'. Applicant requested an increase in stories at 9 stories. Staff recommended an increase to 9 stories with no change in height with a change in use from office to non-residential mixed-use.
- Lot 13 is currently approved as a restaurant building with a maximum of 2 stories and a maximum of 30' in height. Applicant requested an increase in stories to 4 stories and 56' in height. Staff recommended an increase of maximum of 48' in height which would be able to accommodate a 3-story building. Lot 13 had always been proposed to be developed as a

1 restaurant, however the use of restaurants does not fall in the general commercial code and
2 does not meet the ordinance.
3

- 4 • Lot 14 is currently approved as a residential building with a maximum of 5 stories and
5 maximum height of 65'. Application requested a maximum of 5 stories and an increase in
6 height of 70'. Staff recommended no change to the height maximum.
7
- 8 • Lot 15a and 15b are currently approved as a restaurant building with a maximum of 2 stories
9 and 32' in height. Applicant requested a maximum of 4 stories and 56'. Staff recommended
10 an increase in height of 48' which would be able to accommodate a 3-story building.
11
- 12 • Lot 16 is currently approved as a residential building with a maximum of 4 stories and a
13 maximum height of 45'. Applicant requested an increase in height of 56'. Staff recommended
14 no change to height maximum.
15
- 16 • Lot 17 and 18 – currently approved as a restaurant use with a maximum of 2 stories and a 30'
17 maximum in height. Applicant requested an increase in stories to 4 stories and a maximum
18 height of 56'. Staff recommended an increase of 48' in height which would accommodate a
19 3-story building.
20
- 21 • Lot 19 – currently approved as a residential building with a maximum of 2 stories and a
22 maximum of 42' height. Applicant requested an increase to 4 stories and a maximum of 56'
23 in height. Staff recommended an increase to 48' which would accommodate a 3-story
24 building.
25
- 26 • The proposed amendment does not affect the Design Standards or Pedestrian Circulation that
27 was approved in the 2019 Ordinance (Zoning Map Amendment and Development Plan).
28

29 Chair Monson opened and closed the public hearing at 7:26 p.m. without any comments.
30

31 Mr. Bartee stated that this ordinance amendment is a change to the general master plan for these
32 properties. The proposed current square footage will be able to meet the parking requirements and
33 currently exceeds the required parking requirements. The specific approvals and requirements for
34 each building including the parking would be approved as each lot is brought forward for approval
35 with Planning Commission and City Council.
36

37 Mr. Broadhead stated that the intent of the ordinance amendment is not to have major changes but
38 wanted to clarify their intentions for this project. The proposed changes are to be used to allow more
39 flexibility for development and the proposed uses and would like clarification for potential height and
40 number of stories.
41

42 Commissioner Spratley was concerned about the height restrictions and hesitant to approve any
43 changes in light of the exhaustive analysis and extensive public input done previously from prior
44 hearings. She had a concern for the residents that have a proximity for the residents parking spaces.
45 The Commission and Council put a lot of thought and care for the approvals at previous meetings.
46 She felt okay with the changes to the uses.
47

1 Commissioner Bell was also concerned about the height and the ability for a walkable community.
2 It is important to have a master plan and be able to share the vision of this project.

3
4 Planning Director Astorga met with a number of concerned citizens in the Planning offices to discuss
5 the proposed changes with them.

6
7 Chair Monson agreed to the changes in the uses but was concerned about the proposed height changes.

8
9 Commissioner Jacobs stated that he likes the project and the idea of the transit system at this location
10 but does not want to make a number of changes so fast. He discussed concern for pedestrian
11 walkways.

12
13 The Planning Commission and Planning Director Astorga did not feel that the changes of uses would
14 be detrimental to the project but felt that a minimum of 2 lots be approved for restaurants.

15
16 MOTION: Commissioner Spratley made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to City
17 Council to amend the requested uses as proposed, maintain the already approved height limits in feet
18 and remove stories/floors, and let building code prevail. Her motion also included that at least 2 pads
19 should be used as restaurants with a minimum of 14,200 square feet. City Council has the option to
20 revisit the issue of the walkability for the west side of the property.

21
22 Commissioner Clark seconded the motion.

23
24 Commissioners discussed the concern for the lack of sidewalk on the west side of the property. Mr.
25 Broadhead noted a portion of the west side of the property is not owned by him. Planning Director
26 Astorga noted the pedestrian walkways are not intended to be changed.

27
28 VOTE: The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

29
30 **5. Omnibus Land Use Code Text Amendment – *City Planner Curtis Poole and Planning Director***
31 ***Francisco Astorga.***

32
33 City Planner Curtis Poole presented the item. He indicated that the proposed omnibus amendment
34 covers various sections of the Land Use Code and is reviewed with Commission and Council on a
35 regular basis. These changes include accuracy and clarification to the existing code. City Planner
36 Poole indicated the following changes:

- 37
38 1. Building Height
39 Remove the text of two (2) stories in Single Family and Multi-family zone and leave the height
40 of the building at thirty-five (35) ft.
41 2. Non-conforming
42 Clarification to the non-complying and non-conforming language. A non-conforming site is to
43 be reduced and mitigate the use of the previous use. The removal of the references to definitions
44 that were not listed in the code.
45 3. Home occupation – Day Care
46 Correction to the language of the number of children.
47 4. Mixed -Use Zone
48 Clarification of open spaces or public space in the Mixed-use zone.

- 1 5. Mixed-Use Zone (Uses)
- 2 Clarification of the sub-zone designations.
- 3 6. Planning Commission Voting
- 4 Clarification of language for voting requirements must have a majority of the number of Planning
- 5 Commissioners attending the meeting.
- 6 7. Shipping Container
- 7 Clarification of the zone the containers are allowed and the regulations for the container.
- 8 8. Location of Street Trees
- 9 Additional language for the location of street trees.
- 10 9. Access Requirements
- 11 Additional item clarifying the removal and replacement of an abandoned existing driveway.
- 12 10. Site Plan Review Application Submittal
- 13 Clarification to the preliminary site plan review and the addition to include submittal of the
- 14 purpose and a survey to be required.
- 15

16 *Councilwoman Harris left meeting at 9:23 p.m.*

17
18 City Planner Poole recommended the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to
19 City Council.

20
21 Chair Monson opened and closed the public hearing at 9:30 p.m. without any comment.

22
23 Commissioner Bell discussed the approved street tree list. Planning Director Astorga suggested the
24 list should be reviewed to ensure the proper trees would be given as the standard for street trees. This
25 review would need to include individuals with expertise in landscaping and horticulture.

26
27 Commissioner Bell questioned how the shipping containers would apply to sheds and accessory
28 structures and did not feel like the proposed amendment provided language that would regulate how
29 these situations would be addressed. City Planner Poole explained this amendment has come from
30 many requests from residents to build with shipping containers, which may reduce the cost of building
31 a new home and suggested the Commission remove item 7 and have staff come back later with
32 language to address the concern.

33
34 MOTION: Commissioner Spratley made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to City
35 Council for all items excluding item seven (7). Commissioner Jacobs seconded the motion.

36 VOTE: The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

37
38 MOTION: Commissioner Bell made a motion to adjourn. Chair Monson seconded the motion.

39 VOTE: The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

40
41 The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

42
43
44 
45 _____
Sean Monson
Planning Commission Chair

