

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
AUGUST 4, 1992**

Present: Chairman Jeff Chretien, Kathi izatt, Mick Johnson, Dick Dresher, Mike Holmes, Don Milligan, Mark Green; Barbara Holt, City Council Rep.; Jack Balling, City Engineer; Blaine Gehring, Planning and Redevelopment Director; Jon Reed Boothe, Planning Director; Shirley Chevalier, Recording Secretary

Absent: Elaine McKay

Chairman Chretien called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Minutes of July 21, 1992 were unanimously approved as amended by Dick Dresher, August 18, 1992:

7-21-92.10A Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval for Professional Office, Dresher Associates, the minutes should show that Dick abstained from voting and approval was by majority vote.

Conditional Use:

8-4-92.5A 92-6C Multi-Family Complex, 20 Units, 598 S. 200 E., Mill Hollow Apartments, Joe Lyon, Developer; Jerry Tulley, Planning Consultant

Mr. Lyon is proposing a 20 unit apartment complex on property located in Neighborhood 6 District 2 which allows for mixed use development, commercial/residential, as a conditional use. Ordinance allows a density of 25 units per acre; since the area is .8 of an acre, he is allowed 20 units. The preliminary site plan shows 35 parking stalls for 20 units for a net of 1.75 stalls per unit (1 -1/2 is required by ordinance), 35% of site is landscaped open space (ordinance requires 10%), 8 one bedroom and 12 two bedroom apartments, and detached storage units on the northwest corner of the property. There will be 1/2 story in the ground and 2-1/2 stories above.

This proposal is compatible with adjacent land uses. Apartments adjoining this property to the west have a net density of 18 units per acre, and condominiums on Main Street at almost 27 units per acre. A large commercial complex is located between Main Street and 100 East along the entire frontage of 500 South one block away, and a six-plex apartment building located across the street on 100 East. The Bountiful City office complex is two properties to the south. The Comprehensive Plan recognizes this as a transition area to commercial and office uses. The multi-family residential use is a good buffer between commercial and lower density residential uses.

For final site plan approval, some corrections will be required. The drive access is shown as 22 ft. and needs to be increased to 25 ft. for a minimum depth of 20 ft. to allow vehicles to safely enter and exit the development at the same time; a 6 ft. high solid barrier fence should be built along the south property line. The storage units are set back from the rear property line about 5 ft. which causes two problems; i.e., there will be a strip of ground which will be difficult to maintain in landscaping, and ft leaves only 18 ft. in front of the storage units for access. Staff recommends they be pushed to the back property line allowing a greater access area in front of the storage units. Staff recommends approval subject to the following:

1. A complete site plan submitted for preliminary and final architectural and site plan review including the following:
 - a. The driveway access be changed to a minimum 25 ft. for the first 20 ft. to allow for safer ingress and egress;
 - b. A 6 ft. high solid barrier fence be included along the south property line;
 - c. The storage units be pushed back to property line to allow for better access and to eliminate a maintenance problem.

Neighborhood residents who were present protested the development of 20 units and 2-1/2 story building height. They were concerned of the increased traffic on 100 East and the already heavy traffic on 500 South; whether there were enough parking stalls for the units and visitor parking; tenants on the upper floor being able to look down into their yards; height of the building not being compatible with the single story family residences; devaluation of their property. One neighbor, who opposed in writing, stated the storage units would be "in his back yard". One resident asked what type of barrier would be put on the north and west sides of the property to separate the single family property from the multi-unit building for noise, litter, and light. They would prefer a two story building with 12 to 16 units, and two parking spaces per unit, plus storage for every apartment.

The developers said they will meet the city's requirement for fencing. There are existing fences which could be utilized by being repaired and updated where needed. There is a strip along the north side of the parking to provide some trees for an additional buffer. The lighting will be directed away from the residences and toward the project. Mr. Lyon said they will put lighting in the Garports at the back of the project and the stairwells, which is required by code. Regarding the height, the difference in a two-story building from the ground to a 3 story building with 1/2 story in the ground, is only 4 ft.

As for looking into the neighbor's back yards, the outdoor decks face east and west; the residences immediately adjacent are north and south. There will be some minor windows on the end units; the second floor will have windows that face north and south; the third floor will not.

The storage units will be available for tenants to rent. Mr. Gehring said they would have to be restricted to use just for the apartments and cannot be made available to the general public. There will be no vehicular access to the storage area.

Regarding the increased traffic, City Engineer Jack Balling said 100 East Street is capable of handling the traffic. It is 66 ft. wide, 42 ft. back to back of curb and is capable of carrying 12,000 vehicles per day. It is now carrying approximately 3,000 a day maximum.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved, to close the public hearing at 7:40 PM. Chairman Chretien read two letters received by property owners who could not be at the meeting.

Barbara Holt said she would feel more comfortable with this proposal if it was cut to two stories because it would be more livable with the residents in the area as well as the people who would live in the units.

Dick Drescher suggested more landscape trees on the north and south property lines along with the fence to provide more screening; perhaps set the units back and berm the landscaping in the front; the possibility of enlarging the units and reduce the density (developers said the economics require more density). They feel it is better to have a successful project with an on-site manager, than a marginal project with less units.

Chairman Chretien said personally he is in favor of decreasing the number of units and the height to better fit the surrounding area and alleviate some of the problems that are inherent to multi-family dwellings regardless of where they go.

Mike Holmes said his only concern is the compatibility. He feels the developer has met all the other requirements; the traffic, parking, landscaping, the design of the building, everything is adequate to meet the ordinance, but a 2-1/2 story building is incompatible with the area.

Mike Holmes said he would like to make one of two motions. He would move to table it if the developers would like to take another shot at it, or he will move to deny it if they don't want to take another shot at it. The feeling is incompatibility with the area regarding the number of units and the height. Mr. Lyon said he wanted to leave here with an answer. If they are asked to come back, they would make the same arguments for 20 units again. Mr. Holmes said a denial is not the best thing they can have. It would preclude them from coming back for a year. Mr. Lyon said he would rather have the approval of the project at 16 units and two stories because then they can redo their figures and not have to come back in.

Mike Holmes made a motion to approve subject to the conditions by staff and subject to the building being no higher than 2 stories, and the number of units be limited to 16; Kathi Izatt seconded the motion; Don Milligan asked a question on the motion: on the lower level, will it be 1/2 story underground. The building could be two stories above ground vs 1-1/2. They could put in a basement but it could not be inhabited as living units unless they were part of the 16 allowed by this approval. Dick Drescher asked if we wanted to keep the parking at 1.75 or reduce it. Mike said the ordinance states 1.5 and he would be happy with that. Mr. Lyon said they had already made the decision to go above the 1.5 and they will stay with 1.75. The motion was unanimously approved.

Subdivisions - Final:

8-4-92.7A Eagle Ridge Subdivision, 1400 E. 1000 No., Revised Plan, Preliminary and Final

This item was tabled from the meeting July 21, 1992 so the developer and engineer could work out some details on the proposal; however, no representative for the subdivision showed up this evening.

Miscellaneous:

8-4-92.11 A City Power Department Expansion, Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval, 198 South 200 West

The new substation will be located on the corner of 200 West and 300 South. It is currently being used as a storage yard for equipment and supplies. The Power Dept. will remove the asphalt and build on the site. It will be enclosed with a decorative block wall on two sides, with landscaping around the perimeter. The majority of the site will be in either grass, landscaping, or gravel, requiring no major drainage plans. There will be a minor structure with the majority of the development containing poles, wires, transformers, etc. Landscaping will be along the frontage of 200 West and the parkstrip and area between sidewalk and the wall along 300 South. The masonry wall is proposed to be 6 ft. high with a small imbedded strand of razor wire on top for security. The existing chain link fence to the rear of the property will remain. There will be motion detectors and a video camera for surveillance.

Mick Johnson made a motion to approve; seconded by Barbara Holt; voting was unanimous.

8-4-92.11 B Consider Amending Bountiful City Sign Ordinance, Chapter 11, Section 11 -8029 Political Signs

Mr. Gehring is recommending the size allowed for political signs be changed from 16 sq. ft., which is currently the maximum size allowed in the ordinance, to 32 sq. ft. which seems to be more standard in other communities that were surveyed. Another recommended change is to delete the limit of 100 signs per candidate, and add "No sign shall be located within or over the public right-of-way or in any location which impairs or blocks the clear vision area of intersecting streets or traffic ways."

Following a discussion, it was the consensus of the Planning Commission that 32 sq. ft. was too large. Barbara Holt made a motion to leave the ordinance as is for political signs: seconded by Kathi Izatt; voting was unanimous.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 PM.