

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

November 6, 1990

Present: Chairman Cheryl Okubo, Berwyn Andrus, Elaine McKay, Kathi Izatt, Jeff Chretien; Les Foy, City Council Rep. ; Jack Balling, City Engineer; Jon Reed Boothe, Planning Director

Excused: Mike Holmes

Absent: Mick Johnson, Dick Dresher

Invocation: Berwyn Andrus

Minutes of October 16, 1990 were unanimously approved as amended: 1st line, 2nd paragraph, 2nd page: "It was suggested that a (insert) chainlink fence with slats", etc.

Conditional Use:

11-6-90.5A 90-9C Private School/Day Care, 880 So. Main Carryover from October 16th meeting. Mike Youngberg, Petitioner

Petitioner not present. Mrs. Carole Fowler, 58 W. 900 So. was present representing five families whose property is adjacent to two sides of the property in question. At the meeting of October 16, 1990, Mrs. Youngberg was advised of several items that needed clarification before the Planning Commission could approve the conditional use permit. Inasmuch as neither Mr. or Mrs. Youngberg attended the meeting this evening, it was assumed they no longer wished to pursue this request. Therefore, due to the lack of information as requested, Les Foy made a motion to deny; seconded by Jeff Chretien; voting was unanimous.

11-6-90-.5B 90-11C Storage Building, 446 W. 1250 So. Lynn Dixon, Owner

Mr. Dixon proposes to build a 3200 sq. ft. private storage facility in Fordham Commercial Park to store his car collection. Staff informed the Planning Commission that his plans did not show the drainage plan, landscaping is deficient in the 10% required by ordinance, and there were no contour drawings or site elevations. The plans have to meet all requirements of the Uniform Building Code and are to be stamped by a licensed architect or engineer. Staff did not have access to the plans until Mr. Dixon brought them into the meeting.

There was concern as to whether or not the Planning Commission could review this application without adequate plans, but the hearing can be held, and approval can be given subject to conditions. No one was present in the audience regarding this application.

Les Foy made a motion to grant the conditional use permit for private use of a commercial building, subject to the requirements that have been outlined by staff; i.e., all provisions in the preliminary plan review, Chapters 12 and 12.1 of the zoning ordinance; plans to meet all requirements of the Uniform Building Code, payment of all required fees; submit a storm detention plan or pay the fees; and any other requirements contained in the city ordinances; Berwyn Andrus seconded the motion; Kathi Izatt opposed; approval was by majority vote.

Subdivisions - Preliminary:

11-6-90.6A Temple Hills Estates Plat A, Amended, 500 S. 1450 E. Cancelled.

11-6-90.6B Temple Hills Estates Plat B, 16 lots, 500 S. 1450 E., Dean Hill

Plat A was given approval in August, 1990 for the 16 lots to the west. Plat B consists of the east 16 lots. The land has an average slope of 23% which requires a minimum lot size of 20,000 sq. ft. Lots 17 through 22 do not meet the 20,000 sq. ft. minimum area. The developers would like to add these six lots to Plat A approval which would reduce the minimum lot area to 16,000 sq. ft., since the average slope of Plat A plus the six lots (17 through 22) would be between 15% to 20%. This would give a good transition as the development proceeds eastward (12,000 in Plat A, 16,000 in the middle six lot area, and 20,000 in the east Plat B section).

The cuts and fills exceed the ordinance requirements of 10 ft. In order to construct the cul-de-sac in the eastern section, cuts will be made up to 20 ft. along the frontage of lots 25 and 26. Cuts in lot 27 will exceed 10 ft. There will be a substantial amount of grading in this area.

The proposed grade on the road leading into the cul-de-sac is 15%, which exceeds the 12% grade requirement of the ordinance. The Planning Commission and City Council may allow 15% grade. If the grade was reduced to 12%, the cuts over 10 ft. would extend along lots 25, 26, 27 and 28, and the earthwork would be enlarged to cover all of the east lots. Instead of 20 ft. cuts it could go up to 30 ft. of cut in the lower region. On the east side it would be up to about 10 ft. into the cul-de-sac, compared to 5 or 6 ft. now, with 6 or 7 ft. of fill on the west side. If the cul-de-sac was eliminated, they could meet all the requirements for the existing grades, which would eliminate a lot of the problems, and the requirements of the Foothill Ordinance would be met. There would not be any cuts in excess of 10 ft., and no grades over 12%.

Lots 30, 31, and 32 have double frontage on two streets. The Planning Commission may make an exception to the ordinance since this is an unusual topographic condition.

Staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Lots 17 through 22 be allowed to have a minimum area of 16,000 sq. ft.;
2. Exceptions be granted for excessive cuts on lots 25, 26, 27 and 28; allowance of 15% grade on cul-de-sac road; allowance of double frontage for lots 30, 31, and 32.

Kathi Izatt made a motion to table this matter until the Planning Commission and staff can take a field trip to the site; Elaine McKay seconded the motion; voting was unanimous.

The field trip is scheduled at 4:00 PM, November 20th; everyone to meet at City Hall.

Miscellaneous:

- A. Socio-Cultural Report, Elaine McKay

It is recommended that Bountiful City make its existing recreational facilities more readily available to the high schools. There is very good rapport between the city and the Davis County school system in allowing use of the swimming pool, tennis courts, and other facilities. In return the schools allow use of the gymnasiums and their facilities for city programs. Davis County school officials feel, however, that the city needs to expand its own facilities.

There are target groups for whom increased educational opportunity should be provided, i.e., high school students and graduates, adults, and senior citizens. Many of these needs are met by the Davis County School District and could be deleted from the Master Plan.

The library is a county facility, built on city deeded property. It serves 92,517 active cardholders. When the library was built, 1973-74, Bountiful City donated approximately \$40,000 from the taxpayers to help stock the library. Within the next 10 years the library is looking at state funding. The city should look at deleting, in the Master Plan revision, any further expanding of the library system in Bountiful by supplementing Davis County facilities.

Bountiful should arrange the provision of special programs for gifted children with the Davis County School District. (There are programs at a couple of Jr. high schools and Washington and Valley View elementary schools.) In a revised Master Plan, this could be deleted.

On city government level, there is very little that could be done in the area of education or the social interaction.

Socio-Cultural: 1. No evidence that the city, through the media or billboard advertising, encourages minority recognition or awareness and their rights; 2. No such community service council emerged; 3. All matters of city government were decided on the basis of sound management and were fair and equitable to all systems of our community regardless of race or religion; 4. Cultural exchange projects: nothing of a permanent and ongoing nature, but there is the Bountiful Sister City program and the Arts Festival; 5. There was no information available regarding a Bountiful Citizens, Council (since 1978). There were two groups, Charettes and a Downtown Development Committee, but they are no longer active.

The impact is in the area of cultural needs: 1. A cultural center; 2. A cultural recreation park; 3. An open air amphitheater; 4. An indoor sports complex facility similar to the Deseret Gym.

Planning Commission could recommend reserving Block 29 as a civic center when revising the Comprehensive Master Plan. It is a grass roots effort and funds are needed. There is a need for a volunteer citizens group whose sole purpose is to see that we have a civic center. This could be an agenda item for City Council.

It was suggested that each Planning Commission member list 10 names of people who would work toward organizing a citizens group, and submit these names to Elaine McKay by Friday, November 9, 1990.

11-6-90.11B Discussion re height of single family homes. Cancelled.

11-6-90.11C Discussion re future plans, Cheryl Okubo.

Cheryl has asked Mr. Boothe to provide the Planning Commission with training on the different ordinances they need to become more familiar with. The first will be the Foothill Ordinance.

Miscellaneous

#### A. SOCIO-CULTURAL REPORT, Elaine McKay

EDUCATION: E-1. Writers of the 1978 Bountiful Comprehensive Plan recommended that Bountiful City make its existing recreational facilities more readily available to the high schools. Currently, a very good rapport exists between the city and the Davis County school system in allowing use of the swimming pool, tennis courts, and other facilities. In return, schools allow use of gymnasiums and their facilities for city programs. Davis County school officials feel, however, that the city needs to expand its own facilities.

E-2. The Comprehensive Plan named target groups for whom increased educational opportunity be provided: high school students and graduates, adults, and senior citizens. Many of these needs are now met by Davis County School District. Item E-2 could therefore be deleted.

E-3. The library is a county facility, built on city deeded property. It serves 92,512 active cardholders. When the library was built in 1973-74, Bountiful City donated approximately \$40,000 from the taxpayers to help stock the library. The library may soon qualify for state funds after staff members have prepared and submitted a 10-year plan. Since the library is a county facility, Item E-3 could be deleted from the Bountiful Comprehensive Plan.

E-4. The 1978 Plan recommended that Bountiful and the Davis County School District provide programs for gifted children. Currently, programs are available at Washington and Valley View elementary schools. Two Junior High schools have tracking programs. Bountiful City had no input into these programs. Item E-4 could be deleted.

SOCIO-INTERACTION: S-1. No evidence that the city fostered an awareness of community needs or, through the media or billboard advertising, encouraged minority recognition or rights.

S-2. No such community service council emerged. S-3. Apparently, matters of city government have been decided on the basis of sound management and were fair and equitable to all citizens of our community, regardless of race or religion. S-4. Cultural exchange projects: Nothing of a permanent nature is sponsored by the city to encourage social interaction within the city, but there is the Bountiful Sister City program and the Arts Festival. There is no information available regarding an ongoing Bountiful Citizen's Council (since 1978). There were two groups, Charettes and a Downtown Development Committee, but they are no longer active.

CULTURAL NEEDS: In 1978, the following needs were listed. C-1.

A Cultural Center. C-2. Large Cultural/Recreational Park. C-3. open-Air Amphitheater. C-4. Indoor Sports Complex. C-5. Suggested that the city facilitate communication between city, church and school personnel to increase community use of existing facilities.

In summary, except for expanding its own facilities and the sharing of existing facilities (E-1), city government is somewhat limited as to its direct impact upon EDUCATION. As for the 1978 SOCIO- INTERACTION recommendations, it's difficult to measure to what extent city government officials adopted or achieved these goals. But clearly, city government has had insufficient impact in meeting CULTURAL NEEDS as outlined in 1978. The focus should now be in the area of CULTURAL NEEDS, where the city government has both power and responsibility--and could make a measurable difference. Future generations may suffer if present planners ignore today's obvious and urgent needs.

The Planning Commission could recommend reserving Block 29 for a Civic Center for Recreational, Cultural, and Performing Arts. If the Center is to become a reality--citizen awareness, grass roots effort, and private funds are necessary. Bountiful needs a volunteer citizen's group whose sole purpose is to see that the city has a Civic Center. This could be an agenda item for City Council.

It was suggested that each Planning Commission member list 10 people who would work toward organizing a citizen's group and submit these names to Elaine McKay by Friday, November 9, 1990.

DATE: November 6, 1990  
TO: Planning Commission  
FROM: City Engineer  
SUBJECT: Review of Preliminary Plat for Temple Hill Estates Plat B Subdivision

This subdivision is an extension of the Temple Hill Estates Subdivision at 500 South 1400 East which was approved in August, 1990. This subdivision contains 16 lots and is located in the foothill area, and all of the provisions of the Foothill Ordinance prevail.

The land has an average slope of 23%, which requires a minimum lot area of 20,000 sq. ft. Lots 17 through 22 do not meet the 20,000 sq. ft. minimum area. The developers would like to add these six lots to Plat A approval, which would reduce the minimum lot area to 16,000 sq. ft., since the average slope of Plat A plus the six lots (17 through 22) would be between 15% to 20%. This would also give a good transition as the development proceeds eastward (12,000 in Plat A, 16,000 in the middle six lot area, and 20,000 in the east section).

The cuts and fills also exceed the ordinance requirements of 10 feet. In order to construct the cul-de-sac in the eastern section, the cuts will be made up to 20 feet along the frontage of Lots 25 and 26.

The grades on the road leading into the cul-de-sac also exceed the 12% grade requirement of the ordinance. The proposed grade would be 15%. If the grade were to be reduced to 12%, the excessive cuts (over 10 feet) would extend along Lots 27 and 28 and the earthwork would be enlarged to cover all of the east lots.

Lots 30, 31, and 32 have double frontage on two streets. The Planning Commission should recognize that this is an unusual topographic condition and may make an exception to the ordinance for this condition.

After review of the subdivision, we would recommend approval, subject to the following conditions:

1. Lots 17 through 22 be allowed to have a minimum area of 16,000 sq. ft.
2. Exceptions be granted for:
  - (a) Excessive cuts on Lots 25, 26, and 27,
  - (b) Allowance of 15% grade on cul-de-sac road,
  - (c) Allowance of double frontage for Lots 30, 31, and 32.