



SARATOGA
SPRINGS

Life's just better here

1. 2020-02-27 Pc Agenda

Documents:

[2020-02-27 PC AGENDA.PDF](#)

2. 2020-02-27 Pc Packet

Documents:

[2020-02-27 PC PACKET.PDF](#)



AGENDA – Planning Commission Meeting

Planning Commissioner Bryan Chapman, Chair
Planning Commissioner Troy Cunningham, Vice Chair
Planning Commissioner Bryce Anderson
Planning Commissioner Audrey Barton
Planning Commissioner Ken Kilgore
Planning Commissioner Reed Ryan
Planning Commissioner Josh Wagstaff

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

Thursday, February 27, 2020 @ 6:00 pm

City of Saratoga Springs Council Chambers

1307 North Commerce Drive, Suite 200, Saratoga Springs, UT 84045

1. Pledge of Allegiance.
2. Roll Call.
3. Public Input: Time has been set aside for any person to express ideas, concerns, comments, questions, or issues that are not listed as a public hearing on the agenda. Comments are limited to three minutes.
4. Public Hearing: General Plan Amendment from Institutional (I) to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) and Rezone from Low Density Residential (R1-10) to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) for Ring Road, City initiated.
5. Public Hearing: Code Amendments, Title 19, Conditional Use Permits.
6. Public Hearing: Code Amendment, Title 18.06, Storm Water Regulations.
7. Approval of Minutes: February 13, 2019.
8. Reports of Action.
9. Commission Comments.
10. Director's Report.
11. Possible motion to enter into closed session for the purchase, exchange, or lease of property; pending or reasonably imminent litigation; the character, professional competence, or the physical or mental health of an individual; or the deployment of security personnel, devices, or systems.
12. Adjourn.

PLEASE NOTE: The order of items may be subject to change with the order of the planning commission chair. One or more members of the Commission may participate electronically via video or telephonic conferencing in this meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify the City Recorder at 801.766.9793 at least one day prior to the meeting.



AGENDA – Planning Commission Meeting

Planning Commissioner Bryan Chapman, Chair
Planning Commissioner Troy Cunningham, Vice Chair
Planning Commissioner Bryce Anderson
Planning Commissioner Audrey Barton
Planning Commissioner Ken Kilgore
Planning Commissioner Reed Ryan
Planning Commissioner Josh Wagstaff

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

Thursday, February 27, 2020 @ 6:00 pm

City of Saratoga Springs Council Chambers

1307 North Commerce Drive, Suite 200, Saratoga Springs, UT 84045

1. Pledge of Allegiance.
2. Roll Call.
3. Public Input: Time has been set aside for any person to express ideas, concerns, comments, questions, or issues that are not listed as a public hearing on the agenda. Comments are limited to three minutes.
4. Public Hearing: General Plan Amendment from Institutional (I) to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) and Rezone from Low Density Residential (R1-10) to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) for Ring Road, City initiated.
5. Public Hearing: Code Amendments, Title 19, Conditional Use Permits.
6. Public Hearing: Code Amendment, Title 18.06, Storm Water Regulations.
7. Approval of Minutes: February 13, 2019.
8. Reports of Action.
9. Commission Comments.
10. Director's Report.
11. Possible motion to enter into closed session for the purchase, exchange, or lease of property; pending or reasonably imminent litigation; the character, professional competence, or the physical or mental health of an individual; or the deployment of security personnel, devices, or systems.
12. Adjourn.

PLEASE NOTE: The order of items may be subject to change with the order of the planning commission chair. One or more members of the Commission may participate electronically via video or telephonic conferencing in this meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify the City Recorder at 801.766.9793 at least one day prior to the meeting.



**SARATOGA
SPRINGS**

Life's just better here

Planning Commission Staff Report

Ring Road General Plan Amendment and Rezone

February 27, 2020

Public Hearing

Report Date:	February 20, 2020
Applicant:	City-Initiated
Owner:	City of Saratoga Springs, Patriot Ridge LLC, Calvin K Jacob Family, Corp of Pres Bishop Church of Jesus Christ of LDS
Location:	Ring Road
Major Street Access:	Ring Road and Redwood Road
Parcel Number(s) & Size:	59:002:0023, 8.01 acres; part of 59:002:0156, +/-2.85 acres; part of 59:002:0154, +/-6.96 acres; 59:002:0136, 2.52 acres; total +/- 20.34 acres
Land Use Designation:	Institutional
Parcel Zoning:	R1-10
Adjacent Zoning:	R1-10, RC, NC
Current Use of Parcels:	Fire Station, Undeveloped
Adjacent Uses:	Residential, Commercial, Undeveloped
Type of Action:	Legislative
Land Use Authority:	City Council
Future Routing:	City Council
Planner:	Rachel Day, Planner I

A. Executive Summary:

The City seeks to amend the General Plan land use map from Institutional to Neighborhood Commercial and rezone property from R1-10 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) at Ring Road as shown on Exhibit 1. This request affects approximately 20.34 acres.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing on the proposed General Plan amendment and rezone, take public comment, review and discuss the proposal, and choose from the options in Section H of this report. Options include recommendation of approval with or without modification, recommendation of denial, or continuation.

- B. Background:** The subject property is unplatted, contains a fire station on the City property, is otherwise undeveloped, and a desirous location for neighborhood commercial development. The applicant's objective is to amend the General Plan land use map and rezone the property to allow for commercial uses to complement the area.
- C. Specific Requests:**
- General Plan. The first request is to amend ~20.34 acres of the General Plan land use map from Institutional to Neighborhood Commercial. If approved, this change would then permit the applicant to request the applicable zone.
 - Rezone. If the General Plan land use map is amended as proposed, the applicant requests a rezone of the aforementioned ~20.34 acres from R1-10 to Neighborhood Commercial.
- D. Process:**
Rezone and General Plan Amendment
The table in Section 19.13.04 outlines the process requirements of a Rezone and General Plan Amendment. A public hearing is required with the Planning Commission who then make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council shall then either approve, continue, or deny the request at a public meeting.
- E. Community Review:** This item was noticed in the *Daily Herald* as a Planning Commission public hearing and a mailed notice sent to all property owners within 300 feet. As of the date of this report, no contact has been made with the City regarding the proposal. The notice has also been posted in the City building, www.saratogspringscity.com, and www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html.
- F. General Plan:** The land use designation of the parcels is Institutional and the request is to change it to Neighborhood Commercial. The applicant's request to change the zone from R1-10 to Neighborhood Commercial is consistent with the requested land use of Neighborhood Commercial.

The General Plan defines Neighborhood Commercial as:

Areas where small-scale neighborhood oriented commercial developments are to be located. These commercial developments are to provide goods and services that are used on a daily basis by the surrounding residents.

Staff conclusion: *complies.* *The requested zone complies with the requested land use designation. The Neighborhood Commercial zone will be adjacent to existing residential and can provide goods and services to be used daily by surrounding residents.*

G. Code Criteria:

Rezoning and General Plan amendments are legislative decisions. Therefore, the City Council has significant discretion when making a decision on such requests. Because of this legislative discretion, the Code criteria below are guidelines and are not binding.

Rezone and General Plan Amendment:

Section 19.13.04. requires the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding rezones and General Plan amendments.

Staff finding: *complies.* *A Planning Commission public hearing is scheduled on February 27, 2020.*

19.17.03. Planning Commission and City Council Review.

1. The Planning Commission reviews the petition and makes a recommendation to the City Council within 30 days of the receipt of the petition. **Staff finding: consistent.**
2. The Planning Commission shall recommend adoption of proposed amendments only when it finds the proposed amendment furthers the purpose of the Saratoga Springs Land Use Element of the General Plan and this Title. **Staff finding: consistent.**

The Land Use Plan identifies desired land uses for all areas within the City of Saratoga Springs and provides a framework to guide future planning for the community – where people live, work, play, and shop. It supports a variety of land uses that can continue to make Saratoga Springs an attractive place to live and work, while preserving Saratoga Springs’ small-town charm. Stable and peaceful single-family neighborhoods are the “building block” of the community, with a mix of smaller and denser residential units in appropriate locations to help diversify the housing stock. Employment areas accommodate a diverse array of businesses and support well-paying jobs.

3. The Planning Commission shall provide the notice and hold a public hearing as required by Utah Code. For an application which concerns a specific parcel of property, the City shall provide the notice required by Chapter 19.13 regarding a public hearing. **Staff finding: consistent.**

All required notices in compliance with State and local laws have been sent or posted informing the public of the Planning Commission public hearing.

19.17.04. Gradual Transition of Uses and Density.

It is the policy of the City Council, through exercising its zoning authority, to: (a) transition high intensity uses to help prevent the impacts of high density uses on low density areas; and (b) to limit inconsistent uses being located on adjacent parcels. The City Council may implement this policy using its zoning powers. Through amendments to the General Plan and the Zoning Map, the City Council intends to apply the following guidelines to implement this policy:

1. Residential lots, parcels, plats, or developments should not increase by more than 20% of density as compared to adjacent lots, zones, parcels, plats, or developments to enable a gradual change of density and uses. To appropriately transition, new lots should be equal to or larger than immediately adjacent existing platted lots.
2. Exceptions

a. The City should avoid allowing high intensity uses (e.g., commercial, industrial, multi-family structures, etc.) adjacent to lower intensity uses (e.g., single family, low density residential, etc.), however may allow these uses to be located adjacent to each other if appropriate transitions and buffers are in place. Appropriate buffers and transitions include a combination of roadways, landscaping, building orientation and facades, increased setbacks, open spaces, parks, and trails.

3. Despite these guidelines, the City Council recognizes that it will become necessary to allow high intensity next to low intensity uses in order to allow for the implementation of multiple zones in the City. The City Council should use their best efforts to limit inconsistent uses and zones being located on adjacent parcels and to mitigate inconsistent uses and zones through transitions and buffers.

Staff finding: consistent. *The approved General Plan identifies Neighborhood Commercial adjacent to Low Density Residential. As stated above, with many zones implemented in the City, commercial next to residential maybe necessary at times. The location of the subject parcels is very conducive to neighborhood commercial development as opposed to this area a location of residential development.*

19.17.05. Consideration of General Plan, Ordinance, or Zoning Map Amendment.

The Planning Commission and City Council shall consider, but not be bound by, the following criteria when deciding whether to recommend or grant a General Plan, ordinance, or zoning map amendment:

1. The proposed change will conform to the Land Use Element and other provisions of the General Plan. **Staff finding: consistent, if approved.**

The changes proposed are compatible with the surrounding land uses.

2. The proposed change will not decrease or otherwise adversely affect the health, safety, convenience, morals, or general welfare of the public. **Staff finding: complies.**

No adverse consequences are anticipated by the changing of the land use designations and zones. Neighborhood Commercial is considered an appropriate use adjacent to residential areas.

3. The proposed change will more fully carry out the general purposes and intent of this Title and any other ordinance of the City. **Staff finding: complies.**

The purpose of Title 19 is to preserve and promote the health, safety, morals, convenience, order, fiscal welfare, and the general welfare of the City, its present and future inhabitants, and the public generally. The proposed development complies with Title 19.

4. In balancing the interest of the petitioner with the interest of the public, community interests will be better served by making the proposed change. **Staff finding: complies.**

The proposal of the applicant in regards to the Neighborhood Commercial zone can serve as a small-scale commercial area for surrounding residents.

5. Any other reason that, subject to legislative discretion of the City Council, could advance the general welfare.

H. Recommendation and Alternatives:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing, take public input, discuss the application, provide feedback on the concept plan and choose from the following options.

Option 1 – Staff Recommendation: positive

I move to forward to the City Council a **positive** recommendation regarding the Ring Road General Plan land use map amendment and rezone generally at Ring Road and Redwood Road as outlined in Exhibit 1 with the findings and conditions in the staff report dated February 20, 2020:

Findings

1. The General Plan amendment will not result in a decrease in public health, safety, and welfare as outlined in the findings for approval in Section G of this report, which section is hereby incorporated by reference, herein.
2. The Rezone is consistent with Chapter 19.17 of the Code, as articulated in the findings for approval in Section G of this report, which section is incorporated by reference, herein.

Conditions

1. The Ring Road General Plan land use map amendment and rezone is recommended as shown in the attachment to the Staff report in Exhibit 1.
2. All other Code requirements shall be met.
3. Any other conditions or changes as articulated by the Planning Commission.

Alternative 1 – Continuance

The Planning Commission may also choose to continue the item. “I move to **continue** the Ring Road General Plan land use map amendment and rezone to another meeting on [DATE], with direction to the applicant and Staff on information and/or changes needed to render a decision, as follows:

1. _____
2. _____

Alternative 2 – Negative Recommendation

The Planning Commission may also choose to forward a negative recommendation to the City Council regarding the application. “I move to forward a negative recommendation to the City Council regarding the Ring Road General Plan land use map amendment and rezone with the findings below:

1. The Ring Road General Plan land use map amendment and rezone is not consistent with the General Plan, as articulated by the Planning Commission:
_____, and/or,
2. The Ring Road General Plan land use map amendment and rezone is not consistent with Chapter 19.17 of the Code, as articulated by the Planning Commission:
_____.

J. Exhibits:

1. Location of Ring Road
2. General Plan land use map
3. Zoning map

Exhibit 2





MINUTES – Planning Commission

Thursday, February 13, 2020

City of Saratoga Springs City Offices

1307 North Commerce Drive, Suite 200, Saratoga Springs, Utah 84045

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Call to Order - 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Bryan Chapman

Present:

- 5 Commission Members: Bryan Chapman, Bryce Anderson, Audrey Barton, Troy Cunningham, Ken Kilgore, Reed Ryan, Josh Wagstaff.
Staff: Dave Stroud, Planning Director; Sarah Carroll, Senior Planner; Tippe Morlan, Senior Planner; Gina Grandpre, Planner II; Rachel Day, Planner I; Conrad Hafen, Assistant City Attorney; Gordon Miner, City Engineer; Nicolette Fike, Deputy Recorder.
10 Others: Pam and Neil Infanger, John Linton, Ivy and Michael Turnow, Brock Loomis, Mitch Vance, Sid Allsop, Richard

1. **Pledge of Allegiance** - led by David Johnson

15 2. **Roll Call** – A quorum was present

3. **Public Input**

Public Input Open by Chairman Bryan Chapman

20 Richard (?) came to hear the information about Fox Hollow.

Public Input Closed by Chairman Bryan Chapman

4. **Business Item: Site Plan for Pony Express Dental, located at 2253 S. Redwood Road, Vincent Design Group, applicant.**

25 Planner I Rachel Day presented the site plan which includes one building at 8,660 square feet with the dental office occupying the north end unit. Associated parking and landscaping complies with the minimum requirements of the zone.

30 Ivy Turnow and Michael Turnow with Triple S Land Development, LLC, were present for applicant. They noted they have opened dental offices in Eagle Mountain and Daybreak communities also.

Commissioner Kilgore

- 35 - Received confirmation from the applicant that they would comply with the conditions from City Staff.
- Received clarification about parking and condition 3 from Planner I Rachel Day that other tenants could only have uses that need 4/1000 stalls or less because the dental office required more.
- Received confirmation that park strip maintenance would be done by owners. Planner I Rachel Day advised the City would do maintenance along the trail and Redwood Road.

Commissioner Ryan

- 40 - Received advice from City Engineer Gordon Miner that a level 1 traffic study is done by UDOT. The trip generation memo indicates the need for that study. Any impacts will be discussed with the applicant for mitigation.
- Mentioned that during tournaments attendees may use this parking for overflow.

45 **Motion made by Commissioner Kilgore to approve the proposed site plan of Pony Express Dental at 2253 South Talons Cove Drive in the RC zone with the findings and conditions in the staff report. Seconded by Commissioner Barton. Aye: Bryce Anderson, Audrey Barton, Bryan Chapman, Troy Cunningham, Ken Kilgore, Reed Ryan, Josh Wagstaff. Motion passed 7 - 0.**

50 5. **Public Hearing: Rezone, and General Plan amendment for Fox Hollow neighborhoods 4 & 13 and Master Development Agreement amendment for neighborhoods 4, 12, 13. Chad Bessinger SCP Fox Hollow, applicant.**

55 Senior Planner Sarah Carroll presented the item. The amendment is to modify land uses and zoning in several neighborhoods with the development. The applicant is requesting that they retain 10 acres of commercial in neighborhood 4 and that it be zoned Community Commercial. This results in an increase of the R-1-10 PUD zoning, but they are not requesting an increase in units. They are proposing to stick with the 335 units that was previously approved, which results in a decrease in density from 9 units per acre to 7.59 units per acre. Neighborhood 13 is currently zoned R-1-10 Planned Unit Development and allows for 125 units at 6 units per acre. The application is proposing to replace this with 10.76 acres of Community Commercial zoning. 60 The land use map would also be amended to match these requests. Neighborhood 4 is proposed to be amended from Regional Commercial and High Density Residential to 10 acres of Community Commercial with the remainder as High Density Residential. The land use map for Neighborhood 13 would be amended from Medium Density Residential to Community Commercial.

65 Brock Loomis and Mitch Vance were present as applicant.

Public Hearing Open by Chairman Bryan Chapman

Richard (?) Asked for clarification on the project.

Public Hearing Closed by Chairman Bryan Chapman

70

Commissioner Kilgore

- Asked if the request from the HOA that the small lots have full length driveways needed to be a condition. Planning Director Dave Stroud advised it could be added as a condition if the Planning Commission would like. Mitch Vance responded they would be glad to look at that.

75

A 5 min. break was taken to help a resident understand the item because he couldn't hear well. Meeting resumed at 6:28.

Commissioner Cunningham

80

- In favor of moving the commercial.
- In favor of longer driveways.

Motion made by Commissioner Cunningham that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed Rezones and General Plan Amendments for Fox Hollow Neighborhoods 4, 12, and 13 as described in Section C of this report and as depicted in the attached exhibits, with the findings and conditions in the staff report. Adding a condition to review the driveways on the smaller lot homes. Seconded by Commissioner Kilgore. Aye: Bryce Anderson, Audrey Barton, Bryan Chapman, Troy Cunningham, Ken Kilgore, Reed Ryan, Josh Wagstaff. Motion passed 7 - 0.

85

90

6. **Public Hearing: Major Amendment for Jordan Promenade (Wander) Village Plan 1, located approximately Riverside Dr. and 400 South. Oakwood homes, applicant.**

95 Planning Director Dave Stroud presented the item. The applicant is requesting the ability to remove the meetinghouse site and replace with residential units. Overall unit count is still within the range of approval. Ability to remove or reduce the commercial node at Pony Express and Redwood Road. The owner is already working with a developer to bring a commercial site to this location. This commercial site is the reason for the next amendment. The developer anticipates relocating the removed commercial node just to the north and will be identified in a future village plan. They are also asking that Convenience Store and Refueling Station, Public, be added to the list of permitted uses. Refueling Station, Private, is proposed to be removed.

100

Sid Allsop with Oakwood Homes was present as applicant.

Public Hearing Open by Chairman Bryan Chapman

105

Pam and Neil Infanger felt a stoplight at 400 S. and Redwood Road is warranted. Even a Street light to illuminate the street sign would help. They had also been told that Saratoga Road structure in the area could not handle the traffic it was getting with all the new development. They had been told in the past that it could not be improved because of the water table.

Public Hearing Closed by Chairman Bryan Chapman

- 110 City Engineer Gordon Miner responded to public comment. He noted that UDOT has done a traffic study and have warranted that a signal is needed at that intersection and it is under design. He will let Public Works Dept. know that there needs to be light there. The structure of the road will be taken into account as they work with that road in the future.
- 115 Commissioner Kilgore
- Asked about the refueling station. Planning Director Dave Stroud advised that the refueling station would not include fast food.
 - Asked if Moderate income housing be included in this development. Sid Allsop responded that they have about 5-6 product types that would fit into a median income. It would come down to density, where they can have units at a lower cost.
- 120
- Received a little clarification on color for vinyl fences which the applicant replied to his knowledge they would be gray and white. It's up to the designer to allocate which colors go where.
 - Asked if there was designated parking for the public park. Sid Allsop responded there would be a bridge across the spring and parking would be across that in the City regional park area.
- 125
- Asked if the Clear view triangle noted in the Community Plan matches the City Standard. Planning Director Dave Stroud advised that what is there is already approved in the Community Plan and not under review tonight. City Engineer Gordon Miner advised that he was comfortable with the ASHTO standard included in the Community Plan. It addresses a broader base of scenarios.
- 130 Commissioner Wagstaff
- Received clarification that they were only requesting eliminating this one meeting house area now.
 - Received clarification that the commercial on south side was being reduced.
 - Noted a bike trail on the north side of 400 S. and there is not a light on the north side of the intersection.
- 135 Commissioner Anderson
- Received clarification on the meeting house and how it affected open space. Planning Director Dave Stroud advised that it did not affect the Open Space on this plan.
 - Noted Pony Express Parkway, when it comes in will alleviate traffic on 400 S. but timing may not be soon enough. Applicant responded that the timing should be on phase 2. City Engineer Gordon Miner noted that Public Works conducted a pre-proposal meeting with potential engineers to design that. It will just be a couple lengths of Pony Express, not the whole street.
- 140
- Commissioner Barton
- Asked if a Signal on 400 S. and Redwood Road had been discussed before. She noted it is a very dark corner and hard to see in the dark when trying to get to Patriot Park for instance. City Engineer Gordon Miner advised that a Signal was being designed by UDOT. He noted, after research, there was a light at the point of curvature to the south currently. Public input noted it was not right on the corner and was not bright enough to illuminate the whole intersection.
- 145
- Commissioner Cunningham
- Received clarification that the approval was to remove the meeting house in just this Village Plan. Planning Director Dave Stroud advised that this gives the flexibility to keep it open if the Church decides to bring a meeting house back in the area.
 - He is ok with the refueling station change but is a little hesitant in seeing less commercial. Planning Director Stroud advised that the commercial will be more on the north side at the major intersection.
- 150
- Commissioner Ryan
- Received clarification that with the commercial there is nothing there binding right now that we are giving up.
- 160

Motion made by Commissioner Anderson to forward a recommendation of approval regarding the Jordan Promenade Village Plan 1 amendments with the findings and conditions in the staff report. Seconded by Commissioner Ryan. Aye: Bryce Anderson, Audrey Barton, Bryan Chapman, Troy Cunningham, Ken Kilgore, Reed Ryan, Josh Wagstaff. Motion passed 7 - 0.

165

7. **Public Hearing: Updates to the Standard Technical Specifications and Drawings Manual for the City of Saratoga Springs.**

170 City Engineer Gordon Miner presented the item. The proposed typical street section requires 85 feet of right-of-way, which provides the needed traffic volume capacity with minimal impact to new development particularly in the area of Saratoga road, where the City has the opportunity to widen the road at minimal cost to avoid costly property takings in the future.

Public Hearing Open by Chairman Bryan Chapman

175 Neil Infanger asked what the arterial size road looked like on Saratoga Rd.

City Engineer Gordon Miner advised this cross section would not proceed further south, access to a future park is yet to be determined. This would be from for 145 and north up to Pioneer Crossing only.

Public Hearing Closed by Chairman Bryan Chapman

Commissioner Anderson

180 - Received clarification that this would be from 145 and Saratoga Rd. and northward only. (Lehi's 2300 W.) In front of Loch Lomond would be the typical arterial East-West.

185 **Motion made by Commissioner Kilgore to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to add this standard drawing to the City's Standard Technical Specifications and Drawings. Seconded by Commissioner Cunningham. Aye: Bryce Anderson, Audrey Barton, Bryan Chapman, Troy Cunningham, Ken Kilgore, Reed Ryan, Josh Wagstaff. Motion passed 7 - 0.**

8. **Work Session: Title 19 Code amendments – Conditional use Permits, City Initiated.**

190 Planning Director Dave Stroud presented the items for discussion. The City Council held a Special Meeting on January 23, 2020 and approved initiating proceedings pursuant to Utah Code § 10-9a-509(1)(a)(ii)(B), a proposed draft of an ordinance that removed Conditional Uses within all zoning designations from the Title 19 land use table in City Code.

195 Prior to the special meeting, City Staff was already in the process of drafting amendments to the Use Table in Title 19 by removing certain conditional uses, designating other conditional uses as permitted uses, and retaining a few conditional uses in various zones. Now, due to Pending Ordinance, City Staff has clear policy direction to remove conditional uses.

200 Staff has gone through the Land Use tables and changed the designation for all the Conditional Uses by either removing them, changing them to permitted uses, or changing them to permitted uses that will have associated standards. Superscript #4 indicates that additional standards will be proposed. Additional standards have not yet been drafted and will be presented to the Planning Commission at a later date.

205 Commissioner Kilgore asked if all Home Occupations would be staff review with this. He felt Class 3 would still be good to come to Planning Commission. He reviewed with staff where sexually oriented businesses were allowed and was advised it does have its own set of standards now.

Commissioner Cunningham liked the changes so far. He like having a distance standard for hotels and that they need a crime mitigation plan.

210 Commissioner Chapman asked why pawn shop was in industrial and Office Warehouse. Planning Director Dave Stroud advised that they have a store front and then need a warehouse in the back, which Office Warehouse would provide.

215 Commissioner Barton asked if there had been some research from other cities and the background for the changes. Economic Development Director David Johnson advised that they had done some research and looked at other cities. He had heard from developers that wanted to come here but felt the use table was restrictive and needed cleaned up. This will help with those situations.

220 Commissioner Ryan likes the changes so far and noted it's always hard to see the future. He would like to know what staff feels need to happen and if they felt this was on the right track. Economic Development Director David Johnson noted for some business that have looked at the City there may be impacts as to where they can go, but he feels as a whole this is in the right direction. Planner II Gina Grandpre advised that we are proposing these changes but there will always be something that comes up and tweaks to be made.

225 Planner II Gina Grandpre noted that she gets calls for storage units which is a use that needs feedback also.

Commissioner Barton noted that as far as storage units, they all seem to be in the north but there needs to be a better balance in location. She felt location was very important for hotels with things like schools and homes.

230 Commissioner Wagstaff received clarification on the redlines in the staff report, e.g. Riding Arenas were Conditional, now they would just be Permitted in certain zones. He noted that the idea of hotels 300 ft. from residential is a good idea, but much of Redwood Road is within 300 ft. of residential and it would prohibit many locations. Planning Director Dave Stroud advised that the thinking is to determine distance from the actual building, not the lot line.

235 Commissioner Kilgore commented that storage units are needed and in demand. His felt aesthetics may help more than distance. If it's got a lot of trees or landscaping it can look good and not be as intrusive. He cited an example. Commissioner Anderson had similar thoughts but how do you say one type or brand is preferred and not another based on their design and architecture. You can't codify preference.

240 **9. Approval of Minutes: January 23, 2020**

Motion made by Commissioner Anderson to approve the minutes of January 23, 2020. Seconded by Commissioner Cunningham. Aye: Bryce Anderson, Audrey Barton, Bryan Chapman, Troy Cunningham, Ken Kilgore, Reed Ryan, Josh Wagstaff. Motion passed 7 - 0.

245 **10. Reports of Action.**
Planning Director Dave Stroud presented a Report of Action for Major Amendment for Jordan Promenade (Wander) Village Plan 1.

250 **Motion made by Commissioner Barton to approve the Report of Action for Major Amendment for Jordan Promenade (Wander) Village Plan 1. Seconded by Commissioner Kilgore. Aye: Bryce Anderson, Audrey Barton, Bryan Chapman, Troy Cunningham, Ken Kilgore, Reed Ryan, Josh Wagstaff. Motion passed 7 - 0.**

255 **11. Commission Comments.**
Commissioner Chapman noted that as he has been finishing his basement he was impressed with the Building Inspector and it reflected well on the City.

260 **12. Director's Report.** – Planning Director Dave Stroud advised of upcoming agenda items.

13. Possible motion to enter into closed session – No closed session was held.

14. Meeting Adjourned Without Objection at 7:58 p.m. by Chairman Bryan Chapman.

265 _____
Date of Approval

Planning Commission Chair
Bryan Chapman

270 _____
Deputy City Recorder