MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE WEST JORDAN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD MARCH 1, 2011 IN THE WEST JORDAN COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PRESENT: Justin Stoker, Kathy Hilton, Nathan Gedge, David McKinney, John Winn, Jesse Valenzuela, and Dan Lawes.

STAFF: Tom Burdett, Robert Thorup, Greg Mikolash, Scott Langford, Nathan Nelson, Paul Brockbank, and Vicki Hauserman.

OTHERS: Mark Garza, Terry Diehl, Gayle McMurray, Charles Funke, June Christiansen, Donna Maute, Christine Tate, Andrew Lenz, Ryan Castro, Stephanie Roach, Don Fountaine, Pete K., John O'Donnell, Sherry Devenberg, Troy Sanders, Matthew Smith, Von Anderson, and Dave Fesques.

****

The briefing meeting was called to order by Justin Stoker.

Staff would like to add a condition to Item #1B that the use must be allowed in the covenants and restrictions of Jordan Landing. Item #2 was recommended for the Consent Calendar. A brief discussion was held on Item #3. Clarifications were made on the application for Item #4. A letter from a resident of The Maples area was distributed.

****

The regular meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m.

1. Consent Calendar

A. Approve Minutes from February 15, 2011

B. Oasis Outdoor Furniture; 7611 South Jordan Landing Boulevard; Temporary Use Permit (150 days); SC-2 Zone; Oasis Outdoor Furniture (applicant) [#TUP20110002; parcel 21-29-351-008]

[This item was moved from the Consent Calendar for discussion.]

2. Dance Image Academy; 7826 South 3200 West; Conditional Use Permit; P-C Zone; Dance Image Academy/Dannielle Brannan (applicant) [#CUP20100005; parcel 21-32-227-020]

Based on the findings in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission grant Conditional Use Permit approval for the Dance Image Academy, located at 7826 South 3200 West, with the conditions of approval as listed below. Planning Commission approvals do not include Public Safety, Fire, Building and Safety, or Engineering approval.

1. The Conditional Use Permit is subject to review and/or revocation as per City Code Section 13-7E-10.

MOTION: Nathan Gedge moved to approve Consent Calendar Item #1A the minutes from February 15, 2011, that they pull Item #1B for discussion, and if there is no public opposition that they move Item #2 Dance Image Academy to the Consent Calendar for approval. The motion was seconded by Dan Lawes.

Justin Stoker asked if there were any in attendance to speak against Item #2 Dance Image Academy. There were none.

VOTE: The motion passed 6-0 in favor. With Kathy Hilton absent

****

1B. Oasis Outdoor Furniture; 7611 South Jordan Landing Boulevard; Temporary Use Permit (150 days); SC-2 Zone; Oasis Outdoor Furniture (applicant) [#TUP20110002; parcel 21-29-351-008]

Greg Mikolash gave an overview of the application. This type of temporary use would typically be allowed in this zoning throughout the city. Only six parking stalls will be used by the use. The fire department has no issues with the application. Mr. Mikolash explained that the staff was made aware of some potential problems with covenants associated with Jordan Landing that might prohibit this type of use, so staff would like to add a condition that the conditional use permit is contingent upon the applicant having the legal right to operate this use within Jordan Landing.

Based on the findings in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission grant Temporary Use Permit approval for Oasis Outdoor Furniture located at 7611 South Jordan Landing Boulevard in a SC-2 zoning district with the conditions of approval as listed below. Planning Commission approvals do not include Public Safety, Fire, Building and Safety, or Engineering approval.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Dates of operation are from April 15, 2011 to August 15, 2011, or shall not exceed 150-days consecutive.
2. A $300 site restoration bond shall be placed with the City. The bond will be released after the use has ceased operation and the site has be cleaned and restored to previous conditions.
3. Maintain the temporary stand in good order and the parking lot from trash and debris during the extent of the temporary use.
4. The stand and all associated equipment/materials shall be removed from the site, and the site fully restored, within five days of permit expiration.
5. Obtain and maintain a valid West Jordan City Business License.
6. Provide for a safe pedestrian access area next to the temporary stand. This area must be blocked off to prevent vehicular traffic from entering by either traffic cones or by other appropriate device, as approved by staff.

Nathan Gedge asked if security would be on site after hours or if the inventory would be stored elsewhere.

Charles Funke, applicant, 4350 West 2100 South, asked what would be the proper means to determine if they are operating within the covenants for Jordan Landing.

Greg Mikolash said the owner should be able to provide a copy of the covenants.

Charles Funke said the tents are designed with full side panels and will be a furniture showroom, and that will be the only inventory maintained from night to night. There are locking mechanisms along the base and means of securing the inventory with locking cables. They had considered having a security service that would make periodic checks on the property at night. He asked if he needed to provide a copy of the approval from Jordan Landing. Greg Mikolash said he could do that as a courtesy.

Further public comment was closed at this point for this item.

MOTION: John Winn moved to approve the Temporary Use Permit for Oasis Outdoor Furniture; 7611 South Jordan Landing Boulevard; Oasis Outdoor Furniture (applicant) with the conditions of approval listed in the planning commission packet 1 through 6, adding:

7. The conditional use permit is contingent upon the applicant having the legal right to use the property.

The motion was seconded by Nathan Gedge and passed 6-0 in favor. Kathy Hilton was absent.

****

2. Dance Image Academy; 7826 South 3200 West; Conditional Use Permit; P-C Zone; Dance Image Academy/Dannielle Brannan (applicant) [#CUP20100005; parcel 21-32-227-020]

[This item was moved to the Consent Calendar and approved.]

****

3. Text Amendment – Amend the West Jordan Municipal Code, Section 12-3-2 Sign Standards (Specifically, Monument Signs); City-Wide, Signz and Lightz - Gayle McMurray, (applicant) [#TA20100006]

Ray McCandless explained that Granger Medical is proposing an amendment to the sign code. The original application was to allow a pylon sign in the P-O Zoning district, which staff felt would be too large for the scale of development in the professional office zones. They asked the applicant to look at the monument sign criteria instead. The code allows for monument signs four feet high and less and those over four feet high. He explained how the sign copy area is calculated and where the different types of signs are allowed. He showed examples of the two types. The smaller signs are recommended to change the front setback line to 18 inches instead of 20 feet. They also propose that they allow a domed or gable shaped architectural feature on the signs that would raise the overall height of the sign by one foot, but no logo or copy aside from an address could be placed in that area. Changes for the monument signs over four feet in height include splitting them in two categories 1) those with less than 250 feet in street frontage, and 2) those with more than 250 feet of street frontage. The current code sets the copy area of 50 square feet with an overall height of 6 feet with a required 2-foot high base. Staff recommends that the domed architectural feature be allowed and instead of requiring a 2-foot high base it would allow an option of having a base with the maximum of 2 feet. This change would not change the copy area. On the lots with more than 250 feet in frontage the change would allow a 78-square foot maximum.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission accept the findings contained in the staff report and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed Text Amendment to City Code, Section 12-3-2 Sign Standards as proposed.

Nathan Gedge asked if this were passed, could existing signs that meet the frontage criteria then be changed to 78 square feet and how many signs that would include.

Ray McCandless said that is correct. He didn't know how many signs would be eligible to change.

Nathan Gedge asked if there are safety concerns with an 8-foot tall sign regarding setbacks.

Ray McCandless said the engineering division controls the egress and sight triangle distances, so monument signs need to be set back from the driveways and out of the clear vision area.

Justin Stoker was concerned with the 18-inch setback with regards to the line of sight.

Ray McCandless said the distance that it is set back from the intersection is a function of the speed of the road. In order to get it out of the sight triangle it might have to be set back further on a 40 mph road than on a 25 mph road. That distance is determined by the engineering department.

Greg Mikolash stated that a building permit application is submitted for each sign and they are reviewed to determine if they are within that sight triangle. For the most part they are keeping signs out of the 20-foot setback area for the smaller signs. They are just trying to make it consistent with the existing 18-inch setback for the larger signs.

Justin Stoker referred to a sign near his home that was set back according to the sight triangle, but it is grossly inadequate.

Commissioner Kathy Hilton arrived at 6:27 p.m.

David McKinney asked if there was a need to include in the code the need for sight analysis.

Greg Mikolash said they take care of most of this in Title 8 in the engineering standards, because construction is not allowed within the sight triangle.

Justin Stoker would like a setback closer to three or five feet instead of 18 inches.

Ray McCandless said the further they are set back the closer they get into the parking area.

Gayle McMurray, 1992 Park Street, Provo, applicant, said most cities have a 25-foot clear vision triangle from the intersection. The illustration shows that including the sidewalk, the sign is set back 6.5 feet from the curb. The current code already states that it can't be closer than 25 feet to the intersection or to an egress.

John O'Donnell, 191 Lakeview, Stansbury Park, Utah, stated that Granger Medical Clinic is very excited about the new development. They were appreciative of staff's support of their proposal.

MOTION: David McKinney moved that the commission accept the findings contained in the staff report and forward a positive recommendation to the city council for the proposed text amendment to city code Section 12-3-2 Sign Standards as proposed. The motion was seconded by Nathan Gedge.

Kathy Hilton said she would be voting against the motion since it is not just changing the code for one building, but for the entire city, and she didn't want to see a mini billboard in front of every business in the city that is allowed to have a sign. The signs less than four feet were always meant to let pedestrians and vehicles know where the business was but not to be like a pole sign.

Justin Stoker said he would be voting against the motion because he felt that an 80-sqaure foot sign needs more than an 18-inch setback.

John Winn felt that it needed more of a five-foot setback to make sure pedestrians aren't obscured from motorists' vision.

Roll Call Vote:
Commissioner Valenzuela – yes
Commissioner Stoker – no
Commissioner Hilton – no
Commissioner Gedge – yes
Commissioner Lawes – no
Commissioner McKinney – yes
Commissioner Winn – no

Motion Failed 3-4

MOTION: Justin Stoker moved that the commission accept the findings contained in the staff report and forward a positive recommendation to the city council for the proposed text amendment to city code Section 12-3-2 Sign Standards as proposed with one change that the front setback be

modified to five feet for both monument signs over four feet in height and those four feet or less in height. The motion was seconded by Nathan Gedge.

David McKinney thought it would be unwise to propose another motion without considering a new proposal from the start and not to compose one off-the-cuff.

Roll Call Vote:
Commissioner Gedge – no
Commissioner McKinney – no
Commissioner Winn – yes
Commissioner Valenzuela – no
Commissioner Hilton – no
Commissioner Stoker – yes
Commissioner Lawes – no

Motion Failed 2-5

MOTION: **Nathan Gedge moved based on the discussion and voting that the planning commission forward a negative recommendation to the city council for the proposed text amendment to the city code Section 12-3-2 Sign Standards. The motion was seconded by David McKinney.**

Roll Call Vote:
Commissioner Hilton – yes
Commissioner Lawes – yes
Commissioner Stoker – yes
Commissioner McKinney – yes
Commissioner Winn – yes
Commissioner Gedge – yes
Commissioner Valenzuela – yes

Motion passed 7-0.

Justin Stoker explained that he voted yes on the motion, but he would be in favor of the amendment if the setback were modified as previously discussed.
****

4. East Maples; **<u>Continued from 2-15-11;</u> 6509 West 7800 South; General Plan Amendment for approximately 51.75 acres from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential and Rezone from P-C (Planned Community) maximum density of 2.87 dwelling units per acre to P-C (Planned Community) maximum density of 5.15 dwelling units per acre and Preliminary Development Plan; East Maples Investments, LLC/Mark Garza (applicant) [#GPA20110001; ZC20110001; parcels 20-27-400-017 and 20-27-427-011]**

Scott Langford gave the overview of the application and the zoning history of the property. He explained that when increasing the existing density they look at levels of service such as transportation, utilities, infrastructure, and commercial services. He showed a map of pending changes with the addition of the Mountain View Corridor that will be running Fall 2013 and is within one-quarter mile of the subject property. The preliminary development plan shows how the project will tie in to the existing Maples development to the west. There are 254 single-family residential lots shown and 7.5 acres of open space. He explained that if these requests are approved by the city council, then applications for the preliminary subdivision plat will come back to the commission along with an enhanced preliminary development plan that will include additional technical details.

The overall density of the proposed development is less than the neighboring Maples at Jordan Hills Village development. Staff had some concern with the proposed lot widths, because the four-foot side yard setback won't allow for adequate maneuvering area if a window well were on the side of the house. Building Code also requires a firewall construction for buildings that have less than a five-foot setback to the property line. The P-C Zone requires less focus on the garage, so it must be set behind the front of the home. A 45-foot wide lot would make the garage more prominent. The smallest lot width in the existing Maples development is fifty feet.

Future Land Use Map Amendment
Based on the findings of fact as mentioned in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend the General Plan Future Land Use Map of property generally located at 6509 West 7800 South from the Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential land use designation.

Preliminary Development Plan
Based on the findings in the report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the East Maples Preliminary Development Plan located at 6509 West 7800 South in a Planned Community (P-C) zoning district and the following conditions of approval.

1. Upon submittal of a Preliminary Subdivision Plat, the East Maples Preliminary Development Plan shall be updated to provide all items listed in Section 13-5J-10C of the City Code; including but not limited to specific building elevations, amenities, and landscape plans.
2. The East Maples Preliminary Development Plan must be updated to show full width street construction along 6400 West; unless a less than full width road is approved through a separate application and review by the City Council.

Zoning Map Amendment
Based on the findings of fact as mentioned in the staff report and the Preliminary Development Plan, staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend the Zoning Map of property generally located at 6509 West 7800 South from P-C (Planned Community) maximum density of 2.87 dwelling units per acre to P-C (Planned Community) maximum density of 5.15 dwelling units per acre.

Kathy Hilton asked if they were required to show more open space with the increased density.

Scott Langford said the P-C zoning district requires a minimum of 15% of open space. If this were in the West Side Planning Area they would have to add more open space, but this is in the P-C zone that doesn't have the density buy-up.

David McKinney reviewed the history of the property that originally was approved for 146 lots and asked how many lots/units they requested in their application for high density.

Justin Stoker thought it was 8.2 dwelling units per acre.

David McKinney said that would equal about 430 units. The current proposal requests 254 units, which is about 70% more than the current zoning, but about 170 less than the last proposal. He asked what the minimum allowed setback is for the P-C zone.

Scott Langford said there is no minimum, but it gives latitude to the developer. In previous P-C developments such as The Maples, there was a 4-foot setback, but there was a zero lot line that was staggered. They also had wider lots. When they processed the building permits for those lots they found that the staggered setback was a good idea in theory, but it was difficult to administer with the different contractors and builders.

David McKinney said many of these lots will require retaining walls due to the steep slope, which may be difficult with 4-foot setbacks.

Nathan Nelson said staff has not yet seen a complete grading and drainage plan, which is not required at this point, but it would be required at subdivision approval. Any retaining walls that are required will have to be installed by the developer and not the home owners. The retaining walls will most likely be at the rear lot lines rather than on the side property lines. He was also concerned with the small setback because drainage needs to get from the rear of the lots to the front and the street. If there are window wells in the side yard it reduces the area for a swale to remove the water. The applicant would have to address that issue with either prohibiting window wells or moving the water with pipes, etc.

David McKinney counted approximately twenty lots that had retaining walls on the side property line.

Kathy Hilton suggested that they first look at whether or not this is an appropriate zoning for the property before they talk about site planning.

John Winn was concerned that the lots would be smaller than those in the neighboring area.

Justin Stoker asked if the updated timeline for the Mountain View Corridor and the new elementary school change the findings of fact from their previous recommendation for high density.

Scott Langford said that the construction of the elementary school is underway as well as grading for the corridor.

Justin Stoker mentioned that in areas of Salt Lake City with narrow lots that the garages are placed behind the homes or alleyways are used. He asked if these might be considered to avoid the prominence of the garages.

Scott Langford said it hadn't been discussed in any detail, but the applicant is aware of the requirement in the P-C zone to move the garage behind the front face of the home. He noted that these lots are not very deep.

John Winn wondered if the students in The Maples would be bused to the new elementary school.

Sherry Devenberg, Jordan School District, 7387 South Campus View Drive, said she wasn't sure if that had been determined at this point, but she could get the information.

John Winn asked if there were plans to build a school in The Maples area.

Ms. Devenberg said not that she was aware of.

David McKinney referred to the projected numbers for school children provided from the district, and he asked if those numbers include this proposal.

Sherry Devenberg thought that the projections were made without the new development; however, they also take into account that there will be growth in the area. She answered questions regarding busing distances. She also corrected the letter for high school students to 9 students per 100.

Terry Diehl, applicant, 4198 East Prospector Drive, invited Ron Raddon who is developing the commercial property in the area to give an update.

Ron Raddon, 3248 East, Sandy, owner/developer of Jordan Hills Retail at 7800 South U-111 Highway, was asked to give an update on the commercial development. Two years ago they were close to having Macey's on the site, but economic issues put that on hold for a couple of years. Within the last sixty days they had WalMart and Macey's out and Smith's will be visiting the site in two weeks. He felt that the additional 250 units coming in across the street it would entice them to locate here. He was in favor of the rezoning.

Troy Sanders, ASWN, 5151 South 900 East, Salt Lake City, explained that the proposal is for three phases with about 80-85 units each. Dedication of the roadways would be given to the city. The steepest section is a band right through the middle of the property. The average slope from the existing roadway at the top of the hill down to the bottom of the hill is about 8% grade. After the property is mass graded they anticipate the lots to be at an average of 7-8% grade, which would require along the steepest sections some three to four-foot retaining walls every lot or two to pick up the grade. The largest grades can mostly be accommodated with a walk-out basement, eliminating the need for most retaining walls through those sections. The required 15% open space has been met through five different areas: Clay Hollow Wash, open space on the corner where the well head is, landscaping along 6400 West that serves as a buffer to the more intensive uses to the east, a small neighborhood pocket park, and open space to dedicate to the city to be incorporated in the larger regional park area. They agree with the findings in the staff report.

Commissioner Gedge was excused at 7:23 p.m.

Terry Diehl said their intent is to carry over what exists in The Maples with the same types of housing and price range. He explained that the 'staggered' homes that Scott Langford spoke of were actually zero lot line on one side and an 8-foot setback on the other, which would accommodate a driveway to access a garage behind the home. When the project was originally approved the Mountain View Corridor was not planned for its current location. He didn't feel that the current land use designations were compatible with each other with low density next to high density. At the very northern part the Mountain View Corridors is almost touching the property. There will be a homeowners' association for East Maples that would maintain the pocket parks. The trail system is in the city master plan, so the developer would provide the trail and the city would take it over. They had also been concerned with the retaining walls, so they had done extensive work on the grading plan. They are convinced that any lots that need retaining on the side would be minimum 2-feet and on the back it would be 3-4 feet. There is a large amount of dirt work to complete since it was a gravel pit previously and there are collapsible soils that need to be removed. They will probably mass grade the property and then come back and phase it in the actual development. The technical issues will be reviewed in detail by the engineering department at the time of the subdivision approval. He said they had spoken with the school district to see if they needed a school site in this area, but they declined. He felt that product type should be discussed in the next phase, but they would encourage the garages to be set back and/or be side garages.

David McKinney said assuming the maximum density is approved adjustments to deal with potential setback problems could result in fewer lots. He asked if the applicant would accept that kind of solution.

Mr. Diehl said that they would.

Justin Stoker said many of the issues are site related, but he felt it is applicable when considering the proposed density. He thought that lot size and grade also relates to the density.

Terry Diehl said the average lot size is less than the Maples, but their numbers show those averages as 5485 square feet in one phase and in the other two it is 5592 square feet. Their proposed plan average is 5112 square feet, and even though they are asking for a four-foot side yard, the setbacks in The Maples are actually wider than that. He stated that the 15% open space was not required in The Maples, and that is what reduces the lot size.

Kathy Hilton was concerned that if the property were to be sold after the zoning is in place, they might not get the things that the applicant is stating now.

Terry Diehl said they sell all the land that they do entitlement work on, but he was committed to go through the entitlement process and to also go through the preliminary and final subdivision plats as well as the infrastructure. The builders they sell to will be dependent upon the guidelines established by the city and themselves.

Kathy Hilton said it was stated that there were problems with the setbacks due to staggering because of the different builders involved after the project was approved.

Mr. Diehl said they will put some general design guidelines together for the builders to allow them to develop their product.

Commissioner Gedge returned to the meeting at 7:34 p.m.

Andrew Lenz, West Jordan resident, didn't feel like anything had changed since the last request in October. It is overcrowded, schools are crowded, 7800 South is not improved, and there are no solidly funded plans for fire, police, roads, sewer, schools, or snow removal since October. He stated that the setbacks in The Maples are not adequate. He was concerned that the requested density was at the maximum level of the medium range. The trail will be maintained by the city, which burdens the taxpayers. He dismissed the idea of any commercial development in this economy. He didn't feel that the applicant had addressed the impacts that a change in density would bring.

June Christiansen, West Jordan resident, asked why would they want to change what is already in place. She didn't think that anyone would benefit from the change. There would be more people in a smaller area, increased traffic, lack of traffic signals, the busing and traffic situation would be awkward. She felt there would be an increase in accidents just based on the current traffic situation. The quality of living will definitely decline with the addition of people, noise, and crowding in schools that decreases the quality of education. She felt that the low density proposal was a positive way to go.

Matthew Smith, West Jordan resident, was against the rezoning and encouraged the commission to look at the findings 1 through 6. The findings are about the same since the October meeting, yet not much has changed since then. He felt the retaining walls and slope were problematic. He lives in a fairly flat portion of The Maples, but his retaining wall is six feet tall. He was afraid that if the layout doesn't work out that the applicant would then propose multi-family units. In October the applicant presented a financial cost analysis that stated medium density would be the most costly to the city. He felt that the low density plan made sense.

Ryan Castro, West Jordan resident, said the Mountain View Corridor will be a phased roadway and will only be four lanes, which is smaller than Bangerter Highway and will have traffic signals initially. When he moved here six years ago it took him 19 minutes to get to work in Cottonwood Heights, but now as more homes have been built it takes 33 minutes and the proposal will only increase that. He questioned the statement from Mr. Raddon that 160 new homes might have solidified the deal for the commercial development when three years ago Serengeti Springs was approved, which added 168 homes directly adjacent to the commercial pad.

Von Anderson, West Jordan resident, was against the rezoning for reasons similar to those already given. He said there are retaining walls 15-20 feet high on phases 5 and 6 and the lots below the Hamlet Homes to compensate for the slope. He questioned the statement that the retaining walls in the East Maples would only be 3 to 4 feet, because he thought it would be similar to those other phases in The Maples. Also, 7800 South needs to be improved before it can accommodate this type of project.

Dave Fresques, West Jordan resident, said most of his concerns had already been presented. He said one of the selling points when they purchased their home five to six years ago was that there would be larger lots with 2.87 dwelling units per acre in the subject property, which would provide a better resell for his home. He said there is no low density other than this north of 7800 South except for the area that the Mountain View Corridor runs through. He didn't know if it is always in the best interest to have densities all the same. The smaller lot sizes would benefit the developer. He also didn't think the narrow lots would accommodate even the options for a rear garage or alleyway. School issues were also a concern to him. He suggested that 4.01 units per acre might be a compromise between the developer and the residents.

Further public comment was closed at this point for this item.

Terry Diehl felt that most of the issues with infrastructure and schools had been explained. He offered to increase the minimum lot width to 50 feet.

David McKinney asked if they would be willing to change the density to 4.5 units per acre, which would decrease the number by about 32 homes.

Terry Diehl said if they made the lots 50 feet wide it would drop the number of lots to 234, but he didn't know if they could do anything less than that.

David McKinney asked if they recommended 4.75 units per acre would the applicant be agreeable with that.

Terry Diehl said if 4.75 puts it in the 234 lot range then they would be fine with it.

Jesse Valenzuela commented that although a commercial development sounds possible it is purely speculative, because there is nothing under contract at this time.

Terry Diehl said he didn't know of any commercial properties under contract to develop, but that property had been sold to Ron Raddon. He said it is ironic that one of the things that cause a problem with trying to get something under contract is the lack of rooftops.

Jesse Valenzuela said a lot of time and money was spent to develop a master plan for the area. He is more inclined to stick to that master plan, because people base their home purchases and future on those plans. He felt that the original plan provides for a better diversity of homes in the area.

John Winn said it appeared to him that low density residential is not economically sound right now and there aren't a lot of builders who want to buy the larger lots, so he felt that the reason for the change in the plan is that it is more lucrative at this time, which makes sense to him.

Terry Diehl said one of the reasons is that there is not a market for larger lots right now, and there is a downsizing in all markets. There has also been a change in the location of the Mountain View Corridor that warrants the change to medium density.

Kathy Hilton said the city as a whole had worked hard on the west part of the city, which they hadn't been able to do on the east part of the city. That is the reason why such care was taken when preparing the master plan for the west side. She said piece by piece the developers are coming in and wanting to change the densities. She said that right now there might not be a market for low density, but she is tired of hearing that West Jordan can't sell big lots or large homes. She said that West Jordan certainly can do that. There are many people that look for this, but since they can't find it they go somewhere else. She agreed that people look at the master plan for their area when they buy their homes, and it should be able to stay that way.

David McKinney asked if the master plan was created before the current route for the Mountain View Corridor was determined.

Tom Burdett clarified that the Mountain View Corridor was first located along 5600 West. At about the time the rest of Jordan Hills Villages was started they looked at a new alignment that moved it further west to around 5800 West. What is new is that the Jensen property owners asked UDOT to have it moved about 500 feet further to the west. The route is now fixed.

David McKinney said that as a general rule of good planning, higher densities and more intensive uses of property are located closer to major arterials. He felt that a medium density designation on this site is more appropriate given the proximity to the corridor and the commercial uses contemplated in the area. He was concerned with the lot widths and would be in favor of a lower density than was requested.

Justin Stoker said the developer indicated they could accommodate 234 lots and going off of the 49.27 acres of property gives 9,000 square foot lots on average, but some of that is open space. If they were to look at a minimum lots size of 6,000 to 8,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of more than 50 feet, it would be a decent compromise.

David McKinney asked if they could specify a maximum density and a minimum lot width in their recommendation.

Scott Langford said they could do either.

There was additional discussion regarding density and acreage.

Kathy Hilton felt that there is at least a mile between the east property line and the Mountain View Corridor.

Scott Langford said from 6400 West to U-111 is one mile. It is about a half-mile from Mountain View Corridor.

Kathy Hilton said she lives three of four homes in from 9000 South, which right now is busier than the Mountain View Corridor will be for five to six years or more, which is plenty of distance for a low density subdivision. Her subdivision has anywhere from one-half to three-quarters of an acre lots. She didn't think that there was any correlation between this being changed to medium density just because of the Mountain View Corridor.

John Winn reiterated his comment from the last time it was heard that he didn't think that the increase in density was a positive thing. Commercial development will continue to come whether or not this is changed. He thought that we would lower our standards by accepting medium density when residents in the area were planning on low density. There are no plans to improve 7800 South. He would vote no for an increase in density.

Justin Stoker asked how the commission felt about recommending a density of 4.75.

David McKinney would agree to something that specified a minimum lot with of 50 feet or a maximum density of 4.75. He felt that the Mountain View Corridor looked very close to the site as you go north on the property, so it should be considered.

John Winn said they set a goal and a master plan, and although it may not come as fast as they thought it would, it would still come and he doesn't want to change the plan or the goals of the city.

Nathan Gedge didn't see anything in the proposal that would change his mind from the October meeting, and in order to be consistent with himself he would vote no.

Justin Stoker thought that most of the findings of fact had been negative and there is still a great deal of concern with 7800 South and the east/west connection.

MOTION: **Nathan Gedge moved based on the reasons that the increased density is currently not near any significant commercial services or transit corridors, because there are adequate optional sites for the proposed use or change in density, and because the expectations of neighbors related to prior density standards for the property are not consistent and the greater density is incompatible with the existing use, and that the proposal seems intended primarily to benefit the developer and not the city that the planning commission forward a negative recommendation to the city council to amend the General Plan Future Land Use Map for East Maples; 6509 West 7800 South; East Maples Investments, LLC/Mark Garza (applicant) from Low Density residential to Medium Density land use designation. The motion was seconded by John Winn and passed 6-1 in favor with David McKinney casting the negative vote.**

MOTION: **Nathan Gedge moved based on the reasons that the increased density is currently not near any significant commercial services or transit corridors, because there are adequate optional sites for the proposed use or change in density, and because the expectations of neighbors related to prior density standards for the property are not consistent and the greater density is incompatible with the existing use, and that the proposal seems intended primarily to benefit the developer and not the city that the planning commission forward a negative recommendation to the city council for the Preliminary Development Plan for East Maples; 6509 West 7800 South; East Maples Investments, LLC/Mark Garza (applicant). The motion was seconded by John Winn and passed 6-1 in favor with David McKinney casting the negative vote.**

MOTION: **Nathan Gedge moved based on the reasons that the increased density is currently not near any significant commercial services or transit corridors, because there are adequate optional sites for the proposed use or change in density, and because the expectations of neighbors related to prior density standards for the property are not consistent and the greater density is incompatible with the existing use, and that the proposal seems intended primarily to benefit the developer and not the city that the planning commission forward a negative recommendation to the city council to amend the Zoning Map for East Maples; 6509 West 7800 South; East Maples Investments, LLC/Mark Garza (applicant) from P-C Zone with maximum density of 2.87 du/ac to P-C Zone maximum density of 5.15 du/ac. The motion was seconded by John Winn and passed 6-1 in favor with David McKinney casting the negative vote.**

****

Tom Burdett gave an update on a subcommittee regarding revisions to the landscape code. Commissioners Lawes and Valenzuela stated that they would attend.

MOTION: **Nathan Gedge moved to adjourn.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Justin Stoker
Chair

ATTEST:

JULIE DAVIS
Executive Assistant
Development Department

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011