

Approved Minutes of the
BOUNTIFUL CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 6, 2023 – 6:30 p.m.

1
2
3
4
5 Location: Council Chambers City Hall, 795 South Main Street, Bountiful UT 84010
6
7 Present: Commission Members Lynn Jacobs (Chair), Alan Bott (Vice-Chair) Jim Clark,
8 Krissy Gilmore, Cecilee Price-Huish and Sharon Spratley
9 City Attorney Clinton Drake
10 City Engineer Lloyd Cheney
11 Chief Building Official Don Simons
12 Planning Director Francisco Astorga
13 Senior Planner Amber Corbridge
14 Recording Secretary Darlene Baetz
15
16 Excused: Commission Member Sean Monson
17

18
19 **1. Welcome.**

20
21 Chair Jacobs called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.
22

23 **2. Approval of the minutes for May 2, 2023.**

24
25 MOTION: Commissioner Spratley made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Commissioner
26 Clark seconded the motion.
27

28 VOTE: 6-0 in approval.
29

30 **3. Architectural Site Plan Review Lot 11 at 1791 South Renaissance Drive.**

31
32 Brian Knowlton was present. Senior Planner Amber Corbridge presented the item.
33

34 The applicant requested preliminary and final architectural and Site Plan approval for Renaissance
35 Towne Centre Lot 11. City Council previously approved a zone change for the entire Renaissance
36 Town Centre to MXD-R zone in May 2019 which amended the Development Plan/Ordinance. The
37 Development Plan was amended in April 2021 and then in October 2022 for this site. The proposed
38 project will consist of seventeen (17) townhouses, three (3) apartments, and two (2) non-residential
39 (office/retail) spaces. The maximum building height for all the structures would be fifty-four (54)
40 feet.
41

42 Mr. Knowlton will correct the plans to show the removal of the fencing on the ground floor patio
43 areas.
44

45 Commission members discussed a desire for this project to have a walkable area for the inside four
46 lots.
47

48 Staff made a recommendation to forward approval for this project.
49

50 MOTION: Commissioner Gilmore made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to City
51 Council for the approval of the Architectural Site Plan Review of Lot 11. Commissioner Bott

1 seconded the motion.

2
3 VOTE: 6-0 in approval.

4
5 **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 6
7 1. Remove the fencing around the patios facing the street.
8 2. Update plans to show patio designs consistent with each other.
9 3. Meet all department staff review comments and corrections.

10
11 **4. Downtown Zone Amendment Change.**

12
13 John Egan, applicant was present. Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item.

14
15 Mr. Egan requested three amendments to the land use code text be changed in the Downtown zone.
16 The proposed code amendments are in Title 14 Chapter 7 and Title 14 Chapter 18 to include Building
17 Width and Height, Parking, and Carport.

18
19 Building Width and Height:

20
21 Staff discussed the proportion and ratio of the width and height of the building and noted a block in
22 the Downtown zone is 330 ft in width.

23
24 Staff recommended approval of the building width and height text amendment with the three
25 conditions:

- 26
27 a. Break the building up horizontally (base, middle, and top) and vertically every forty-five (45) feet
28 or less using step-backs, architectural beams, cornices, windows, etc.
29 b. Stagger building heights every forty-five (45) feet or less.
30 c. Use various materials, colors, and textures approved in this chapter.

31
32 Commissioner Gilmore felt design is very important to her and would like to see mid-block pedestrian
33 access and that a large 350 ft building needs to have more than the recommended 50% glass.

34
35 Commissioner Bott discussed the parking on Main St. versus having rear parking and likes a
36 breezeway to be added at mid-block to accommodate pedestrians and parking in the rear.

37
38 Commissioner Clark stated that he has no problem with having one building but would like to require
39 the height differences to appear as separate structures.

40
41 Commissioner Spratley had a concern that a project has the appropriate number of entrances for the
42 buildings.

43
44 Parking:

45
46 Staff discussed the downtown needs for parking and other transportation options including
47 walkability and Bus Rapid Transit. Senior Planner Corbridge discussed the parking analysis study

1 done in other cities.
2

3 The proposed amendment would reduce multi-family residential parking for the entire city. Staff
4 recommended having a standardized multi-family residential parking minimum of 2 stalls per unit
5 and reduce Mixed-Use in the Downtown multi-family residential parking minimum of 1-2 bedrooms,
6 1.75 stalls/unit and 3+ bedrooms, 2 stalls/unit.
7

8 Staff recommended approval of the parking text amendment.
9

10 City Engineer Cheney stated that no matter what is decided for this item, occupants don't always
11 follow the rules and could impact off-street parking. There are a number of streets in the downtown
12 area that are smaller in width than normal. In the winter the city does receive a lot of snow and it
13 becomes a challenge to remove, hold snow and maintain the public right-away. There is a section of
14 Main St that on-street parking can be used during the winter.
15

16 Planning Director Astorga noted that at the time of this meeting, the consultant for the General Plan
17 project is still compiling data from the General Plan open houses.
18

19 Carport Setbacks 20

21 This proposed ordinance would allow for carports to be placed in the side and rear yard setbacks, if
22 there are no negative effects on adjacent properties. The current code requires the carport to meet the
23 same setbacks as the primary structure and requires a building permit.
24

25 Staff did not make a recommendation for a approval for this section of the code amendment but asked
26 the Commissioners for their thoughts and concerns.
27

28 Chief Building Official Simons stated he had a discussion with Fire Marshall and noted he didn't
29 have a problem with the carport being open on all sides with the fire ratings.
30

31 Councilwoman Price-Huish is concerned about the vagueness of the applicants' code request and
32 asked if a parking study or analysis had been done for the Downtown zone.
33

34 Planning Director Astorga noted that a parking study or analysis was not done for the downtown area.
35 The City does not have the resources available for a study done in-house. To outsource this project
36 would be extremely expensive and would take a great deal of time.
37

38 Commissioner Bott felt that the market should dictate what the project or public needs and felt that
39 we should focus our time on the look of the structures and not the carport requirements.
40

41 Mr. Egan thanked the staff and Commissioners for the great amount of time put into these projects.
42

43 Chair Jacobs opened the Public Hearing at 8:43 p.m.
44

45 Brian Knowlton resides at 630 E 500 S. Mr. Knowlton discussed the history of the downtown code
46 written several years ago and noted the problem at the time was parking. He is in support of the
47 applicants request for the height and width of the building, the carport on the property line, and the

1 shared parking.
2

3 Walker Woods resides at 771 E Hills Dr. Mr. Woods would like to see more housing and had a
4 concern about the amount of parking in the Downtown area. He noted his full support of the staff's
5 recommendation.
6

7 Richard Higginson resides 195 W 200 N. Mr. Higginson noted that a study was done by Envision in
8 2005 with concerns about the size of the buildings. He stated that he likes that the buildings show a
9 difference in height and width. If the parking changes are adopted, every project will still be required
10 to include on-site parking and will not allow on-street parking in the required parking. He likes the
11 request for not requiring covered parking and to include studio requirements listed in the code and
12 need to be addressed in the code for parking. We should have flexibility to help the developer to
13 move the project forward and not be a detriment.
14

15 Sharman Shoot resides at 781 S Sunrise Circle. Mr. Smoot agrees with a number of comments that
16 have been made, including helping the developer with more flexibility. He noted that parking is
17 important but is concerned about the proposed standard from staff.
18

19 Kenny Knighton resides at 575 Woodland Hills. Mr. Knighton discussed the economical reasons
20 why small projects are being built on expense lots. He felt that breezeways are a bad idea and agreed
21 with the reduction in parking standards. He did not have a problem with the carports to be on the
22 property line and that developers need flexibility with their projects.
23

24 Chair Jacobs closed the Public Hearing at 9:24 p.m.
25

26 Commissioner Bott would like to propose a parking study be done for each project.
27

28 Planning Director Astorga noted that shared parking can't be used for a commercial project.
29

30 Discussion about the possible options for motion.
31

32 **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**
33

- 34 a. Break the building up horizontally (base, middle, and top) and vertically every forty-five (45) feet
35 or less using step-backs, architectural beams, cornices, windows, etc.
36 b. Stagger building heights every forty-five (45) feet or less.
37 c. Use various materials, colors, and textures approved in this chapter.
38

39 **MOTION FOR WIDTH AND HEIGHT:** Commissioner Spratley made a motion to forward a
40 positive recommendation to the City Council for the approval of the width and height text amendment
41 with the change to section A and C. Moving section C to the end of A.
42

43 Commissioner Bott seconded the motion.
44

45 **VOTE:** 6-0 in favor.
46

47 **APPROVED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1 a. Break the building up horizontally (base, middle, and top) and vertically every forty-five (45) feet
2 or less using step-backs, architectural beams, cornices, windows, etc. *and include the use of*
3 *various materials, colors, and textures approved in this chapter.*
4 b. Stagger building heights every forty-five (45) feet or less.
5

6 MOTION FOR PARKING: Commissioner Bott made a motion to table this item to the June 20
7 meeting Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Clark seconded the motion.
8

9 VOTE: 6-0 in favor.
10

11 MOTION FOR CARPORT: Chair Jacobs made a motion to table this item to the June 20 Planning
12 Commission meeting. Commissioner Bott seconded the motion.
13

14 VOTE: 6-0 in favor.
15

16 **5. Planning Director's report, review of pending applications and miscellaneous business.**
17

18 **6. Adjourn**
19

20 Chair Jacobs adjourned the meeting at 9:56 p.m.