

1 **DRAFT Minutes of the**
2 **BOUNTIFUL CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**
3 **Tuesday, April 7, 2026 - 6:30 p.m.**
4

5 Official notice of the Planning Commission Meeting was given by posting an agenda at City
6 Hall, and on the Bountiful City Website and the Utah Public Notice Website.
7

8 **City Council Chambers**

9 795 South Main Street, Bountiful, Utah 84010
10

11 Present: Planning Commission Acting Chair Krissy Gilmore, Sean
12 Monson, Beverly Ward, Chair Alan Bott, Alan
13 Arbuckle, Lynn Jacobs, and Beth Child
14
15 Planning Director Francisco Astorga
16 Excused City Engineer Lloyd Cheney
17 City Attorney Brad Jeppsen
18 Recording Secretary Rachel Coleman
19 Excused Assistant Planner Chaz Leech
20 Senior Planner Amber Corbridge
21
22
23

24 **1. Welcome**

25
26 Vice Chair Gilmore called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed everyone.
27

28 **2. Meeting Minutes from January 20, 2026**

29
30 Vice Chair Gilmore noted that the meeting minutes were going to be postponed due to an error.
31

32 **3. 2523 South 100 West Zone Change from Single-Family Residential (R-4) Subzone to**
33 **Mixed Use Residential (MXD-R)**
34

35 Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item as outlined in the packet
36

37 Planning Director Astorga stated that Vice Chair Gilmore was Acting Chair, even though Chair
38 Alan Bott was present but late.
39

40 Planning Commission members introduced themselves in response to a request from an audience
41 member.
42

43 Acting Chair Gilmore requested clarification on whether the Planning Commission would be
44 reviewing and voting on the rezone and/or the development plan outlined in the packet
45

46 Mr. Astorga clarified that the Planning Commission's role is to provide a recommendation to the
47 City Council based on adopted policy and the General Plan.

48
49 Mr. Astorga noted that the Planning Commission previously recommended adoption of the
50 General Plan, which was approved by the City Council in December.
51 He stated that the General Plan has not yet been fully implemented, though staff are currently
52 working through the implementation process.

53
54 Mr. Astorga explained that the subject application was submitted prior to adoption of the General
55 Plan and was paused at the request of the applicant, Alexander Clark, until after its adoption.
56 He noted that the Land Use Code has not yet been updated to align with the General Plan and the
57 applicant is proceeding with a request to rezone the property from Single-Family Residential (R-
58 4) to MXD-R Zone. Mr. Astorga referenced other developments in Bountiful that are located
59 within the MXD Zone and went through the same zone change process but have different
60 parameters than the subject application. The subject application zone change proposal is site
61 specific.

62
63 Mr. Astorga explained that he created the MXD Zone Change Development Plan Application
64 Guide, included in the packet, as a framework for the current proposal and future rezoning
65 applications. The guide outlines applicable code requirements, provides brief explanations, and
66 includes findings and analysis. Mr. Astorga explained that applicants are encouraged to use the
67 MXD Zone Change and Development Plan Application Guide when preparing submittal
68 materials.

69
70 Mr. Astorga stated that his findings support a recommendation to the Planning Commission that
71 the proposed development aligns with the General Plan. He noted that the MXD Zone predates
72 the current General Plan, but clarified that the General Plan may still be used to guide decision-
73 making for the proposal.

74
75 Mr. Astorga highlighted key sections of the Application Guide, including staff findings related to
76 MXD Zone requirements. These include demonstrating outstanding site characteristics to justify
77 a zone change for a property smaller than the five-acre minimum and applying standards for
78 determining sub-zone designation based on land use percentages.

79
80 Mr. Astorga explained that the applicant submitted updates after the packet was finalized and
81 provided the Planning Commission with a hard copy. The updates included revisions to the
82 parking study, corrections to the café land use designation, and adjustments to square footage
83 allocations.

84
85 Mr. Astorga explained that the application is for the MXD-R subzone and noted that all existing
86 MXD designations in Bountiful are currently MXD-R, with predominantly residential land uses.

87
88 Commissioner Jacobs clarified that it is possible that a prospective applicant could propose a
89 MXD designation that is not for the MXD-R subzone.

90
91 Mr. Astorga explained that applicants may propose modifications to default setbacks and height
92 limits outlined in the Application Guide. He noted that a previous applicant for the Renaissance
93 Town Center was granted increased building height under the provisions of the applicable land
94 use code. He also confirmed that the current applicant is requesting a deviation of how the height
95 is measured rather than an overall increase in height.

96
97 Mr. Astorga emphasized the importance of meeting requirements that align with urban design
98 characteristics. He further explained that, because this is a legislative application, the Planning
99 Commission has the authority to establish specific standards for this site within the general urban
100 design framework outlined in the applicable land use code.

101
102 Mr. Astorga confirmed that the applicant submitted calculations intended to demonstrate
103 compliance with open space requirements; however, these calculations have not yet been verified
104 by staff.

105
106 Mr. Astorga explained that the applicant needs to meet the required parking standards, though
107 reductions may be possible if shared parking is shown to be a workable option. He also noted
108 that the City can decide how much parking is needed and where it should be located to meet the
109 goals of the code. He added that the parking reduction analysis was based on a general office use
110 for the commercial portion; however, since the proposed use is now a café/restaurant, which
111 typically has higher and more overlapping peak demand with residential uses the shared parking
112 reduction may not be as effective as originally assumed.

113
114 Mr. Astorga explained that the applicant submitted the required site plan documents and noted
115 that staff may request additional materials if needed to show compliance with the applicable code
116 and planning standards.

117
118 Mr. Astorga explained that if the development plan is approved then all uses under the applicable
119 code will be processed as permitted uses, unless otherwise stated, with residential and
120 hotel/entertainment serving as the primary use designations within the MXD-R subzone.

121
122 Mr. Astorga asked if the Planning Commission had any questions about the MXD rezone
123 process. Commissioner Monson requested clarification on the rezoning process, asking if it
124 involves setting site-specific standards between the applicant and the City, followed by approval
125 from the City Council. Mr. Astorga confirmed this understanding.

126 Commissioner Monson also asked whether the standards run with the land. Mr. Astorga
127 confirmed that, once approved, the standards become an ordinance and a regulating document
128 specific to the proposed development. Finally, Commissioner Monson asked whether a future
129 property owner could change those standards. Mr. Astorga confirmed that a new owner could
130 apply to amend the development plan, rather than the entire zone.

131

132 Commissioner Bott asked for clarification on whether an applicant seeking an MXD rezone must
133 first identify the appropriate subzone and then set standards through a site-specific development
134 plan, subject to the applicable code. Mr. Astorga confirmed this understanding.

135
136 Mr. Astorga explained that only a few properties have applied for an MXD rezone, including the
137 property at 189 South 200 West. Ms. Corbridge noted that this property was also significantly
138 smaller than the five-acre minimum requirement.

139
140 Chair Monson asked for clarification on the five-acre minimum requirement for an MXD rezone,
141 noting that smaller properties may still be considered if the applicant can demonstrate unique
142 characteristics, as with the subject property. Mr. Astorga confirmed this understanding.

143
144 Mr. Astorga gave a visual presentation to guide the Planning Commission through the process.
145 He explained that the development supports the City's overall goals by aligning with the place-
146 type provisions in the General Plan. He referenced the adopted Future Land Use Map, noting that
147 the subject property is within the Neighborhood Mix Residential Overlay, also known as
148 "Orchard Bend." This overlay was added to allow a variety of appropriately scaled housing
149 types, along with small-scale, low-intensity mixed-use development.

150 Mr. Astorga added that staff is supportive of the application because it complies with the
151 Neighborhood Mix Residential Overlay by meeting its key characteristics.

152
153 Mr. Astorga continued his presentation, stating that he and staff support rezoning the subject
154 property to help achieve the goals of the proposed development. He also noted that this
155 application would be the first to use the MXD zone to implement the General Plan place-type
156 vision without the Orchard Corridor Study. Mr. Astorga noted that the Orchard Corridor Study
157 originated as an idea from the Planning Commission.

158
159 Mr. Astorga continued by asking whether the proposed development is an appropriate interim
160 approach until zoning code updates are completed. He also noted that any property owner has the
161 ability to apply to rezone their property

162
163 Mr. Astorga noted that the property is located along the UTA Route 455 and that the proposed
164 development includes characteristics that support a pedestrian-oriented design, integrated
165 housing, and neighborhood-serving uses, all of which help advance the General Plan goal of
166 activating the Orchard Drive Corridor.

167
168 Mr. Astorga concluded by asking whether the proposed development aligns with the City's vision
169 and whether the issues identified in the staff report, including the parking study, can be resolved
170 through further refinement.

171 He stated that while Staff supports the proposed rezone, several technical issues remain
172 outstanding. As such, Staff is not advancing a recommendation for approval at this time. The
173 meeting is intended to serve primarily as a work session while also fulfilling the public hearing
174 requirement.

175

176 Commissioner Monson asked whether, given the need for further refinement, it would be
177 appropriate to continue the item and public hearing until the development plan is updated. Mr.
178 Astorga responded that the decision to continue the public hearing rests with the Planning
179 Commission and recommended continuing it rather than re-opening it, as this would inform
180 those in attendance of the date for the continued hearing. He noted that re-opening the public
181 hearing would require additional public notice.

182 Commissioner Monson clarified that if the item were continued, the public hearing would not
183 proceed that evening but would instead occur after the development plan is refined. Mr. Astorga
184 explained that because the public hearing was properly noticed for that meeting, the Planning
185 Commission is required to open it, and any continued hearing would not require additional
186 notice.

187
188 Commissioner Bott stated that he found the rezone proposal and development plan to be an
189 interesting, precedent-setting project. He explained that he envisions the corridor as more
190 commercial-oriented rather than multi-family residential.
191 He emphasized the need for the Planning Commission to establish a clear direction and overall
192 vision for the subject property and surrounding area, noting that such a vision has not yet been
193 solidified. Mr. Astorga asked for clarification on whether Commissioner Bott was referring to
194 implementation of the General Plan. Commissioner Bott responded that he envisions a
195 commercial-oriented place type, not a multi-family residential area, and expressed a desire to
196 further clarify the City's vision and work collaboratively with the property owner.

197
198 Acting Chair Gilmore responded that the Planning Commission had extensive discussion during
199 the General Plan process, identifying the Residential Neighborhood Mix Overlay as the
200 predominant place type along Orchard Bend, with any commercial development intended to be
201 small in scale.

202
203 Commissioner Jacobs concurred with Acting Chair Gilmore and stated that the area presents
204 significant transportation challenges. He expressed concern that the proposed café use may not
205 meet parking requirements, noting that café standards typically require more parking than office
206 use and should be applied accordingly.

207 He stated that while the Commission has taken a more conservative approach to parking in the
208 Downtown area due to available on-street parking, overflow parking from the proposal could
209 impact surrounding neighborhoods.

210 Commissioner Jacobs also raised concerns regarding the parking layout along 100 West,
211 indicating that its use as an extended driveway could result in traffic queuing and spillover onto
212 Orchard Drive. He noted safety concerns at the intersection of Orchard Drive and 100 West,
213 citing limited visibility and speeding.

214 He further stated that UTA Route 455 should not be considered a major transportation corridor
215 and that Main Street BRT should be the primary focus. He also expressed concerns regarding site
216 access and stated that the presence of transit does not justify development on a parcel smaller
217 than five acres.

218

219

220 Commissioner Monson concurred with Commissioner Bott regarding the vision for the Orchard
221 corridor, particularly along Orchard Bend, supporting a more commercial-oriented development
222 rather than continuation of expanding the existing multi-family uses. He also expressed concern
223 that the proposed parking configuration along 100 West could result in spillover onto Orchard
224 Drive, creating negative impacts.

225
226

227 Commissioner Ward concurred with other Commissioners regarding parking and traffic
228 concerns. She noted visibility issues for southbound traffic on Orchard Drive due to a tall solid
229 brick fence adjacent to the property and stated that drivers traveling at higher speeds may not
230 anticipate vehicles exiting 100 West or traffic queuing during peak hours associated with drop-
231 off and pick-up at Boulton Elementary.

232 She also expressed concern that proposed street trees near the 100 West intersection and Orchard
233 Bend could further obstruct visibility. Additionally, she noted significant congestion during
234 school start and dismissal times.

235 Commissioner Ward further questioned the viability of the proposed development with only 12
236 parking stalls, stating that this may limit customer capacity unless supported by increased
237 pedestrian, bicycle, or transit use.

238

239 Commissioner Jacobs requested clarification regarding the sight distance triangles referenced in
240 the packet. He noted that while the applicant may have addressed some traffic-related
241 considerations, additional review may be necessary in light of visibility concerns at the 100 West
242 left-turn lane, as raised by Commissioner Ward, and suggested the traffic report may need to be
243 updated.

244

245 Commissioner Child said that the Orchard Corridor Study needs to take place before any
246 development along Orchard is considered. She said she liked the idea of a café but was
247 concerned about the feasibility of staying in business with 12 seats.

248

249 Commissioner Jacobs stated that the purpose of the Orchard Drive Study is to establish a
250 community vision.

251

252 Mr. Clark addressed the Planning Commission and thanked them for their consideration. He
253 expressed enthusiasm for the project and stated his intent to improve the property and enhance
254 neighborhood viability. He noted that the concept has been discussed for several years and was
255 developed to align with the General Plan vision, including the addition of a coffee shop to bring
256 vibrancy to the area.

257 Mr. Clark stated that he worked with engineers to evaluate parking and other site considerations,
258 and thanked residents for their participation. He indicated a willingness to consider modifications
259 to the proposal to better align with the Planning Commission's vision.

260

261 Commissioner Child and Arbuckle thanked Mr. Clark and said that the proposed development is
262 a great step forward to beautifying the area.

263

264 Mr. Astorga noted that Mr. Clark had previously considered a purely multi-family residential
265 development. He explained that while the applicant could revise the proposal to a residential-
266 only project, the requested MXD zoning would not support such use without a secondary
267 commercial component. He stated that a café would serve as an appropriate light commercial use
268 and would align with the General Plan and Future Land Use Map.

269
270 Acting Chair Gilmore opened the public hearing at 7:55 pm

271
272 Cullen Irvine, a resident within 500 feet of the subject property, spoke in opposition to the
273 proposal. He expressed concerns regarding increased traffic at the blind corner, the lack of a
274 sidewalk on 100 West, and the suitability of the site for mixed-use zoning due to its size. He also
275 stated that the proposal represents high-density development and could negatively impact the
276 character of the neighborhood.

277
278 Myca Irvine expressed concerns regarding student safety, noting that many elementary and
279 junior high students in the area walk to school. She cited inadequate sidewalk conditions and
280 raised specific concerns for the safety of children, including those with disabilities. She also
281 identified safety issues at the intersection of 200 West and Orchard Drive, including conflicts
282 with right-turning vehicles and limited crossing guard presence, and stated that additional traffic
283 could increase risks to pedestrians.

284
285 Brett King stated that the parking comparison to 100 West at Bountiful Town Square is not
286 comparable. He expressed support for a walkable community.

287
288 Judy Johnson submitted a letter from Ross L. Youngberg, who was unable to attend. She stated
289 that the 100 West corner is currently a traffic hazard even without additional development. She
290 also expressed concern regarding the height of the proposed building and stated that there is
291 insufficient parking.

292
293 Acting Chair Gilmore gave Mr. Astorga the letter from Mr. Youngberg and asked that it be
294 documented.

295
296 Elaine Oaks stated that the proposed high-density housing is not compatible with the scale of the
297 surrounding neighborhood and expressed concern that it could contribute to water supply and
298 aquifer recharge issues.

299
300 Debbie Holbrook expressed concerns that high-density development would contribute to
301 increased traffic, particularly affecting children and pedestrian safety.

302
303 Cathy McDonald thanked Commissioner Ward for taking time to walk the neighborhood. She
304 expressed concerns regarding building height, privacy impacts, and lack of on-street parking.
305 She also raised concerns about increased traffic and suggested consideration of less dense multi-
306 family development. She stated that, in her view, the site is not suitable for the proposed
307 development.

308 Ron Mortensen stated that this would be the first decision made under the new General Plan and
309 expressed concern that it does not justify the proposed development on a five-acre site. He also
310 requested that an aquifer study be completed.

311
312 Mason Malin stated that the proposed development would directly impact his family and
313 expressed opposition, noting that he did not believe it was beneficial for local families or
314 neighborhoods..

315
316 Mitchell Dawson stated he is resident of Bountiful but not near the proposed development. He
317 asked the Planning Commission to do something.

318
319 Mary Sellers stated that she installed the tall brick wall for safety, which was referenced as a
320 visibility concern adjacent to the proposed development. She also reported experiencing multiple
321 traffic hazards on Orchard Drive.

322
323 Ray Wilson said he lives across street from proposed development and is against the rezone and
324 proposed development.

325
326 Acting Chair Gilmore continued the public hearing for a future meeting at 8:37 p.m.

327
328 Mr. Clark thanked those in attendance and expressed appreciation for support from neighborhood
329 residents near the proposed development, including those not present at the meeting, regarding
330 their desire for change.

331
332 Commissioner Monson asked Mr. Astorga that if the rezone is not approved how much density
333 could that applicant have on his property based off the current zoning regulations.

334
335 Mr. Astorga stated that the property is located within the Single-Family Residential (R-4)
336 subzone and that a reanalysis of the General Plan would be required to evaluate whether the
337 current neighborhood zoning supports the Plan's goals. He further noted that, under current
338 zoning, duplexes are not a permitted use.

339
340 Commissioner Jacobs stated that his primary concern is improving safety along Orchard Drive.
341 He noted that the current proposed development does not adequately address safety concerns for
342 roadway users and stated that a traffic study is needed.

343
344 Commissioner Bott thanked Mr. Clark for his willingness to work with the City on potential
345 modifications. He stated that he does not support the current proposal but encouraged continued
346 collaboration to develop a plan that would benefit both the applicant and City residents.

347
348 Commissioner Arbuckle expressed his concern about sidewalk safety along all of Orchard and
349 supported the Orchard Drive Corridor study idea.

350

351 Acting Chair Gilmore stated that, as currently proposed, she does not support the project. She
352 noted that a café could be beneficial for youth and the community, but stated that a study and
353 landscape buffer, including a backyard buffer, are needed. She also expressed opposition to
354 vehicles backing out onto 100 West.

355
356 Commissioner Child stated that the Mayor has suggested pursuing a grant to fund the Orchard
357 Drive Corridor Study and noted that the referenced items could be completed in 2026.

358
359 Mr. Astorga asked the Planning Commission to provide direction if the consensus is not to make
360 a positive recommendation to City Council.

361
362 Commissioner Jacobs suggested that the motion should include clarity on the issues identified by
363 staff about the parking study and the other technical issues that were identified. He also
364 encouraged the applicant to take what he heard tonight to heart and see if there are reasonable
365 modifications that could be made to the proposed development.

366
367 Commissioner Bott asked if it would be appropriate to continue the item and commence
368 discussion for a future date once the issues have been addressed.

369
370 Acting Chair Gilmore said she didn't think that they could hold an application indefinitely

371
372 Mr. Astorga stated that, as a legislative item, there is no specific timeframe for how long the
373 application may be held.

374
375 City Attorney Jeppsen said that the proposed development as is would be unfavorable
376 recommendation to City Council. Applicant could request a delay in order to address concerns.

377
378 Commissioner Jacobs clarified that the Planning Commission is not the final decision-making
379 body and that City Council serves as the deciding authority.

380
381 Mr. Jeppsen advised that if there is to be a prolonged delay to address application issues, the
382 delay should be initiated at the applicant's request.

383
384 Mr. Clark addressed the Planning Commission and expressed concern regarding how to move
385 forward, noting that the property has significant potential and is relatively large compared to the
386 existing development on the site.

387
388 Commissioner Bott stated that, although the applicant has completed a parking study for the
389 development, an Orchard Drive corridor study should first be completed. He noted this would
390 help determine the best use of the site and provide greater comfort to both the Planning
391 Commission and affected neighbors.

392

393 Mr. Jeppsen stated that the Planning Commission may either proceed with a vote on the
394 application or the applicant may take the Commission's recommendations, work with Mr.
395 Astorga, and request a continuance to a future meeting date.

396
397 Mr. Clark said his preference would be to request a delay and work with Staff to create a more
398 favorable proposal.

399
400 Commissioner Bott asked Commissioner Jacobs what changes would be necessary to achieve a
401 favorable recommendation for the proposed development. Commissioner Jacobs stated that the
402 site is challenging from a transportation perspective and noted safety concerns and anticipated
403 increases in traffic volume.

404 He stated that if the proposal were modified to eliminate use of 100 West for parking, he would
405 be more supportive and would expect more than minimum parking requirements to be provided.
406 He further stated that it is not appropriate for the neighborhood to absorb excess parking demand
407 and indicated he does not support reducing parking below the minimum requirement of 22 stalls.

408
409 Commissioner Bott suggested options for moving forward, including proceeding with a vote or
410 continuing the item. He noted that a continuation may be unproductive if the Planning
411 Commission does not have clear direction to reach a favorable outcome.

412
413 Commissioner Monson asked Mr. Astorga how long it would take Staff and the applicant to
414 develop modifications that could address Commissioner Jacobs' concerns regarding parking and
415 traffic safety.

416
417 Mr. Astorga said that May 5 would be the earliest available date.

418
419 Commissioner Monson motioned to continue the 2523 South 100 West Zone Change from
420 Single-Family Residential (R-4) Subzone to Mixed Use Residential (MXD-R) proposal no more
421 than 60 days pending the preparation and analysis by Staff and the applicant of the information
422 outlined by Commissioner Jacobs. Commissioner Jacobs made an amendment to the motion to
423 continue the public hearing. Commissioner Monson agreed to the proposed amendment.

424 Commissioner Ward clarified that, under the current zoning, the property would allow only a
425 single-family dwelling and not a duplex. Commissioner Jacobs agreed and said that the existing
426 duplex is a legal nonconforming structure. The motion was unanimously approved with
427 Commissioners Gilmore, Arbuckle, Bott, Monson, Ward, Jacobs, and Child voting "aye."

428
429 **4. Land Use Code Text Amendment – RM Zone and Access Standards**

430
431 Planning Director Astorga presented the item as outlined in the packet.

432
433 Mr. Monson was excused at 9 p.m.

434
435 Planning Commission agreed to conduct straw polls in order to quickly gauge opinions before
436 making an official decision.

437 The Planning Commission approved the positive recommendation, with staff alternatives for
438 Amendment 1: Allow Shared Driveways and Fire Access and Amendment 2: Reduce Setbacks
439 for Townhome Development.

440
441 The Planning Commission approved Staff's negative recommendation, as proposed, for
442 Amendment 3: Increase Lot Coverage, Amendment 4: Reduce Landscaping Requirements, and
443 Amendment 5: Revise Minimum Lot Size Density.

444
445 Commissioner Jacobs expressed concern, in reference to Amendment 3 and 4, given current
446 drought conditions and water shortages in the City, increasing impervious surface area may not
447 be advisable.

448
449 Mr. Astorga asked the applicant, John Blocker, whether he was agreeable to Staff's negative
450 recommendation for Amendments 3-5. Mr. Blocker indicated that he was agreeable to Staff's
451 recommendation. Mr. Blocker explained that the intent of the proposed text amendments was to
452 encourage meaningful development and provide opportunities for affordable housing. Referring
453 to Amendment 3, he noted that numerous existing requirements within the RM Zone limit the
454 ability to achieve higher density on smaller lots. Mr. Astorga stated that Staff does not support
455 Amendment 3 because they have not yet had the opportunity to evaluate whether it would
456 support the base density outlined in the Land Use Code.

457 The Planning Commission approved Staff's negative recommendation for Amendment 6:
458 Reduce Landscape Buffer Requirement.

459
460 The Planning Commission approved the positive recommendation, with staff alternatives, for
461 Amendment 7: Update Open Space Flexibility.

462
463 Commissioner Arbuckle asked Mr. Astorga to explain the modification to yard setbacks up to
464 20%, referring to Amendment 7. Mr. Astorga said he didn't want to change the 20% setback
465 modification because it gives the Commission the ability to reduce yard setbacks.

466
467 Mr. Astorga, referring to Amendment 8 & 9 Access Width and Dead-End Driveway Standards,
468 noted that the code was revised to align with the adopted International Fire Code (IFC), improve
469 clarity, and eliminate double standards.

470
471 Commissioner Ward asked whether it is common for other cities throughout the State to utilize
472 the International Fire Code (IFC) in their review process.

473 Mr. Astorga responded that, per Mr. Blocker's understanding, most cities utilize IFC Appendix
474 D. Mr. Astorga further noted that while he is not adopting all of Mr. Blocker's recommendations
475 in Amendment 8 & 9, Mr. Blocker is agreeable to Staff's recommendations.

476
477 Mr. Blocker addressed Planning Commission and thanked them for their consideration in
478 reviewing the changes to the Land Use Code. He said there is a huge hole in the Land Use Code.

479
480

481 Acting Chair Gilmore opened the public hearing at 9:28 p.m.

482

483 Mr. Cullen Irvine stated that he is in favor of development but not high-density development.

484

485 Acting Chair Gilmore closed the public hearing at 9:29 p.m.

486

487 Commissioner Bott stated, in reference to Amendment 5, that if a property is just under one (1)
488 acre, the development should be allowed the same density. Acting Chair Gilmore concurred with
489 Commissioner Bott's statement.

490

491 Mr. Astorga shared a visual of Land Use Code §14-5-103 and explained how density is
492 calculated based on lot size within the designated zone. He noted that properties under one (1)
493 acre and above certain thresholds are subject to different density allowances, and that properties
494 under 0.25 acres are generally limited to single-family zoning.

495 Mr. Astorga stated that Staff frequently explains density calculations at the front counter, at least
496 once per month. He further explained that Staff did not recommend approval of the amendment
497 because it was unclear whether the proposed language would be consistent with the General
498 Plan. Based on the information submitted, Staff did not feel there was sufficient detail to support
499 a recommendation of approval.

500

501 Commissioner Bott asked Mr. Astorga whether consideration could be given to revising the code
502 related to density calculations in the RM Zone at a future date. Mr. Astorga responded that it
503 could be considered at a future time.

504

505 Commissioner Jacobs suggested that any discussion of policy be discussed at a different time.

506

507 Commissioner Ward asked Mr. Astorga how long the density calculation requirements have been
508 in the Code. Mr. Astorga responded that, without researching the exact date, he estimated the
509 provision has been in place for at least 20 years. Commissioner Ward stated that if the referenced
510 code has been in place for that length of time, it may be best not to make a quick decision
511 regarding changes to it.

512

513 Mr. Blocker asked the Planning Commission if he could table the policy items

514

515 Attorney Jeppsen said that if the item is tabled without a future date, then it is dead.

516

517 Mr. Blocker asked the Planning Commission what they proposed to do with the policy items.

518

519 Commissioner Jacobs suggested that it would be important to give Staff clear direction on what
520 they would want.

521

522 Mr. Astorga stated that Mr. Blocker did not provide sufficient information to support a
523 determination of how the proposed text amendment would be beneficial.

524

525 Commissioner Bott asked the applicant what he would like to see. Mr. Blocker responded that he
526 agreed with the Planning Commission's assessment that the text amendment requires additional
527 research and that insufficient information had been provided to support the request.
528

529 Acting Chair Gilmore stated that she believes policy issues should be addressed in a separate
530 amendment and indicated that the Commission would likely proceed with Staff's
531 recommendation at this time.
532

533 Commissioner Ward asked whether the decision rests with the Planning Commission or the City
534 Council. Commissioner Jacobs responded that the Planning Commission's action is a
535 recommendation to the City Council.
536

537 Commissioner Jacobs motioned to approve staff recommendations of forwarding positive and
538 negative recommendations outlined in the staff report with Commissioner Ward's recommended
539 typo corrections. Commissioner Bott seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously
540 approved by Acting Chair Gilmore, Commissioner Bott, Jacob, Ward, Child, and Arbuckle.
541

542 **5. Director's Report**

543 Mr. Astorga discussed the General Plan Implementation that was discussed at Council retreat.
544 Mr. Astorga said that City Manager Gary Hill and City Council have had positive discussions
545 about economic development in the City.
546

547 Mr. Astorga said he is no longer the RDA director
548

549 Acting Chair Gilmore adjourned the meeting at 9:41 p.m.
550