1 2 3 4	DRAFT Minutes of the BOUNTIFUL CITY PLANNING COMMISSION Tuesday, June 17, 2025 – 6:30 p.m.			
5 6 7	Official notice of the Planning Commission Meeting was given by posting an agenda at City Hall, and on the Bountiful City Website and the Utah Public Notice Website.			
8 9	<u>City Council Chambers</u> 795 South Main Street, Bountiful, Utah 84010			
10 11 12	Present:	Planning Commission	Chair Lynn Jacobs, Alan Bott, Krissy Gilmore, and Beverly Ward	
13 14 15 16 17 18		Planning Director City Engineer City Attorney Senior Planner Recording Secretary	Francisco Astorga Lloyd Cheney Bradley Jeppson Amber Corbridge Sam Harris	
19 20 21	Excused: Commissioners Jim Clark, Sean Monson, and Richard Higginson			
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	 <u>Meeting</u> Commission Bott second Bott, Gilmo <u>Condition</u> 	hair Jacobs called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance. <u>Meeting Minutes from May 20, 2025</u> pommissioner Ward made a motion to approve the minutes from May 20, 2025. Commissioner out seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved with Commissioners Jacobs, out, Gilmore, and Ward voting "aye." <u>Conditional Use Permit for a Vehicle Service Emission Testing Center at 416 West 500</u>		
34 35 36	South Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item as outlined in the meeting packet.			
 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 	Chair Jacobs asked whether the applicant would be required to obtain approval from UDOT for the change of use. Senior Planner Corbridge confirmed that UDOT approval is required. David Bornholdt, applicant, stated that the site layout will remain unchanged and provided an overview of the business operation. In response to a question from Chair Jacobs about whether the business would perform vehicle repairs for those who fail emissions tests, the applicant clarified that no vehicle repairs would be conducted on-site.			

- 46 Commissioner Bott inquired about the flow of customer traffic. The applicant explained that
- 47 vehicles would enter through the rear entrance, located between the subject property and Point S,
- 48 and exit through the front. Commissioner Bott also asked whether the business would operate by
- 49 appointment or walk-in. The applicant confirmed that no appointments are necessary, and the
- 50 service will operate on a walk-in basis.
- 51
- 52 Chair Jacobs opened the Public Hearing at 6:42 p.m.53
- 54 Ed Ortega expressed concerns regarding the filtration system and the proposed operating hours. 55
- 56 Chair Jacobs closed the Public Hearing at 6:44 p.m.
- 5758 In response to the concerns raised, the applicant stated that the business is not expected to
- 59 generate noticeable emissions, as approximately 95% of vehicles pass the test. Additionally,
- 60 traffic impacts should be minimal and comparable to those of the neighboring Valley Glass
- 61 business.
- 62
- Commissioner Gilmore motioned to approve. Commissioner Ward seconded the motion. The
 motion was approved with Commissioners Jacobs, Bott, Gilmore, and Ward voting "aye."
- 65 66

67

68

- 4. <u>Final Architectural & Site Plan for Vehicle Service Emission Testing Center at 416 West</u> 500 South
- 69 Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item as outlined in the meeting packet.
- 70
 71 Commissioner Gilmore made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to City Council.
 72 Commissioner Bott seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously, approved with
- 73 Commissioners Jacobs, Bott, Gilmore, and Ward voting "aye."
- 74 75
- 5. Final Architectural & Site Plan for Personal Service at 515 West 500 South
- 76
- 77 Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item as outlined in the meeting packet.
- 78
- Tom Longaker, applicant, explained the reason for the application and the response from UDOTabout the possibility of taking part or all of the building.
- 81
- 82 Commissioner Gilmore asked about the possibility of changing policy so that if a proposal meets
- 83 all applicable standards in the Bountiful City Code, it could be approved administratively by
- 84 Planning Staff rather than being brought before the Planning Commission. Planning Director
- 85 Astorga stated that such a change is a possibility in the future. All present Commission Members
- agreed that streamlining the process in this way could improve efficiency and reduce
- 87 unnecessary delays, provided that appropriate safeguards and transparency measures are in place.
- 88 It was also noted that under the current process, a change in use in the Commercial Zone requires
- 89 site plan approval by the Planning Commission. However, Director Astorga expressed a
- 90 willingness to explore official code changes that would allow administrative approval in cases

- 91 where the new use is equal to or less intensive than the previous use in terms of community
- 92 impacts, including, but not limited to, parking, etc., Staff would be open to drafting a policy
- 93 delegating such approvals to the Planning Department under controlled conditions.
- 94
- 95 Commissioner Bott made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to City Council.
- 96 Commissioner Ward seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously, approved with
- 97 Commissioners Jacobs, Bott, Gilmore, and Ward voting "aye."
- 98

99 Chair Jacobs switched items 6 & 7. Chair Jacobs announced a switch in agenda items, 100 addressing Item 7 before Item 6.

- 101
- 102 6. Final Architectural & Site Plan for Hidden Gardens Mixed-Use Development at 2122
 103 Orchard Drive
- 104
- Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item as outlined in the meeting packet.
- 107 Commissioner Gilmore made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to City Council.
- 108 Commissioner Bott seconded the motion. The motion was approved with Commissioners Jacobs,109 Bott, Gilmore, and Ward voting "aye."
- 110 110 111

7. <u>Amended Zoning Development Plan for Hidden Gardens Project at 2122 Orchard</u> <u>Drive</u>

112 113 114

116

- 115 Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item as outlined in the meeting packet.
- 117 Chair Jacobs opened the Public Hearing at 7:04 p.m.
- 118119 Claudia Lindeburg shared concerns regarding parking and the implications of the mixed-use120 zoning.
- 121
- 122 Chair Jacobs closed the Public Hearing at 7:06 p.m.
- 123
- 124 Chair Jacobs asked a clarifying question to confirm whether the request was simply to correct a
- small discrepancy and that no substantive changes were being made from the original approval.
- 126 Commissioner Bott confirmed that the amendment addresses a minor discrepancy and that the
- 127 proposal remains consistent with the original approval.
- 128
- 129 Planning Director Astorga further clarified the nature of the discrepancy and confirmed that it 130 was a technical correction with no changes to the approved project.
- 131
- 132 Commissioner Gilmore made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to City Council.
- 133 Commissioner Bott seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved with
- 134 Commissioners Jacobs, Bott, Gilmore, and Ward voting "aye."
- 135

136 137	8. <u>Final Architectural & Site Plan for Towne Place Suites Hotel at 630 North 500 West</u>
138 139	Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item as outlined in the packet.
140 141 142	Commissioner Bott asked about the space between the hotel and the existing commercial building. Senior Planner Corbridge confirmed it is eleven feet (11').
143 144	Logan Johnson, applicant, provided the background and explained the tightness on the setbacks.
145 146 147 148	Chair Jacobs asked about the pedestrian access from the hotel to Culver's. Logan Johnson stated that it will be connected with a pedestrian walkway to the 7Brews and from there pedestrians can take the sidewalk to Culver's.
149 150 151	Commissioner Ward asked about the distance to the building on the North end and if it is common to reduce it. Commissioner Bott stated that in other cities it is pretty common.
151 152 153 154 155	Commissioner Bott made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to City Council. Commissioner Gilmore seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved with Commissioners Jacobs, Bott, Gilmore, and Ward voting "aye."
156 157 158	9. <u>Land Use Code Text Amendment for Single-Family Residential Accessory Structure</u> <u>Building Height</u>
158 159 160	Planning Director Astorga introduced and clarified the item.
161 162	Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item as outlined in the meeting packet.
162 163 164 165 166 167	Commissioner Bott asked about the applicable sidewall and overall height standards for single- family residential zones. Senior Planner Corbridge explained that the Code does not currently specify a sidewall height, but the maximum overall height for a primary single-family dwelling is thirty-five feet (35').
168 169 170 171 172	Commissioner Bott raised additional questions regarding setbacks requirements. Senior Planner Corbridge provided clarification and referenced a diagram included in the packet. Commissioner Gilmore expressed concern about setback implications, particularly in relation to Commissioner Bott's suggestion to eliminate the height requirement for accessory dwelling units (ADUs), noting that ADUs should remain subordinate to the main dwelling.
173 174 175 176	Lisa Hicks, the applicant, explained the reasons for submitting the proposed text amendment application.
177 178	Chair Jacobs opened the Public Hearing at 7:51 p.m.

- 179 Barbra Belyea, a resident, voiced concerns about privacy impacts from potential two-story ADUs
- 180 and asked whether the proposal applied citywide. Chair Jacobs confirmed that the Land Use
 181 Code Text Amendment would apply citywide
- 181 Code Text Amendment would apply citywide.182
- 183 Tanner Peck, a resident, expressed support for the proposal.
- 184

185 Paula Hales, a resident, expressed concern about the significance of the amendment and asked 186 the Commission to consider continuing the item to allow more public awareness and input.

186 187

188 Sarah Myia, a resident, shared her support for ADUs while also recognizing the importance of189 respecting neighbor privacy.

190

191 Melinda Waterberry, a resident, raised concerns about the differences in lot sizes and their

- 192 relationship to ADU standards.
- 193
- 194 Chair Jacobs closed the Public Hearing at 8:10 p.m.
- 195

196 Chair Jacobs explained that the item had been properly noticed, and while he generally preferred

- 197 not to table items, the Commission is tasked with making a recommendation based on the
- 198 information presented. He emphasized the importance of Land Use Code Text Amendments,

199 given their citywide impact. He asked whether there was a statutory time limit for acting on the

- application. Planning Director Astorga stated there is no time limit on this particular amendment
 but emphasized the Commission's responsibility to forward a recommendation: positive,
- 201 but emphasized the commission's responsionity to for 202 modified, or negative to the City Council.
- 203

204 Commissioner Gilmore inquired about window orientation requirements for Accessory Dwelling 205 Units (ADUs). Planning Director Astorga explained that window placement can be evaluated as 206 part of the Conditional Use Permit process, which is reviewed by the Administrative Committee. 207 He noted that this issue is typically addressed during staff's initial review and/or during the 208 Committee's formal evaluation, where conditions may be imposed to mitigate potential impacts 209 on neighboring properties. Chair Jacobs elaborated on the Administrative Committee's role in 200 reviewing such permits and ensuring appropriate safeguards are in place.

210

212 Commissioner Bott clarified that there is a limit as to how much buildable space there is on a lot

- 213 depending on lot size. Senior Planner Corbridge stated that the overall lot coverage requirement
- for a Single-Family Dwelling is sixty percent (60%) coverage and forty percent (40%) open

space plus an additional requirement for Detached Accessory Dwelling Units not to exceed one

- thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250 sq ft) square feet for the footprint.
- 217

218 Commissioner Bott discussed how height can vary depending on roof design and lot slope.

- 219 Commissioner Gilmore expressed support for allowing two-story ADUs under appropriate
- conditions.
- 221

- 222 City Engineer Cheney clarified that the proposed amendment applies to all accessory structures,
- not just ADUs, and noted that accessory structures are restricted to 10% of the lot size by right and up to 15% through a conditional use process.
- 225
- 226 Planning Director Astorga explained the rationale behind the proposed 3-foot setback, noting that
- increasing the setback to 8 feet would render thousands of existing structures legallynonconforming.
- 228 229
- Commissioner Bott raised concerns about increasing the maximum sidewall height from 15 feet
 to 20 feet. Planning Director Astorga confirmed that the proposed amendment reflects that
 change.
- 232
- 234 Commissioner Gilmore suggested that it should be increased on the standard.
- 235
- 236 Commissioner Bott asked about how subordinate it should be. Commissioner Gilmore stated that
- she wants it to be subordinate. Chair Jacobs agreed with Commissioner Gilmore. Planning
- Director Astorga stated that the reason for the amended code is to be subordinate and onestandard.
- 239
- 241 Commissioner Bott explained his profession and as a general contractor that he looks at every242 inch.
- 243

Commissioner Gilmore suggested that the height is kept at twenty feet (20') and allow the wall height to go up to eighteen feet (18'), and on the enhanced height to go up to twenty-eight feet

- 246 (28') and allow the wall height to stay at twenty feet (20'). Commissioner Bott agreed with
- 247 Commissioner Gilmore.
- 248

Chair Jacobs asked about the minimum slope for asphalt roofing. Commissioner Bott stated thata 4:12 pitch (4 inches of rise for every 12 inches of run) is standard.

- 251
- 252 Chair Jacobs also voiced concern about potential privacy impacts from second-story windows
- 253 overlooking neighboring yards with only a 3-foot setback. Commissioner Gilmore noted that
- such concerns can be mitigated through the Administrative Committee's review process.
- 255
- 256 Commissioner Ward asked for clarification on the roof slope. Commissioner Bott clarified the 257 slopes being up four inches (4") and over twelve inches (12").
- 258
- 259 Commissioner Jacobs made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council
- with the modification that the enhanced height standard allow a maximum height of 28 feet
- while maintaining the maximum sidewall height of 20 feet, as recommended by staff, and
- 262 consistent with the corresponding setbacks also recommended by staff. Commissioner Bott
 263 seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously, with Commissioners Jacobs, Bot
- seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously, with Commissioners Jacobs, Bott,Gilmore, and Ward voting "aye."
- 265

Bountiful City Planning Commission Draft Meeting Minutes June 17, 2025 Page 7 of 7

266 267

269

266 10. Land Use Code Text Amendment for Boundary Adjustment Process

- 268 Senior Planner Corbridge presented the item as outlined in the meeting packet.
- Chair Jacobs opened the Public Hearing at 8:57 p.m. Seeing no public comments, he closed thePublic Hearing at 8:57 p.m.
- 272
- 273 Commissioner Gilmore made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to City Council.
- 274 Commissioner Bott seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved with
- 275 Commissioners Jacobs, Bott, Gilmore, and Ward voting "aye."
- 276
- 277 11. Planning Director's Report/Update
- 278279 Planning Director Astorga reported that staff is nearing completion of the draft General Plan. He
- 280 noted that the document will be publicly released for 30 days, which will coincide with the
- 281 Planning Commission's initial review timeline.
- 282

283 12. <u>Adjourn</u>

- 284
- 285 Chair Jacobs adjourned the meeting at 8:59 p.m.