



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING STAFF REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 19, 2016

NAME OF PROJECT: Ashton Robertson Enterprises LLC

NAME OF APPLICANT: Berg Engineering

AGENDA ITEM: Zone Map Amendment

LOCATION OF ITEM: 250 East 200 South

ZONING DESIGNATION: R-1-9 and R-1-11

PROPOSED ZONING: R-1-9

ITEM: 2

Ashton Robertson Enterprises LLC is requesting a Zone Boundary Clarification regarding their parcel that is dissected by the R-1-9 and R-1-11 zones. The property is located at 250 West and 200 South.

BACKGROUND & ANALYSIS:

Ashton Robertson Enterprises LLC owns parcel OMI-0449-0-035-034 which is 4.94 acres in size and is located at about 250 West and 200 South. The parcel is dissected by two separate zones being the R-1-9 (3.58 acres) and R-1-11 (1.36 acres) zones. The applicant is asking that the City zone the entire parcel as R-1-9. If the entire parcel is zoned R-1-9 then the possible density will increase for the property in potentially two ways. First, the lots in the R-1-9 zone are smaller than the lots in the R-1-11 zone by 2000 square feet which, therefore, may allow more lots to be located on the property. Second, duplexes are allowed in the R-1-9 zone where they are not in the R-1-11 zone. Potentially the density

on the property will increase by five units if the determination is made to zone the entire parcel R-1-9.

The density of a potential development on the property if half the lots are considered R-1-9 (duplex units) and the other half are R-1-11 (single-family units) is 15 units. The potential density if the entire parcel if it is entirely zoned R-1-9 (duplex units) is 20 units. If the City Council does allow the R-1-9 zone to be considered for the entire property, then the increased impact of more density should be considered. For example, the traffic count for the development will increase by approximately 50 trips per day for the increased density of the five units. Also the parcel's location should be considered. The parcel is located close to Main Street and where many services are located. It is also close to the Midway Elementary School and an LDS chapel. If density is to be added to the City this would a better location than most for increased density.

The General Plan describes through the Land Use map that higher density should located near Main Street and decreases the farther you are from the center of town. This location is near Main Street so staff feels that the General Plan of zoning will be maintained with the higher density. As for a more harmonious mixing of uses, generally the surrounding area is populated by single-family dwellings. Adding duplexes in the area will not be a harmonious mix with the existing single-family neighborhoods in the area. As for analyzing the proposal within the proposed development, is it more harmonious to have one side of the street with duplexes and one side with single-family dwellings or is it better that both sides of the street have duplexes?

Since this is a legislative matter, the City should ask what it is receiving for allowing higher density on the property. General public sentiment that has been received through public hearings and comments gathered through the General Plan review process indicate that the public would rather have more open space and less density. It appears this application creates the opposite of that sentiment. Is there a community benefit that should be considered? Can the developer contribute in some manner to help promote other goals in the General Plan such as creating open space in another area of the City? Or does the City feel that creating more affordable housing in the community is a benefit in itself?

POSSIBLE FINDINGS:

- The potential density and coinciding required services and traffic of that density of the parcel will increase if the entire property is zoned R-1-9
- The property is located near Main Street and many services that are located on Main Street which would allow this to be a walkable development
- Approving the zone change would allow more affordable housing in the community.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

1. Recommendation of approval. This action can be taken if the Planning Commission feels proposal is acceptable and in the community's best interest.
 - a. Accept staff report
 - b. List accepted findings
 - c. Place condition(s)

2. Continuance. This action can be taken if the Planning Commission feels that there are unresolved issues.
 - a. Accept staff report
 - b. List accepted findings
 - c. Reasons for continuance
 - i. Unresolved issues that must be addressed
 - d. Date when the item will be heard again

3. Recommendation for denial. This action can be taken if the Planning Commission feels that the request is not acceptable and not in the best interest of the community.
 - a. Accept staff report
 - b. List accepted findings
 - c. Reasons for denial