

as the existing right-of-way to the east so there would be a consistent 68-foot right of way on 6th South.

Chairman Dyer asked about plans for a bridge at 6th South to the west of the canal. Will the planned new street that is to go over the canal be able to be accommodated?

Val Christensen said it would be. The proposed street will fit within the 68-foot right-of-way. It is not seen to be an arterial or a collector.

Currently, 7th South is seen as the major arterial through the area.

The vacate was pointed out on the projected map; it would be located north of the proposed project and the armory. The area was clarified on this map for the Commissioners.

Dan Hanna motioned to recommend the vacation of the right-of-way (vacate 31-feet of 6th South right-of-way, from 4th West to 3rd West) subject to staff approval, to City Council for public hearing. **Mary Ann Mounts** seconded the motion.

None opposed. **Motion carried.**

2. Kartchner Conceptual Plan for development at 6th South and 4th West

Troy Kartchner distributed copies of a conceptual site plan, to brief the Commission on the proposed project. Tonight they would like input from the Commission on this proposal. The property is at 6th South and 4th West - on 7th South just west of the armory and then north on 6th South. They will have 296 men's living spaces and 312 women's spaces (106 single student apartments). A Conditional Use Permit application has been submitted and will be coming before the Commission for public hearing. The project is located in the PEZ (Pedestrian Emphasis Zone) Zone. They would like to extend 6th South to the east, to 2nd West, and hope to be reimbursed by adjacent property owners of future developments. A bridge would be put in crossing over the canal for the extension of 6th South. There will be a large landscaped area along the canal. They would put in a 12-foot wide pedestrian walking path on City property to connect the area. Snow storage locations were shown.

Mr. Kartchner stated that a big concern to them was the fact that 69 per cent of single students bring cars. They are concerned about parking because the location is a little further away from campus than other complexes. They plan to have 90 per cent parking on the men's side and over 85 per cent parking on the women's side. They have spoken with the University and feel the parking will be more than adequate. There would be indoor storage for bikes, beneficial for the students and keeping the project uncluttered. They have met with staff to discuss the project.

Thaine Robinson asked the height of the planned buildings.

Troy Kartchner said the buildings will be 2-story town homes, stacked, so that another rental is not above or below a unit. Their first phase would be the four buildings (each a 12-plex holding 72 students) shown on the 7th South property.

Dan Hanna asked how they would deal with the drainage ditch on the property.

Troy Kartchner said they will pipe it, seeing that as the best alternative. They will work with City Engineer John Millar.

Chairman Dyer pointed out that a building is shown on the fault line.

Mr. Kartchner reiterated that they would welcome suggestions from the Commission and would like to hear any concerns.

Chairman Dyer stated there is a traffic concern with one of the entrances being close to the intersection of 4th West and 6th South, and generating traffic. Three entrances are smart; it is just the location of this one that could be problematic. He also pointed out that the conceptual drawing shows neatly lined-up buildings. He said they may want to stagger the buildings and realizes that this is just a conceptual site plan.

Dan Hanna thought the plan was great.

The requirement for parking in area 2 of the PEZ Zone is at least 50 per cent; they are going to provide more than what is required.

Val Christensen stated that Troy Kartchner has met with John Millar regarding the right-of-way, but Mr. Millar has not seen this conceptual plan that is being presented tonight.

Chairman Dyer said that pedestrian connectivity is also important.

There is also a concern of increased traffic on 7th South.

Discussion continued.

Troy Kartchner said bikes will be safe and sheltered from winter weather.

Gil Shirley wondered about possible bike paths to campus, separate bike paths.

There will be 6- foot sidewalks and the 12- foot trail going south.

It was expressed that possibly parking could be taken out on one side of the street to put in bike paths.

Troy Kartchner thanked the Commissioners for their comments and time. He added that they have started developing their Summerfield project this week and thanked the Commission for their support and patience.

Unfinished/Old Business:

1. Mixed Use Zones - Discussion

Val Christensen handed out the draft document update for Mixed Use-1 (MU-1) only, to guide tonight's discussion. He tried to implement the points they spoke about at their last meeting into the document. The Comprehensive Plan Map (Preferred Land Use Map) shows the mixed use designation between the university and the downtown corridor and along 1st North. He pointed out the mixed- use designated areas on the projected Comprehensive Plan Map. It is felt to be most viable in the PEZ Zone.

The City's zoning map was projected on the overhead screen. Val Christensen pointed out the same area on this map. There are medium and high density residential with a small piece of commercial. His question is, what is the incentive for someone wanting to change to mixed- use in these zones?

Chairman Dyer said the intent was to have neighborhood commercial businesses that would appeal to the community, such as a laundromat. or a sandwich shop, so residents would not have to travel by car for some everyday needs. That was the vision.

Val Christensen stated the idea of the PEZ Zone was to get redevelopment. College Avenue has been brought up numerous times as the perfect area for that. From a developer's standpoint of buying up homes on College Ave. to build a project, what would the underlying zoning do? The current underlying land use designation is mixed-use, although the developer would want high density. If it was mixed use, if bringing in commercial near single student complexes, there could be conflict. University projects are autonomous projects.

A representative (Phil Packer) from BYU-I who was in the audience, said the University did not really have a problem with the mixed use zone itself, but if commercial and residential were in the same building, the University may see that as a problem.

Val Christensen said they may need to address this issue while this zone document is being formulated. It is a question of whether or not the zoning that is already there is more desirable than what they are being asked to go to.

The City could look at the possibility of rezoning some of the zones.

Chairman Dyer said these areas need to be rezoned to High Density; the hope was that the mixed use would increase densities plus add the opportunity for some commercial to make the area even more attractive for more development.

A certain component of commercial would be part of development projects.

Val Christensen said if that area was all rezoned to Mixed Use 2 with a PEZ overlay that may be the best of both worlds. There was agreement among the Commissioners.

Richie Webb said what they are trying to accomplish is increased flexibility of these properties. If such a change would do so, it makes a lot of sense.

The Commission discussed the zone ordinance specifying permitted businesses to keep them appropriate to the neighborhood.

It was expressed that true mixed use has both commercial and residential together.

Nephi Allen said Mixed Use areas may have residential and commercial in the same building, but it is still completely separate – entrances, firewall, etc.

The possibility of a meeting between representatives from the University, Planning and Zoning, City Council, and City staff was suggested.

The University may have concerns about what types of businesses are next to student residences.

Chairman Dyer stated that the City and the University working together could help to resolve the University's concerns.

The BYU-I representative agreed. He does not at this time have input from the executive level at the University and will try to look into this matter further. He will come back to the Commission with further information. This will help the Commission know how best to proceed.

Richie Webb pointed out the Professional Plaza area on the projected map. The Comprehensive Plan map was changed for part of this property. The idea was that offices would go there. Under the idea of mixed use, things do not quite fit because of the addition of office alone only in the middle of residential.

This issue concerns a horizontal mixed use. If there was an overlay, it would be like a spot zone.

Discussion continued.

Val Christensen asked if the Commission was interested in possibly changing some of the areas near the university from mixed use. The College Ave area could not be allowed high density residential due to the Comprehensive Plan Map current land use designation. The area would have to go to mixed use zoning. Should the mandatory commercial percentage then be removed?

The matter will need further discussion.

The Commission and the BYU-I representative both felt that the City and the University working together could help to resolve the University's concerns. The BYU-I representative does not at this time have input from the executive level at the University and will try to look into this matter further to help the Commission know how to best proceed.

The draft Mixed-Use One document being discussed tonight lists uses by right and by conditional use permit. The Commission will study these, and the issue will be further addressed at a future meeting.

The stated mandatory percentages of a minimum of 30 per residential or commercial for each development may need to be revisited.

It was expressed that the best way to regulate may be to let the market control.

Ted Hill suggested looking at successful mixed use projects in other college towns.

Thaine Robinson expressed that it is very problematic for the University to co-exist with the commercial. Perhaps they are trying to put a round peg in a square hole near the University; the Mixed Use idea fits well in other nodes in the City.

There was discussion on perhaps needing to rezone to high density. The comprehensive plan may first need to be changed.

Val Christensen expressed that a good portion of the PEZ zone fits perfectly in the areas adjacent to the University.

It was suggested that perhaps these areas should be high density designation rather than mixed use designation on the Comprehensive Plan Map.

Ted Hill wondered about a mixed use overlay here.

Val Christensen said there could possibly be a mixed-use overlay that could go over an existing high density residential.

Mandatory percentage language could be removed to let the market decide development.

The consensus was that College Avenue would need to be changed to high density residential on the Comprehensive Plan Map. There could be an overlay of mixed-use here.

The Commissioners will review the draft document, including the permitted and conditional uses, which will be addressed at the next P&Z meeting, along with what elements should go into a section of the document that would address an overlay.

There was more discussion.

The draft document also addressed ownership - should there be single ownership of a project? As long as the commercial/residential mix is maintained, the ownership question may not need addressing.

Single ownership could possibly be in an overlay.

Lot configuration and density - set the density low at 10 per cent, and up to 20 per cent with a conditional use permit in MU-1. The MU-2 will further address density.

Setbacks distance - do they want to allow on-street buildings?

Mary Ann Mounts said this may be good for College Avenue.

If densification is wanted, bring the setback out – this will be further addressed in MU-2.

Underground parking - allowing into setbacks, and to include landscaping – this will be addressed in MU-2.

Building height is stated as 45-feet.

The 55 foot height (wall, not pitch) is now allowed for some commercial and high density projects, but is not allowed in Medium Density. This height could be used in MU-2.

Distance between buildings – with respect to accessory buildings, there would be no set distance. Other buildings should have some degree of separation.

Permissible lot coverage was discussed as 70 per cent in MU-1 and 90 per cent in MU-2.

Building footprint - the Commission voiced that it did not need to be restricted.

Joint use parking was addressed, and the Commission supported this section as written in the draft (with the indicated changes).

Landscaping – if a development abuts a different zone, it needs to go by that zone.

Architectural Design Standards are currently being re-written.

Gil Shirley asked Val Christensen to look into the University providing the Commission with a list of suggested uses for MU-1 and MU-2.

Val Christensen will work on the Mixed Use Zones draft document to include tonight's input. The discussion will continue at the next P&Z meeting.

Non controversial Items Added to the Agenda:

1. Design Review Committee Organization - Discussion:

Per the request of **Chairman Dyer**, a draft organizational description of the Design Review Committee process as defined for the development code revision was handed out for discussion. City Attorney Stephen Zollinger is looking at the protocol and legal aspects of this issue.

Chairman Dyer briefly described a Design Review Committee meeting that had recently been held, as an example of how these meetings have been conducted.

Val Christensen said he is present at the Design Review meetings and has often met with the developer in the past. It was really helpful to him in regard to this meeting to have someone else (in this instance **Chairman Dyer**) take leadership of the meeting, as this was a new voice for the developer to hear.

This Design Review Committee document stated there would be representatives from three (3) pools of individuals: the Planning and Zoning Commission, the City Council and Mayor, and a Professional Group. The pools would be rotating.

A Planning & Zoning Commission member would be in charge of directing the meeting. The goal is for these meetings to be a win-win situation, both for the developer and the community, a meeting of give and take and compromise.

If a development does not meet design requirements when reviewed by the Community Development Director or designee, or if the developer feels there is a special reason for what they want to do and requests a meeting, the issue could go before the Design Review Committee.

Thaine Robinson asked why this change from how the Design Review Committee currently is meeting on projects was being done. The meetings have always had very harmonious outcomes.

Val Christensen said that staff felt the current committee might be overburdened with the frequency of meetings.

Ted Hill stated that as outlined in the presented document, the size of the pool of people to be involved is way too big. It would be a continual learning process for people new to the meeting process. The Design Review Committee that is currently involved has attended meetings long enough to know the process and how to move it along, and a conclusion is reached each time. He is not against other people being involved, but he feels the size of the pool as stated involves too many people.

There was discussion.

The consensus appeared to be that the pool of people who would participate in the Design Review Committee meetings should be smaller.

2. Inter-Local Agreement status.

Chairman Dyer stated that the P&Z Commission had recommended the agreement to go before City Council for approval. He asked if this had been completed.

Val Christensen said that the Inter-Local Agreement has not gone before the City Council, as City Attorney Stephen Zollinger wants provisions on the utilities included in the document. Madison County's attorney did not agree. The problem has not been resolved and is actively being worked on toward resolution.

Compliance:

Compliance Officer Natalie Powell stated that applications for signage for new businesses have been positive. When a business license is applied for, the applicant is given a registration packet of information and necessary forms. Signage is addressed at that point.

Report on Projects: None

Tabled Requests: None

Building Permit Application Report: None

Heads Up:

The Planning & Zoning October 1st agenda will include two Conditional Use Permit applications and a Preliminary Plat proposal.

The meeting adjourned at 9:28 pm.