

**Francis Planning Commission Meeting  
Thursday, January 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021 7:00 p.m.**

This meeting will be held as an electronic meeting without allowing the public to enter the Community Center or another anchor location to participate, pursuant to Governor Herbert's Executive Order 2020-5.

Francis City is inviting you to attend by following the link below or by calling 1-301-715-8592

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83055913956?pwd=SXppU0dXWUo2YitKc0ppbFdpTFJlZz09>

Meeting ID: 830 5591 3956 Meeting Password: 414002

**You can also comment by email to [comments@francisutah.org](mailto:comments@francisutah.org)**

**Attending:** Chair Brian Henneuse, Co-Chair Bob Murphy, Commissioners Jan Brussel, Natalie Atkinson and Felicia Sotelo, Planner Katie Henneuse, City Engineer Scott Kettle and Treasurer Mandy Crittenden

**Others Attending:** Rick Rapp, Eric, Tom Flinders, Jeanna Kuczanski, Jerry Heck, Betty Ann Heck, Nick Malone, Troy Thomas, Collette Madsen, Shauna Demars, Kimberly Lawson, Rodney Ekstrom, Beverly Grey, Kathy Crook, Clayton Querry, Monkey Eubanks, Melissa Thompson, Wes Price, Peter Abosida, Sharon Duso, Jamie Larsen, Rex Larsen, Harriet Natter, Nate Rushton, Dave Sutherland, Robin Ross, Justin Jones, Jeff Faulkner, Kathleen Tollison, Julie Hooker, Nick Berry.

Written comments by residents that did not attend meeting: Kit Burton, Juliy Marie, David Evans, Steve Fitzgerald, Lindsay Saylor, Elizabeth, Lee Ann Squires, Roy Atkinson.

**1. Call Meeting to Order**

Chair Brian called meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

**2. Elect Chair and Vice Chair**

Current Chair Brian opened up nominations for Chair of Planning Commission.

***Commissioner Jan nominated and made a motion for Commissioner Brian to remain Chair, since he does such a great job. Commissioner Bob seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.***

***Commissioner Bob nominated and made a motion for Commissioner Jan to be Vice Chair. Commissioner Natalie seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.***

**3. Public Hearings**

**A. Application for Zone Change – Francis Commons (Rick Rapp)**

Chair Brian informed we would be using the raise your hand feature on zoom for the public hearing. He explained how that works and reminded everyone they have two minutes and for everyone to be respectful.

Planner Katie read her staff report. She explained it is a long staff report because the applicant is asking for 3 different zones within the project. She will be treating each zone as its own application.

Engineer Scott gave his staff report. He stated this property was at one time zoned for something similar, but that the zoning has since been changed and they would need to re-evaluate infrastructure to see if we could still handle it. He explained the analysis is a very expensive, time consuming process, so he wants to know where the Planning Commission sits on wanting something like this before he requires the study to be done.

The developer Rick Rapp asked for his consultant Eric to provide some commentary on the project.

Eric stated they have taken the comments from the Planning Commission and City Council and applied them to the project. He said they are trying to incorporate a variety of living within the project to fill all needs. He explained that they heard a lot of feedback on townhomes and there were more people against the density of those, so they reduced the number of those and expanded their Residential Cottage Zone. He feels like the transition from State Road 32 to the current Scenic Heights Subdivision is fitting. Eric showed a concept plat and explained the changes from zone to zone. Overall, he believes this is the right location for this type of development and that they have planned a well transitioning project. Tom Flinders read a comment from Kit Burton. (Attached)

Commissioner Jan pointed out that they are within a ¼ mile of the City Center Zone.

Engineer Scott clarified that the City Center Zone was not based off a certain amount of footage, but to certain parcels to prevent partial parcels from being in the zone.

Chair Brian opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Jeanna Kuczmanski –is a data scientist, she looks at trends and does predictive analytics. Her studies show it will be adding 984 people to Francis on 17 acres, an additional 1,968 cars. She said the density is too much for this small of an area. She said the pollution, resource of water, and the school district need to be taken into consideration. She said parking will not be feasible, people will be parking on the roads. She is also worried about sex offenders, stacked homes attract problems.

Consultant Eric argued Jeanna’s numbers, Commissioner Brian moved on.

Jerry & Betty Ann Heck- like the idea of affordable housing, but she worked and saved her entire life to be able to buy a beautiful home in Oakley when she retired. They don’t want to live in a city, that’s why she moved here to live in the country, other people can do the same. She said there is enough traffic and congestion as it is and the schools are already crammed, we can’t add more people to the mix. They are very against this.

Nick Malone- supportive of all previous comments. Questioned why chat was disabled, Chair Brian responded yes, the comments got out of hand at the last meeting so it was disabled, to keep the meeting professional.

Troy Thomas-wants to know with the two roads that are stubbed into his property, what is the width requirement of them? The distance between the two roads? What is the fencing plan that the City will require for adjacent property. What will happen with the main irrigation ditch?

Chair Brian responded the roads are for future development if they chose to develop, they will not be taking their property,

Engineer Scott clarified they would require a 60’ right of way and 30’ pavement.

Chair Brian explained it will all be reviewed and needs to be approved by the irrigation company at a later time. But those are things that will be worked out before they get approval.

Collette Madsen-is worried about the impact on schools as we cannot get a bond to pass as is, and too many seniors on a fixed income that can’t afford their taxes to go up. This is not just about Francis, this is the whole district that needs to be considered. The impact on traffic, not just with this development but with all the already approved subdivisions its way too much. This plan does not conform to our General Plan of keeping this a rural town. We need to recognize the whole valley not just Francis. Echoed Troy’s concern of the irrigation ditch, this is a big ditch that effects a lot of people.

Shauna Demars- echoes what everyone is saying. Worried about the infrastructure. Does not agree with the letter from Kit that sounds like he is saying it is not really their problem to fix the infrastructure that it’s on the other approved developments. Schools are a huge issue already. She is not opposed to development and she would love to see some

commercial, but does not think this is the answer. She also agreed with Mrs. Heck, that she worked hard to be able to live here, for the rural feel and to be able to see the stars. With this type of development that gets taken away.

Kimberly Lawson-commented Planner Katie started the meeting well, with reading the mission statement of Francis. It states that density should only be added if the infrastructure can handle it. She also stated we have already met the requirement of median income per the General Plan, so we don't need to add to that. She moved here from Bluffdale to get away from the same thing that is being proposed here. We need to be smart about growth once you let something like this in, it wont stop.

Planner Katie clarified, we don't have a quota on how many moderate-income units we will allow, just what we will need.

Commissioner Natalie clarified, with a project like this one would argue the smaller the property the more affordable. Contrary to that there is some lender issues that she sees, as young people who are looking for the affordability and minimum down loans, those lenders such as FHA, USDA, 1% down conventional loans, do not lend for these types of developments that have over 20% commercial. She has not done the research, but with her knowledge that's what she sees here, which leaves these properties for nothing more than investment properties.

Rodney Ekstrom- is concerned about retail, look at Kamas, nothing can survive there. What do they expect to survive in Francis? He thinks 3 stories is too high. How are we going to support the water, our bills are already high and we're on restrictions. Too many people without the infrastructure to support it. People will be doubling up in these condos and there will be no control, we don't want to be a mini Park City. He also wanted to clarify that this should be stated Wild Willow Limited, the residents of Wild Willow are not pushing for this development and do not want to be included in the push for approval of this.

Planner Katie clarified residential is 32' height restriction and in commercial it is 40'.

Beverly Grey- lives in Marion and can see Francis and does not want to see this development. She is also on a water board in the Valley, and knows last year we were on really strict water restrictions because we didn't have the water, and it is going to be way worse this year. She said there is no turning lane, trail, or landscape buffer off of HWY 32 into this project. Too much density in any part of this valley. We need to incorporate some preservation for some historic features.

Rick Rapp commented they have efficient water shares with the property.

Kathy Crook- echoed Commissioner Natalie, lending would be tough to get for the targeted criteria, so we are opening this up for investors in the property but not into our City. Also, she wanted to point out that the Residential Cottage lots are 7,000 sq. ft., which means there will be three homes to ½ acre lot, that is small. She also wants to know is this something the developer is going to build in phases and sell himself or sell off lots for others to build. Kathy feels it is an awful lot for the city to take on right now with all that is already approved at this time.

Rick Rapp responded, everything other than the apartments above the commercial is considered for sale. He said yes, it will be built out in phases, although the phases would overlap.

Consultant Eric clarified, as far as the funding for the townhomes, they are intended to be for rent.

Chair Brian asked who would own those.

Rick responded they would work with a builder who specifies in that, he would not personally own them.

Commissioner Natalie reiterated that these are landlords renting to tenants, they would not be personally invested into our community. Her original opinion of this development was that we were going to provide some affordable purchasing

opportunity for those who can not afford to buy a single-family home, she is turned off even more knowing that they are rentable units.

Clayton Querry- does not see this as being a benefit to those who grew up here to be able to stay here, it is for the developer to get as much as they can out of every piece of property. He built with Mountainlands a few years ago, and it was at the top of what they could afford at the time. They worked hard for 10 years in Salt Lake to be able to move back and approving developments like this is swaying what people are trying to move back for. Look at Heber, it's exploded and its not what it was when they were kids. The same thing is happening here and we need to do a better job of slowing it down and not packing in as much development as possible into each piece of open ground. He also thinks the City Park bargaining is over, we have enough Parks in Francis.

Monkey Eubanks- says traffic is going to be a mess, they will need to have roads built with turning lanes. She is worried about her property taxes in Kamas paying for the infrastructure in Francis. She said that the goal is to get kids that have grown up here their whole lives to be able to stay here, but what about the older people who have been here their whole lives and are going to get taxed out of here? Also, more police will need to be hired for all the crime and sex predators.

Melissa Thompson- is not against building. Finds the commercial aspect of this appealing, but keeps going back to Kamas's strip of commercial by the Mexican restaurant and it seems like they are always empty, and it's an eye sore. Because of COVID businesses have found a way to work from home, and she doesn't see these units being filled. Water is an issue, we may have the water but we have no holding tank to store it. She also reminded of a similar application coming next week to City Council, please everyone come to that as well. Also, she is worried about police, we don't even have our own police department or gas station.

Wes Price- he is concerned about the schools, we are already in a mess, and nothing has been addressed to fix that. He said there is a lot more to be done and fixed before considering a development like this.

Peter Abosida- used to be on the Planning Commission in the early 90's. One of the reasons he moved here was for the rural area, and half acre lots. Lighting coming in is already crazy, he moved here from a City because he didn't want to be in a City.

Brian read a comment from Juliy Marie. (attached)

Brian read a comment from David Evans. (attached)

Brain read a comment from Steve Fitzgerald. (attached)

Brian read a comment from Lindsay Saylor. (attached)

Brian read a comment from Elizabeth. (attached)

Sharon Duso- she said this is not what she signed up for twenty plus years ago. All this development is not what she had envisioned for her older years. She is worried about property value, traffic, water quality. This is a nightmare for her this is her real-life and they need to consider the residents.

Jamie & Rex Larsen- stated that with all the comments from the residents in this meeting, it is obvious that this is not what the residents of this valley want. At the end of the day the Planning Commission and the Council represent the people of this community and they need to do that or step down from their positions.

Chair Brian closed the public comment portion.

Commissioner Bob said he is floored by how many people are attending this meeting. He threw out putting a moratorium on zone changes. The Planning Commission and the City Council really need to get together and revamp the General Plan. He stated he has been on the Planning Commission for over a year, never missed a meeting, and still feels like he is left in the dark. He would like to sit down with the committees and see where exactly they are going. He concurs with all the comments today on the water and the schools and thinks we need to get to a place where we have answers. He also agrees they represent the people making these comments and that they need to do their bidding for them. He doesn't know what it would take to do a moratorium, but thinks we need to consider that. He feels they need to get a grip on what is coming ahead. He moved here for the same reasons everyone else did. He does not feel we need the density.

Chair Brian is concerned for the same thing, although he sees a cycle coming in the development, people are coming here now because of being able to work remotely, but eventually will all migrate back to the Cities to work.

Vice chair Jan commented he understands why everyone is coming here, he came here eight years ago for the same reasons, he did not want to live in a city. He stated growth does not drive cost, but that supply, demand and interest rates do. He commented on the traffic with 248, 32 and 35, he said those are Summit County and State problems, not Francis City problems. We should be involved and cognizant of them, but we cannot as a town shut down developments because of them. Same thing goes for schools, and it is a District wide problem, but it needs to be addressed that way. He said we are talking to a zone change, not a development approval. When we talk of property rights, they are rights to what the property is zoned currently, not to what the owner wishes to have it zoned. He said he does not know the legalities of stopping zone changes until we find out what we want or what we are doing, but we need to discuss what does Francis want to be when it grows up. He said as these developments with these higher densities get approved, we are setting a precedence that all parcels in Francis are eligible for a higher density zone change, and that all applications from here forward will be just that. He does not think the General Plan is written badly, he thinks it is a good plan, we just need to be more cognizant of it and follow what it is proposing. He feels that if we do allow high density on some parcels in the City then the Council should predetermine where those properties are and not just leave everything up for an option.

Chair Brian agreed with Vice Chair Jan's comments. He added he thinks Heber was very poorly planned and we are fortunate to hopefully learn from and prevent that going forward.

Commissioner Natalie agreed Heber has set an example for what we do not want to do. We need to use zoning as an enforcement for being proactive to make sure we don't end up where they're at. She thinks we lack infrastructure as is without allowing for the zone change. She also fears there are so many approved developments that are not being exercised and until they are put in place and we know where we are, she is against adding more density. She also believes office space is not a viable concept, that they will be dead. There is not a market for a bunch of retail space right now. She stated she has had multiple calls from others in her line of work (real estate), that are also against this project because of its lack of sense. She said we are too big for our britches right now and we need to have responsible growth and this is not it. She stated that unless you are a Francis resident you can not understand what is going on here. Unless you have put in your time here and know what the people here are about you can not understand the impact this is and will have on the people here.

Commissioner Felicia agreed and added to what Commissioner Natalie commented, she feels it would be wise to see what the already approved developments will bring and the impact we feel from them. She agreed with Commissioner Jan on law enforcement, it will take a long time for meetings and different departments to catch up. We will find ourselves in a mess. The 4-way stop in the summer is already a nightmare, she has directed traffic there and knows it is already a problem. She said that although Kamas does have its own police department they only have a couple officers and they don't have jurisdiction over Francis City, Summit County does. She said the Summit County is wide spread and the officers can drive fast but it still takes time to respond to problems.

Chair Brian summarized what everyone had commented. There is so much on the back burner we are waiting for to start, its hard to predict where we would actually stand if all of the approvals were built. He stated he understands that the water issue is frustrating, but we do live in a Western state and it will always be an issue. He stated that there is a difference in

paper and physical water and we need to be able to analyze that. He explained the inflation rate of water and from where it was 20 years ago to now and its right on track of where it should be.

Chair Brian and Commissioner Natalie conversed about supply and demand and cost per square footage.

Chair Brian went on with the school, he hates it is a weapon against the City, in that taxes are going to go up. He is sympathetic to the issue because he grew up in a county that he seen this happen, but he does see a problem with a bond ever getting passed. We do have an issue with our teachers having a place to live, but how do we solve that.

Commissioner Natalie gave information that we can create a deed restrictive development, that would be restricted to those that qualify on income and job description. It is done in Park City, a development called Park City Heights, has incorporated this type of subdivision. She agrees with Chair Brian and thinks we are there and that this is something we need to look in to.

Chair Brian would like to see a conservation subdivision that included town homes that does exactly that.

Commissioner Bob asked that we move on.

Chair Brian agreed to move on, quickly added that because of State Law, they are prohibited to have conversations such as this privately. He stated he will push for a joint work session that this can be discussed in further.

Commissioner Natalie agreed to move on, but wanted to give listeners hope that there is a way to go forward with getting a result of what were looking for.

***Commissioner Felicia made a motion to forward this to the City Council with a negative recommendation. Commissioner Natalie seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.***

## **B. Application for Zone Change – Harriet Natter**

Planner Katie read her staff report.

Engineer Scott gave his updates. His biggest comment was, when they originally approved this plat, they planned on the cul-de-sac being tied into SR 32 for the water line, so there was not a dead-end line. He says if we go through with the zone change we need to make sure we get the water line connected, so that we don't have two dead end lines, and so they we have better fire flow.

Chair Brian questioned Engineer Scott if he has seen any issues with the Army Corp getting a line ran through the wetlands.

Engineer Scott responded he is not an expert, but said it is easier to get a water line through there then a road.

Chair Brian explained where the current cul-de-sac is and why it no longer is viable, because UDOT will not give an access point to connect there.

Engineer Scott explained we could even run a water line down SR 32 and back down the side, but we needed to make sure we got the connection. UDOT would allow us to run it down SR 32.

Applicant Harriet stated she thinks Katie did a good job explaining the issues. Her only problem is it will be an uphill battle to get the water line connection through. She stated the main thing with the Corp is that they will make you justify why it has to be connected. If it is feasible to leave it unconnected, they may not approve it.

Chair Brian opened the public hearing.

Mandy Crittenden commented she thinks the commercial buildings need to go forward first with this approval before any residential permits are pulled. Too many developers promise commercial with developments, but the residential gets finished and the commercial is never followed through with.

Rex Larsen got clarification on the proposed drawing for the Commission.

Nate Rushton commented he was in favor of the zone change. They do not want commercial traffic coming through the residential subdivision.

Dave Sutherland commented he is in favor of the zone change. It makes sense with the wetland issues and UDOT access restrictions to go this route. He asked if the wetlands will be part of the residential lots.

Harriet responded that when dealing with the wetlands, it is easier to have it be deemed as open space and have one HOA responsible for maintaining it versus multiple landowners. In this case, because it is only two lots, it probably will be easier to do the deed restriction to each lot, which is what she will most likely do. Landowner would be responsible to maintain the property.

Robin Ross is concerned with putting an access point to commercial off Lambert Lane, it would draw a lot of traffic. She is in favor of the residential at the end of the cul-de-sac versus having any commercial there.

Planner Katie clarified that the Commercial property will have to come back for Commercial Review with the City. Right now, we are just focusing on the zone change for the portion of the Commercial that parcel is changing to Residential.

Nate Rushton commented that currently in the Village at Lambert Lane Subdivision, they have an HOA that is in charge of all the open space. He thinks it makes sense to include the open space of what is being zone changed to residential to their existing HOA. He also wanted clarification that these two residential lots would be single family, not duplexes or any type of multifamily.

Chair Brian confirmed that, yes this would be two single family residential lots.

Justin Jones seconded what Dave and Nate commented. Wanted to know if they would be required to follow the same rules in the HOA they have?

Engineer Scott stated they would need to get clarification from the City Attorney on how we could handle combining their HOA to these lots.

Jeff Faulkner echoed his neighbors, he'd much rather it be residential than commercial right there. He questioned if these lots would be subdividable in the future? And who is this a benefit for?

Planner Katie responded she believes this is a win-win for everyone. Based on the neighbors comments they would rather see the residential than the commercial. It will also make it a more feasible development for the applicant to do residential on this space then commercial given the hurdles. It is also a benefit for the City in pushing to get some commercial started in the City. She also commented on the further subdivision question, she thinks that is something that needs to be added to the development agreement, that these lots are not able to be further subdivided.

Chair Brian read a comment from Lee Ann Squires, she is in favor of the zone change. She said they have many young children in the subdivision and would hate to see commercial traffic coming through there.

Chair Brian closed the public comment portion.

Vice chair Jan stated this one is an easy one, with all the support from the surrounding neighbors and the decrease in density, he is in favor of the zone change with the restrictions mentioned so far.

Chair Brian clarified the three restrictions mentioned being:

1. No further subdividing in the future.
2. Deed restrict the open space to be tied to the landowner.
3. Loop the water line.

Commissioner Natalie is in support of the zone change, because of the neighbor's comments and that it seems to be a viable solution for the property with the wetland issues.

Commissioner Bob agreed with the other Commission members and is in favor of the zone change.

Commissioner Felicia is in agreeance also.

***Co-Chair Jan made a motion to forward the Zone Change with a positive recommendation to the City Council following the three stipulations 1. No further subdividing in the future. 2. Deed restrict the open space to be tied to the landowner. 3. Loop the water line. Commissioner Bob seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.***

### **C. Commercial Development Concept Plan – Premier Pet Lodge (Kathleen Tollison)**

Planner Katie read her staff report.

Engineer Scott said as far as the Concept Plan goes, he thinks they have done a good job. When they come back for their building permit they need to submit a site plan, it will need to show their water and sewer connections. They will need to dedicate the right of way to UDOT. Also, need to submit their construction drawings and show that it is all up to City standards.

Chair Brian brought up the issue of waste disposal. Questioned what that would entail?

Engineer Scott responded dog kennels and animal clinics can connect to the City sewer system. He said so as far as the waste it could go down the sewer system when it is collected inside the premises. As far as the outside waste, they could just dispose of it in the garbage, we would not require a permit of any kind for that.

Applicant Kathleen gave some insight to the project. It will be a small animal clinic. They will have 64 kennels, indoor play area, cat boarding, and a grooming salon. It provides a splash pad in the summer and lots of room for the animals to play outside as well. There will be a drive thru/convenience factor for easy drop off and pick up.

Chair Brian questioned if she would be recycling or wasting water with the splash pad.

Kathleen responded there is an option for both, she is a water conservator for sure, so she said yes, they will look into the best option for using less water.

Chair Brian opened the public comment up.

Julie Hooker complimented the Planner and the Commission for all of their hard work. She questioned how the noise will be handled.

Kathleen responded it will be a metal building, but she has had in depth conversation with the builder about putting in very thick, insulated walls to help as a sound barrier. She said the design of larger kennels allows the dogs to have more space and be more comfortable so they won't be barking a lot all the time.

Julie Hooker asked Planner Katie about the access. She also gave a shout out to the Planning Commission for giving a positive recommendation on the last item, the neighbors appreciate it.

Planner Katie responded that the only access is off Lambert Lane. UDOT would not approve or give any access point off SR 32.

Dave Sutherland likes this proposal. He feels that it is not a Commercial development that will attract a lot of traffic, which is great being next to Residential zoning. He questioned not specific to this piece of property, but to all within the City, at what point does the City refer parcels to the Army Corp for review on whether they contain wetlands or not. This parcel and others in the City are flooded and are sheets of ice, he assumes because they are wetlands. He is also concerned about traffic coming off SR 32 with this because of the already approved Hart Ranch development down Lambert Lane.

Kathleen responded there are no wetlands on this property.

Chair Brian also responded we do require a wetland study on all approved developments.

Engineer Scott responded Hart Ranch is responsible for widening and putting in a turning lane at the intersection of SR 32 and Lambert Lane as part of phase 2 or 3 of their development.

Rex Larsen was concerned about traffic as well, but it sounds like that will be resolved. He was concerned about the quality of Lambert as well and wanted to know if with the expansion Hart Ranch is required to do will they also have to fix the current road? He was also curious how building up to avoid the water issue on this piece of property will affect those upstream from there with flooding.

Engineer Scott stated that Lambert Lane is on our schedule to get fixed this next year. Scott responded that the water is something they will look at and see if it will cause any issues for anyone else with the water as part of their site plan approval.

Chair Brian read a comment from Roy Atkinson. (attached)

Engineer Scott said that we can require Kathleen to submit a traffic study to see if there is great impact, but does not believe with this small of a project there would be. Also, all developments are required to bond before building to ensure the projects get finished.

Kathleen assured there is a plan to have a proper waste process in place and that they will have a nice fence with landscaping as a barrier for noise. She wants to be a good neighbor and does not want any issues. As far as water goes, she will supply as much as the City requires.

Nick Berry commented he thinks this is a great concept and something really needed in the valley. He suggested putting up a berm to help as a sound barrier like freeways do.

Chair Brian closed the public comment portion.

Vice chair Jan likes the concept and is fine with all the details being worked out through the approval process. He thinks it is a needed service and will furnish some job opportunities so he is in favor.

Commissioner Natalie is in agreeance with Commissioner Jan, she thinks this is a great addition to Francis.

Commissioner Bob is on board as well, thinks it is a great addition for our valley.

Commissioner Natalie did question if this would have emergency care.

Kathleen responded, she does not have a solid answer for that yet. She is working with two veterinarian's that are discussing that, but there is no final answer yet.

Commissioner Felicia is in agreeance with everyone, it is a needed service and it's great and it will provide some employment.

Chair Brian agrees as well. It is a needed source and will be a great addition.

***Commissioner Natalie made a motion to forward this to the City Council with a positive recommendation. Commissioner Felicia seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.***

#### **4. Planner Update**

Planner Katie reminded we have a second meeting next Thursday, she said we had a lot of items come up in January that needed addressed. We will have a Storage Yard Code Text Amendment, a Landscaping Plan for Premier Storage/Nick Berry, and Hart Ranch will be coming back for Final Master Plan and Phase 1 and 2 approvals on the agenda next week and all information is in the Dropbox for the Planning Commission. We will also have training next month for open and public meetings. She asked Chair Brian to forward links to the Planning Commission for additional training as well.

***Co-Chair Jan made a motion to adjourn the meeting. All in favor, motion passed.***

Meeting ended.

"I have lived in Woodland for 30 years and commute to Park city.  
I am opposed to rezoning for higher density.  
I think there is a concern about the water and infrastructure.  
Let's Honor the zoning at the time of purchase.  
Juliy Marie

I want to thank Katie Henneuse for preparing information on the on tonight's Zone Change requests. I would like to make a couple of comments: 1) The request for the zone change for the Villages at Lambert Lane seems reasonable to me considering the history and issues the property has had. 2) The Francis Common's request is a much different matter. As the staff report shows there is already 426 residential units approved but not yet built in Francis. That number will at least double the population of our town. 3) In the decision the planning commission and city council will make, on this and other proposals that are coming to them, the desinity of out community will rest. I would ask that you consider what you want this city to be 20 or 30 years in the future 4) Summit and Wasatch counties are going to see growth like never seen before. Where will out town fit in. Park City and the Snyderville Base have a real problem in that they have planned poorly for the increase number of people that need reasonability priced housing. Because of the ski resorts and related businesses, they cannot adequality house these employees, both temporary and permanent. The resorts want to keep their properties available to build high priced condo's, homes and hotels. This is a big part of their profits. So where do their worker live? Who will provide the rentals properties. The ski resorts and business owners in Park City and the Snyderville Basin see the Kamas Valley as part of the answer. Why do we have Park City bus service here? How many people in our community use this service? How does our community benefit from people who live here and work

somewhere else. They require the same services as everyone else, schools, water, garbage, police protection etc., but they spend much of their time and money somewhere else. We don't even receive sales tax revenue, because we don't have anywhere for them to shop, buy gas and only one place to eat out.

5) If we have a critical need of more affordable housing, condo's and townhouses sold as primary residence or second homes would seem to me a better solution. 6) As stated in the engineer's report "the City should evaluate the impacts the increased density will have on existing infrastructure prior to approving the zone change..." Water, schools and increased traffic are major concerns. On top to the already approved projects, which will double our population, this project as proposed will add another 35%. I don't know if my lawn can take it. 7) Another concern is police protection. In the apartments in Park City and Snyderville, it is not uncommon to see 2 or more families living in a two bedroom unit. I know because I lived in Park City for 38 years. One of my children works in Park City School District, and another who works for Summit County law enforcement. We will need addition law enforcement here whether we form our own police department or pay Summit County, just because of the increased population. 8) Please take a hard look at this proposal. Our very way of life will be affected in a profound way, whatever decision you make. Our future is in your hands.

David Evans

January 20, 2021

Francis Planning Commission and Town Board,

This letter is to address the proposal of the Francis Commons Master Plan that is on the agenda for Thursday, January, 21, 2021; as I am not able to attend via zoom conference as I am not tech savvy. As a resident of Francis City for the last 60 years, I have seen our little town of Francis grow to a city and is continuing to change so much. As a property owner, I have had to go through and deal with the Town Board and Planning Commission with both personal and business needs. I do not envy your job but appreciate your time.

During the last 15 years as of resident of Francis City, my water and sewer bill has increased from \$40 a month to now \$93. I have actually decreased the amount of both services I use as it is now just me, myself and I living at my home. I have received water shortage notices the last few summers, telling me when I can and cannot water my yard. And let me be clear, this is the most expensive water in the valley and we as current residents who have called this home for many years are paying for it.

I have paid to have the sewer ponds rebuilt once, and have done so in protest as I believe this is not a fee that the residents of the City should have to foot as we have not asked for the changes or development.

I have read, reviewed and done my homework regarding the Francis Commons proposed plan. Below are a few questions and concerns I have:

The definition of multi-family and live/work townhomes is very vague. I would like a more detailed plan to see what this would look like? I can only think this kind of "mixed" units would lead to code enforcement matters, property tax issues, (residential verse commercial and how to sort them out), in addition to sewer and water hook ups. Lastly, what businesses would be allowed and what would not be allowed in the commercial area?

The commercial businesses will approximately be .05% of the square footage of what is proposed by the plan. The City of Francis needs more commercial income to help offset some of the common fees of the growth.

A few other concerns are parking issues, it says there will be street parking but there is no mention of snow removal or snow storage.

There is nothing that talks about the impacts of fire, police and traffic issues this development would bring; as well as the overcrowding of the current school district that is already a current topic.

This property has been rezoned without public notice before in a lawsuit between Francis City and the property owner at the time. I am unsure of the year or timing on this but I would hope that this is documented within the property records. That change of zoning approval was made to settle the lawsuit and no public input was allowed nor the correct steps followed as they should have been for that to happen. It is currently zoned to have 30-40 single family homes/residential lots and this plan will increase density by more than 4 times than what it is currently zoned for.

My biggest reasons for sending this letter to address the *severe* concern of water storage that we face. It has been an ongoing issues for years and I have seen no signs of relief or change in the near future. This is putting all the current residents of Francis City, their property and the City of Francis in big danger.

A new well has been drilled but the storage tank has not been built. This is a big issue already as the recent developments that have already been approved and with some building started. We cannot support what we already have, why would we think it's a smart idea to add more to the problem.

It should be a fee to the developer to make those improvements as a cost to develop the properties as it is currently zoned. It should not be fees that are past down to the residents and we are just trapped, as we have *over* built the current means we have.

In short, the plan shows an extreme amount of greed by the developers, and total disregard to Francis City code and to the residents and value of Francis as a whole.

I would strongly encourage you to deny the whole plan, and send the developer back to the drawing board to come up with something that is in the means of what the property is approved for as the current zoning states.

Cordially,



Steve Fitzgerald Resident, Francis City

To whom it may concern,

As a resident of Francis I'm concerned about the developments that are attempting to change zoning to build high density housing, our community has a long history of a farm community with large lots. We already have inadequate water supply, many roads need repair, lack of police to enforce speed limits, and we don't have a solution to the overpopulation in our schools. Please hear the community that these changes should not be approved.

Sincerely, Lindsey Sayler

To whom it may concern, City Leaders of Francis:

The proposed development, scheduled for a Zoom meeting next week, if approved is asking for the following:

Reduction in the available water supply

Increased traffic and thereby, increased road maintenance

Overflowing schools that are already impacted

Air quality reduction

There are more negative impacts, but those are at the top of my list.

City Government is for the People, not for the dollars.

I hope you consider the negative aftermath to the citizens before making a decision.

Thank you, Elizabeth

To whom it may concern,

We would like to let you know that we are in favor of the zone change from commercial to residential that you are proposing on the land that runs on State Rd 32. We would not like commercial traffic to run through our neighborhood on Village Drive. We are a neighborhood of many children and we feel this would be very detrimental.

We also built here because of the small town feel and privacy we could have which would be gone if we have commercial traffic running through our neighborhood.

We hope to connect for the meeting tonight.

Thanks for your time. Kent and Lee Ann Squires

To whom it may concern:

My property borders the proposed development and I have some concerns:

- Dogs barking at all hours of the day. There needs to be a noise barrier fence outside and the building needs to absorb sound.
- There needs to be a barrier fence between this development and the residential neighbors. It needs to prevent dogs from coming onto our land where we have valuable horses.
- I am also concerned about how the poop and waste will be handled. How will it be disposed of?
- Near the proposed driveway there is a low point and water naturally collects in this area. The water table is high on this lot. The development could need to tie in to my storm drain.
- There are many trees proposed, which I like. I am wondering how the City can provide enough water for the trees, splash pad, and dog grooming when we already have water shortages.
- There have been developments in Francis (like Circle T), that have been started but not finished. There needs to be a bond for this project to make sure the developer doesn't start something and leave a mess. There also needs to be a time limit set so that the project is completed in a reasonable timeframe.
- The intersection at Lambert and SR-32 is supposed to be widened for Hart Crossing. This might impact this development. I would like to see a traffic study and find out what they are planning to do on this corner.

Roy Atkinson