

renoticing fee for them this time.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Commissioners, is there any additional questions you need answered or -- from the applicant or from staff? Hearing none, I -- Commissioner Holland.

Holland: I was just going to make a motion.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead, ma'am.

Holland: December 17th, is that the date we are looking at?

Fitzgerald: Yes, ma'am.

Holland: Mr. Chair, I move that we continue the public hearing for Poiema Calvary Chapel, H-2020-0095, to the hearing date of December 17th to allow for proper noticing and that the city would waive that fee for them on the renoticing.

Seal: Second.

Grove: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to continue file number H-2020-0095, Poiema Calvary Chapel, to the hearing date of 12 -- of December 17th. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Thank you all very much and, Tamara, we appreciate your patience and give our best to your -- your client.

Thompson: I will. Thank you.

- 5. Public Hearing for Wadsworth Meridian Subdivision (H-2020-0104) by Wadsworth Development, Located at 3085 E. Ustick Rd.**
 - A. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of five (5) commercial building lots in the C-G zoning district for ownership purposes.**

Fitzgerald: Moving on to the next item on our agenda is a public hearing for Wadsworth Meridian Subdivision, file number H-2020-0104. And, Joe, I think this one is yours as well, sir.

Dodson: Yes, sir, it is. Thank you. And thank you, Commissioners, for being accommodating for my snafu. I appreciate that and thank you, Tamara, for that as well. I greatly apologize for that. As noted, the next application on our docket here is for Wadsworth Meridian Subdivision. It is a commercial subdivision requesting a five lot

subdivision. The site consists of 3.29 acres of land, currently zoned C-G, and it is located at 3085 East Ustick. The subject site is located specifically at the southwest corner of Eagle and Ustick. To the east and across Eagle are two large commercial centers. To the north is an additional commercial center. The surrounding areas provide a plethora of commercial uses that are used at a regional level. Directly to the west of the subject site is intended and I should say approved the high end indoor gym, the Villa Sports subdivision, and further to the south of the site is existing residential and some community serving commercial between. As lots within this subdivision develop over time staff believes that they will likely be a higher benefit or utilized more by the future users of Villa Sport and residents to the southwest of this site, rather than regional when compared to the adjacent commercial across Eagle. Staff is of the opinion that there is less need for these five relatively small commercial lots to serve a regional base than those sites to the north and east. In addition, this project, in conjunction with the approved projects -- or uses to the west should satisfy the Comprehensive Plan and mixed use policies for mixed use regional. The requested preliminary plat proposes five commercial building lots that vary in size from .39 acres to just over one acre. The C-G zoning district does not have a minimum lot size requirement and all landscape buffers are previously approved with the original CZC for the overall site improvements and that approved in early 2020 with a 2019 number. When future buildings are proposed on each building lot staff will analyze each building for compliance with other dimensional standards of the C-G zoning district, like height. Access for the development will be via a shared driveway at the western boundary line and shared with the Villa Sport to the west and it's supposed to be constructed with the Villa Sport improvements and is limited to a right-in, right-out access. This applicant will be required to construct that shared driveway should this site develop before the Villa Sport project. There are no public streets as a part of this commercial development, therefore, no stub streets are proposed. Instead there are private drive aisles, as our standard for commercial developments. The applicant has an existing cross-access agreement with the adjacent commercial properties. That's to the west and to the south. It will be required to maintain the cross-access agreements across these proposed lots within their CC&Rs. Wrong computer. I got two computers going here. Off-street parking is required to be provided in accord with the standards listed in UDC 11-3C-6B for nonresidential uses at the ratio of one space per 500 square feet of area. If any future restaurants are proposed, the parking ratio is one per 250. With the existing and approved CZC 109 parking spaces were approved, but did not show any parking directly adjacent to the future commercial buildings. So, the approved CZC does not show any of these lots, if you can see my pointer. The revised site plan provided by the applicant shows some changes to the parking lot that differ from the currently approved site plan. One of these changes includes three additional trash enclosures to totally four and are now proposed along the perimeter of the parking area. The original had one proposal in the center. Overall the changes with the additional trash enclosures and the parking here shows a net positive gain of 16 additional parking spaces. Again, as each pad site is developed the required number of spaces will be checked throughout the site and the applicant will be required to comply with the code requirements. And as noted above the parking for the whole site will be available for each building site. So, the -- each tenant will not be able to say that, oh, my part in front of my building is my spaces. They all have the cross-access. Because the overall parking plan has changed since the

original approval of the CZC, the applicant will need to obtain approval of a new one outlining the changes made to the site improvements prior to obtaining any building permits. There were no written testimony for or against this and staff does recommend approval of the requested preliminary plat and after that I will stand for questions. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Joe. Are there questions for Joe or the staff at this time? Hearing none, would the applicant like to come forward or be recognized on Zoom.

Thompson: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, Tamara Thompson with The Land Group, 416 East Shore Drive in Eagle and I am representing the property owner for this project as well. I do have a PowerPoint, but Joe did a really nice job of explaining everything. We have -- we have read the staff report and agree with staff's analysis and findings -- or recommended conditions and so we request your approval tonight and I will answer any questions, unless you do want me to share my screen, but a lot of it is the same thing that Joe just went through.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Tamara. Appreciate you doing double duty this evening. Are there any questions for Ms. Thompson? Tamara, I think you are hopefully getting off easy right now. Let's see if there is public testimony and I will allow you to close, ma'am. Madam Clerk, is there anyone who would like to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, one minute.

Fitzgerald: If there is anyone who would like to testify on this application, please, raise your hand via Zoom. And, Commissioner Seal, I take it there is no one in chambers with you?

Seal: That is correct.

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we did have one person sign up online, but did not indicate a wish to testify.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thank you, Madam Clerk. If there is a desire for that person to testify or anyone else that would like to testify, please, raise your hand. We will give a little bit of a pause here, make sure everyone has a chance to speak. Going once. Going twice. Are there any additional questions for Tamara at this time? Tamara, do you have any other comments you would like to make, ma'am?

Thompson: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, no. I suspect that the other person that signed in was my client. But we -- again, we agree with staff's analysis and the recommended conditions of approval and we request your approval tonight. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Tamara. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Seal: So moved.

McCarvel: So moved. Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on H-2020-0104, Wadsworth Meridian Subdivision. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Team, what do you think? Anybody want to lead off?

Holland: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Holland.

Holland: It seems like a pretty straightforward application to me. I don't see any big concerns.

Fitzgerald: My thoughts exactly. It was pretty thorough. I think we had a -- we thought through the original application with -- to the west of this for a long time. So, it's good to see this hard corner coming to fruition on Ustick. So, I feel comfortable with where they are headed. Anyone else? Comments or thoughts? If not, motions are always in order.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: I will make a motion if that's okay with everyone.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead, sir.

Grove: All right. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2020-0104 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 19th, 2020.

Seal: Second.

Yearsley: I will second that.

Fitzgerald: Okay. I was just going to say, I think I have a motion and a second. I have a motion and a second to recommend approval of file number H-2020-0104. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Tamara. We appreciate it. Good luck. Hopefully we will see you in December. Well, that was a relatively painless adventure, folks. I think the next ones are