

**WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 14, 2023**

The minutes of the Woods Cross Planning Commission meeting held February 14, 2023, at 6:30 P.M. in the Woods Cross City Hall located at 1555 South 800 West, Woods Cross, Utah.

CONDUCTING:

Joe Rupp, Chairman

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Joe Rupp, Chairman
LeGrande Blackley
Melanie Brooks

Mike Doxey
Jim Grover-remotely
Eric Jones

COMMISSION MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Brian Bean

STAFF PRESENT:

Tim Stephens, Community Development Director
Bonnie Craig, Secretary
Gary Sharp, City Council Member-remotely

VISITORS:

Jeremy Peterson
Camron Peterson
Don Schrader

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Eric Jones

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Rupp then called for the review of the Planning Commission minutes for the meeting held January 24, 2023.

Following the review of the minutes by the Planning Commission, Commissioner Blackley made a motion to approve the minutes as written with Commissioner Brooks seconding the motion and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

OPEN SESSION

Chairman Rupp then opened the meeting to items from those present that they would like to bring before the Planning Commission that were not on the agenda.

There were no items for the open session and Chairman Rupp closed the open session.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED HILTON HOMES 2 SUITES HOTEL—DAVID & JEREMY PETERSEN

Mr. Tim Stephens, the Community Development Director, noted the following for the Planning Commission:

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 14, 2023
PAGE 2**

“As you are aware, the Cottontree Group that owns the Hampton Inn is proposing the construction of a second hotel on the Hampton site. The staff has begun to review a site plan and associated design drawings for this project as part of a site plan application. During the review, it was made known that the applicants wish to divide the property creating a lot for the existing Hampton Inn and a lot for the proposed Home 2 Suites. As the staff reviewed the proposed lot configuration it was apparent that meeting the frontage requirement may be difficult. This property is located within the S-1 Special Use Zone. The S-1 Special Use Zone does not include specific development standards for non-residential uses, such as setbacks, lot widths, lot area, building height, etc. It does state that the Planning Commission will determine these requirements. However, it states that absence of a written finding of compelling need, such consideration shall be reviewed in light of regulations of the city for the use proposed, e.g., for commercial uses, the city shall consider the requirements of Chapter 12-24 General Commercial C-2 Zone. With that in mind, the Commission can determine the specifics, however, they review them in light of the C-2 Zone. The C-2 Zone does not have a minimum lot size but does require a minimum lot width of 100 feet of frontage. Given to the Commission is a proposed subdivision layout for two lots. Lot #2 or the lot that the Home 2 Suites would be on would be similar to a flag lot, and due to the location of the Hampton Inn, it would not have to have the required frontage if the C-2 Zone standards were applied in this situation. The applicants would like to discuss with the Commission their views on this matter in light of the S-1 language noted above. Also, we can have a discussion regarding parking since ten stalls of the Hampton Inn are encumbered by shared parking with the adjacent Coventry Townhomes next door.

“The S-1 Zone is structured in a way that the Commission can determine development standards such as lot size, width, and yard requirements and other standards. However, again, it states the Commission, in the absence of other compelling need, will consider the C-2 standards in making those decisions. This proposal would essentially create a flag lot which is not permitted in the S-1 Zone. Flag lots are typically permitted as a conditional use in several of our residential zones. Based on where the discussion goes and the Planning Commission’s feelings regarding this matter, one option may be to have the applicants petition for a text amendment permitting flag lots as a conditional use in the S-1 Zone. There are some possible options we can discuss in more detail.”

Mr. Stephens said he had discussed several options regarding this matter with the City Attorney to try to get to the 100 feet of frontage that is required by city ordinance. Mr. Stephens said there was a suggestion of a text amendment to make a flag lot for part of the property. Mr. Stephens said he also had discussion about the C-2 Zone and what is required. He said there was another plan for how the project as a whole could fit. He said it could be a multi-lot commercial development similar to the Smith’s shopping center project, and as a whole it meets the requirements with shared parking and other items that are required applied to the project. He said there were specific requirements and Mr. Stephens outlined what those might be. He said the Woods Crossing projects mentioned were in compliance with the standards as discussed and this project might be considered as something similar. Mr. Stephens said this could be a second option according to Mr. Bell.

Chairman Rupp asked if this were done on one lot as one owner would it be able to be built on this parcel. Mr. Stephens said yes as long as they meet the standards for development. He said the concern was about the frontage requirements and how that would be met to subdivide this property for the project. He

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 14, 2023
PAGE 3**

said they could amend for a flag lot or multitenant commercial project. Mr. Stephens said flag lots are permitted in the residential zone but not in commercial zones. He said there is nothing that says flag lots are not permitted in a commercial zone.

Commissioner Doxey asked about the parking situation. Mr. Stephens said there are 10 parking stalls that are shared with the apartments next door and with the Hampton Inn. He said in the final approval of that project the parking was permitted and recorded.

Mr. Stephens said for the Cottontree project they are looking at putting in parking and the 10 shared parking stalls with Coventry would include 10 stalls with the 79 required parking stalls and 179 stalls includes the shared stalls that would be required by both hotels. There was concern that there would not be enough parking stalls for both hotels with those that are being shared with Coventry. It was noted there would need to be further discussion on the parking.

Mr. Stephens said the main concern tonight was the lot configuration.

Representatives of the Cottontree group were at the meeting to discuss this project with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Jeremy Petersen and Mr. Camron Peterson appeared before the Commission and said they own the Best Western Cottontree Inn and are proposing another 139 room Home 2 Suite hotel which is an extended suite hotel. He said this product has a good clientele and which includes many business travelers who do not seem to cause a lot of problems for the hotel. He said they have been looking for this market set and they have found that families also like the rooms offered by this product that are bit larger. He said these types of guests probably stay a few more nights than a regular hotel.

Mr. Petersen said the flag lot option did not look like it would work for them. He said the current Hampton Inn has plenty of parking and they would also have plenty of parking for the new hotel. He said there are 139 parking stalls.

Commissioner Jones asked why they are not doing pad sites having separate ownership. He said he had seen it done some different ways and there could be two pads and have them be separate pieces and have an interior lot with access and shared parking between the two parcels with an access easement in the front. He said this is a more traditional look that would meet the 100 feet of frontage. He said there could be a pad created with easements and cross easements with a shared parking agreement.

Commissioner Jones said there are easements on the lot anyway, so he did not see why there needed to be a flag lot. He said for him it makes sense to go with the masterplan development which had been presented.

Commissioner Blackley said he did not have any problem with the flag lot because there would not be much traffic at the same time, and it may trickle in at night when travelers come in. Commissioner Blackley said he liked the flag lot design better and what it looked like.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 14, 2023
PAGE 4**

Mr. Stephens said if the Commission liked the flag lot design there would need to be a text amendment and changes would need to be made to make it work within the zone.

Chairman Rupp said it looked more like it should be a masterplan development with the way it looks and the way it would function. He said it would have two way traffic coming in and out so a single driveway for a flag lot would not look or work very well. He said the masterplan would have shared parking and rights that could be used for their enjoyment and not limited to particular parking spots.

Commissioner Brooks said a flag lot would not function well so it would work better to make it a masterplan development.

Commissioner Doxey said he agreed a masterplan element would be the better way to go than to change city ordinance to make a flag lot option for the property.

Mr. Stephens said the recordable documents would spell out where the parking belongs and if there were a change in ownership it would not cause issues in the future. He said how they get to the street, and cross easements and parking could be utilized in the recordable documents.

Mr. Peterson said they would be willing to look at a masterplan development, but he said they have liked the idea of owning a piece of property on the way out of the project but at the end of the day there would be an agreement that would get everyone in and out of the property. He said when the land was divided the way it was drawn it would look nice to have an easement that would show how there could be an out. He said they would be fine to go that direction for the masterplan development.

Commissioner Jones asked if where the lot line was drawn would the parking work. He said it would be better to line up the parking and then work out the easements. Mr. Peterson said it was not drawn out that way. Mr. Stephens said as a whole the square footage would meet the requirements for the project. Mr. Stephens said there would have to be a cross parking agreement as part of the project, and it would have to be looked at again and would have to have a different approval if it was sold in the future.

Council Member Sharp said he felt like the Council would probably be more in favor of the masterplan development.

Commissioner Jones said the 10 shared parking stalls may be an issue.

Commissioner Grover said he is fine with the way things are proceeding with the masterplan concept.

Chairman Rupp said he felt like the Commission was leaning towards the masterplan development concept. He asked if that helps with what direction the Cottontree group would like to go, and Mr. Peterson said it helped them a lot. He also said they are looking at the parking quite closely and said they are aware of the shared parking. He said they have been tracking their clients and said there have been less cars for more rooms. He said they are getting to about 85% parking to the sold rooms because families are getting two rooms but having only one car. He said they are finding they are using fewer parking stalls. He said they are running about 70% annualized and are not selling out every night and they are not quite as

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 14, 2023
PAGE 5**

jammed packed in their parking lots as they used to be. He said they went about 60 days above 90% sold out last year.

Chairman Rupp said he was glad they were looking at parking because it is an issue that the Planning Commission and the City Council will look closely at, and parking will be something that is sensitive.

Mr. Peterson said they have a parking monitor that goes out and counts cars every night to keep track of their parking, so they will be prepared with that information for future use.

Mr. Peterson thanked the Commission for their help and input on this matter and said it gives them a good direction to go moving forward.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT

Council Member Sharp was at tonight's meeting, and he reported on the City Council meeting held February 7, 2023. Please see the minutes of that meeting for the details of his report.

GENERAL AND PENDING BUSINESS

Mr. Stephens noted he had nothing for tonight.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Planning Commission, Commissioner Brooks made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:18 P. M.

Joe Rupp, Chairman

Bonnie Craig, Secretary