CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA
December 17, 2019 – WORK SESSION

Meetings of the City Council of Clearfield City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-207 as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meetings will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

Clearfield City Hall
55 South State Street
Multi-purpose Room, Second Floor
Clearfield, Utah

6:00 P.M. JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
Presentation by the Master Developer and Discussion on the Proposed Master Plan for the Clearfield Station Development Located at Approximately 1250 South State Street

**ADJOURN THE JOINT CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION AND IMMEDIATELY RECONVENE IN A CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION**

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Discussion on Amendments to the Form Based Code

**ADJOURN AS THE CITY COUNCIL**

Dated this 12th day of December, 2019.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

The City of Clearfield, in accordance with the ‘Americans with Disabilities Act’ provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens needing assistance. Persons requesting these accommodations for City sponsored public meetings, service programs or events should call Nancy Dean at 525-2714, giving her 48-hour notice.
TO: Mayor Shepherd and City Council Members
FROM: Summer Palmer, Assistant City Manager
MEETING DATE: December 17, 2019
SUBJECT: Clearfield Station Partners’ Presentation

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This will be an opportunity to meet the partners involved in the Clearfield Station TOD site. No action required at this time.

DESCRIPTION /BACKGROUND

In the spring of 2019, UTA completed the RFP process for a new master developer for the remaining 60 acres of Clearfield Station. Representatives from UTA, WFRC and the City made up the selection committee and ultimately UTA selected the development group of Stack Real Estate, Hamilton Partners, and Arch/Nexus as partners for the project. We have been meeting as a group bi-weekly to work through the design and development agreement. At this point in the process, we wanted to provide you with an opportunity to meet the partnership team, see the preliminary designs, ask questions and provide feedback.

Attached is the most recent conceptual rendering of the project. The project contains three (potentially four) office towers close to the platform consisting of approximately 600,000 square feet of Class A office space, apartment buildings, townhouses (approximately 829 units), retail space (approximately 62,000 square feet), two parking structures and more than 7 acres of trails, public and private recreational offerings. The currently proposed phasing structure shows:

**Phase 1: 2021-2022**
- 150,000 SF Class A Office
- 270 Multifamily Units
- Climbing Gym (30 SF Retail)
- 4,000 SF Retail

**Phase 2: 2023-2024**
- 150,000 SF Class A Office
- 331 Multifamily Units
- 8,000 SF Retail

**Phase 3: 2025-2026**
- 150,000 SF Class A Office
- 160 Multifamily Units
- 20,000 SF Retail

**Phase 4: 2027+**
- 98 Townhome Units
- 150,000 SF Class A Office
- Everything else
As you review the plan, you will no doubt formulate your own questions, but other potential items to be discussed may include:

- Does the current plan meet your expectations? If not, what alteration would you like considered?
- Does the current phasing schedule meet your expectations? Notice each phase includes both residential and commercial/office.
- Do you have any concerns with the proposed street network and connectivity? Are there any “deal breakers” when it comes to changes to our current state street configuration as we work with traffic engineers to accommodate traffic coming in and out of this project?
- Are there any specific park amenities you would like to see programmed for this site?
- What is the status of the Davis County School District optional school site and RSL soccer facility?
- How is this plan different from the one that was originally used to create the CRA? Does this change the TIF projections?
- What is your comfort level associated with bonding for the infrastructure?

**CORRESPONDING POLICY PRIORITY (IES)**

This item corresponds directly to the policy priority of Improving Clearfield’s Image, Livability, and Economy.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this discussion. There may be financial decisions related to bonding and TIF incentives that will a part of future discussions.

**ALTERNATIVES**

**SCHEDULE / TIME CONSTRAINTS**

**LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

- Clearfield Station TOD conceptual plan
Class A Office Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>gsf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office A</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office B</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office C</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office D (fut.)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Market Driven Retail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>gsf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/Gym</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail A</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail B</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail C</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail D</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail E</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail F</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail G</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail H</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential A</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential B (fut.)</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential C</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>829</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Park 1</td>
<td>~3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park 2</td>
<td>~1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Plaza Space</td>
<td>~3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>~7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a Conceptual Master Plan and Statistics are intended to convey the ultimate potential at full buildout, and all information provided is subject to adjustment based on market influences.
TO: Clearfield City Planning Commission

FROM: Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner
brad.mcilrath@clearfieldcity.org
(801) 525-2784

MEETING DATE: Wednesday, December 4th, 2019

SUBJECT: Public Hearing, Discussion and Possible Action on ZTA 1909-0002, a zoning text amendment request by Clearfield City to update the format and content of the Downtown Form-Based Code. Location: Approximately State Street and HWY 193 corridors. Planner: Brad McIlrath (Legislative Matter).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of APPROVAL for ZTA 1909-0002 to the Clearfield City Council, a zoning text amendment to amend Downtown Clearfield Form-Based Code to update the format and content. This recommendation is based upon the recommended changes and findings outlined in this report.

RECOMMENDATION OPTIONS

1. Move to recommend approval of ZTA 1909-0002 to the Clearfield City Council, a zoning text amendment to amend the Downtown Clearfield Form-Based Code as proposed.

2. Move to recommend denial of ZTA 1909-0002 to the Clearfield City Council, a zoning text amendment to amend the Downtown Clearfield Form-Based Code as proposed.

3. Move to table ZTA 1909-0002 to request additional information for consideration.

The Planning Commission may also make a recommendation that is different than those listed above such as a modified recommendation of approval.

BACKGROUND

As the land use authority for administrative land use items and a recommending body for legislative items, it is imperative that the Planning Commission provide a thorough review of not only the current ordinance, but the updates that are being proposed at this time in order to and provide staff with comments for changes as is necessary. This staff report provides summary of staff’s review to assist the Planning Commission with their review of the draft document. It is important to understand all of the items that may require attention and should be addressed. Comments provided, at this point, by the Planning Commission were serve a vital role in finalizing the code in a way that will create positive change and opportunities for Clearfield for years to come.

The purpose of this update is to provide development standards consistent with the Creating Downtown Clearfield vision, as well as provide clear direction for the development community for the redevelopment and helping the city with the creation of “Downtown Clearfield”. This update is intended
to provide the needed design standards and direction for the development of the public and private
realms within State and Main corridor of Clearfield City.

In a joint work session on July 30, 2019 the Clearfield City Council and Planning Commission met to
review the progress of the code update. Following that meeting on August 28, 2019 Planning and FFKR
staff met with the staff of UDOT Region 1 to discuss access management for the corridor within the
Downtown FBC area. Based upon the meeting it was decided that the City and UDOT will work together
to develop a Corridor Agreement that will outline the required and necessary changes needed along SR-
126 (State/Main Street) and SR-193 (700 South) as those areas redevelop. The corridor agreement
would constitute the formal agreement for the access management and right-of-way design for these
two major arterials.

The Clearfield City Council reviewed the progress of the code update in a work session on September 17,
2019. On October 2, 2019 the Planning Commission reviewed the progress of the code update along
with providing input regarding thematic design elements for the downtown. Comments and discussion
in each meeting have been reviewed and incorporated where applicable into the most recent draft
version of the code.

ANALYSIS - OVERVIEW OF AMENDMENTS (by chapter)

This code update has updated with a new look and organization for the document along with an in-
depth review of each chapter and the development standards therein. Based feedback from the
Planning Commission and City Council, changes have been made to; the location of zoning districts; the
types of uses and finally building types that are allowed in each district. The items identified in the
previous sentence provide as updates to the code better display the idea to have a centralized core for
the “Downtown” with areas that build up to and scale down from the core in intensities and use. A
review of the changes in each chapter is provided below.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

This chapter has been modified to provide a cleaner look and more precise background for the code’s
purpose along with the organization of the code as it is currently constituted.

Chapter 2 – Zoning Districts

This chapter includes updates to zoning district names and the locations of the zones within Downtown
Clearfield. The zoning district names have been changed in the following ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic (CV)</th>
<th>Civic (CV) – No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Corridor (CC)</td>
<td>Gateway Corridor Commerce (CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Commerce (TC)</td>
<td>Town Mixed Commerce (TC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Residential (TR)</td>
<td>Town Neighborhood Residential (TR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Commerce (UC)</td>
<td>Urban Core Commerce (UC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Residential (UR)</td>
<td>Urban Mixed Residential (UR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen on page 6 of the Form-Based Code (FBC), the downtown area has been expanded to the
northern municipal boundary at 800 North. The different nodes of Exchange Place, Mabey Place, and
Access Point have been removed with the UC and UR zones considered the core or “heart” of the
downtown area. The reorganization of the zones is intended to provide a deliberate increase and
decrease heading into and away from the core as well and locating uses and building types in areas that are most appropriate. The area along 700 South for example was previously comprised of only the TC zone but has been changed to include the CC and TR zones as they more appropriate for the locations in which they are proposed. CC being a more suburban type of commercial that allow the intensity and design to ramp up with the TR and TC zones as we head into the downtown core. This map calls out locations for future roads if and when they are developed as a way to provide more complete connectivity within the downtown core.

Chapter 2 now provides an overview of the different zones and what building types are allowed in each zone along with visual representation of those building types. A description of each district along with the general scale is provided.

Chapter 3 – Uses

This chapter has been modified to provide more information about the uses that are allowed under the general classifications along with a simpler layout to read and understand. The categories and types of uses have been carefully calibrated for the new zone locations and reviewed to ensure compatibility in the downtown. To provide more clarification, this chapter now includes a table of uses that are allowed by building type. Development standards for specific uses are outlined at the end of the chapter.

Chapter 4 – Street and Block Network

This chapter has been modified to provide more detail about the streets and blocks that exist or could exist in Downtown Clearfield. The current ordinance does not provide this type of detail and lacks the information that is imperative to this local context. It is important for these standards to align with current Public Works and Engineering standards while allowing for new standards that support this urban framework. This chapter has been revised to provide detail for each street type and a regulating, or hierarchy plan, for those streets in the downtown area (see page 24). This chapter also provides standards to be used by the City in the development of pedestrian crossings and block network and accesses.

Chapter 5 – Street and Streetscape Standards

This chapter has seen significant modifications to include updated graphics, street standards, and streetscape design standards to create a welcoming and safe pedestrian environment. The Public Works Director, Street Superintendent, and City Forester have reviewed this and other chapters and provided feedback that have been incorporated into this draft. Planning Staff would like to see the integration of conceptual building types into the graphics to better illustrate the relationship between the public and private realms. This is something that FFKR has started and will have completed prior to the final deliverable. Staff has provided comments to FFKR regarding some of the street designs and standards, and recommends that additional clarification be provided where a residential street type or commercial street type would apply. As outlined in Chapter 4 all of the streets that are not arterials or connectors are labeled as “neighborhood local.” Staff would like to make sure that the commercial street type could also be used in those commercial zoning districts. This additional comment has been forwarded on to the consultant for inclusion into the code.

The Streetscape standards section of this chapter is still undergoing some changes. Staff is requesting that the designs that have been approved for the street furnishings be included in this section with the actual design specifications included in an appendix at the end of the code. Additional information regarding the types of street trees required, based upon the width of the planting or furnishing zone, should be provided along with the requirement that the City Forester/Arborist approve all designs prior to a final approval being granted. There also needs to be standards in this section that require an
automatic irrigation system that is tied to the City system and dedicated to the City for future maintenance and watering. This section has come a long way, but Staff feels that these changes will better meet the needs of the City.

**Chapter 6 – Building Types**

This chapter was updated and re-calibrated for Downtown Clearfield. New images for the different building types have been provided along with the replacement of the Mansion building with a Garden Court building type. The Multi-Family building type has been removed from the T-R (Town Residential) Zone as that has become more of a transition zone to the existing single-family residential areas. It is important for the Planning Commission to determine if the Multi-family building type should remain in the T-R zone or be removed as proposed.

The format for the beginning of the chapter has been modified to include more images, however staff recommends that the consultant use similar format and organization as was included in the September 25, 2019 draft. Building standards have been calibrated in detail with more clarity to allow for ease in reading of the document. Staff has provided comments for each building type to identify changes to the proposed standards as well as comments on the format of and content of each table. Staff also recommends that additional or different example pictures be used for the building types. This chapter has also been modified to include building, unit, and site amenities for residential developments. There is a difference in the amount that is required in the Urban zones and the Town zones based upon the types of development that would be allowed within each zone.

Building design standards have been modified to address entry types as frontage types along with the addition of the contemporary frontage type. The roof types have been clarified along with the building materials. The Building Variety section needs additional clarity as called out in the comments. Other staff comments refer to residential windows, building amenities, and balconies to name a few.

**Chapter 7 – Site Landscape and Amenity Standards**

This chapter has been modified to provide a clearer format for landscape standards. This section previously included individual outdoor space to address site amenities for residential developments. Those standards have been simplified and moved to the Building Types chapter; however, the section for site amenities needs to be added to Chapter 7 and should include the types of acceptable site amenities. These should be provided as a selectable list similar to the building features and amenities table in Chapter 6.

Additional clarification/cleanup of this chapter is needed as called out in the staff comments in the attached draft. This is something that staff will need to put the required time into, with help from the consultant to clearly indicate expectations and standards that were previously acceptable and could remain unchanged. Staff is confident that they can work with FFKR to have these changes completed prior to final review and adoption of the code, by the City Council.

**Chapter 8 – Civic Open Space Standards**

It is the opinion of staff that this chapter has some of the most impactful changes from the current code. Instead of requiring open space individually on each development, civic open spaces must be provided for developments that are five (5) acres in size or greater. There is also a fee-in-lieu, or land-in-lieu of a civic open space which will be calculated and required for developments less than five (5) acres in size. The process for calculating these in-lieu options is being created by Staff and will be included in the final document for adoption. The civic open spaces provided in this chapter have been modified with the removal of the pocket park open space as the Capital Improvements Plan for Community Services
recommends that no new pocket parks be created within the City. Comments and changes recommended by Staff are included in the attached draft.

**Chapter 9 – Parking Standards**

These standards have been revised to appropriately address the parking requirements for uses within Downtown Clearfield. Changes include updated parking ratios and the encouragement of parking structures with an allowance for parking reductions for this type of parking facility. The process for calculated multiple use reductions has also been more clearly outlined. Changes have been made to match Public Works standards for access and to address pedestrian access. Additional changes are provided in Staff comments are provided in the attached draft.

**Chapter 10 – Signs**

This chapter has been cleaned up to address formatting and included additional information provided regarding the different sign types and standards. Staff recommends that certain standards be modified to be the same standards outlined in Chapter 15 “Sign Ordinance” of the Land Use Title such as directional signs and monument signs. Comments provided in this chapter should be addressed prior to City Council review and approval.

**Chapter 11 – Administration and Appendix**

This chapter impacts City Staff as well as the Planning Commission and City Council with regards to the process by which this code is administered. This chapter has been updated to be more consistent with current code standards and review processes. The Development Agreement section has been modified to allow/encourage the use of a development agreement only to further establish conditions of approval and to amend/modify standards only if the development meets the objectives of the FBC. A development agreement must be reviewed by the Planning Commission and then the City Council for approval. It is the intent of this section to limit the use of development agreements only for special circumstances and to allow the FBC to stand on its own in every instance, with few exceptions. The Planning Commission and City Council should review this section to decide if this is the process they are comfortable with moving forward.

Additional definitions and code references have also been provided with the update of this chapter.

**REMAINING CHANGES**

As shown in the attached FBC Draft, Planning Staff has provided comments for changes to be made and in some instances required as part of the adoption of the code, which should be completed prior to final review and adoption by the City Council. The Corridor Agreement between Clearfield City and UDOT is being amended due to access needs at Clearfield Station; the agreement will be extended to include the entire SR-126 corridor down to Clearfield Station. The corridor agreement will involve a separate process, but the agreement will be added to FBC upon final acceptance and approval by both Clearfield City and UDOT. Design specifications for street lights, tree grates, street trees, trash receptacles, and the sidewalk design for the core area will be added as an appendix to the code for reference and use by the development community and staff. This will ensure a consistent design and construction throughout Downtown Clearfield.

Once the code is finalized and adopted, any rezoning of properties within the downtown area will need to take place through the public hearing process.
PUBLIC COMMENT

Public notice was placed in the newspaper on November 24th, 2019, on the State of Utah public notice website, and on the City’s website. No public comment has been received to date.

GENERAL FINDINGS

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment

Clearfield Land Use Ordinance Section 11-6-3 establishes the following findings the Planning Commission shall make to approve Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments. The findings and staff’s evaluation are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Consideration</th>
<th>Staff Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The proposed amendment is in accordance with the General Plan and Map; or</td>
<td>The General Plan encourages continual evaluation and modifications to adopted ordinances as circumstances require. The General Plan includes the proposed code amendments are in accordance to the policies, goals, and objectives of the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Changed conditions make the proposed amendment necessary to fulfill the purposes of this Title.</td>
<td>With changed conditions to sites adjacent to the freeway and in an effort to provide a consistent measurement point the proposed amendment is necessary and will contribute to the general well-being of the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The proposed Downtown Clearfield Form-Based Code draft shall be modified to address staff comments and changes as outlined in the attached draft.
2. The final executed Corridor Agreement for SR-126 (State/Main Street) shall be provided as an appendix to the final code.
3. Design specifications shall be included as an appendix to the Downtown Clearfield Form-Based Code prior to final acceptance from the consultant.
4. An amendment to the Clearfield City fee schedule shall be adopted to provide the fee-in-lieu of civic open space process which includes the monetary calculation for the fee.
5. Properties located within the Downtown Clearfield Form-Based Code area shall be rezoned to align with the new zoning district locations.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Downtown Form-Based Code – November 22, 2019 Draft
Clearfield Station
Prior Proposals

Thackeray Garn

Stadler Rail
Recent History

2018 UTA TOD Policy Adopted

2019 Clearfield Connected Station Area Plan (Completed by IBI, Q1 2019)

2019 Clearfield Connected Adopted by Clearfield City

2019 RFP Issued and Development Partner Selected
Recent History

2018 UTA TOD Policy Adopted

2019 Clearfield Connected Station Area Plan
(Completed by IBI, Q1 2019)

2019 Clearfield Connected Adopted by Clearfield City

2019 RFP Issued and Development Partner Selected
Recent History

2018 UTA TOD Policy Adopted

2019 Clearfield Connected Station Area Plan
(Completed by IBI, Q1 2019)

2019 Clearfield Connected Adopted by Clearfield City

2019 RFP Issued and Development Partner Selected
Recent History

2018 UTA TOD Policy Adopted

2019 Clearfield Connected Station Area Plan (Completed by IBI, Q1 2019)

2019 Clearfield Connected Adopted by Clearfield City

2019 RFP Issued and Development Partner Selected
Current Proposal

Class A Office Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>gsf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office A</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office B</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office C</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office D (fut.)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Market Driven Retail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>gsf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/Gym</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail A</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail B</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail C</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail D</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail E</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail F</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail G</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail H</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential A</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential B (fut)</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential C</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>829</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Park 1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park 2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Plaza Space</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustrated road network connection to 1000 east is dependent on coordination with UDOT and the future city connection to State Street and 1450 south.
**Chapter 1: Introduction**

Big Ticket Items:

- 

To Consider:

- Add an overview of each chapter’s intent (replicate intent paragraph from each chapter)

**Chapter 2: Districts**

Big Ticket Items:

- Added details regarding allowed building types on allowed streets

To Consider:

- Confirm the allowed building types on the street types

**Chapter 3: Uses**

Big Ticket Items:

- Use Category consistency with existing code
- Use by District and Use by Building Type included
- Remember that uses and building types differ (e.g. Office Uses are allowed in TR; the Office Building Type is not, so Office Uses would occur in a Mixed-Use building type).

To Consider:

- Move chapter after Building Types [confirmed with City Council on 12/10/2019]

**Chapter 4: Street & Block Network**

Big Ticket Items:

- Added details regarding allowed building types on allowed streets

To Consider:

- Confirm the street hierarchy and/or if a street would be Neighborhood or Commercial in type depending on adjacent district

**Chapter 5: Street Types & Streetscape**

Big Ticket Items:
- Updated diagrams
- UDOT Corridor agreement – lane width, medians, space for bike facilities
  - Urban Core – 11’ lanes
  - Gateway – 12’ lanes
- Streetscape design for Urban Core (may be modified to support healthier spaces for urban trees)

To Consider:
- Vehicular Realm – expand bicycle sections to refer to bicycles and e-scooters

**Chapter 6: Building Types**

Big Ticket Items:
- Added additional frontage/entrance types
- Secondary uses in residential and civic building types (e.g. small café on ground floor)
- Removed adaptive re-use as a building type
- Added the Garden Court for expanding housing type options in the TR zone (e.g. missing middle housing options between SF and MF apartments)
- Materials
- Building/Site Amenities
- Updated structure/flow of Building Type Tables

To Consider/Add:
- Need to include a height transition diagram for the buffering between existing residential and FBC zones
- Separating single Building Type tables into two or three smaller tables

**Chapter 7: Landscape**

Big Ticket Items:
- Differentiation of chapter intent/applicability for landscaped areas – front/side/rear setback landscaping; parking lot buffer landscaping; interior parking lot landscaping. Streetscape and Street Trees moved to Streetscape chapter

To Consider:
- Remove section on installation if covered in a city-wide policy document
- Clarify the intent and use of setback areas - e.g. active urban landscape to be used by building residents/users/visitors; to provide privacy; to enhance with plants/vegetation; and/or to function as transitions between lots/districts
- Use this chapter to define/specify “Active Streetscape” or do it in Chapter 8 (as an open space type)
- More clarification and updated diagrams/table for buffers vs. screens.
- Provide more information/examples of xeriscaping (are more options than just rocks)

**Chapter 8: Open Space Types**

Big Ticket Items:

- Civic/Public Open Space types only – not on-site amenities for residential projects (these are covered in Building Types chapter now)
- Use fee-in-lieu to create open space types that are a true urban amenity
- Clarify the desirability of smaller open space types to help serve an increasing urban population and urban context. While city CIP is suggesting no more pocket parks, the open space types in this chapter are tailored to serve an urban population. Using the “special park type” designation

To Consider/Define:

- Need to decide on fee-in-lieu amount structure, impact fee schedule
- Do not decrease the LOS as recommended in the CF Plan, which would lower the amount of impact fees the city can request. Keep a higher LOS and ensure the proposed open spaces that will be part of downtown are part of the overall tally for proposed parks.

**Chapter 9: parking**

Big Ticket Items:

- Updated Shared Parking table
- Clarified visitor parking for residential

To Consider:

- Tandem parking

**Chapter 10: Signs**

Big Ticket Items:

- Iconic sign example

To Consider:

- Make Center Identification Sign – Pole Signs
- Create Wayfinding/Center Identification sign type

**Chapter 11: Administration**

Big Ticket Items:
• Updated development agreement section

To Consider/Define:

• FBC flow diagram for using code and administering the code