MEETING NOTICE OF THE CLEARFIELD CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Notice is hereby given that the Clearfield City Planning Commission will hold a regularly scheduled meeting at 7:00 P.M., Wednesday, July 1, 2015, on the 3rd floor in the City Council Chambers of the Clearfield City Municipal Building, 55 S. State, Clearfield, Utah.

7:00 PM CALL TO ORDER-- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

1. ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. June 3, 2015

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

3. Public Hearing - CUP 1506-0001: A request by David Martini, on behalf of A Fence Utah, for a Conditional Use Permit for outdoor storage related to the retail sale of fencing materials located at 420 W. 1700 S. Unit B (TIN: 12-065-0174).


5. Public Hearing - PSP 1506-0004: A request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval for a two lot subdivision located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018).

6. Public Hearing - ZTA 1506-0002: A request by Jared Nielson, on behalf of MV Properties, for a Zoning Text Amendment to consider changes to Title 11, Chapter 14 – Off Street Parking and Loading, to amend parking lot standards, and create standards for parking garages. This zoning text amendment would be effective across all commercial and manufacturing zones in Clearfield City.

SCHEDULED ITEMS:

7. Discussion and Possible Action – SP 1505-0005: A request by April Seidel, on behalf of Radon-B-Gone, for a Site Plan Approval of asphalt and landscaping improvements located at 172 N. Main (TIN: 12-001-0198).
8. Discussion and Possible Action - CUP 1506-0001: A request by David Martini, on behalf of A Fence Utah, for a Conditional Use Permit.

9. Discussion and Possible Action - CUP 1506-0003: A request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Conditional Use Permit Approval for outdoor storage related to the sale and distribution of liquid fuels.

10. Discussion and Possible Action - SP 1506-0003: A request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Site Plan Approval.

11. Discussion and Possible Action - PSP 1506-0004: A request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval.

12. Discussion and Possible Action - FSP 1506-0004: A request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Final Subdivision Plat Approval for a two lot subdivision located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018).

13. Discussion and Possible Action - ZTA 1506-0002: A request by Jared Nielson, on behalf of MV Properties, for a Zoning Text Amendment to consider changes to Title 11, Chapter 14 – Off Street Parking and Loading.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

14. Political Campaign Signs – Title 11 Change

COMMUNICATION ITEMS:

15. Staff Communications – Administrative Site Plan Reviews

16. Planning Commissioners’ Minute

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ADJOURNED**

Dated this 29th day of June 2015
/s/Scott A. Hess, Development Services Manager

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 accommodations for City sponsored public meetings, service programs, or events, should call Christine Horrocks at 525-2780, giving her 48 hours notice.
TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Scott A. Hess, MPA
Contract City Planner
scottahess@gmail.com
(801) 643-3337

MEETING DATE: July 1, 2015

SUBJECT: Discussion and Possible Action on SP 1505-0005, a request by April Seidel, on behalf of Radon Be Gone, for Site Plan approval of new landscaping, asphalt, and storm detention, located at 172 N. Main (TIN: 12-001-0198). The property is approximately 0.94 acres and lies in the C-2 (Commercial) zoning district.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Move to approve as conditioned, SP 1505-0005, a request by April Seidel, on behalf of Radon Be Gone, for Site Plan approval of new landscaping, asphalt, and storm detention, located at 172 N. Main based on the findings and discussion in the Staff Report.

BACKGROUND

Radon Be Gone is a business located in an existing structure located at 172 N. Main Street. The site has been continuously used as an office and business location. Radon Be Gone received a Facade Improvement Grant from Clearfield City CDRA in early 2015. A condition of approval for that grant was that a Site Plan be approved through Clearfield City for future improvements on site.

PROJECT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Radon Be Gone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>172 N. Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax ID Number</td>
<td>12-001-0198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant and Property Owner</td>
<td>April and John Seidel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Actions</td>
<td>Site Plan Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning</td>
<td>C-2 (Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan Land Use</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Site Area</td>
<td>0.94 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS

Comprehensive Plan and Zoning
This project is subject to Site Plan approval due to the proposed addition of asphalt, which will affect the storm drainage system for Clearfield City. The General Plan classification is
commercial, and the current zoning is C-2 Commercial. The use is a business office, and is permitted in the zone.

**Site Plan Review**

**DESIGN STANDARDS**

The structure as it exists is a legally non-conforming building in the C-2 zone. The exterior of the building is metal, and was recently painted by the applicant to help improve the exterior. There are not any proposed building changes at this time. Staff would recommend that any future expansions or renovations to the structure require that the building come into compliance with Chapter 18 Design Standards.

**SITE CIRCULATION and PARKING**

The current pavement on the site is in very rough shape. The proposed Site Plan shows new asphalt pavement to be installed in two phases, north and south. The south side of the lot is currently where the existing pavement and parking exists on site, and would be improved in phase 1. The northern area would be improved in phase 2. The site’s access points from Main Street (S.R. 126) are in their existing locations and are not proposed to change. There is an existing sidewalk on Main Street. The plans should be updated to reflect that any missing, broken, or otherwise damaged asphalt and concrete should be replaced. The Site Plan shows four parking stalls with 1 labeled ADA accessible. The overall utilization of the site appears to be more intensive than the four stalls upon observation, and staff would recommend that the parking lot be striped with additional stalls to accommodate employees and customers. Parking stalls shall be designed to City Standard at 9’x20’.

**LANDSCAPING**

The Site Plan landscaping calculation includes the entire lot that is split zoned C-2 and R-1-8. The landscaping shown is over half of the site, due to including the non-developed eastern portion of the lot. An estimate of the actual landscaping on the improved C-2 portion of the lot is approximately 17% or 2,770 sqft of the approximately 16,250 sqft lot. This exceeds the 10% requirement. A detailed drawing of the landscaping materials, plant list, and irrigation plan needs to be submitted for review.

**GARBAGE DUMPSTER**

The site has a proposed dumpster enclosure with plans to match it to the exterior color of the existing building. The dumpster meets the requirements as proposed.

**FENCING PLAN**

An existing chain link fence surrounds the site. There are no proposed changes to fencing on the Site Plan. The fence is legal non-conforming, and staff does not recommend any changes to the current fence configuration.

**SIGN PACKAGE**

The existing sign was legally granted a sign permit through Clearfield City Planning Department.

**ENGINEERING REVIEW**

Please see the attached City Engineer Review.

**OTHER AGENCY REVIEW**

**UDOT**
Access to State-owned roadways is controlled by UDOT. There are no proposed changes to access points, or access widths. Access improvements must be cleared through UDOT.

Public Comment
No public comment has been received to date.

REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

Site Plan Review
Clearfield Land Use Ordinance Section 11-5-3 establishes the review considerations the Planning Commission shall make to approve Site Plans. 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) <strong>Traffic:</strong> The effect of the site development plan on traffic conditions on abutting streets.</td>
<td>The site is located with two direct access points to Main Street (S.R. 126). Staff does not foresee any traffic impacts from this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) <strong>Vehicle; Pedestrian:</strong> The layout of the site with respect to locations and dimension of vehicular and pedestrian entrances, exits, drives and walkways.</td>
<td>The site is accessible through two existing driveways. There is a public sidewalk along Main Street (S.R. 126). Deteriorated or damaged sidewalk and concrete will need to be replaced or installed. Currently the site has two access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3) **Off-Street Parking:** Compliance of off-street parking facilities with Chapter 14 of this Title. | The current Site Plan shows parking lot improvements in two phases. Currently there are four parking stalls shown with one ADA Accessible stall. The proposed parking lot is asphalt, which meets city code. Staff would recommend that at least 10 parking stalls be striped for employees and customers based on observation of the utilization of the parking lot over the past year. The parking lot stall size shall be 9’x20’.

<p>| 4) <strong>Loading and Unloading Facilities:</strong> The location, arrangement and dimensions of truck loading and unloading facilities. | The site is not subject to an off-street loading space requirement. |
| 5) <strong>Surfacing and Lighting; Parking:</strong> The surfacing and lighting of off-street parking. | The proposal does not include any additional surface lighting. Should the construction documents include new lighting for either the parking lot or exterior of the building, the lighting must meet City code. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Screen Planting:</strong> The location, height and materials, of walls, fences, hedges and screen planting.</th>
<th>This site is not subject to screen plantings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Landscaping:</strong> The layout and appropriateness of landscaping.</td>
<td>A minimum of 10 percent landscaping is a requirement in the C-2 zoning district. The construction drawings will need to demonstrate this standard is met and the provisions of 11-13-23 for the minimum number of trees and shrubs are included. The appropriate number of trees and shrubs, planting materials list, and irrigation plan must be included in the required landscaping plan to be submitted and approved by the Planning Department prior to issuance of any Permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Drainage:</strong> The effect of the site development plan on City storm water drainage systems.</td>
<td>The applicant will demonstrate in the Construction Documents compliance with current City standards and mitigate the impact on the storm drain system. Incorporation of the City Engineer’s comments will adequately address on site drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Utility:</strong> The effect of the site development plan on City utility systems.</td>
<td>The applicant will demonstrate in the Construction Documents compliance with current City standards and mitigate impact the on the utilities system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building Locations:</strong> Consideration of building locations on the site, elevations and relation to surrounding areas (Ord. 84-06B, 9-11-1984)</td>
<td>The site layout is not changing, as the existing building will remain on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exterior Design:</strong> Consideration of exterior design in relation to adjoining structures and area character to assure compatibility with other structures in the neighborhood, existing or intended. (Ord. 84-08, 10-23-1984)</td>
<td>The applicant will continue to occupy the existing structure with no requested changes at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Signs:</strong> Compliance of signs with Chapter 15 of this Title and particular consideration to the location of signs upon the site, their effect upon parking, ingress and egress, the effects upon neighboring properties and the general harmony of signs with the character of the neighborhood, existing or intended.</td>
<td>A sign package review will be under separate review and approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1) The Construction Documents submitted for building permits shall be in substantial conformance with the documents submitted in this Site Plan approval, SP 1505-0005; however, they will also include and address the following:
   a. The final engineering design (construction drawings) submitted for site improvements shall meet City standards and be to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
   b. A minimum of ten (10) parking stalls shall be delineated and designed for the site and shown on submitted construction drawings with the dimensions of 9’x20’. A minimum of one parking stall must meet ADA standards.
   c. Site circulation must be designed in such a manner that on site traffic flow is not impeded. Adequate paved markings and/or signage shall be provided and incorporated on the site.
   d. New lighting for the site, either parking lot or exterior to the building shall be shown on the construction documents and meet City Code.
   e. A minimum of 10 percent landscaping shall be provided and meet the minimum standards set forth in 11-13-23.

2) A garbage dumpster screen must be in place prior to providing a dumpster on site.

3) Site Plan approval is subject to North Davis County Fire District review and approval.

4) Site Plan approval is subject to obtaining any necessary reviews and approvals from the State of Utah Department of Transportation for access on State Highways.

5) Should the landscape not be installed prior to Certificate of Occupancy, pursuant to Land Use Ordinance 11-13-23(B), (C) and (D) Final building permit approval is subject to the applicant establishing an escrow account, as reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and City Attorney.

6) The applicant shall provide proof of having obtained and of having maintained, as may be periodically requested by the City, all applicable local, state, and federal permits.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Site Plan Set
2. City Engineer Review Letter
SITE PLAN FOR:
JOHN SEIDEL
172 NORTH MAIN
CLEARFIELD, UTAH
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22 June 2015

City of Clearfield
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah 84015

Attn: Scott A. Hess, Development Services Manager (Contract Manager)
Proj: Radon Be Gone – John Seidel – 172 North Main Street
Subj: Site Plan Improvement Drawing Review

Dear Scott,

Attached is my review of the above referenced Site Plan for your consideration:

General Note:

1. An **electronic copy** of the Site Plan & Improvement drawings and details must be submitted to the Public Work Department via our office for record keeping upon design completion and prior to approval of the final drawings from our office.

Site Plan – Improvement Drawings

1. Notes need to be placed on the improvement drawings indicating all deteriorated, damaged or missing surface improvements surrounding the perimeter of the development and on-site be replaced or installed; i.e., curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaping park strip improvements, asphalt patching, landscaping replacement, site lighting, dumpster screening, concrete improvement, etc.

2. A “Geotechnical Report” will need to be submitted for review. The report should address the depth of sub-base material for the paved areas, thickness of the roadbase and asphalt materials for the site pavement and other typical report items.

3. The “Demolition Plan” needs to be submitted and needs to address those items which will be removed prior to construction. It appears that the existing smaller driveway in the center of the property will need to be removed due to conflicts with the “storm water basin”. Will the
large tree on the southerly side of the site be removed? The developer needs to show and make known the demolition changes planned.

4. The Storm Water “Calculations” need to be prepared and submitted for review. The storm water facilities will need to be designed to manage a 24-hour storm water event and consider volumes from a 100-year storm water event.

5. The only storm water data submitted is contained on the drawing, as a summary of the volume (required & provided) for the “Retention Basin”. Will the storm water basin be “Retention or Detention”? Information (data) from the City “Storm Water Base Map” indicated that there is an existing 18” diameter storm water pipe in Main Street, near the easterly curb & gutter. This existing storm water pipe needs to be field located by the Developer’s Engineer and this new development will need to connect onto this existing storm water pipe.

6. The storm water basin will need to have a 12” freeboard berm designed with the basin having an armored overflow spillway to the curb & gutter on Main Street. The outlet storm water control box and orifice, all piping, collection boxes, curbs, waterways, etc. need to be shown on the plans.

7. The “Site Plan” needs to be finished and submitted for review. The existing and proposed contour lines, surface grades, top of finished improvements (TC, TP & TBC) need to be prepared and the drawing submitted for review. All other site elements need to be shown (i.e. curbs, gutters, walls, fencing, utilities, landscaping, parking stalls (provided widths), handicap stalls and building access ramps, dumpster pad, dumpster enclosure, etc.

8. The site plan needs dimensions and all service utilities shown i.e., culinary water, sanitary sewer, communications, electrical and natural gas supply.

9. I would recommend a 10-foot deep x width shown concrete approach pad (6” thick) at the front of the dumpster pad to handle the front wheels impact load. This will prevent rutting of the asphalt. The detail drawing needs to indicate the color of the CMU blocks for the dumpster enclosure and dimensions.

10. The detail for the culinary water meter/connection in needed to be shown (the property should have existing culinary water service).

11. The landscaping notes should call out the various types of plants, sod, trees and the tree caliper size. The plants and trees should be of sufficient size to make a difference on the site (a tree near a 2” caliper is suggested).

12. The irrigation plans should be shown in detail on the drawings. There needs to be backflow prevention at the culinary water service pipeline connection. The backflow equipment needs to be shown in detail in the drawings.

13. I would recommend that the storm water collection pipes be a minimum diameter size of 12” diameter. Consideration for piping roof run-off water directly to the detention basin should be evaluated by the Developer and his Engineer.
14. I would recommend that a 12” wide x 6” thick concrete apron be installed around all storm water inlet boxes and be dowelled into the side of the box. The apron will help in the bottom of the detention/retention basin to control grasses from growing over the edge of the grate and blocking flow.

15. I would recommend that all waterways be a minimum of 4’ wide which would better transport storm water flows.

16. Location and details of all site lighting and business signs need to be shown on the drawings.

17. All other items required by other departments need to be included with the final approved Site Plan drawings.

We would be happy to meet with the Developer and/or his Engineer to review the above items should they have any questions.

Sincerely,

CEC, Civil Engineering Consultants, PLLC.

[Signature]

N. Scott Nelson, PE.
City Engineer

Cc. JJ Allen, Assistance City Manager
Scott Hodge, Public Works Director
Dan Schuler, Public Works Inspector and Storm Water Manager
Michael McDonald, Building Official
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Scott A. Hess, MPA
       Contract City Planner
       scottahess@gmail.com
       (801) 643-3337
MEETING DATE: July 1, 2015
SUBJECT: Public Hearing, Discussion and Possible Action on CUP 1506-0003, a request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Conditional Use Permit Approval for outdoor storage related to the sale and distribution of liquid fuels located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018). The property is approximately 3 acres and is located in the M-1 Manufacturing Zoning district.

Discussion and Possible Action on SP 1506-0003, a request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Site Plan Approval of a new manufacturing use related to the sale and distribution of liquid fuels located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018). The property is approximately 3 acres and is located in the M-1 Manufacturing Zoning district.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Move to approve CUP 1506-0003, a request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Conditional Use Permit Approval for outdoor storage related to the sale and distribution of liquid fuels located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018), as conditioned, based on the discussion and findings in the Staff Report.

Move to approve SP 1506-0003, a request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Site Plan Approval of a new manufacturing use related to the sale and distribution of liquid fuels located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018), as conditioned, based on the discussion and findings in the Staff Report.

PROJECT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax ID Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND
Brad Randall on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing has applied for a Conditional Use Permit, Site Plan, and Subdivision Plat for the purposes of relocating a local business from Layton City to Clearfield City. The site is zoned M-1 Manufacturing, and currently has an existing single-family home. The site is located at 95 West 200 South near South Main Street, and is accessed off of Center Street or the S.R 193 extension.

ANALYSIS CUP-SP
Comprehensive Plan and Zoning
The project is 3.04 acres between two proposed parcels. The property is Master Planned Business Park and is currently zoned M-1 Manufacturing.

The project is subject to conditional use permit related to the request for outdoor storage. The project is subject to Site Plan approval due to a change in use from the existing residential to manufacturing and distribution.

Conditional Use Permit Review
A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) has been requested for Outdoor Storage. Chapter 3 of the Land Use Ordinance defines the use as follows:
Outdoor Storage as “The commercial storage or keeping of building materials, equipment, fuels, vehicles, goods, commodities or raw materials outside of a building or structure. Outdoor storage shall be subject to the regulations set forth in section 11-13-12 of this title.”

Clearfield City Code Section §11-13-12 Outdoor Storage outlines the requirements that must be met, and the following are applicable to this request: Outdoor Storage must be enclosed by wall or fence at least 6 feet tall and be impervious to sight from public streets, right-of-ways, and adjacent property.

The project as proposed places all Outdoor Storage on “Lot 2” of the proposed Randall Subdivision Plat. Lot 2 would be completely surrounded by M-1 Manufacturing. This allows the storage to be taller than six feet in height, if approved by the Planning Commission. There are numerous storage tanks that range in height from 14’ tall to 35’ tall. Clearfield City ordinance 11-13-12E2 states that in no case shall storage exceed 15 feet in height. Staff would recommend that this be a condition of approval, and the proposed tanks either be recessed into the ground, or constructed shorter and wider to stay within City Code for total height.

Outdoor Storage must be enclosed in a fence. Staff realizes that the railroad spur exists and may cause problems with strict adherence to this code, but would like to make an attempt to screen the tanks. Staff would recommend that a six foot tall fence that is impervious to view be installed between the structure and the property lines as well as along the east property line, and west property line up to the railroad right-of-way as close as practical.

The additional requirements for Outdoor Storage are being met by this request. The storage is placed on hard surface, is not within view of a Commuter Rail Train, and would be surrounded entirely by M-1 Manufacturing uses once the new subdivision plat is recorded.

Public Comment
To date, staff has not received any public comment.

---

GENERAL STANDARDS
Conditional Use Permit Review
Clearfield Land Use Ordinance Section 11-4-3 establishes the general standards and determination the Planning Commission shall make to approve Conditional Use Permits. The findings and staff’s evaluation are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Standard</th>
<th>Staff Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DETERMINATION: A Conditional Use Permit shall be approved if conditions are proposed, or can be imposed, to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with the standards set forth [in the Land Use Code]. If the reasonably anticipated detrimental impacts or effects of the proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated or eliminated by the proposal or the imposition of conditions to achieve compliance with the standards set forth [in the Land Use Code], the Conditional Use Permit may be denied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Equivalent to Permitted Use: Any detrimental impacts or effects from the proposed use on any of the following shall not exceed those which could reasonably be expected to arise from a use that is permitted in the zone:  
  a. The health, safety, and welfare of the City and its present and future inhabitants and businesses;  
  b. The prosperity of the City and its present and future inhabitants and businesses;  
  c. The peace and good order, comfort, convenience and aesthetics of the City and its present and future inhabitants and businesses;  
  d. The tax base;  
  e. Economy in governmental expenditures;  
  f. The State’s agricultural and other industries;  
  g. The urban and nonurban development;  
  h. Access to sunlight for solar energy devices; or  
  i. Property values.  

The request to place Outdoor Storage in the M-1 Zone is equivalent to a permitted use. This particular parcel is adjacent to residential, but due to a Subdivision Plat submittal, the area where the storage is being placed is surrounded entirely by M-1 Manufacturing. The outdoor storage is not expected to injure property values, health, comfort, or impede any individual property rights of neighbors. The storage will be a visual impact, and due to that, Staff recommends that the storage be no taller than 15 feet, and be enclosed entirely by a six foot tall fence that is impervious to view. |
| Impact Burden: Any cost of mitigating or eliminating detrimental impacts or effects in excess of those which could be reasonably expected to arise from a permitted use shall become a charge against the development so as not to constitute a burden on the municipality, surrounding neighbors, or adjacent land uses.  

The outdoor storage is not expected to create an additional impact burden on the City. The additional impacts to the storm water collection system for the City will be mitigated through the installation of an engineered storm water detention facility that will be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The visual impact burden will be mitigated through the implementation of land use controls regarding the height of the storage, and the inclusion of a six foot tall fence that is impervious to view. |
| Conform to the Objectives of the General Plan: The proposed conditional use shall not limit the effectiveness of land use controls, imperil the success of the General Plan.  

The proposed use does not limit the effectiveness of land use controls or the success of the General Plan. Development of new businesses within Clearfield City is an effective way to promote the local economy, |
Site Plan Review

DESIGN STANDARDS

New development in the M-1 Zone is required to meet Chapter 18 Design Guidelines. The structure as proposed is a 20,000 distribution building that is approximately 200'x100'. The exterior of the building is a combination of concrete, masonry, and split-faced block. There are four main pedestrian scaled entrances along the building's front facade with another pedestrian entrance located on the west elevation. Five roll-up bay doors provide primary access to the rear of the building. There is a man door provided adjacent to each roll-up door.

The building as proposed meets the Design Guidelines in all ways except for one, and that is the required facade articulation. The building design provides vertical articulation along the roof line, but the main facade is 200 feet long and is completely flat aside from the entry features. Staff would recommend that the main facade on the north side of the building include horizontal articulation, bump outs, or otherwise provide variation along its length. Clearfield City Code 11-18-5 requires that buildings with facades 100 feet in length or greater have at least one significant facade variation. The variation must be at least 5% of the facade depth and at least 20% of the facade width. With this change, staff believes the building meets the intent of Chapter 18 Design Guidelines.

SITE CIRCULATION and PARKING

The site is accessed via two drive approaches off of 200 South Street. Vehicle parking is provided on the north side with immediate access to the pedestrian entrances for the building. There are 21 stalls provided with one stall labeled as ADA accessible. The parking requirement for Industrial or Wholesale establishments is 2 stalls per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area, except for those areas used exclusively for storage. By this calculation, the maximum area of useable floor area within the building for sales, or uses other than storage is 10,000 square feet. Staff feels that this is an adequate number of parking stalls for this use. Parking Lot Islands must be provided at a minimum of every 12 stalls per City Code 11-14-5F2. Staff would recommend the installation of a parking lot island to break up the long façade and provide additional landscaping on the North side of the building.

The site plan shows a sidewalk to be installed along 200 South Street along with a pedestrian access point to the parking lot on the west vehicular entrance. There is also adequate pedestrian access provided on the north side of the building between the parking and the front of the building with a wide sidewalk.
The site provides truck access the south side of the structure located on both the east and west side. The site plan shows how a semi-truck and trailer would be able to adequately make a turn and back into the loading dock ramp. Staff feels that the size and design of the rear loading facilities meets City Code, and will be sufficient for this use.

**LANDSCAPING**
The Site Plan shows over 32% total landscaping. This includes the proposed retention pond, and areas along 200 South Street. A landscaping plan showing details of the landscape types and tree species as well as an irrigation plan must be submitted for review. Staff would recommend that the landscaping plan be approved administratively based on conformance with the proposed site plan.

**GARBAGE DUMPSTER**
The garbage dumpster is shown in an enclosure on the east side of the site. The enclosure must be masonry construction and color-matched to the exterior of the building.

**FENCING PLAN**
The Site Plan does not show any fencing. Staff would recommend a six-foot tall fence that is impervious to view be installed surrounding the property. Staff understands that the rail spur presents a challenge in this regard, so fencing should be installed along the east and west property lines up to the rail spur as close as practical. Fencing between the building and the property lines may include a gate, but should secure the site from pedestrian access after business hours.

**ENGINEERING REVIEW**
Please see the attached City Engineer Review.

**OTHER AGENCY REVIEW**
The keeping and storage of fuels will necessitate a North Davis Fire Department Review. Staff will forward that review as soon as it is received.

**Public Comment**
No public comment has been received to date.

**REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS**

**Site Plan Review**
Clearfield Land Use Ordinance Section 11-5-3 establishes the review considerations the Planning Commission shall make to approve Site Plans. 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td><strong>Traffic:</strong> The effect of the site development plan on traffic conditions on abutting streets.</td>
<td>The site is located with two direct access points to 200 South Street. Traffic will ultimately increase in this area of the City, but the Site has adequate access via South Main Street to S.R. 193. Staff would recommend that large vehicles accessing the site be discouraged from using the Center Street bridge, and provide primary access from S.R. 193. Staff has requested a traffic plan outlining total truck traffic as well as identified truck routes and size of trucks to better determine traffic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td><strong>Vehicle; Pedestrian:</strong> The layout of the site with respect to locations and dimension of vehicular and pedestrian entrances, exits, drives and walkways.</td>
<td>The site is accessible through two existing driveways. There is a proposed public sidewalk along 200 South Street. Deteriorated or damaged sidewalk and concrete will need to be replaced or installed. The site is not expected to be a draw for pedestrians. The site as proposed has adequate access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td><strong>Off-Street Parking:</strong> Compliance of off-street parking facilities with Chapter 14 of this Title.</td>
<td>The current Site Plan shows 21 parking stalls shown with one ADA Accessible stall. The proposed parking lot is asphalt, which meets city code. The minimum parking lot stall size shall be 9'x20’. Parking Lot Islands must be provided as required in City Code 11-14-5F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td><strong>Loading and Unloading Facilities:</strong> The location, arrangement and dimensions of truck loading and unloading facilities.</td>
<td>The loading and unloading facilities are more than adequate on the South side of the structure. Accommodation for turning a semi-truck and trailer has been provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td><strong>Surfacing and Lighting; Parking:</strong> The surfacing and lighting of off-street parking.</td>
<td>The proposal does not include any additional surface lighting. Should the construction documents include new lighting for either the parking lot or exterior of the building, the lighting must meet City code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td><strong>Screen Planting:</strong> The location, height and materials, of walls, fences, hedges and screen planting.</td>
<td>This site is not subject to screen plantings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td><strong>Landscaping:</strong> The layout and appropriateness of landscaping.</td>
<td>A minimum of 10 percent landscaping is a requirement in the M-1 zoning district. The construction drawings will need to demonstrate this standard is met and the provisions of 11-13-23 for the minimum number of trees and shrubs are included. The appropriate number of trees and shrubs, planting materials list, and irrigation plan must be included in the required landscaping plan to be submitted and approved by the Planning Department prior to issuance of any Permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td><strong>Drainage:</strong> The effect of the site development plan on City storm water drainage systems.</td>
<td>The applicant will demonstrate in the Construction Documents compliance with current City standards and mitigate the impact on the storm drain system. Incorporation of the City Engineer’s comments will adequately address on site drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td><strong>Utility:</strong> The effect of the site development plan on City utility systems.</td>
<td>The applicant will demonstrate in the Construction Documents compliance with current City standards and mitigate impact the on the utilities system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td><strong>Building Locations:</strong> Consideration of building locations on the site, elevations and relation to surrounding areas (Ord. 84-06B, 9-11-1984)</td>
<td>The building is located on Lot 1 of the proposed Randall Subdivision Plat. The parking lot is in front of the building. Due to the Manufacturing nature of the site, and the fact that it is not a high-traffic commercial area, staff feels that the building layout and parking lot configuration are adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td><strong>Exterior Design:</strong> Consideration of exterior design in relation to adjoining structures and area character to assure compatibility with other structures in the neighborhood, existing or intended. (Ord. 84-08, 10-23-1984)</td>
<td>The proposed structure meets the Chapter 18 Design Guidelines in its material choice, and pedestrian access. Due to the length of the north façade, staff would suggest that a horizontal articulation be provided in the building that meets Chapter 18 Design Guidelines as listed in the Staff Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15)</td>
<td><strong>Signs:</strong> Compliance of signs with Chapter 15 of this Title and particular consideration to the location of signs upon the site, their effect upon parking, ingress and egress, the effects upon neighboring properties and the general harmony of signs with the character of the neighborhood,</td>
<td>A sign package review will be under separate review and approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – CUP 1506-0003

1) This Conditional Use Permit is for Tom Randall Distributing located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-001B). This CUP will become valid only upon final recordation of FSP 1506-0004 Randall Subdivision Plat, as well as meeting of all other conditions.

2) No visibility or stacking of materials or Outdoor Storage may exceed fifteen (15) feet high. If this standard is documented to be violated, the revocation process for the CUP and Business License will be initiated.

3) Outdoor Storage must be kept orderly and clean of debris and items not permitted by this Conditional Use Permit.

4) A six-foot tall fence that is impervious to view must be installed around the perimeter of the property including from the structure to the east and west property lines, and be placed as close to the rail spur as practical.

5) Applicant must adhere to submitted traffic plan dated ?.

6) The applicant shall provide proof of having obtained and of having maintained, as may be periodically requested by the City, all applicable local, state, and federal permits. Applicant must also comply with all local, state, and federal laws and regulations.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL - SP

1) The Construction Documents submitted for building permits shall be in substantial conformance with the documents submitted in this Site Plan approval, SP 1506-0003; however, they will also include and address the following:
   a. The final engineering design (construction drawings) submitted for site improvements shall meet City standards and be to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
   b. Parking stalls shall be delineated and designed for the site and shown on submitted construction drawings with the dimensions of 9’x20’. A minimum of one parking stall must meet ADA standards. Parking lot islands shall be provided at a minimum of every 12 stalls, and meet the requirements of City Code 11-14-5F.
   c. Site circulation must be designed in such a manner that on site traffic flow is not impeded. Adequate paved markings and/or signage shall be provided and incorporated on the site.
   d. New lighting for the site, either parking lot or exterior to the building shall be shown on the construction documents and meet City Code.
   e. A minimum of 10 percent landscaping shall be provided and meet the minimum standards set forth in 11-13-23. A detailed landscaping plan must be submitted and approved prior to issuance of any Permits.
2) Applicant must adhere to submitted traffic plan ?.

3) The newly proposed structure shall have horizontal façade articulation on the north side as required by City Code 11-18-5.

4) A garbage dumpster screen must be in place prior to providing a dumpster on site.

5) Site Plan approval is subject to North Davis County Fire District review and approval.

6) Pursuant to Land Use Ordinance 11-13-23 (B), (C) and (D), prior to issuing a building permit, the applicant must either bond, or establish an escrow account to guarantee the installation of landscaping improvements.

7) The applicant shall provide proof of having obtained and of having maintained, as may be periodically requested by the City, all applicable local, state, and federal permits. Applicant must also comply with all local, state, and federal laws and regulations.
17 June 2015

City of Clearfield
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah 84015

Attn: Scott A. Hess, Development Services Manager
Proj: Randall Subdivision
Subj: Plat and Site Plan Improvement Drawing Review

Dear Scott,

Attached is my review of the above referenced Subdivision for your consideration:

General Note:

1. An electronic copy of the Plat and Improvement drawings and details must be submitted to the Public Work Department via our office for record keeping upon design completion and prior to approval of the Plat drawings from our office.

Plat:

1. A 10-foot public utility easement should be shown around the perimeter of the Subdivision.
2. All property corners will need to be set in the field and the Plat drawing should indicate that they are to be set with a drafting symbol as shown in the Legend.
3. The perimeter boundary description shown on the Plat drawing does not match the “Boundary Description” also found on the Plat drawing.
4. Below the “Boundary Description” verbiage the “Total Acres” and the “Total Square Footage” of the property needs to be given and shown.
5. In the “Owners Dedication” the name of the owner’s representative(s) that will be signing the Plat will need his/her name to be printed under the signature line.

Site Plan – Improvement Drawings

1. Notes need to be placed on the improvement drawings indicating all deteriorated, damaged or missing surface improvements surrounding the perimeter of the development and on-site be replaced or installed; i.e., curb and gutter, sidewalk, landscaping park strip improvements,
asphalt patching, landscaping replacement, site lighting, dumpster screening, concrete
improvement, etc.

2. A “Geotechnical Report” will need to be submitted for review. The report should address
the ground water height in reference to the detention basin floor height, the depth of sub-
base material for the building foundation and the paved areas, thickness of the roadbase and
asphalt materials for the site pavement and other typical report items.

3. The layout for paving the City street should indicate saw cutting the asphalt along the edge of
the existing paving and patching next to the new curb & gutter with a minimum 2-foot wide
patch.

4. I would recommend a 10-foot deep x width shown concrete approach pad (6” thick) at the
front of the dumpster pad to handle the front wheels impact load. This will prevent rutting
of the asphalt. The detail (8/C2.1) indicated that the color of the CMU blocks for the
dumpster enclosure match the “school”. I think this is from another project – please correct
and call out a color.

5. The landscaping notes should call out the tree caliper size. The trees should be of sufficient
size to act as screening of the storage tanks as referenced on the drawings.

6. The irrigation plans should be shown on the drawings. There needs to be backflow
prevention at the culinary water service pipeline connection. The backflow equipment needs
to be shown in detail in the drawings.

7. The drawings have called to different volumes for the “retention basin”, i.e. 27,756 cubic feet
and 23,909 cubic feet. The correct volume needs to be shown on the drawings. A note
needs to be placed on the drawings stating: The retention pond volume actually constructed
will be surveyed and certified to the City as correct. The certification must be by the design
engineer following construction.

8. The retention basin will need to have a 12” freeboard berm designed with the basin having an
armored overflow spillway.

9. I would recommend that the storm water collection pipes be upgraded to a minimum
diameter size of 12” diameter. Consideration for piping roof run-off water directly to the
detention basin should be evaluated by the Developer and his Engineer.

10. I would recommend that a 12” wide x 6” thick concrete apron be installed around all storm
water inlet boxes and be dowelled into the side of the box. The apron will help in the bottom
of the detention/retention basin to control grasses from growing over the edge of the grate.

11. I would recommend that all waterways be a minimum of 4’ wide which would better
transport storm water flows.

12. The detail for the culinary water connection (4/C4.1) shows a valve atop the pipe gooseneck.
The City does not require a valve at this location thus the detail needs to be corrected to
reflect the City standards.
13. Location and details of all site lighting and business signs need to be shown on the drawings.

14. All other items required by other departments need to be included with the final approved Site Plan drawings.

We would be happy to meet with the Developer and/or his Engineer to review the above items should they have any questions.

Sincerely,

CEC, Civil Engineering Consultants, PLLC.

N. Scott Nelson, PE.
City Engineer

Cc. Scott Hodge, Public Works Director
    Dan Schuler, Public Works Inspector and Storm Water Manager
    Michael McDonald, Building Official
TO: Planning Commission  
FROM: Scott A. Hess, MPA  
Contract City Planner  
scottahess@gmail.com  
(801) 643-3337  
MEETING DATE: July 1, 2015  
SUBJECT: Public Hearing, Discussion and Possible Action - PSP 1506-0004 a request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval for a two lot subdivision located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018). The property is approximately 3 acres and lies in the M-1 Manufacturing Zoning district. 

Discussion and Possible Action on FSP 1506-0004 a request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Final Subdivision Plat Approval for a two lot subdivision located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018). The property is approximately 3 acres and lies in the M-1 Manufacturing Zoning district.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Move to approve as conditioned PSP 1506-0004 a request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval for a two lot subdivision located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018), based on the discussion and findings in the Staff Report.

Move to recommend approval to the City Council as conditioned FSP 1506-0004 a request by Brad Randall, on behalf of Tom Randall Distributing, for Final Subdivision Plat Approval for a two lot subdivision located at 95 W. 200 S. (TIN: 12-022-0044, 12-022-0049, 12-022-0018), based on the discussion and findings in the Staff Report.

PROJECT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax ID Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANALYSIS
The applicant is proposing a two lot subdivision located approximately 95 W. 200 S. in an existing M-1 Zoning district. The preliminary and final subdivision plats are substantively the same with no phasing proposed in the project. This area of Clearfield includes some of the most diverse land uses within the City, in a small area made up of residential, commercial, public facilities, and manufacturing along the same road corridor on South Main Street. This parcel is on the edge of the M-1 zone with R-1-8 located across 200 South Street. The General Plan shows this area to be "Business Park" which provides for a number of different manufacturing and commercial uses.

The proposed plat consists of two lots. Lot 1 is accessed directly from 200 South Street, and is proposed to provide a perpetual access easement for lot two along the west side of lot 1. Lot 2 does not have any frontage, and utilizes a single perpetual access easement. The same business owner will use both parcels. The Site Plan will consider use of the property including access points, parking, structures, landscaping, and utilities. The Preliminary and Final Plat review is accompanied by a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan review.

Staff would recommend that the parcels be surrounded by 10-foot public utility easements. The lots as shown are 1.41 acres and 1.63 acres respectively. The parcels are shown substantially meet the M-1 Zone requirements for size and access. Staff does not foresee any concerns with the lot layout or proposed configuration of the subdivision.
ENGINEERING REVIEW
Please see the attached Engineer’s Review Letter dated June 17, 2015.

OTHER AGENCY REVIEW
The North Davis Fire District review has been requested. At minimum, the improvements for the plat must meet fire hydrant placement requirements.

Public Comment
No public comment has been received to date.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – PSP 1506-0004

1) A final clean copy of the Preliminary Subdivision Plat needs to be filed with the Planning Department, with all changes and redlines corrected from Planning, Public Works, and Engineering.

2) 10 Foot public-utility-easements must be provided around Lot 1 and Lot 2.

3) Future development of the site will be subject to a Site Plan review and approval. Approval of the Preliminary Plat does not constitute approval or granting of a building permit.

4) Plat approval is subject to North Davis County Fire District review and approval.

5) The applicant shall provide proof of having obtained and of having maintained, as may be periodically requested by the City, all applicable local, state, and federal permits.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – FSP 1506-0004

1) A final clean copy of the Final Subdivision Plat needs to be filed with the Planning Department, with all changes and redlines corrected from Planning, Public Works, and Engineering.

2) 10 Foot public-utility-easements must be provided around Lot 1 and Lot 2.

3) Future development of the site will be subject to a Site Plan review and approval. Planning Commission’s recommendation for approval for the City Council does not constitute approval or granting of a building permit.

4) Plat approval is subject to North Davis County Fire District review and approval.

5) The applicant shall provide proof of having obtained and of having maintained, as may be periodically requested by the City, all applicable local, state, and federal permits.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Randall Subdivision
2. Engineer’s Review Letter
TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Scott A. Hess, MPA
Contract City Planner
scottahess@gmail.com
(801) 643-3337

MEETING DATE: July 1, 2015

SUBJECT: Public Hearing, Discussion and Possible Action on ZTA 1506-0002 a request by Jared Nielson, on behalf of MV Properties, for a Zoning Text Amendment to consider changes to Title 11, Chapter 14 – Off Street Parking and Loading, to amend parking lot standards, and create standards for parking structures. This Zoning Text Amendment would be effective across all commercial and manufacturing zones in Clearfield City.

RECOMMENDATION

Move to recommend approval of ZTA 1506-0002 to the City Council, a request by Jared Nielson, on behalf of MV Properties, for a Zoning Text Amendment to consider changes to Title 11, Chapter 14 – Off Street Parking and Loading, to amend parking lot standards, and create standards for parking structures, based on the findings and discussion in the Staff Report.

ANALYSIS

Clearfield City Code 11-14-2B requires that all parking stalls be 9'x20' listed as 180 square feet. Clearfield City’s desire for a more urban form of commercial development conflicts with this “one size fits all” approach to parking stall size and type. Jared Nielson, Developer of the Sandridge residential project, located at approximately 50 South State Street and zoned (D-R) Downtown Redevelopment, has proposed that a "Compact Car" parking stall standard be considered. This would allow a certain percentage of parking stalls to be developed at a smaller standard. Compact Parking standards would provide flexibility in parking lot design and land utilization for Clearfield City’s small lots, and redevelopment parcels.

Jared Neilson has provided background information gathered by Logan City when they considered this topic in February and March of 2015. (Please see the provided Compact Parking Stall Comparison Chart).

SURFACE PARKING

The different cities that were reviewed vary in their parking flexibility from zero compact stalls up to an allowance of 30% of the total parking lot in the City of Ogden. The closest project to Clearfield City is the Transit Oriented Development in Layton City in which MV Properties was the developer. Staff would encourage the Planning Commission members to visit the Layton...
City project site and review how the various parking stalls are laid out. Layton City allows 10% of total parking stalls to be "compact" which are listed with the dimensions of 8'6"x18'.

In addition to the consideration of Compact Parking standards, Jared Nielson is asking the City to review their access standards. Clearfield City Code requires that there be a minimum of 26' of separation between parking stalls that abut internal parking travel lanes. There is a provision for a 24’ travel lane when parking is single sided, however the “Clearfield City Parking Design Standards” do not clearly show all potential parking configurations, so there is ambiguity on what is required in some instances. Staff would recommend that the code be amended to require the 26-foot travel lane width only where fire access is necessary, or at the nearest travel lanes to developed buildings on site. In other travel lanes with dual rows of parking, staff would recommend allowing 24 foot travel widths, subject to prior approval from the North Davis Fire District.

STRUCTURED PARKING
Another consideration for this ordinance amendment is the standard by which parking structures are developed, and whether parking structures should be included in compact parking space calculations. The proposed Sandridge Apartment development is currently being planned to include an underground parking structure with compact sized parking stalls abutting a 25 foot travel lane between the stalls. This underground structure is equipped with a fire suppression system, and is not designed nor is it intended to be accessed by a fire department vehicle. For this reason, staff can support the tighter lane width, and compact car parking stall size. The smaller stalls are necessary in this project based on the overall size and design of the apartment project itself. Adding 4 feet in total width to the entire apartment will significantly impact the site’s limited room for setbacks and building placement.

Due to the limited access, slow speeds, and general compact nature of structure parking, staff would recommend that the sizing of stalls within developed parking structures be allowed to be made up of 100% compact sized stalls. The developer would be allowed to create larger spaces as necessary or desired. It is staff's opinion that a developer would not go to the extreme cost of developing underground parking that was unusable and unsellable to residents.

Proposed Changes:

11-14-2B - Add language - 10% of total surface parking may be developed as "compact sizing" with the parking stall dimensions of 8'6"x18'.

Parking Structures: May be developed entirely with parking stall dimensions of 8'6"x18'. Parking structures shall be required to include an adequate fire suppression system.

Add Definition: Parking Structure: A structure or building where motor vehicles can be placed and left temporarily. Parking structures are only allowed as an accessory use to a specific primary use or building on the same parcel. The primary use/building and its accessory parking must be entirely located within Clearfield City. Parking must meet the minimum requirements of chapter 14 of this title.

Add Definition: Parking Space Compact: A permanently surfaced area of not less than eight feet six inches by eighteen feet (8’6” x 18’), exclusive of access or maneuvering area, ramps or columns, to be used exclusively as temporary storage space for one private compact motor vehicle.
11-14-5E Design:

Add language (or diagram) indicating that travel lanes between dual rows of 90 degree parking may be developed at 24’ in width subject to prior approval from the North Davis Fire District. Primary access points to the parking lot, or the access lane located closest to the primary structure on the lot must be provided with 26’ travel lanes.

Public Comment
No public comment has been received to date.

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 proposed text amendment is consistent with the goals and policies of the Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan. It will assist in encouraging development of downtown parcels of land, and provide more flexibility through additional parking standards that developers can take advantage of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Changed conditions make the proposed amendment necessary to fulfill the purposes of this Title.</td>
<td>A downtown redevelopment parcel has prompted staff to consider changes to the existing parking ordinance in order to better facilitate development of downtown parcels of property. The applicant for the Sandridge Apartment development has asked the City to consider additional parking standards for Compact Parking Stalls, as well as standards for Parking Structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENTS

1. Supplemental Zoning Code research and Information provided by applicant.
MEMORANDUM TO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

DATE: March 17, 2015
FROM: Mike DeSimone, Director
SUBJECT: LDC Text Amendment – Parking Amendment

Summary of Planning Commission Proceedings

Project Name: Parking Amendment
Request: Code Amendment
Project Address: City-wide
Recommendation of the Planning Commission: Approval with modification

On February 12, 2015, the Planning Commission recommended that the Municipal Council approve a request to amend the Land Development Code Chapters 17.38 (Parking) by modifying the minimum parking standards in the Town Center and Campus Residential zones, creating standards for compact parking, and completing some minor grammatical corrections.

Planning Commissioners vote (3 - 2):
Motion to recommend approval: D. Adams
Second: T. Jensen
Yea: D. Adams, S. Sinclair, T. Jensen
Nay: A. Davis, R. Price

Attachments:
Staff Report
Ordinance 15-009
PC Meeting Minutes
REPORT SUMMARY...
Project Name: Parking Regulations Amendment
Proponent/Owner: Community Development Department
Project Address: Citywide
Request: Code Amendment
Type of Action: Legislative
Date of Hearing: February 12, 2015
Submitted By: Mike DeSimone, Director

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the Municipal Council for the following amendments to the Land Development Code (LDC): Sections 17.38 (Parking).

REQUEST
Originally, the proposed amendments to Section 17.38 of the Land Development Code included the following:

17.38.080 B.4 – in the Campus Residential (CR) zone, eliminated the covered parking requirement and increased the unit count threshold where structured parking becomes a requirement from 10 units to 20 units.

17.38.090 B.3 – adding additional language regarding parking structures in the Town Center (TC) zone.

17.38.090 D.8 – added compact stall standards.

There are also a few minor “clean-up” language changes which are highlighted in red in the attached document.

The direction from the January 22, 2015 PC meeting, was to research other jurisdictions to see how Logan’s proposal compares. I compared our current language and the proposed changes with the 15 largest jurisdictions in Utah. The following is a comparison of Logan’s compact stall proposal with 15 other jurisdictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>Percentage of Lot for Compact Stalls</th>
<th>Compact Stall Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Logan Proposal     | C. Stalls | 25% in lots with more than 50 stalls | Normal size – 9’ x 18’
                                      |                      | Compact size – 8’ x 16’                                |
| Salt Lake City     | Yes      | None given                           | 8’3” x 17’6”, 8’6” x 17’6”, 8’9” x 17’6”, 9’ x 17’6” – stall size is flexible depending upon project location and amenities |
| West Valley        | Yes      | 25%                                  | Normal size – 9’ x 18’
<pre><code>                                  |                      | Compact size – 9’ x 16’                                |
</code></pre>
<p>| Provo              | No       |                                      | Normal size – 8’6” x 18’                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Percentage or Requirement</th>
<th>Parking Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Jordan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Normal size – 9’ x 18’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8’3” – 8’6” x 18 Low Turnover Uses</td>
<td>8’6” – 8’9” x 18 Med Turnover Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8’9” – 9’ x 18 High Turnover Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Normal size – 9’ x 18’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Allows a reduction from 9’ x 20’ to 9’ x 18’ if nose over a landscaped area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30% in lots with more than 20 stalls</td>
<td>Normal size – 8’9” x 18’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compact size – 8’ x 16’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Allows a reduction from 9’ x 18’ to 9’ x 16’ if nose over a landscaped area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Normal size – 9’ x 20’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compact size – 8’6” x 18’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylorsville</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Normal size – 9’ x 20’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced size – 9’ x 18’ (landscaping)</td>
<td>Compact size – 8’ x 16’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Jordan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Allows a reduction from 9’ x 20’ to 9’ x 18’ if nose over a landscaped area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10% in lots with more than 50 stalls and in projects with low turnover uses</td>
<td>Normal size – 9’ x 18’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compact size – 8’6” x 16’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15% - compact stalls only in downtown</td>
<td>Normal size – 9’ x 18’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compact size – 8’ x 16’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bountiful</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Allows a reduction from 9’ x 20’ to 9’ x 18’ if nose over a landscaped area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10% in lots with more than 50 stalls and provides a bonus of up to 25% with additional</td>
<td>Normal size – 9’ x 18’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>landscaping</td>
<td>Compact size – 8’ x 16’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For discussion purposes, the average mid-sized car is 197” (length) x 73” (width) or 16’ x 6’.
Logan’s “normal size” stall of 9’ x 18’ is similar to most other jurisdictions. As you can see from
the table above, 9 of the 15 cities allow for compact stalls while 4 of the remaining cities provide
for a reduction in length with landscaping. Our proposed percentage of 25% is higher than all
but 2 of the other jurisdictions. Mathematically, a compact parking percentage of 25% applied to
the minimum number of 50 stalls, represents 12 stalls per 50 could be designed as compact
stalls.

A factor to consider is the Landscaping requirements in Chapter 17.39 relative to parking lots.
Section 17.39.070.C provides minimum landscaping standards and requires interior parking lot
landscaping as well as landscaping every 15 stalls.

C. Parking Lot Interior Landscaping.
The parking lot interior landscaping requirements apply to all off-street parking lots that contain five or more parking spaces. Only areas specified in figure §17.39.070.C are counted towards a project's interior parking lot landscaping requirements. Interior planting areas are required within all parking lots as specified in this subsection.

1. At least eighteen (18) square feet of interior landscape planting area shall be provided within the interior of an off-street parking area for each parking stall contained with the parking area.

2. Landscaping located within the interior of a parking area shall be evenly dispersed throughout the area. All planting areas shall be protected to prevent damage by vehicles and vehicle overhang.

3. When the number of stalls in a parking area exceeds the number of required parking stalls defined in Chapter 17.39 by 125%, the minimum interior parking lot landscaping requirements shall be increased to thirty-six (36) square feet of interior landscaping for each parking space contained within the parking stall.

4. All aisles shall have landscaped areas at each end of the aisle.

5. One landscaped planter area containing at least one (1) tree shall be installed within the interior of a parking area every fifteen (15) stalls. Interior parking area landscapes shall have a minimum of fifty percent (50%) plant material coverage measured at plants maturity.

**Figure 17.39.070.C: Interior Parking Lot Measurement Area**

The maximum length of a row of parking stalls is 15 stalls, which with the normal stall dimension of 9' x 18', equates to a length of approximately 135'. The same 15 stalls with the proposed compact stall dimension of 8' x 16' equates to a length of approximately 120' of stall area, or a difference of 15'. The provision of compact stalls provides for flexibility in laying out a parking lot and does not lead to additional units being constructed nor eliminate the minimum parking requirements for specified uses.

**Recommendation on Compact Stalls:** Leave in the proposed language for compact stalls; however, because this is a citywide standard and not just a student housing/parking consideration, reduce the overall percentage of compact stalls from 25% of a lot greater than 50 parking stalls to 10% of a lot greater than 50 parking stalls may be designed as compact parking stalls.
The second item for consideration are the proposed language changes to 17.38.080.B.4 & 17.38.090.B.3, both of which modify the structured parking requirement in either the Campus Residential (CR) zone or the Town Center (TC) zone. Again, I surveyed the same cities as shown in the following table.

**Structured Parking Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Structured Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Structured Parking Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Taylorsville</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>South Jordan</td>
<td>May Require if &gt; 3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Jordan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Yes – Hotels &gt; 6 stories &amp; other bldgs. &gt; 3 story</td>
<td>Bountiful</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logan City currently requires structured parking in the CR zone for projects exceeding 10 dwelling units and for 50% of all required parking in the TC zone. Sandy requires structured parking for taller buildings and South Jordan may require, but the conditions under which said requirement was imposed were unclear, structured parking for buildings in excess of 3 stories. The remaining jurisdictions did not require structured parking in any of their zones.

The Campus Residential zone covers an area from 4th North to 12th North and from 6th East up to USU. The maximum density is 40 units per acre which may equate to a total of 240 occupants per acre. The current parking requirement is 1 parking stall per occupant with surface parking permitted for up to 10 units or 60 total occupants. Over 10 units, structured parking is required. 60 stalls of surface parking requires approximately .5 - .7 acre to accommodate stalls, driveways and landscaping.

The Town Center zone runs from 2nd South to 5th North, generally from 1st West to 1st/2nd East and comprises the commercial core of Logan. Current parking requirements are determined by the underlying use, with retail averaging 1 stall per 250 square feet and general office space averaging 1 stall per 300 square feet. The current Code language requires that, regardless of the size of the project, at least 50% of the proposed parking shall be structured parking. A project containing 2,500 square feet of retail space would require 10 stalls, five of which are to be structured parking.

Based on available 2013 cost data, the average cost for a parking structure is $50.00 - $70.00 per foot square foot, or approximately $15,000 - $30,000 per stall. The cost of surface parking is approximately $1,500 per stall. To construct 11 units with 66 occupants in the CR zone would require almost $1,000,000 for structured parking whereas 10 units with 60 occupants in the CR zone would require approximately $90,000 for surface parking. Parking for the retail example above in the TC zone would cost that business an additional $75,000 for five structured stalls.

**Recommendation on Structure Parking in the Town Center Zone:** Eliminate the structure parking language in the TC zone (17.38.090.B.3) and replace with the following:

---
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Staff Report for the Planning Commission meeting of February 12, 2015