

LAYTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 13, 2024

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Trevor Steenblik, Vice Chair Lindsey Hamilton, Commissioners Scott Carter, Wesley Felice, Peter McDonough, Bret Nielsen, Julie Pierce, Justin Whitworth, and George Wilson

MEMBERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Staff: City Planner Weston Applonie, Planner Curtis Poole, Secretary Michelle Williams, and Deputy City Attorney Darren Curtis

Councilmember Dave Thomas

Chair Steenblik called the work meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

1. Northridge Learning Center – CONDITIONAL USE

Planner Poole presented the conditional use petition for a private/quasi-public school in the PB (Professional Office) zone. It is located across the street from Northridge High School. The use is an allowed use with conditions that mitigate anticipated negative impacts to the neighbors. There is an open code compliance case on this property. The business has been operating without a business license for a few years. To obtain a business license, the applicant needed to submit a site plan application and conditional use application. The applicant has worked with staff for a couple of years and the site plan was approved in January.

This is an accredited private school offering private education and tutorial services. There will be at most 8 employees at this location. Parking requirements are based on the square footage of the building. Typical conditional use impacts are landscape buffering and parking issues. Parking will be shared with the property to the south via a Shared Use Parking Agreement. Between the 2 properties, 19 stalls are required. The plan provides 4 new stalls behind the building, 9 new stalls, and an ADA stall were added along the property boundary between the buildings. The parking requirement was met with the installation of the new stalls and the existing stalls. The properties will share one access to Hill Field Road.

The facility is adjacent to single-family residential zoning which requires buffering. That buffering will be met with trees and water-wise landscaping. Street trees will be added to front of the building. The access drive aisle will posted as No Parking and used only for access.

The cross access and parking agreement would need to be recorded with the county before the business license would be issued. The landscaping needs to be installed or a bond provided to secure landscaping installation at a future date. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use.

Commissioner Felice asked for context on the code compliance issue. Planner Poole stated it started about 3 years ago after the business moved from the south property into the current location. The applicant applied for a business license; however, was informed that the land use needed to go through site plan approval and a conditional use.

Chair Steenblik clarified that the business had been at a different location. City Planner Applonie responded that when the building was built it was merely a shell for general office use. When the applicant applied for a business license it was identified for a school that has different building standards than the general office and a school is a conditional use in the PB zone.

Commissioner Nielsen asked about the parking stalls being on the other side of the property line and whether there would be an easement. Planner Poole stated there would be a shared parking access agreement recorded with the county. Commissioner Nielsen asked if there would be signage identifying which stalls were dedicated to which business. Planner Poole answered that there wouldn't be as the parking is shared between the two businesses, clients can park anywhere on the premises.

Commissioner McDonough asked if the south building was part of the school. Planner Poole affirmed.

2. Ridgeview East Subdivision – PRELIMINARY PLAT & DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Planner Poole presented the preliminary plat and development plan for Ridgeview East Subdivision. This development came before the Planning Commission in April 2023 for a rezone to MU (Mixed-Use) zoning. A development agreement was included with the rezoning, which required office space fronting Gordon Avenue and 72 apartment units to be built behind the office space.

Two items are before the Commission, first is a preliminary plat that separates the parcel into 6 different lots with the larger Lot 1 holding the residential units, common space, parking, and new public roadway. Lots 2 through 6 will be sold separately as units of the commercial building, which fronts onto Gordon Avenue. The preliminary plat does meet code requirements.

The second item is the development plan for both the residential and commercial buildings. The commercial building was required to be a minimum of 10,000 square feet, which is shown in the plan, along with 72 apartment units within 3 buildings. The unit count is 27 1-bedroom units, 33 2-bedroom units, and 12 3-bedroom units. Elevations for the apartment buildings and commercial building were shown for review of the architecture, design, and materials used. The Design Review Committee reviewed the design elements and the applicant has incorporated the Committee's suggestions.

Planner Poole shared the parking diagram and stated Code requires one covered parking stall for each unit, which can be a garage or covered carport. The developer chose the covered carports. The minimum parking for the two uses independently would be 144 stalls; however, the MU zone allows for the implementation of shared parking, which allows for a parking reduction based on peak-hour compatibility

of uses. The development will have 128 stalls, which is based on the shared parking table. There will be an ebb and flow of parking from commercial to residential. The peak parking for this development is 119, and with 128 provided, the parking requirement was met.

Landscaping requirements are met with new street trees along Gordon Avenue, water-wise landscaping throughout the development, along with some lawn areas for the residents. There will be a 5' landscape buffer along the east boundary with a 6' vinyl fence. Code gives the developer two options for buffering adjacent to single-family residential. The first option is an 8' masonry fence with a 2' landscape buffer. The second option is a 6' solid fence, which would be wood, vinyl, or masonry, along with paneled carports. The applicant chose the 6' vinyl fence with the paneled carport.

Commissioner Felice asked what the distance would be between the fence and the carport. Planner Poole stated Code requires a 2' buffer; however, the applicant would provide a 5' buffer.

Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat and development plan.

Planner Poole noted that the east property owner was disputing the property boundary, which was brought up during the rezoning process. As was stated at that time, there were items recorded with the county that indicate that the applicant owns the property for which the development is proposed. Any dispute that is alleged is between the property owners. The applicant had a survey completed, which indicated the property line was accurate. Another concern of the neighbor was the proposed fencing; however, the applicant had a choice of which form of fencing to install and the 6' vinyl fence meets the Code requirement.

City Planner Applonie stated that during the rezoning phase the neighbor brought their documentation to the City, staff vetted the information, and based upon that process, this is still the developer's property. It is a property owner dispute and the City has done all that can be done. Deputy City Attorney Curtis added that the City Attorney's office reviewed the documents at that time and determined that the property was the developer's and they were entitled to move forward with the development.

Commissioner Pierce asked if the agricultural uses disclaimer would be noted. Planner Poole affirmed that the disclaimer would be added to the plat.

ADJOURNMENT:

At 7:06 p.m., Chair Steenblik adjourned the work session to proceed to the regular meeting.



Michelle Williams
Planning Commission Secretary