

NORTH OGDEN PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

March 18, 2015

The North Ogden Planning Commission convened in a regular meeting on March 18, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. in the North Ogden City Municipal Building, 505 E. 2600 N. North Ogden, Utah. Notice of time, place and agenda of the meeting was furnished to each member of the Planning Commission, posted on the bulletin board at the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on March 12, 2015. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on December 21, 2014.

COMMISSIONERS:

Eric Thomas	Chairman	(arrived at 6:35 p.m.)
Don Waite	Vice-Chairman	
Scott Barker	Commissioner	
Blake Knight	Commissioner	
Brandon Mason	Commissioner	(arrived at 6:39 p.m.)
Steven Prsbrey	Commissioner	
Dee Russell	Commissioner	

STAFF:

Jon Call	City Attorney
Annette Spendlove	City Recorder
Gary Kerr	Building Official
Robert O. Scott	City Planner
Brian Smith	City Planner

VISITORS:

Chris Palmer	Wade Christiansen
Rick Scadden	Lori W. Lee
Ray Ward	Colby Boerd
Greg Day	

REGULAR MEETING

Vice-Chairman Waite called the meeting to order at 6:31pm. Commissioner Barker offered the invocation and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 4, 2015 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Russell made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Commissioner Barker seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Thomas	not present
Vice-Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Knight	yes
Commissioner Mason	not present
Commissioner Prisbrey	yes
Commissioner Russell	yes

The motion passed.

ACTIVE AGENDA

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

2. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR A DAYCARE, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1928 N 600 E

A staff memo from City Planner Scott explained when the Planning Commission is acting as a land use authority, it is acting in an administrative capacity and has much less discretion. Examples of administrative applications are conditional use permits, design reviews, and subdivisions. Administrative applications must be approved by the Planning Commission if the application demonstrates compliance with the approval criteria. The applicant is requesting the approval of a site plan review to operate a daycare in her home. The applicant has submitted an application.

ORDINANCE COMPLIANCE

11-7B-2: PERMITTED USES

Home daycare center for up to nine (9) people. The operator must be a resident of the home. The home daycare area shall not be greater than three hundred (300) square feet or twenty five percent (25%) of the house, whichever is less. The daycare area of the home shall conform to the standards of IBC table 1003.2.2.2.

Staff comment: The daycare will have 5 children attending. The hours of operation will be from 6 AM to 5 PM Monday through Friday. The daycare will operate within the home and is approximately 200 square feet.

11-10-27: SITE PLAN APPROVAL REQUIRED

1. A site plan shall be submitted to the planning commission which shows the location of main and accessory buildings on the site and in relation to one another, the traffic circulation features within the site, the height, bulk and character of building, the provision for off street parking space, the provision of driveways for ingress and egress, the provision for other open space on the site and the display of signs. Each of the foregoing features shall be in accordance with the site plan (or subsequent amendment thereof) of the proposed development approved by the planning commission prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Staff comment: The applicant's application has an aerial photo showing the existing home along with landscaping, fencing, and driveway.

2. A site plan shall include landscaping, fences and walls designed to further the purpose of the regulations for commercial, manufacturing and multiple housing zones, and such features shall be provided and maintained as a condition of the establishment and the maintenance of any use to which they are appurtenant. The site plan shall include a comprehensive sign plan in accordance to section 11-22-5 of this title.

Staff comment: The home is located on a cul-de-sac; parents will park in front of the home, drop off their children, and exit the site. No signs have been requested.

3. In considering any site plan, the planning commission shall endeavor to assure safety and convenience of traffic movement, both within the area covered and in relation to access streets, harmonious and beneficial relation among the buildings and uses in the area covered, and satisfactory harmonious relation between such area and contiguous land and buildings and adjacent neighborhoods, and that the requirements of this title have been met.

See Staff comment under item two.

4. In approving site plans, the planning commission may act on a site plan submitted to it or may act on its own initiative in proposing and approving a site plan, including any conditions or requirements designated or specified therein or in connection therewith. Staff comment: The zoning ordinance allows daycare facilities as a permitted use when there are fewer than 9 people. The Planning Commission should hear any concerns from adjoining neighbors and address them as appropriate.

11-10-10 DAYCARE CENTER REGULATIONS

1. State Law Applicable: The regulations and licensing of daycare centers shall be in accordance with Utah Code Annotated title 26, chapter 39, as amended, or as hereafter amended.

Staff comment: The applicant will need to comply with all state regulations and licensing. Documentation will be provided at the time of business license issuance.

2. Outdoor Play Areas; Fencing: All outdoor play areas shall be within a fenced area and shall be limited to use by the children in the daycare between the hours of eight o'clock (8:00) A.M. to eight o'clock (8:00) P.M. Fence height shall be in accordance with section 11-10-11 of this chapter.

Staff comment: The yard is completely fenced and the applicant will abide by the outdoor hours of operation.

3. Off Street Parking: Sufficient off street parking shall be provided to satisfy the requirements of section 11-17-4 of this title.

Staff comment: The home meets the required two car parking standard.

The memo noted the above described application conforms to the North Ogden City General Plan due to its being compliant with city ordinances and the following Plan goal: A variety of quality housing opportunities will be available to the citizens of the City. Quality residential development will be measured by design, maintenance, preservation of community resources, and open space. The memo then offered the following summary of potential Planning Commission considerations:

- Does the proposed use meet the requirements of the applicable City Ordinances?
- Are there any potentially detrimental effects that need to be mitigated by imposing conditions of approval; and if so, what are the appropriate conditions?

The memo concluded staff recommends approval of this application conditioned upon compliance with North Ogden City ordinance and State of Utah regulations.

Mr. Scott reviewed his staff memo.

Chairman Thomas asked if staff will ensure that all inspections are completed before the business is licensed. Mr. Scott answered yes and noted it is his understanding that the fire inspection has been completed.

Commissioner Russell made a motion to grant site plan approval for a daycare located at approximately 1928 N. 600 E. Vice-Chairman Waite seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Thomas	yes
Vice-Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Knight	yes
Commissioner Mason	yes
Commissioner Prisbrey	yes
Commissioner Russell	yes

The motion passed.

**3. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER HALL TREE SUBDIVISION
PHASE XVI, PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLAT, LOCATED AT
APPROXIMATELY 3000 N 1400 E**

A staff memo from City Planner Scott explained when the Planning Commission is acting as a land use authority, it is acting in an administrative capacity and has much less discretion. Examples of administrative applications are conditional use permits, design reviews, and subdivisions. Administrative applications must be approved by the Planning Commission if the application demonstrates compliance with the approval criteria. The applicant is requesting preliminary and final approval of Phase 16 of Hall Tree subdivision a 9 lot subdivision at

approximately 3000 North and 1400 East. The 9 lot subdivision is on 3.54 acres and is located in the R-1-10 zone. The R-1-10 zone requires a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet on interior lots and 11,000 square feet on corner lots with a frontage requirement of 90 feet. The property is currently vacant. A technical review committee met on June 25, 2014. The applicant will need to comply with the requirements from the referral agencies. The overall layout of the subdivision provides appropriate access to the adjoining properties; however this design is not consistent with the previously approved phasing plan. The design leaves property on the north end of 1400 East for a future phase. The applicant can request that a new phase be added to this subdivision; however, the Planning Commission has the discretion to require that the final plat include the excluded property. All lots meet the minimum size and frontage requirements. The City Engineer has submitted a staff review dated March 10, 2015. There are comments regarding the plat, improvement plans, and culinary water. Each of these comments will need to be addressed as part of the final submittal.

The memo offered the following potential Planning Commission consideration: does the proposed subdivision meet the requirements of the applicable City subdivision and zoning ordinances?

The memo noted the proposed subdivision meets the requirements of applicable North Ogden City Ordinances and conforms to the North Ogden City General Plan. The General Plan map calls for this property to be developed as single family residential. Staff recommends preliminary and final approval of this application for Hall Tree Phase XVI subdivision subject to the conditions from the North Ogden City Engineer and reviewing agencies.

Mr. Scott reviewed his staff memo. City Attorney Call addressed the inconsistency with the previously approved phasing plan for the project and stated staff's concern is that the original phasing plan included access to utilities as well as street access and that is now missing and has been replaced by a temporary turnaround. He stated that he is reviewing the City Code to determine whether it is appropriate to require that an area dedicated to a turnaround be dedicated to the City to provide for appropriate access.

Vice-Chairman Waite stated that there are some items within the application that are somewhat peculiar and he would like to address questions to the applicant. Mr. Scott stated the applicant is not present this evening. General discussion regarding the layout of the subdivision ensued, with Chairman Thomas noting it would be his preference that the applicant be required to dedicate the right-of-way to the City, but not require them to install utilities or extend the road; this would allow for ease of future development of adjacent undeveloped properties. Mr. Scott stated the Planning Commission is not required to approve both applications this evening; he noted it is an option to grant preliminary approval and consider final approval at a later date when concerns can be addressed, or both applications can be tabled until a time the applicant can be present to answer questions.

City Engineer Hartvigsen stated he has required the developer to build a storm drain line in the existing road and he is bothered by the fact that the developer would not be required to provide connectivity to that infrastructure. He added that previous plans included two additional lots and this is the first time he has seen the plan without those two lots, which is very suspicious to him.

He stated he is doubtful that an adjacent property owner would deny the applicant turnaround access because the access would benefit that property as well. He indicated that before granting approval of the application as submitted, he would suggest that the applicant be required to get a letter from the adjacent property owner stating he will not grant turnaround access. Mr. Call added that in the case of re-subdivision the Planning Commission may require that parcels of land allow for the future opening of streets and ultimate extension of adjacent streets; easements providing for those future openings and extensions may be made a requirement of the plat. However, he noted the City Code states that provision only applies to parcel of property one acre or more in size and the subject property is 80 feet short of being an acre. He stated that he feels that the provision can be applied to the subject property due to the fact that it is very close to an acre in size and that is how the Planning Commission can require easements that will provide for future street connectivity.

Discussion then centered on the appropriate action for the Planning Commission to take this evening, ultimately concluding to table consideration of the applications until a time that the applicant can be present to answer questions.

Commissioner Knight made a motion to table consideration of Hall Tree Subdivision Phase XVI, preliminary and final plat, located at approximately 3000 N. 1400 E. Commissioner Russell seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Thomas	yes
Vice-Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Knight	yes
Commissioner Mason	yes
Commissioner Prisbrey	yes
Commissioner Russell	yes

The motion passed.

4. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR THE LAKEVIEW HEIGHTS WELL HOUSE RECONSTRUCTION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 390 E. 3475 N.

A staff memo from City Planner Smith explained when the Planning Commission is acting as a land use authority, it is acting in an administrative capacity and has much less discretion. Examples of administrative applications are conditional use permits, design reviews, and subdivisions. Administrative applications must be approved by the Planning Commission if the application demonstrates compliance with the approval criteria. North Ogden City has a well house that has fallen into disrepair. The applicant is proposing to tear down the old well house so that they can build a new one in the same location. The new well house is much bigger. It is located in the common area of the Lakeview Heights Subdivision. Originally the Lakeview

Heights HOA owned and operated this well as part of their own water system. Later the City took over the well house and water system. North Ogden City is going to replace the existing well house located at 390 East 3475 North in the common space of the Lakeview Heights Subdivision. Construction is expected to begin in late April and completed by the end of June.

ZONING ORDINANCE COMPLIANCE:

North Ogden Zoning Ordinance 11-7B (Single Family Residential Zone R-1-10) Public utility substation is a permitted use in the R-1-10 zone.

11-10-27 (Site Plan Approval Required) The North Ogden Public Works facility is required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. The applicant is proposing to tear down the old well house so that they can build a new one in the same location. The new well house will be approximately 380 square feet. The building will have a metal great roof, with painted CMU cinder block and aluminum fascia finish. The color has yet to be chosen by North Ogden City. The height of the building will be approximately 15 feet in height and will have side yard setbacks of 10 feet from the property line as per city code. The asphalt driveway will remain the same, the park bench that is currently outside the existing structure will be moved and placed in a location suitable to the HOA.

North Ogden Zoning Ordinance 11-10-13: (Exterior Lighting) All exterior lighting must be shielded in order to not penetrate onto the adjoining lots. 11- 17-3(10) has the standards for lighting.

11-22 (Sign Regulations for all Zones) – The applicant will submit a sign permit at a later date.

The above described application conforms to the North Ogden City General Plan due to its being compliant with the spirit of city ordinances and the following Plan goal: All existing and new development should be required to fairly and uniformly provide improvements according to city standards.

The memo summarized the potential Planning Commission considerations:

- Does the proposed use meet the requirements of the applicable City Ordinances?
- Is the proposed use being built to an acceptable standard?

Staff recommends the Planning Commission should consider the site plan and determine if it is acceptable. The Planning Commission can find that the North Ogden City Public Works site plan meets the referenced code standards and approve the site plan with the following conditions:

- Compliance with North Ogden Zoning Ordinance
- Compliance with any reviewing agency requirements

Mr. Smith reviewed his staff memo.

Mr. Hartvigsen provided a detailed review of the site plan and the building elevations for the pump house. He noted the pump house is an existing structure; it has fallen into disrepair and needs to be repaired.

Vice-Chairman Waite inquired as to the reason for increasing the size of the building. Mr. Hartvigsen stated that the current size of the pump house is not large enough to provide enough

room to perform proper maintenance on the equipment located there. He added the chlorine room is sized better, also to allow for easier maintenance of equipment.

Commissioner Mason asked if the well house generates an excessive amount of noise. Mr. Hartvigsen answered no; the well is located 250 feet below ground and it is very hard to hear when it is running outside of the building.

Mr. Smith then briefly reviewed the lighting plan for the building.

Chairman Thomas asked if regulations regarding chlorination have changed since the structure was originally built that would require the City to fence the pump house. Mr. Hartvigsen stated there is no requirement to fence the building for the purpose of protecting residents from chlorine; the reason pump houses are usually fenced is to protect the City's water system from tampering, but that is not an option at this site because the pump house is located in the common space of an homeowners association (HOA). He noted the State Division of Drinking Water wants the building to be secure and that is being accomplished with an alarm system and secure doors that are vandal proof. Discussion ensued regarding the type of alarm system that will be used, with Mr. Hartvigsen noting the system will communicate with Public Works Staff.

Chris Palmer, 552 E. 3200 N., asked if there is any opportunity to build a shed on the site for HOA use. Chairman Thomas stated that the HOA is welcome to apply to build such a building, but it is not likely that the City will pay for such a project.

Wade Christiansen, 546 E. 3500 N., stated the HOA would like to build a structure that actually connects to the well house to reduce costs and the footprint of buildings in the open space. Chairman Thomas stated he did not believe the City would allow the connection of public and private structures, but the HOA has the ability to make an application to build a shed in the area if they so choose. Mr. Hartvigsen agreed and stated he would not recommend that anyone else have access to the building for security reasons. He then provided a brief history of the well house and noted it has been inactive for nearly 20 years; the City now desires to bring the well back on line to provide culinary water service to approximately 500 homes in the City.

Discussion then refocused on fencing and other security measures to be taken at the well house. Mr. Hartvigsen reiterated that fencing is not absolutely required, though it is typically desired for water sources. Commissioner Russell stated he would prefer a fence around the well house, though he understands the HOA does not want fencing erected in their open space. Vice-Chairman Waite wondered what security a fence provides in addition to a brick building. Commissioner Russell stated it provides one more level of security. Mr. Smith stated he feels the design of the building provides adequate security.

Commissioner Knight made a motion to approve the site plan application for the Lakeview Heights Well House reconstruction, located at approximately 390 E. 3475 N. Commissioner Mason seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Thomas	yes
Vice-Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Knight	yes
Commissioner Mason	yes
Commissioner Prisbrey	no
Commissioner Russell	yes

Commissioner Prisbrey indicated that he feels strongly that the well house should be fenced to provide additional security and that is the reason for his no vote.

The motion passed.

5. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO APPROVE A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR THE NORTH OGDEN PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 162 E PLEASANT VIEW DRIVE

A staff memo from City Planner Scott explained when the Planning Commission is acting as a land use authority, it is acting in an administrative capacity and has much less discretion. Examples of administrative applications are conditional use permits, design reviews, and subdivisions. Administrative applications must be approved by the Planning Commission if the application demonstrates compliance with the approval criteria. The North Ogden Planning Commission considered a site plan application on November 5, 2014. The Planning Commission requested that the site plan be revised to address the following items, i.e., include the entire site in the site plan, address the landscaping on the east side of the property, provide fencing on the plan, and include a trash receptacle. A property owner, Brenda Ashdown, whose house is across the street on Pleasant View Drive, is concerned about the lights from city trucks shining into their front window. The City Council was appraised of the ordinance requirements for the public works facility and requested options from the City Engineer and Parks Department regarding the landscape plan. This allowed revisions to the site plan consistent with the needed change orders to amend the site plan. The site plan is now ready for the Planning Commission's review. All of the items the Planning Commission wanted addressed are in the revised plan. The applicant is requesting the approval of a site plan review for the North Ogden City Public Works Facility. The property owner is in the process of annexing this property. Weber County and North Ogden City have approved an Interlocal Agreement designating North Ogden City as the land use authority while the property is being annexed. Although the existing zoning is A-I the anticipated zone will be RE-20. Those standards are being applied to this review.

ZONING ORDINANCE COMPLIANCE

This property was developed using Weber County's A-I Agriculture standards. The Planning Commission will be considering how to bring this property to a reasonable standard meeting the intent of the North Ogden Zoning Ordinance:

11-7A (Suburban Residential Zone RE-20) - Public buildings is a permitted use in the RE-20 zone.

11-10-27 (Site Plan Approval Required)

The North Ogden Public Works facility is required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. The proposal is for the public works facility that includes an office, shop, green house, and outdoor storage. There is a potential wetland that is inside the detention basin. The City is working with Corps of Engineers to determine the appropriate solution. The office building is a single story 4,992 square foot reddish brick building fronting on Lomond View Drive. It has additional truck parking in the basement. The shop is 21,100 square feet. It is located in the middle of the property and has access to both Lomond View Drive and Pleasant View Drive. The shop will be constructed of a combination of CMU split block at the base with metal siding above. The office building is approximately 25 feet in height and the shop building is approximately 30 feet in height. The site plan does not currently provide for curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The City Council has granted a deferral for the sidewalk. Second, the wetland along Pleasant View Drive may necessitate a curvature of the curb, gutter, and sidewalk. Exhibit H has been revised to show the entire site. The site plan is landscaped with a combination of xeriscape natural plantings and xeriscape formal areas which have a low water requirement. The Public Works Office has one area of sod fronting onto Lomond View Drive.

11-10-11 (Fence Height Regulations)

Exhibit G shows a revised fencing for the site. The Pleasant View Drive driveway access is required to have an 8 foot solid masonry or solid material fence where it adjoins the property to the east but must also address the site visibility standard. The Planning Commission may approve other materials and the 8 foot height requirement is subject to the fence ordinance in 11-10-11. This fence along the east side of the project next to Pleasant View Drive is designed to be chain link at 42 inches high along with some shrubs, the fencing then transitions to a 6 foot chain link fence with slats to where it intersects with the north gate. This fence will provide a sufficient buffer for the adjoining property. The driveway is 35 feet wide and has been moved five feet to the west. This will partially address the Ashdown's concern about lights from trucks going into their windows. The lighting from vehicles will only be a concern during the winter months when snow removal is in progress. The frontage on Pleasant View Drive will have a raised berm along the frontage and include a 6 foot high chain link security fence that will go around the detention basin. The west side of the property will have a 6 foot high chain link fence with landscaping behind it until it reaches the outdoor storage enclosure which is proposed to have privacy slats. The fencing along the Lomond View Drive frontage will be a 6 foot high security fence that extends from the west property line to the Public Works Office and then goes to the east property line. A 6 foot high chain link fence gate crosses the driveway.

North Ogden Zoning Ordinance 11-10-13: (Exterior Lighting)

All exterior lighting must be shielded in order to not penetrate onto the adjoining lots. 11-17-3(10) has the standards for lighting.

11-10-25: (Trash Enclosures)

The trash enclosure is now shown on the site plan to the south of the outdoor storage enclosure. The enclosure will comply with this code provision.

11-17 (Parking and Loading: Traffic Access)

11-17-3 (Design and Location of Parking Spaces)

The applicant has submitted plans that address this section of the ordinance.

11-17-4 (Schedule of Required Off Street Spaces)

The business office has a standard of 4 stalls per thousand square feet of office space. The business office is approximately 5,000 square feet and requires 20 stalls. The office has 19 stalls and 2 handicapped stalls. There is not a specified standard for the shop. The city planner can determine the appropriate number for the shop. There are 14 stalls within the shop compound. There are 16 employees in the Public Works Department. This is sufficient.

11-174 (Parking Lot Landscaping)

The standards for parking lot landscaping are met in Exhibit G.

11-22 (Sign Regulations for all Zones) - The applicant will submit a sign permit at a later date.

The above described application conforms to the North Ogden City General Plan due to its being compliant with the spirit of city ordinances and the following Plan goal: All existing and new development should be required to fairly and uniformly provide improvements according to city standards.

The memo offered the following summary of potential Planning Commission considerations:

- Does the proposed use meet the requirements of the applicable City Ordinances?
- Is the proposed use being built to an acceptable standard?

Staff recommends the Planning Commission consider the revisions to the site plan and determine if they are acceptable. The Planning Commission can find that the North Ogden City Public Works site plan meets the referenced code standards and approve the site plan with the following conditions:

- Approve the revised site plan Exhibit H.
- Provide for exterior lighting that meets code as part of the building permit review.
- Obtain a deferral from the City Council for curb, gutter, and sidewalk. Acknowledge that the curb, gutter, and sidewalk will possibly need to avoid any identified wetland along Pleasant View Drive.

Mr. Scott reviewed his staff memo.

Commissioner Russell asked if there will be 24 hour access through the facility site. Mr. Scott stated there will be security gates on both sides of the building; however, there is no security gate keeping people from accessing the administration portion of the site at all hours. Commissioner Russell asked if the site will primarily be accessed from the Lomond View Drive side. Mr. Hartvigsen stated public access is intended to be from Lomond View Drive, but City traffic will primarily access the site from Pleasant View Drive.

Chairman Thomas asked if the issues associated with the wells located on private property adjacent to the site have been addressed. Mr. Hartvigsen answered no.

Discussion then centered on landscaping at the site, after which Chairman Thomas asked for the justification for the decision to not install curb and gutter along Lomond View Drive. He stated all other developers are required to install such infrastructure. Mr. Scott stated that issue was discussed at length by the City Council and they felt that due to the fact that there is no curb and gutter in the area, it would be more appropriate to wait to install it at a later date as future development occurs. Mr. Call added that there are plans to install a sidewalk on Pleasant View Drive, but the Council decided to wait to install curb and gutter until the road is improved. Chairman Thomas stated that the City should be setting the example when it comes to infrastructure improvements; he understands Lomond View Drive needs to be improved and he understands the reasons for deferring the installation of the curb and gutter, but the improvements are necessary. He added he has the same concerns about the application that he had the last time it was considered by the Planning Commission; the City requires an eight-foot solid fence for commercial use and he feels such a fence should be installed on the east side of the property to provide proper screening and buffering between the facility and adjacent residential properties. Mr. Scott reviewed the fencing plan for the site, after which Chairman Thomas asked what type of fence will be located on the southern side of the property. Mr. Scott stated there is a detention basin on the southern portion of the property and there will be a six foot chain link fence there. He noted the fence on the east of the property will also be six foot chain link, but it will be slatted for privacy.

Commissioner Knight stated that he feels an eight foot solid fence would detract from the adjacent residential properties. Commissioner Prisbrey disagreed and stated an eight foot solid fence would provide more screening for adjacent residential properties. He stated that Ogden City has a solid masonry wall around their public works facility. Commissioner Knight stated that facility is located in a commercial/manufacturing area. Discussion and debate regarding the appropriate fencing of the site then ensued. Vice-Chairman Waite stated the biggest concern is whether the City is complying with its own ordinances. Mr. Scott stated that the Planning Commission has some flexibility when applying fencing standards. He also noted that the building should not be considered a commercial use; rather, it is an institutional/public use, which is allowed in the zone that is assigned to the subject property. He stated he feels the plan adequately buffers adjoining properties. Discussion then centered on possible improvements to the fences at some point in the future when the site is further improved. Chairman Thomas concluded that if any other use were to locate on the site, the City would require an eight foot solid fence between the use and adjacent residential uses. Commissioner Knight argued that the eight foot solid fence is not a requirement for this use.

Commissioner Knight made a motion to approve a site plan application for the North Ogden Public Works Facility, located at approximately 162 E. Pleasant View Drive. Commissioner Barker seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Thomas	yes
Vice-Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Knight	yes

Commissioner Mason	yes
Commissioner Prisbrey	yes
Commissioner Russell	yes

The motion passed.

6. DISCUSSION ON WARD FARM SUBDIVISION LAYOUT (STAFF REPORT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE MEETING)

Mr. Scott reviewed the history of the Ward Farm subdivision application and he reviewed the layout that has been submitted by the applicant. The City had placed an importance on the connectivity of the subdivision to 900 East as well as proper setbacks from Fruitland Drive.

Rick Scadden, applicant, approached the Planning Commission and stated that the original design of the subdivision was designed by Mr. Ward; there have been extensive discussions regarding the proximity of the development to Fruitland Drive as well as the viability of cul-de-sacs within the development. Chairman Thomas stated it is his understanding that staff desires connectivity to 900 East as well as the elimination of some cul-de-sacs in the development and he asked Mr. Scadden if he is amenable to that request or if he prefers the plan that has been submitted. Mr. Scadden stated he would prefer the amended plan that has been presented to the City. Chairman Thomas inquired as to what road is located at the top of the development. Mr. Scadden answered 1500 North. Chairman Thomas stated it appears that road curves throughout the development and he asked where it ties into another road. Mr. Scadden stated 850 East runs through the development and connects 1500 North to 1900 North. Vice-Chairman Waite stated that for the purpose of connectivity it would be nice to see what lies west of the area included on the plat because there could be another road that provides connectivity. Mr. Scadden stated there is another road to the west of the plat: 1700 North. He stated he feels the stub road to the north provides adequate future connectivity. Discussion then focused on providing some type of exception to the applicant relative to the requirement to install sidewalk, curb, and gutter on Fruitland Drive, with Mr. Scott noting he believes curb and gutter is desirable for the purpose of protecting the road, but sidewalk may not be appropriate in that area.

Greg Day, Syracuse Utah, stated he is the engineer for the applicant and he noted the subdivision has been designed to conform to City development standards. He feels the layout provides for the highest and best use of the property and creates desirable lot sizes that will accommodate nice homes.

Mr. Hartvigsen addressed storm drain issues associated with the subject property. The storm drain system has been funneled and piped down to Washington Boulevard and the 24 inch line that was used does not have the capacity to handle additional water so storm drain detention will be required on the property. He reviewed a concept drawing that would provide better road connectivity and traffic circulation as well as carves out an area that could be used for storm water detention. He compared this concept plan with the sketch plan that has been provided by the applicant, pointing out the differences between the two plans. There was a brief debate and

discussion among staff and the applicant relative to Mr. Hartvigsen's proposed concept plan, which focuses on connectivity.

Chairman Thomas stated he feels it is the Planning Commission's responsibility to consider existing developments around the subject property when focusing on the proposed development and determine whether the proposed development meets the City's subdivision requirements and standards. He stated the City can make recommendations regarding the layout of the property based on speculations relative to how the area will continue to develop in the future, but the ultimate decision should be based on the existing developments in the area and how the proposed development fits. Mr. Scott stated that the City is not trying to require the applicant to redesign their development, but it is a fact that there is a lack of cohesiveness between the existing developments in the area, and approving the plan that has been presented by the applicant would only add to the problems created by the current lack of connectivity. Vice-Chairman Waite stated he feels it is the Planning Commission's role to consider future development as well as existing development. Mr. Scott agreed and stated that staff has tried to be sensitive to the developer's needs, while also doing what is in the best interest of the community in the future. He stated staff has not suggested that both cul-de-sacs within the applicant's proposed development be eliminated; rather one of the cul-de-sacs should be extended to improve connectivity. He stated that at the very least there should be pedestrian walkways connecting the proposed development with existing developments. He asked for feedback from the Planning Commission relative to an appropriate final design so that the applicant can move forward with the application process.

The Planning Commission, staff, and applicant reviewed the applicant's concept plan and compared it with the concept plan created by Mr. Hartvigsen, with a focus on lot sizes, incorporation of pedestrian walkways, and connectivity to existing developments.

Lori Lee, 4144 N. 250 W., Pleasant View, stated that she projects that this subdivision will contain mid-level homes, not starter homes, and if the road configuration is changed in a way that it reduces lot sizes and eliminates cul-de-sacs, it will be necessary to reduce home sizes to starter home sizes. She stated the proposal as written meets all City ordinances. She added cul-de-sac lots sell 66 percent faster than corner lots. She stated she understands staff must consider the future of the City, but when considering creating developments that attract residents to the area it is important to keep in mind the different things that make lots attractive.

Planning Commission discussion of the proposed development plan continued, with the Planning Commission ultimately concluding to support the design that has been presented by the applicant with suggested incorporation of a pedestrian walkway connecting the development with existing developments and on-site storm water detention. Discussion of a pedestrian walkway centered on maintenance and whether it would lessen the privacy of residents in the development. Mr. Smith added connectivity and walkability is very valuable because it provides residents other choices besides always using their vehicle to get where they are going. He stated it is important to create memorable and valuable communities to preserve the quality of the City into the future. Mr. Scott asked for a detailed summary from the Planning Commission that can be included in the minutes of this meeting to provide staff and the applicant with clear direction.

Chairman Thomas stated it is his understanding that the Planning Commission feels the applicant's design is acceptable; they feel connectivity to Fruitland Drive and to the north of the subdivision is sufficient. They like the neighborhood feel created by the incorporation of cul-de-sacs in the development rather than thoroughfares. The Planning Commission understands storm water detention is needed on site and recommends that this be incorporated into the plan. Mr. Scott stated he does not feel there is a consensus relative to a pedestrian walkway. Chairman Thomas stated he feels that could be left to the developer to determine if a walkway would improve the value of the development.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ray Ward, no address given, stated he has developed a lot of residential properties and now develops commercial properties. He stated that it is important to consider how to make a property profitable and for every lot that is eliminated from a development the profit decreases. He stated the previously discussed property is the final phase of an older development and the design may not flow how staff would like, but the lots are more desirable due to that fact and more people will maintain their property for that reason. He stated access to Fruitland Drive is very difficult and the current design is very appropriate and ties in with the community that currently exists in that area.

8. PLANNING COMMISSION/STAFF COMMENTS

Chairman Thomas reminded the Planning Commission of a joint session with the City Council on April 7, 2015. Mr. Scott anticipates there will be discussions of developing a mixed-use ordinance in the City.

Chairman Thomas then provided a report regarding the progress of the General Plan Steering Committee (GPSC), with a focus on the open house events that have been held recently.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Prisbrey made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Knight seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Thomas	yes
Vice-Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Knight	yes
Commissioner Mason	yes

Commissioner Prisbrey **yes**
Commissioner Russell **yes**

The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Planning Commission Chair

Stacie Cain,
Deputy City Recorder

Date approved