

**CLINTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSESSION MINUTES**

**Commissioner Deborah Barlow, Chair**  
**Commissioner Mike Petersen, Vice Chair**  
**Commissioner Samuel DeLong**  
**Commissioner Allen Labrecque**  
**Commissioner Tony Thompson**  
**Councilmember Blair Bateman, City Council Representative**

<b>Planning Commission Meeting</b>	<b>November 19, 2013</b>	<b>Call to Order: 7:16 P.M.</b>	<b>2267 N 1500 W Clinton UT 84015</b>
<b>Staff Present</b>	Community Development Director Lynn Vinzant and Lisa Titensor recorded the minutes.		
<b>Public Present</b>	Dennis Draayer, Bobby Buckles, John Hansen		
<b>Pledge of Allegiance</b>	Commissioner DeLong		
<b>Invocation or Thought</b>	Commissioner Barlow gave a thought based on the 150 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Gettysburg Address.		
<b>Roll Call &amp; Attendance</b>	All were present.		
<b>Declarations of Conflict</b>	There were none.		
<b>Commissioners Issue &amp; Concerns</b>	There were none.		
<b>City Council Report</b>	Councilmember Bateman reported on the November 19, 2013 Clinton City Council Meeting as recorded in the minutes.		

**INFILL DISCUSSION**

**Petitioner**

Commissioner Barlow explained there are plots of land in the City that could develop as infill. The General Plan Committee felt that the patio home zone would be appropriate for some of these areas. She referred to the table on page 9 of the proposed General Plan. She explained that “small areas” needs to be defined. Infill will need to meet specific requirements and guidelines and may be held to a higher standard.

<b>Characteristics of a desired single family retirement community</b>
Should not be allowed in all zones
Allow in areas where the higher density would not detract from large lot developments
Frontage of lots should not be adjacent to frontage of larger lots
Density increases over established zone should be based on development criteria over standard development and outlined in an infill ordinance
Allow only in small areas that are considered infill
<b>Developments should improve the overall characteristics of surrounding properties</b>
Require proof (through assessed values) of higher quality products
Access should not be restricted
<b>Qualifications for higher density should be established</b>
Quantifiable criteria for percentages of increase over established zone
Landscape requirements and enhancements
Recorded Development Agreement with all approved development criteria
Superior building materials
Quantity and quality of community amenities
Established and professionally managed HOA
Trail / park / shopping / transportation access for residents
Require proof that the City has adequate infrastructure to support the development

Public streets and infrastructure meet established guidelines
Meets unmet housing demand
Developer is builder
Architectural theme with diversity of appearance

John Hansen representing Dennis Draayer gave the Planning Commission a brief presentation. He explained Mr. Draayer would like to develop his 18 acres as patio homes. The development in Clinton would be similar to a community Mr. Hansen has developed in North Ogden at 2300 N 600 E. He said the development will have public streets and operate under an HOA. The homes will be well built, nicely landscaped and very well maintained with restrictive covenants. He said it is a desired community for senior citizens. He explained with a senior community, there is no impact to local schools and minimal impact on the roads because they travel less.

Commissioner Barlow identified that 18 acres is larger than what the General Plan Committee envisioned for an infill zone.

Mr. Vinzant commented that the Patio Home Ordinance states a maximum of 18 acres.

Commissioner Barlow asked Mr. Hansen if Mr. Draayer has considered developing the front of his property as commercial.

Mr. Hansen said not that he is aware of.

Councilmember Bateman expressed concern that a developer should not be allowed to address the PC before the ordinance is written to influence their decision.

Commissioner Petersen expressed concern about safety for the residents in a development of this size in this area. He said 85 units may be excessive and is a safety concern for left hand turns.

Mr. Vinzant commented that he is not in favor of creating another zone.

Commissioner Labrecque expressed concern about being too exclusionary.

Councilmember Bateman said he would like to see the zone left as is.

Commissioner Barlow suggested that rather than having 18 acres as an infill area, consider zoning it as a patio home zone.

The Planning Commission agreed they would like to keep infill at a maximum of 5 acres or less.

They also agreed that the minimum lot size should be 5100 sq. ft. with a minimum 1430 sq. ft. footprint.

Take to the City Council infill zone

- 1) Remnant parcels difficult to develop under other standard ordinance.
- 2) Master Plan – patio zone – Draayer Land 4 acres / Hogge Land 18 acres.

**CONCLUSION** Commissioner Thompson moved in discussion and consideration of the infill ordinance and the applicability of it to larger parcels of property, recommend if the Master Land Use Map is reopened, petition the City Council to change the Draayer Hogge property, the portion that is Master Planned as R-1-9 be reconsidered and Master Planned as patio homes. Commissioner DeLong seconded the motion. Voting by roll call is as follows: Commissioner DeLong, aye; Commissioner Labrecque, aye; Commissioner Thompson, aye; Commissioner Petersen, no; Commissioner Barlow aye.

In regards to infill, the Planning Commission unanimously agreed to give direction to staff to write the ordinance identifying that infill will be allowed if the surrounding areas is R-1-9 or denser.

The Planning Commission discussed appropriate street widths.

Mr. Vinzant clarified the roads consist of 36 feet of asphalt; a few subdivision with 6 foot park strips have 33 feet of asphalt.

<b>SIGN ORDINANCE DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>Petitioner</b>	<p>City Council</p> <p>The Planning Commission discussed and recommended changes to the Sign Ordinance.</p> <p>Title 24</p> <p>Definitions:</p> <p>(i) <b>Berm.</b> A bump or raised area that separates two areas.</p> <p>24-4-2(5)</p> <p>(1) Monument Signs. The following standards shall apply:</p> <p>(a) Monument Sign, Size</p> <p>(i) Monument signs are allowed for any size parcel provided that the parcel has thirty (30) feet of street frontage. The sign area allowed is determined by the following formula: thirty-two (32) square feet plus one (1) square foot per 3.125 lineal feet of street frontage over fifty (50) feet, maximum size is sixty (60) square feet. Parcels with two street frontages are allowed a sign on each street. However, the signs must be separated by at least one hundred (100) feet as measured diagonally across the property from center to center of both signs or only one (1) sign will be allowed. Signs within the visibility triangle may be allowed with the permission of the Clinton City Engineer.</p> <p>(ii) Monument signs must have at least a one (1) foot pedestal, and the height of the sign may not exceed five (5) feet for a total of six (6) feet. The height to the top of the sign may vary where the sign is placed upon a landscape berm. The combined height of the sign plus landscaped berm may not exceed nine (9) feet as measured from the top of the curb. The frontage of the property must be bermed a minimum lineal distance equal to one-half of the square footage of the sign for this to occur. The sign base shall be landscaped.</p> <p>(iii) Reader boards (changeable copy areas) and electronic message centers may be allowed, however, such devices shall not exceed 50% of the gross total sign area calculated in section (i) above and height limitations established in section (ii) above.</p>
<b>Approval of Minutes</b>	<p><b>Commissioner DeLong moved to approve the minutes of the November 5, 2013 Planning Commission Minutes as amended. Commissioner Petersen seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.</b></p>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<p><b>Commissioner DeLong moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Labrecque seconded the motion. All those present voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:46 p.m.</b></p>