



## *Community Development*

PLANNING, BUILDING INSPECTIONS,  
CUSTOMER SERVICE, AND CODE COMPLIANCE

---

### **CLEARFIELD CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA**

Notice is hereby given that the Clearfield City Planning Commission will hold a regularly scheduled meeting at **7:00 P.M., Wednesday, January 18, 2023**, on the **3<sup>rd</sup> floor** in the City Council Chambers of the Clearfield City Municipal Building, located at 55 S. State Street, Clearfield, UT 84015.

**WORK SESSION – Cancelled**

#### **REGULAR SESSION – 7:00 PM- Council Chambers**

- CALL TO ORDER - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR FOR 2023 CALENDAR YEAR
- APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
  - July 6, 2022
  - December 7, 2022

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. Staff Discussion
2. Staff Communications
3. Commissioner's Minute

***\*\*PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING ADJOURNED\*\****

Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of January 2023.  
/s/Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner

Meetings of the Planning Commission of Clearfield City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-207 as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meetings will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established in City Code § 1-6-4H for electronic meetings.

Clearfield City, 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 the Customer Service Center at 801-525-2701, giving the City a 48 hour notice.

The Work Session meeting is a public meeting; however, public comments are only received in the formal Planning Commission meeting. The Planning Commission Public Meeting is a public forum where the Planning Commission may receive comment from applicants, the public, applicable agencies and city staff regarding land use applications and other items on the Commission's agenda. In addition, it is where the Planning Commission takes action on these items. Action may be taken which may include: approval, approval with conditions, denial, continuance or recommendation to other bodies as applicable.

1 **CLEARFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

2 July 6, 2022

3 6:30 P.M. – Work Session

4  
5 PRESIDING: Chris Uccardi Chair

6  
7 PRESENT: David Bloomfield Vice Chair  
8 Kathryn Murray Commissioner  
9 Robert Browning Commissioner  
10 Brogan Fullmer Commissioner  
11 Megan Ratchford Commissioner  
12 Chad Mortensen Commissioner (Alternate)  
13 Zach Gaines Commissioner (Alternate)  
14 Amber Brink Youth Commission Ambassador

15  
16 ABSENT: Lauren DeSpain Commissioner

17  
18 STAFF PRESENT: Shawn Robinson Assistant City Attorney  
19 Spencer Brimley Community Development Director  
20 Brad McIlrath Senior Planner

21  
22 VISITORS:

23  
24 Chair Uccardi called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

25  
26 DISCUSSION ON THE APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE FEBRUARY 2, 2022, AND  
27 FEBRUARY 16, 2022, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS.

28  
29 The Commission and staff discussed some minor grammatical corrections for the minutes.

30  
31 DISCUSSION ON GPA 2022-060055, A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT REQUEST BY  
32 JOSH HUGHES WITH TWENTY-FIVE EIGHT DEVELOPMENT TO CHANGE THE  
33 GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION FOR A PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES  
34 FROM COMMERCIAL TO RESIDENTIAL. LOCATION: 500 WEST 1700 SOUTH  
35 (ANTELOPE DRIVE) (TINS: 12-080-0092 & 12-080-0095). PROJECT AREA: 5.32 ACRES  
36 OF 8.48 TOTAL ACRES. STAFF: BRAD MCILRATH, SENIOR PLANNER (LEGISLATIVE  
37 ACTION).

38  
39 The Commission and staff discussed the following items relevant to the General Plan amendment  
40 request:

- 41  
42 • That the request was to change the land use designation from commercial to residential.  
43 • That changes in land use should happen gradually.  
44  
45  
46  
47

1  
2 DISCUSSION ON RZN 2022-060055, A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT REQUEST BY JOSH  
3 HUGHES WITH TWENTY-FIVE EIGHT DEVELOPMENT TO CHANGE THE ZONING  
4 DESIGNATION FOR A PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES FROM C-2  
5 (COMMERCIAL) TO R-3 (RESIDENTIAL). LOCATION: 500 WEST 1700 SOUTH  
6 (ANTELOPE DRIVE) (TINS: 12-080-0092 & 12-080-0095). PROJECT AREA: 5.32 ACRES  
7 OF 8.48 TOTAL ACRES. STAFF: BRAD MCILRATH, SENIOR PLANNER (LEGISLATIVE  
8 ACTION).  
9

10 The Commission and staff discussed the following items relevant to the rezone request:  
11

- 12 • That R-1-6 was a newer residential zone created and specified in the General Plan as the  
13 preferred zone for infill development.
- 14 • That the request was similar to the Wilcox Farms rezone to R-3 in having a small-lot  
15 single-family development.
- 16 • Commissioner Browning asked about when the development agreement would apply to  
17 the property, giving an example of an apartment building being built as a permitted use in  
18 the R-3 Zone, prior to the development agreement being in effect. Mr. McIlrath explained  
19 that the rezone would be subject to the execution of the development agreement, and that  
20 the zoning on the map wouldn't change until the development agreement was executed  
21 and recorded at the county.
- 22 • Commissioner Uccardi explained that the zoning of R-3 development agreement would  
23 give the City some ability to ensure higher quality building materials in the future  
24 development, where a single-family zone would not allow the City that ability.  
25

26 Chair Uccardi suggested that because the next scheduled Planning Commission would have a lot  
27 of items on the agenda, it could be helpful to move the work session ahead 30 minutes to allow  
28 enough time for any questions. The Commissioners agreed.  
29

30 **Chair Uccardi moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Fullmer.**  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

**CLEARFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

June 6, 2022

7:00 P.M. – Regular Session

**PRESIDING:** Chris Uccardi Chair

**PRESENT:** David Bloomfield Vice Chair  
Kathryn Murray Commissioner  
Robert Browning Commissioner  
Brogan Fullmer Commissioner  
Megan Ratchford Commissioner  
Chad Mortensen Commissioner (Alternate)  
Zach Gaines Commissioner (Alternate)  
Amber Brink Youth Commission Ambassador

**ABSENT:** Lauren DeSpain Commissioner

**STAFF PRESENT:** Shawn Robinson City Attorney  
Spencer Brimley Community Development Director  
Brad McIlrath Senior Planner

**VISITORS:** Ron Benson, Tara Stoddart, Kevin Stoddart, Gunner Stoddart, Matt Johnson

Commissioner Uccardi called the meeting to order and led The Pledge of Allegiance.

Planning Commission Chair Statement.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE FEBRUARY 2, 2022, AND FEBRUARY 16, 2022, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS.**

**Commissioner Murray moved to approve the minutes subject to the corrections identified in the work session. Seconded by Commissioner Fullmer. The motion carried on the following vote. Voting AYE: Commissioners Uccardi, Bloomfield, Murray, Browning, Fullmer, Ratchford, Gaines, and Youth Ambassador Brink. Voting NO: None.**

Chair Uccardi declared the public hearing open for both the General Plan amendment and rezone requests.

**DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF GPA 2022-060055, A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT REQUEST BY JOSH HUGHES WITH TWENTY-FIVE EIGHT DEVELOPMENT TO CHANGE THE GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION FOR A PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES FROM COMMERCIAL TO RESIDENTIAL. LOCATION: 500 WEST 1700 SOUTH (ANTELOPE DRIVE) (TINS: 12-080-0092 & 12-080-0095). PROJECT AREA: 5.32 ACRES OF 8.48 TOTAL ACRES. STAFF: BRAD MCILRATH, SENIOR PLANNER (LEGISLATIVE ACTION).**

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, presented the following information:

- The requests were for the rear 5.32 acres.
- General plan designation: Commercial
- Request to amend the General Plan to residential to allow the R-3 Zone.

Following discussion of the General Plan amendment, Chair Uccardi asked for any questions or comments related to the General Plan. If there weren't any, he said that the Commissioners could consider a motion.

**Commissioner Murray moved to recommend approval to the City Council for the proposed General Plan amendment request based on the analysis of the staff report and the following findings:**

- 1. The proposed general plan amendment is consistent with market changes for housing stock and demand and can be supported by the land use guidelines, goals, and objectives of the Clearfield City General Plan.**

**Seconded by Commissioner Ratchford. The motion carried on the following vote. Voting AYE: Commissioners Uccardi, Bloomfield, Murray, Browning, Fullmer, Ratchford, Gaines, and Youth Ambassador Brink. Voting NO: None.**

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL OF RZN 2022-060055, A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT REQUEST BY JOSH HUGHES WITH TWENTY-FIVE EIGHT DEVELOPMENT TO CHANGE THE ZONING DESIGNATION FOR A PORTION OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES FROM C-2 (COMMERCIAL) TO R-3 (RESIDENTIAL). LOCATION: 500 WEST 1700 SOUTH (ANTELOPE DRIVE) (TINS: 12-080-0092 & 12-080-0095). PROJECT AREA: 5.32 ACRES OF 8.48 TOTAL ACRES. STAFF: BRAD MCILRATH, SENIOR PLANNER (LEGISLATIVE ACTION).

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, presented the following information:

- Current Zoning: C-2 Commercial
- Request to rezone the property to R-3 to develop a single-family and commercial project.
- 45 small-lot single-family development on the rear 5.32 acres
- Commercial development on front 3.16 acres.
- Showed maps of the General Plan designations and zoning.
- Stated that changes in the commercial service and retail markets had drastically changed the amount of land and building square footage needed for new commercial businesses. As demand for commercial land decreased, there continued to be a high demand for land to be developed as residential. For the stated reasons, the applicant and property owner were requesting the General Plan amendment and rezone to allow for smaller amount of commercial with residential to the rear in accordance with current market demands and pressures. To ensure the appropriate density and design while respecting the existing single-family residential in the area, a rezone of the property to the R-2 Zone would be better suited for the area.

Commissioner Fullmer asked why the property would not be rezoned to R-1-8, to match the

1 adjacent single-family neighborhood. Mr. McIlrath said that would be a possibility. He explained  
2 that the analysis by staff was based on the zoning and the type of development that the applicant  
3 was requesting. He continued that the General Plan advised that changes in land use should be  
4 done gradually. He said that a higher density residential neighborhood would transition the land  
5 to the more intense commercial land use, while also acting as a buffer between the existing R-1-8  
6 neighborhood and any future commercial use.

7  
8 Commissioner Fullmer asked why Plant & Grow was planning on selling a portion of their  
9 property. Mr. McIlrath replied that he didn't know for sure, but the applicant might have  
10 additional information.

11  
12 Commissioner Browning asked the minimum lot size of the R-1-8 Zone. Mr. McIlrath replied  
13 that the minimum size was 8,000 square feet. He said that the R-1-6 Zone had a minimum lot size  
14 of 6,000 square feet, and that the concept as proposed by the applicant would have lot sizes of  
15 approximately 4,000 square feet.

16  
17 Commissioner Browning asked what the minimum lot size would be for a single-family home in  
18 the R-2 and R-3 Zones. Mr. McIlrath looked it up in the Code and responded that the minimum  
19 lot size would be 6,500 square feet. Commissioner Browning summarized his understanding of  
20 the rezone request, saying that a neighborhood with 4,000 square feet for lots wouldn't be all that  
21 different from a neighborhood with 6,500 square foot lots.

22  
23 Chair Uccardi asked about the existing neighborhood and the approximate lot sizes. Mr. McIlrath  
24 stated that the zoning was R-1-8, but the actual lot sizes were smaller. He described that many of  
25 the existing R-1-8 neighborhoods were actually developed under a different zone and that was  
26 likely the case with the neighborhood in question, which could explain why they were less than  
27 8,000 square feet in size.

28  
29 PUBLIC COMMENT

30  
31 Tara Stoddart, a resident of the adjacent neighborhood, opposed the requests. She cited concerns  
32 about the high number of homes and small lot sizes being proposed. She stated her concern that  
33 the private drive that would feed some of the homes would dead end near her property line,  
34 raising the possibility of a car travelling too fast and crashing into her backyard. She said that  
35 new homes would possibly raise the crime rate and create more places for people to steal things.  
36 She questioned where agricultural products could be produced if we give up existing agricultural  
37 land. She talked about the power lines that go through the field and asked what would be done  
38 about them. She stated affordability concerns, questioning who could afford a home given the  
39 current high price of gas.

40  
41 Josh Hughes, the applicant, addressed the Planning Commission. He summarized his proposal  
42 and explained the reasons why he thought it would be a good use for the land. He explained that  
43 there would be new commercial next to existing commercial, and new single-family homes next  
44 to existing single-family homes. He said that the homes would have smaller lot sizes but would  
45 act as a good transition between the existing R-1-8 Zone and the commercial uses. To clear up a  
46 miscommunication, he said that he was fine with the density of the R-2 Zone or the R-3 Zone. He  
47 stated he would be fine if the rezone was to R-2. He expressed that in discussions with Mayor

1 Shepherd, the suggestion was that the R-3 Zone with a development agreement would be  
2 appropriate for the type of development being proposed. He suggested that any concerns about  
3 the potential development could be addressed in the development agreement as a protection for  
4 the City to be able to require certain conditions.

5  
6 Commissioner Fullmer asked about the Syracuse property to the west. Mr. Hughes said it was a  
7 newer commercial storage facility. Commissioner Fullmer stated that the City had reticence about  
8 private roads and asked what the applicant's thoughts were on the subject. Mr. Hughes said he  
9 didn't have any concerns about the infrastructure being public, his only concern was that the  
10 width required for a public road wouldn't fit with the type of development they were proposing.  
11 Commissioner Fullmer raised another question, asking what the intent was for the commercial  
12 portion of the development. Mr. Hughes said that would depend on the City's preference. If the  
13 City established a time limit for construction of the commercial, then they would likely build a  
14 multi-tenant retail spec building. If the City was open to waiting for the demands of the market,  
15 then that would depend on the commercial user that eventually wanted to develop the commercial  
16 portion.

17  
18 Commissioner Browning said he liked the location and with the new road he didn't see much  
19 potential for additional traffic going through existing neighborhoods.

20  
21 Commissioner Fullmer asked if the City Council had communicated any of its desires for  
22 development in the area. Mr. McIlrath stated that it hadn't expressed specifics of the type of  
23 development desired but had expressed an openness to evaluating an application for a rezone to  
24 residential with a development agreement, similar to other small-lot single family projects that  
25 had been approved in the City.

26  
27 Chair Uccardi stated that the role of the Planning Commission was not to just rubber stamp the  
28 City Council's positions. He said that the opinion and thoughts of the commissioners were very  
29 valued and important to the process of making recommendations to the Council.

30  
31 Commissioner Ratchford expressed that she felt like there was a handshake type of agreement  
32 regarding the type of development being proposed, whether the zoning was R-2 or R-3. Chair  
33 Uccardi asked what the differences were between the R-2 and R-3 Zones in relation to  
34 infrastructure. Mr. McIlrath stated that the infrastructure requirements were different in the zones,  
35 but either way a development agreement would be needed to put in the private streets as proposed  
36 in the concept. To address Commissioner Ratchford's comment about a handshake agreement,  
37 Mr. Hughes explained that the City didn't have to just trust that he would stick to the type of  
38 development concept being proposed. He said that the City would have assurance in the form of  
39 the development agreement, with the rezone being granted only when the development agreement  
40 was executed and recorded against the property.

41  
42 Commissioner Bloomfield asked about the private drives being proposed and access to all the lots  
43 on the south end. Mr. McIlrath explained that the four lots on the far south would have access off  
44 1900 South.

45  
46 Tara Stoddart asked if she could speak again. She said that people in the area did use  
47 neighborhood roads and drove through them at high speeds.

Kevin Stoddart, resident of the adjacent neighborhood, spoke about the developer trying to fit four houses along a 50-yard driveway. He stated that he thought it was ridiculous. He didn't think the property was meant for development and said he didn't think anyone would want to live so close to the power lines. He stated opposition to the number of homes in what he considered a small piece of land.

Mr. Hughes gave an example of a development that he had under construction in Syracuse, behind the Smiths on Antelope Drive, to help them picture the type of development being proposed.

Mr. McIlrath cautioned against delving too much into the design of the homes and suggested that the Commission focus more on the request of the applicant regarding the zoning for the property.

Chair Uccardi asked for any further discussion regarding the rezone request, or any motion for a recommendation.

**Commissioner Fullmer moved to make a recommendation of denial to the City Council for the request to rezone the subject property from C-2 (Commercial) to R-3 (Residential). The motion was made based on the analysis of the staff report and the following reasons.**

- 1. The use of the R-3 Zone to establish small-lot single-family neighborhoods is inconsistent with the current purpose and permitted uses of the zone as it is intended for medium to high-density multiple-family developments.**
- 2. The General Plan was amended to allow for greater use of the R-1-6 Zone for residential single-family infill development and as an alternative to multi-family residential.**
- 3. The R-2 Zone is intended for medium-density residential neighborhoods and would be a more appropriate zone than the R-3 Zone for this area.**

**Seconded by Commissioner Murray. The motion carried on the following vote. Voting AYE: Commissioners Uccardi, Bloomfield, Murray, Fullmer, Gaines, and Youth Ambassador Brink. Voting NO: Commissioners Browning and Ratchford.**

Commissioners Ratchford and Browning stated that they felt comfortable with a recommendation of approval for the rezone as long as the rezone was conditioned upon a development agreement for single-family homes.

Chair Uccardi declared the public hearings closed and thanked the public for being at the meeting. He then turned the time over to Mr. McIlrath for staff communications.

#### STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

- Upcoming agenda items to include a rezone of City parks to the P-F (Public Facilities) Zone, a Legend Hills subdivision plat, a Towne Place Suites hotel, and an office building on University Park Boulevard.
- An upcoming discussion item regarding amendments to the signs chapter of the Form Based Code.

COMMISSIONERS MINUTE

Chair Uccardi: Seconded the opinions of all and thanked everyone for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebration.

Commissioner Bloomfield: Talked about the growth that had happened in recent years. He said growth would continue. He said he hoped the price of materials would come down soon.

Commissioner Murray: Talked about all the work for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July parade and thanked everyone for their help in preparing the float. She said the turnout for the parade was great.

Commissioner Browning: Spoke about the demand for housing and the unaffordability of current housing. He stated that growth was coming and housing was an important part of handling the growth, which may include rezoning property from commercial to residential.

Commissioner Fullmer: Thanked City staff and everyone for a great 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebration.

Commissioner Ratchford: Stated that she understood both sides of residents that were opposed to the rezone and potential development, and the product that the developer was proposing. She stated those were some of the challenges that came with growth and change. She thanked everyone for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebration.

Commissioner Mortensen: Thanked everyone and said he was excited to see Lime scooters in Clearfield and thought it would be great to increase walkability in the City.

Commissioner Gaines: Nothing.

Commissioner Mortensen: Nothing.

Youth Ambassador Brink: She said she thought the Youth Commission float in the parade was very well done.

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, **Chair Uccardi moved to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Murray.**

1 **CLEARFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

2 December 7, 2022

3 6:30 P.M. – Work Session

4  
5 PRESIDING: Chris Uccardi Chair

6  
7 PRESENT: Kathryn Murray Commissioner  
8 Robert Browning Commissioner  
9 Brogan Fullmer Commissioner  
10 Megan Ratchford Commissioner  
11 Lauren DeSpain Commissioner  
12 Chad Mortensen Commissioner (Alternate)

13  
14 ABSENT: David Bloomfield Commissioner  
15 Zach Gaines Commissioner (Alternate)

16  
17 STAFF PRESENT: Shawn Robinson Assistant City Attorney  
18 Spencer Brimley Community Development Director  
19 Brad McIlrath Senior Planner  
20 Tyson Stoddard Planner I

21  
22 VISITORS: None

23  
24 Chair Uccardi called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

25  
26 DISCUSSION ON THE APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 1, 2022, AND JUNE 15,  
27 2022, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS.

28  
29 Commissioners Murray and Browning provided corrections for some grammatical errors in the  
30 draft minutes.

31  
32 DISCUSSION ON CUP 2022-110144, A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REQUEST BY  
33 RAMESH J. WETTASINGHE TO OPERATE A DOG BOARDING AND GROOMING  
34 FACILITY AT THE SUBJECT LOCATION. LOCATION: 936 WEST 1700 SOUTH, SUITE A  
35 (TIN: 12-508-0022). PARCEL AREA: 1.72 ACRES ZONE: C-2 (COMMERCIAL). STAFF:  
36 TYSON STODDARD, PLANNER I (ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION).

37  
38 The Commission and staff discussed the following items relevant to the conditional use request:

- 39
- Commissioner Murray asked about the location of the proposed business.
  - Commissioner Browning asked about the parking for the proposed use and if there would be enough when considering the other existing businesses in the strip mall. Discussion followed about the amount of parking in the strip mall, the prior use of the space being a hardware store, and that the proposed use would have less parking demand than the store required.
- 40  
41  
42  
43  
44

- Commissioner Ratchford asked why the business was proposing many more dog kennels than cat kennels. Staff responded that there was a much higher demand for dog boarding compared to cat boarding.

DISCUSSION ON SP 2022-110145, A SITE PLAN REQUEST BY RICHARD HIGGINSON WITH PENGUIN INSULATION TO CONSTRUCT A 2,500 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO THE EXISTING BUILDING AT THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. LOCATION: 145 WEST 200 SOUTH (TIN: 12-022-0048). PARCEL AREA: 0.95 ACRES. ZONE: M-1 (MANUFACTURING). STAFF: TYSON STODDARD, PLANNER I (ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION).

The Commission and staff discussed the following items relevant to the Penguin Insulation site plan request:

- Commissioner Murray talked about some of the previous uses in the area.
- Commissioner Browning asked about the adjacent residential home and dumpster screening requirements. Staff explained that the code required the screening of dumpsters when adjacent to residentially zoned properties, but did not require screening from a legal non-conforming house that was in the M-1 (Manufacturing) Zone.
- Commissioner Browning asked about sidewalks. Staff confirmed that the properties along that side of the road didn't have any sidewalks.

DISCUSSION ON SP 2022-110146, A SITE PLAN REQUEST BY JARED SCHOFIELD WITH JENNMAR TO CONSTRUCT A 12,000 SQUARE FOOT STORAGE BUILDING AT THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. LOCATION: 635 SOUTH 175 EAST (TIN: 12-821-0002). PARCEL AREA: 0.67 ACRES. ZONE: M-1 (MANUFACTURING). STAFF: TYSON STODDARD, PLANNER I (ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION).

The Commission and staff discussed the following items relevant to the Jennmar site plan request:

- Commissioner Browning said he thought that 12,000 square feet was really big, but when considering it was in a manufacturing zone, he thought it didn't seem so large.
- Staff explained that it was an accessory building for the existing business and that it would be used exclusively for storage.

DISCUSSION ON A PROPOSED PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE FOR THE 2023 CALENDAR YEAR. STAFF: BRAD MCILRATH, SENIOR PLANNER (ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION).

Staff said that the January 4, 2023 meeting would be canceled because no applications for development were received. Chair Uccardi asked about the meeting on the 5<sup>th</sup> of July, 2023, and if anyone thought it should be canceled because of the 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebrations. Discussion followed about the options to keep the meeting scheduled, to move it to Thursday of the same week, or to move any items for that week to the following meeting. There was also discussion amongst the Commission and staff regarding the election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for the 2023 Planning Commission.

**Chair Uccardi moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Murray.**

**CLEARFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

December 7, 2022

7:00 P.M. – Regular Session

**PRESIDING:** Chris Uccardi Chair

**PRESENT:** Kathryn Murray Commissioner  
 Robert Browning Commissioner  
 Brogan Fullmer Commissioner  
 Megan Ratchford Commissioner  
 Lauren DeSpain Commissioner  
 Chad Mortensen Commissioner (Alternate)

**ABSENT:** David Bloomfield Commissioner  
 Zach Gaines Commissioner (Alternate)

**STAFF PRESENT:** Shawn Robinson City Attorney  
 Spencer Brimley Community Development Director  
 Brad McIlrath Senior Planner  
 Tyson Stoddard Planner I

**VISITORS:** Ramesh Wettasinghe, Crystal Roth, Richard Higginson, Chad Anderson

Chair Uccardi called the meeting to order and excused Commissioners Bloomfield and Gaines. After communicating that Commissioner Mortensen would be voting with the Commission that night, Chair Uccardi led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Planning Commission Chair Statement.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 1, 2022, AND JUNE 15, 2022, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS.**

**Commissioner Murray moved to approve the minutes, subject to the corrections discussed in the Work Session. Seconded by Commissioner Fullmer. The motion carried on the following vote. Voting AYE: Commissioners Uccardi, Murray, Browning, Fullmer, Ratchford, DeSpain, and Mortensen. Voting NO: None.**

**DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF CUP 2022-110144, A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REQUEST BY RAMESH J. WETTASINGHE TO OPERATE A DOG BOARDING AND GROOMING FACILITY AT THE SUBJECT LOCATION. LOCATION: 936 WEST 1700 SOUTH, SUITE A (TIN: 12-508-0022). PARCEL AREA: 1.72 ACRES ZONE: C-2 (COMMERCIAL). STAFF: TYSON STODDARD, PLANNER I (ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION).**

Tyson Stoddard, Planner I, presented the following:

- Applicant requested to operate a dog boarding and grooming facility
- Existing building

- Suite A- 8,000 square feet
- Veterinary services a conditional use in the C-2 Zone
  - Proposed use for the care, boarding, and grooming of animals
  - Not for diagnosis and treatment as could be found in a vet clinic
- Showed an aerial image and zoning map.
- Showed the site plan.
- Discussed the need for the type of fencing proposed for the outdoor play area and that a gate would be required for the dumpster enclosure.
- Showed the floor plan.

Chair Uccardi asked if there was any discussion amongst the Commission or any questions for the applicant.

**Commissioner Fullmer moved to approve the conditional use permit request for Pawtown Oasis, subject to the findings of the staff report and the following conditions:**

- 1. Conditional Use Permit approval is subject to North Davis Fire District review and approval.**
- 2. The applicant shall obtain a building permit for tenant improvements and the project shall comply with all applicable building code standards.**
- 3. The outdoor play area shall be screened with, at minimum, a six foot (6') tall opaque fence. Plans will need to be revised to include a detail of the type, height, and material of the fencing.**
- 4. The outdoor play area shall be limited to use between the hours of 7 a.m. and 9 p.m. and dogs shall be supervised by staff to mitigate any possible noise nuisance.**
- 5. Prior to granting of occupancy, both the outdoor and indoor recreation areas shall be completed.**
- 6. Prior to granting of occupancy, an opaque gate will need to be installed to complete the existing dumpster enclosure.**
- 7. The facility shall be kept clean and sanitary to prevent any type of nuisance resulting from odor or noxious matter.**
- 8. The applicant shall obtain a Clearfield City business license prior to the commencement of business operations.**
- 9. Any signs must meet Chapter 11-15 "Sign Regulations" standards of the City Code. Signs are not included as part of this Site Plan approval. Separate review and approval will be required.**

**Seconded by Commissioner Murray. The motion carried on the following vote. Voting AYE: Commissioners Uccardi, Murray, Browning, Fullmer, Ratchford, DeSpain, and Mortensen. Voting NO: None.**

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF SP 2022-110145, A SITE PLAN REQUEST BY RICHARD HIGGINSON WITH PENGUIN INSULATION TO CONSTRUCT A 2,500 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO THE EXISTING BUILDING AT THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. LOCATION: 145 WEST 200 SOUTH (TIN: 12-022-0048). PARCEL AREA: 0.95 ACRES. ZONE: M-1 (MANUFACTURING). STAFF: TYSON STODDARD, PLANNER I (ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION).

1 Tyson Stoddard, Planner I, presented the following:

- 2 • Penguin Insulation- insulation service company
- 3 • Existing building- 3,600 square feet
- 4 • Proposed addition- 2,500 square feet
- 5 • Zoning was M-1 (Manufacturing)
- 6 • Site Plan Approval
- 7 - Commercial expansions greater than 500 square feet
- 8 • Showed an aerial image and zoning map of the property
- 9 • Showed the proposed site plan
- 10 • Said the applicant would need to provide a planting plan and colors for the proposed
- 11 materials of the building
- 12 • Showed the building elevations

13  
14 Commissioner Murray asked to look at the aerial image again and asked if the property to the  
15 north of the subject property included the existing house. Mr. Stoddard confirmed that it did.  
16 Commissioner Murray asked if both parcels were owned by the same person. Mr. Stoddard  
17 replied that both were owned by the same person, but that Penguin Insulation was under contract  
18 to purchase the parcel that their building was on. Richard Higginson, the applicant, confirmed  
19 that they were under contract to purchase the parcel. He said that at this time they weren't  
20 purchasing the property with the house.

21  
22 Commissioner Fullmer asked if there should be any concerns with the use relative to noxious  
23 noise, pollution, or fumes. Mr. Stoddard replied that they were currently operating out of the  
24 building, and that he was unaware of any complaints of that nature. He stated that the business  
25 they were expanding was a permitted use in the M-1 Zone.

26  
27 **Commissioner Ratchford moved to approve the site plan request by Penguin Insulation,**  
28 **based on the findings of the staff report and the following conditions.**

- 29 1. **Site Plan approval is subject to North Davis Fire District review and approval.**
- 30 2. **The Site Plan shall meet all engineering standards and requirements as outlined in**
- 31 **the engineering letter dated November 23rd, 2022.**
- 32 3. **The plans shall be revised to include colors for the building materials.**
- 33 4. **A landscape planting plan will need to be submitted that shows the following:**
  - 34 a. **Locations of all existing trees and shrubs.**
  - 35 b. **Locations, plant names, and install size for any new plantings.**
- 36 5. **The applicant shall obtain a building permit and the project shall comply with all**
- 37 **applicable building code standards.**

38 **Seconded by Commissioner DeSpain. The motion carried on the following vote. Voting**  
39 **AYE: Commissioners Uccardi, Murray, Browning, Fullmer, Ratchford, DeSpain, and**  
40 **Mortensen. Voting NO: None.**

41  
42 DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF SP 2022-110146, A SITE PLAN REQUEST BY JARED  
43 SCHOFIELD WITH JENNMAR TO CONSTRUCT A 12,000 SQUARE FOOT STORAGE  
44 BUILDING AT THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. LOCATION: 635 SOUTH 175 EAST (TIN: 12-  
45 821-0002). PARCEL AREA: 0.67 ACRES. ZONE: M-1 (MANUFACTURING). STAFF:  
46 TYSON STODDARD, PLANNER I (ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION).

1  
2 Tyson Stoddard, Planner I, presented the following:

- 3 • Jennmar- manufacturing company
- 4 • Created the lot in 2014
- 5 • Proposed storage building- 12,000 square feet
- 6 • Zoning was M-1 (Manufacturing)
- 7 • Site Plan Approval
- 8 - New building construction in the M-1 Zone
- 9 • Showed a zoning map of the subject property and surrounding area
- 10 • Showed the proposed site plan
- 11 • Showed the proposed landscape plan
- 12 • Showed the building elevations and talked about primary building material requirements

13  
14 Commissioner Browning asked about the expansion of the business. Crystal Roth, a  
15 representative from Jennmar, replied that they had outgrown their building and needed more  
16 room to store their product. Commissioner Browning joked that they would have to hire more  
17 people. Ms. Roth responded that it was all storage so they probably wouldn't have to hire more.  
18

19 Commissioner Murray asked how one would get to the proposed building from the existing  
20 building. Mr. Stoddard replied that just north of the proposed building was an asphalt drive and  
21 parking area for the existing building. He said that the asphalt area would be expanded to provide  
22 access to the new building.  
23

24 **Commissioner Murray moved to approve the site plan request by Jennmar to construct a**  
25 **12,000 square foot storage building at the subject location, subject to the findings of the**  
26 **staff report and the following conditions.**

- 27 1. **Site Plan approval is subject to North Davis Fire District review and approval.**
- 28 2. **The Site Plan shall meet all engineering standards and requirements as outlined in**  
29 **the engineering letter dated November 23rd, 2022.**
- 30 3. **The building materials shall meet the minimum standards as established in 11-18-**  
31 **7(C) of the City Code.**
- 32 4. **Any signs must meet Chapter 11-15 "Sign Regulations" standards of the City Code.**  
33 **Signs are not included as part of this Site Plan approval. Separate review and**  
34 **approval will be required.**
- 35 5. **Any outdoor storage shall meet all standards as established in Chapter 11-13**  
36 **"Supplementary Regulations" of the City Code.**
- 37 6. **The applicant shall obtain a building permit and the project shall comply with all**  
38 **applicable building code standards.**

39 **Seconded by Commissioner Ratchford. The motion carried on the following vote. Voting**  
40 **AYE: Commissioners Uccardi, Murray, Browning, Fullmer, Ratchford, DeSpain, and**  
41 **Mortensen. Voting NO: None.**  
42

43 APPROVAL OF A PROPOSED PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE FOR  
44 THE 2023 CALENDAR YEAR. STAFF: BRAD MCILRATH, SENIOR PLANNER  
45 (ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION).  
46

1 Mr. McIlrath stated that there would not be a meeting scheduled for January 4, 2023, because  
2 staff didn't receive any applications before the deadline. He then asked for any questions or  
3 feedback from the Commission.  
4

5 Commissioner Fullmer asked about January 18, 2023, raising the possibility of people being out  
6 of town because of Martin Luther King Day. Mr. McIlrath replied that there had been  
7 development review meetings and there would likely be applications, but staff had yet to process  
8 an application that would go on the meeting for the January 18, 2023.  
9

10 Commissioner Fullmer also asked about July 5, 2023. and if everyone would want to have a  
11 meeting the day after the 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebrations. Discussion followed amongst the Commission,  
12 with no one expressing a strong desire to cancel the meeting.  
13

14 **Commissioner Murray moved to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Schedule for**  
15 **the 2023 Calendar Year. Seconded by Commissioner Ratchford. The motion carried on the**  
16 **following vote. Voting AYE: Commissioners Uccardi, Murray, Browning, Fullmer,**  
17 **Ratchford, DeSpain, and Mortensen. Voting NO: None.**  
18

#### 19 STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

  
20

21 Mr. McIlrath informed the Commission about the Holiday Party in January and welcomed any  
22 that would like to attend.  
23

#### 24 COMMISSIONERS MINUTE

  
25

26 Chair Uccardi: Thanked everyone for their willingness to be here and said he looked forward to  
27 seeing everyone at the next meeting on December 21, 2022.  
28

29 Commissioner Murray: Nothing.  
30

31 Commissioner Browning: Thanked staff and wished everyone a happy new year.  
32

33 Commissioner Fullmer: Talked about December 7, 1941 being the day that the United States  
34 entered WWII and expressed gratitude for the military service of all those who served and  
35 sacrificed.  
36

37 Commissioner Ratchford: Said the holiday decorations in front of City Hall looked great.  
38

39 Commissioner DeSpain: Nothing.  
40

41 Commissioner Mortensen: Thanked staff.  
42

43 There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, **Chair Uccardi moved**  
44 **to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Murray.**