6:00 p.m. – Planning Commission Work Session Meeting (City Offices)
The purpose of the work session is to review maps, plans, paperwork, etc. No motions or
decisions will be considered during this session, which is open to the public.

Planning Commission Work Session Items - Planning Commission Training to be determined

6:30 p.m. – Planning Commission Meeting (Council Chambers)

A. Welcome & Roll Call

B. Open Communications
   (This is an opportunity to address the Planning Commission regarding your
   concerns or ideas. Please try to limit your comments to three minutes.)

C. Presentations and Reports

D. Consent Items
   1. Consideration of Meeting Minutes from:
      October 25, 2016 Work Session
      October 25, 2016 Regular Meeting

E. Action Items
   1. Consideration of Conditional Use Permit for Maverik, Inc. located at 4104 South
      Riverdale Road, Riverdale, Utah 84405
      Presented by: Mike Eggett, Community Development

F. Discretionary Items

G. Adjournment

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons in need of special accommodation should contact the
City Offices (801) 394-5541 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

Certificate of Posting
The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted
within the Riverdale City limits on this 18th day of November, 2016 at the following locations: 1) Riverdale City Hall
Noticing Board 2) the City website at http://www.riverdalecity.com/ and 3) the Public Notice Website:
http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html. A copy was also provided to the Standard-examiner on November 18, 2016.
Jackie Manning
Riverdale City Recorder
AGENDA ITEM: D

SUBJECT:  Consideration of meeting minutes for the prior Planning Commission Meeting held on October 25, 2016.

PRESENTER: Jackie Manning, City Recorder

ACTION REQUESTED: Consideration of approval.

INFORMATION:  

a. Work Session Meeting Planning Commission Minutes 10/25/16

b. Regular Meeting Planning Commission Minutes 10/25/16

BACK TO AGENDA
Minutes of the \textbf{Work Session} of the Riverdale City Planning Commission held Tuesday, October 25, 2016, at 6:00 PM, at the Civic Center in the Administrative Offices, 4600 S Weber River Dr., Riverdale City, Weber County, Utah.

\textbf{Present:} Commissioners: Blair Jones, Vice-Chair  
David Gailey, Commissioner  
Michael Roubinet  
Robert Wingfield, Commissioner  
Excused: Steve Hilton, Chairman  
Kathy Eskelsen, Commissioner  
Lori Fleming, Commissioner  
City Employees: Mike Eggett, Community Development  
Excused: Jackie Manning, City Recorder  
Others Present: Hal Heyman  
Mitch Beckstead  
Konel Banner

Vice-Chair Jones welcomed the Planning Commission members to the Work Session and stated for the record that all were in attendance with the exception of Chairman Hilton, Commissioner Eskelsen, and Commissioner Fleming who were all excused.

\textbf{Presentations and Reports:} Vice-Chair Jones turned the time over to Mr. Eggett who reported the following:

- Maverik continues construction.
- Site Plan Improvements for the old Kia Dealership are moving forward.

\textbf{Consent Items:}

Vice-Chair Jones asked for any changes or corrections to the meeting minutes for Regular and Work Session Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, for the September 13, 2016 meeting. There were no changes/corrections requested.

\textbf{Action Items:}

Vice-Chair Jones invited discussion regarding the first action item, consideration of rezone request for properties located at approximately 1378 West Ritter Drive from Agricultural Zone (A-1) to Single-Family Residential Zone (R-1-6); and make a zoning recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Eggett stated the applicants would like to show a presentation of their design for the proposed subdivision prior to the public hearing. A copy of the presentation was retained for public record. Mr. Eggett reminded the Planning Commissioners that this discussion was for the rezone, not the actual subdivision design/layout. Mr. Eggett read the executive summary and noted all state laws and the city ordinances were met in noticing this rezone.

Vice-Chair Jones invited discussion regarding the second action item, Consideration of Site Plan Amendment for Cutrubus Wasatch Front Kia located at approximately 770 West Riverdale Road, Riverdale, Utah 84405.

Mr. Eggett read the executive summary and noted the multiple department head comments and concerns as listed in the department reports. Mr. Eggett stated the applicant has presented updated plans that have attempted to address those concerns. The department heads have not had an opportunity to review the updated plans as of yet. The updated plans were distributed for review to the Planning Commissioners and a copy was retained for public record.

Mr. Eggett referred to the City Attorney and City Administrator comments, as displayed on the executive summary, which expressed caution to the Planning Commissioners regarding moving this project forward with the current number of outstanding items. Mr. Eggett explained the updated plans, according to the applicant, has addressed most if not all the concerns/outstanding items. It was clarified this site plan would be phase three for this overall development. There was clarification as to the exact location of the project.

\textbf{Discretionary Items:}

Vice-Chair Jones invited discussion regarding discretionary items and there were none.

\textbf{Adjourn:}

Having no further business to discuss the Planning Commission adjourned at 6:11 PM to convene into their Regular Planning Commission Meeting located in the Council Chambers.
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Riverdale City Planning Commission held Tuesday, October 25, 2016, at 6:30 PM, at the Civic Center, 4600 S Weber River Dr., Riverdale City, Weber County, Utah.

Present: Commissioners: Blair Jones, Vice-Chair
David Gailey, Commissioner
Lori Fleming, Commissioner
Michael Roubinet, Commissioner
Robert Wingfield, Commissioner

City Employees: Mike Eggett, Community Development

Excused: Steve Hilton, Chairman
Kathy Eskelsen, Commissioner
Jackie Manning, City Recorder

Visitors: Hal Heyman Mitch Beckstead Konel Banner
dave Pierson Jim Hansen Mauren Stoffele
Jane Hall Nancy Eskel Roy Miller
Claudia Reeves Dianne Copps Camille Gilmore
Mike Davis Sterling Bennion Phillip Layton
Howard Dickson Dee Neilson Connie Sherman
Hank Crogin Jean Hansen Marion Griffiths
Camille Gilmore

This is not a complete list of those in attendance. Some of the names listed on the visitor sign in sheet were unreadable and some of the audience members did not sign in.

A. Welcome & Roll Call

Vice-Chair Jones welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated for the record that all members of the Planning Commission were present, with the exception of Chairman Hilton and Commissioner Eskelsen who are excused.

B. Open Communications

Vice-Chair Jones asked for any open communications and there were not any.

C. Presentations and Reports

Vice-Chair Jones turned the time over to Mr. Eggett who reported the following:
1. Maverik is continuing construction.
2. The site near Maverik is moving forward in development.

D. Consent Items
1. Consideration of meeting minutes from the Planning Commission Meeting held on September 13, 2016.

Vice-Chair Jones asked for changes or corrections to the Planning Commission meeting minutes for the September 13, 2016 Work Session and Regular Meeting. There were no corrections/changes requested.

MOTION: Commissioner Fleming moved to approve consent items meeting minutes as written. Commissioner Wingfield seconded the motion.

There was no discussion regarding this motion.

CALL THE QUESTION: The motion passed unanimously in favor of approving the minutes.

E. Action Items
1. a. Public Hearing: Consideration of Rezone request for properties located at approximately 1378 West Ritter Drive from Agricultural Zone (A-1) to Single-Family Residential Zone (R-1-6).

Mr. Eggett summarized an executive summary which explained:

American Landmark Group LLC, the petitioner in this matter, is requesting a rezone of properties located at approximately 1378 West Ritter Drive from the current Agricultural (A-1) zone to a proposed Single-Family Residential (R-
1-6) zoning to allow for potential future subdivision development opportunities for these properties. Additionally, there is a small parcel of property on the corner of Ritter Drive and 1500 West that is owned by Riverdale City and is proposed to be included with this rezone request. This request is for approximately 10.29 acres of land that would be affected by the proposed rezone request (see the attached zoning map document for more information). As required by State Code and to allow for public commentary, a public hearing has been noticed and scheduled to receive and consider public comment on the proposed amendment to the zoning map. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission may make a recommendation to the City Council regarding this rezone request.

Title 10 Ordinance Guidelines (Code Reference)
This rezone request is regulated under Code City 10-5 "Zone Requests" and is affected by City Codes 10-8 "Agricultural Zones (A-1)" and 10-10-9B "Single-Family Residential Zones (R-1-10, R-1-8, R-1-6, R-1-4.5)".

The petitioner’s properties are currently listed in the County Records under the ownership of Howard C Coleman Family Trust, Howards Land LLC, and Riverdale City. These Coleman Family properties are currently being utilized as agricultural and grazing use properties and have been operating in this fashion for many years. At current time the zoning is compatible with the current use on the site.

American Landmark Group has entered into a purchase agreement with the Coleman Family for the properties affected by this petition. American Landmark Group representatives have indicated that the group’s intent for the properties is to potentially subdivide the properties into single-family residential lots that could be accessible from 1500 West, Ritter Drive, and 1250 West respectively.

The appropriate application and supporting documentation have been submitted and provided to the Planning Commission for review (please see attached documentation). This request for rezone is in agreement with the General Plan for this location as this property is established in the General Plan Land Use section as Residential – Low Density.

Hal Heyman and Mitch Beckstead, partners to the American Landmark Group, discussed their developments throughout Utah. Mr. Heyman showed a presentation showing a draft of the potential subdivision layout. The square footage of the proposed lots would range between 6,000 to 10,000. The presentation showed potential designs for the homes within the subdivision. It would be an integrated subdivision for single family dwellings. There would be no town homes. Mr. Heyman stated they have been in business for over 40 years, and discussed the various projects in which he has been involved throughout Utah and the United States.

Mr. Heyman discussed research regarding today's buyers who showed active adults, 55 years and higher which consume over 50 million houses are selling larger homes for smaller homes. Average home buyer is seeking approximately 1900 square foot living space in their homes. Mr. Heyman stated they pay companies to do this research for them. Younger families are also seeking smaller homes, as a means to reduce debt and allow for a quicker resale. Research also shows families are more inclined to live in the metropolitan areas versus the suburbs. They felt this property offers potential to fulfill this research.

Mr. Heyman discussed the Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC&R’s). He stated the CC&R’s would be upscale homes, with finer inside finishings while maintaining building diversity. There would be maintenance and landscaping requirements as well. Mr. Heyman referred to the design samples as seen in the presentation. The frontage would have mixed set-backs. He re-emphasized the lot size variations and stated he has already received interested parties for building lots for this project. Mr. Heyman stated he would be moving into this subdivision. Mr. Beckstead discussed the marquis theme for this proposed subdivision.

MOTION: Commissioner Fleming made a motion to open the public hearing. Commissioner Roubinet seconded the motion; and all voted in favor.

Sterling Bennion, stated he has been a Riverdale City resident for 30 years. He stated he has watched traffic grow on Ritter Drive. He discussed the traffic on Ritter Drive and felt nothing was being done about the traffic issue. He stated something needed to be done before any additional homes were built in that area.

Mr. Bennion commented on the lot sizes of 6,000 square feet and noted that it was less than a seventh of an acre. He felt they were small lots with too many homes too close to each other. He used Salt Lake City as a comparison for home proximity. He felt this subdivision would hurt the current home values. He would prefer a lot size minimum of 8,000 square feet.

Jean Hansen, 1345 W 5450 S in Riverdale, stated she is a resident and a local business owner in Riverdale City. She stated she has lived in Riverdale 18 years and has watched this area develop. She expressed how much she liked her home which had a lot size conducive to the needs of her family size, as well as not having neighbors too close in proximity to her home. She felt this new subdivision would be a "traffic headache" and didn’t like the number of people this new subdivision would bring into the neighborhood. She stated the business Bravo Arts Academy already increased the traffic in the area. She felt the intersection located near the Larry H Miller car dealership was not designed in a way to accommodate heavy traffic. She stated she had to use alternative traveling routes that add additional time to her commute.
Ms. Hansen discussed her business located in Riverdale City and the difficulties of her delivery drivers dropping off supplies at the office due to the heavy traffic. She felt the new subdivision was high density housing and compared the square footage to her 14,000 square foot lot.

Jane Hall, 1265 W 5175 S, Riverdale, stated her backyard is adjacent to the new proposed subdivisions. She stated she did not receive notification regarding this proposed subdivision. Mr. Eggett clarified the state code noticing requirements. She expressed it would have been nice to receive notification because her property is adjacent to the proposed subdivision. Mr. Eggett noted he did not receive any phone calls or written concerns regarding this rezoning request. Ms. Hall felt the rezoning sign that was placed on the property should be larger as well because it is too small to read.

Ms. Hall asked for clarification regarding the zone, R-1-6. Mr. Eggett explained the R-1-6 would allow 6,000 square foot lot size minimums. He stated the applicant could go as large as they wanted in regards to lot size, this just provides a minimum. Vice-Chair Jones further clarified tonight is a rezoning only. This is not a subdivision or site plan approval, which would occur at a future meeting.

Ms. Hall discussed the traffic on 5175 South. She felt the businesses along that area have increased the traffic. She agreed with the comments already made. She expressed concern regarding water pressure and discussed the impact that adding 50 new homes would have on the already minimal water pressure. She felt there would need to be additional sewer/water infrastructure improvements before the City could accommodate the new buildings.

Ms. Hall discussed the rezoning that accommodated the businesses near 1500 West and felt the concerns were the same at the time the rezone was requested for those businesses. She asked the Planning Commissioners to be cautious regarding this rezone request, because it would impact the neighbors within that area. She expressed 50 homes is too many.

Marion Griffiths, 5352 S 1345 W, Riverdale, stated the rezone sign was on Coleman’s Lane and not on Ritter Drive. She stated she moved the sign because she felt the placement would only allow for limited viewing. Mr. Eggett explained two signs were placed on the site by an employee.

Ms. Griffiths stated she is also concerned about the tentative design plan that was presented and the potential for it to change. Ms. Griffiths stated she wanted to see every proposal the applicant would consider. Ms. Griffiths discussed Coleman Lane and its small size. She felt additional traffic would be problematic for the children that live on that road. She felt the road needed to be widened.

Ms. Griffiths discussed the accidents that have occurred on Ritter Drive. She felt the additional homes and added traffic would be dangerous. She discussed Park City and stated she would not want to live there due to the congestion of homes. She didn’t want Riverdale City to become similar to Park City.

Camille Gilmore, lives near Golden Spike Park in Riverdale City, discussed concern regarding the potential for increased traffic. She discussed her recent visit to Park City and explained it is a tourist town, as where Riverdale City is a family town.

Ms. Gilmore didn’t want close proximity homes. She stated she has been a resident for 22 years and likes the country feel of Riverdale City. She didn’t want 50 additional homes and described Ritter Drive as a “nightmare”.

Mike Davis, 1175 West Ritter Drive, Riverdale, stated the plan looks OK and he would be open to new neighbors, but expressed concern regarding the increase in traffic. He discussed the local businesses in that area such as the car dealership and Harley Davidson Motorcycle and felt that has added to the increase in traffic.

Mr. Davis expressed concern regarding the amount of new homes proposed in that area. He stated he didn’t know if he would mind the additional traffic of new neighbors if the City figured out how to mitigate the impact of the existing businesses. He felt the businesses were more impactful than the proposed homes would be. Mr. Davis specifically discussed Bravo Arts Academy, which makes it difficult to even exit your driveway during certain times of the day. He put more emphasis on the traffic concern.

Mr. Eggett discussed the potential for a round-about in that area to assist in traffic calming measures. He stated they have received funds for the round-about project, they are just waiting for the funds to be released from the regional council. Mr. Eggett discussed roundabouts and how they calm traffic. Mr. Davis expressed concern regarding the round-about idea and didn’t feel it would calm traffic.

Connie Sherman, lives in Ritter Drive in Riverdale, asked if they could reduce the amount of homes they were proposing to 20 instead of 50. Ms. Sherman stated that area is similar to the country not a big collaboration of homes. Ms. Sherman agreed with the sentiments expressed regarding water pressure issues. She stated it’s difficult to back out of her driveway. She asked that the Planning Commissioners keep that in mind, as well as the traffic issues.
Roy Miller, lives on Ritter Drive in Riverdale, and discussed the previously approved Pinebrook Subdivision and the proposed 77 homes on 6,000 square foot lots. He felt larger lots would be better suited for Riverdale. He stated he owns 12 properties in Riverdale and wants to keep it nice.

Richard Copps, Realtor who represents the Coleman Family, thanked the residents who live in this area for attending the public hearing and doing their civic duty. He stated he has known the Coleman Family for 40 years, with this project being in the works for 2 years. He discussed his conversations with Mike Eggett in regards to the best interest for the City regarding the Coleman property. He stated he has had 4 developers contact him regarding placing multi-family housing in that area, and he declined their offers. The Coleman Family expressed wanting to give something back to the area. Mr. Copps discussed the conceptual design plan that was presented by the rezone applicants and he explained only 20 percent of the homes were 6,000 square feet. He discussed the proposed road improvements including a four way stop leading out of the subdivision. Several members of the audience spoke out asking for clarification as to the location of the four way stop. Mr. Copps stated there was a time when he too lived on Ritter Drive at the Coleman Farm. Mr. Eggett clarified the City has not taken a definitive stance regarding a four way stop.

Mr. Copps further explained the smaller lots about the commercial zone. He felt this subdivision would attract a 55 year old type community. A member of the audience spoke out stating there was no way to know the type of home buyers that would move into this proposed subdivision. Mr. Eggett reminded the public this was a public hearing and asked that dialogue exchanges not be made between audience members to ensure everyone who wishes to make a comment has a chance to comment at the microphone. He explained the comments should be addressed to the Planning Commission and not the audience. Mr. Copps encouraged the residents to review the conceptual design plans that were available to the public.

Mr. Heyman discussed the conceptual design and stated there is still work to be done in working with the City Engineer. He further explained no developer would have a definitive site plan at the beginning stages of a rezone request. He will continue to work with City Staff to address traffic concerns and implement traffic calming measures. On the conceptual design presented, Mr. Heyman stated the outlets for the subdivision were at City Staff recommendation.

Jean Hansen asked if she could speak again and was permitted by Vice-Chair Jones. Ms. Hansen stated the neighbors were aware that additional homes would be built on the Coleman property eventually. She discussed Pinebrook Subdivision and explained there were 31 homes near the church, beginning at Ritter Drive all the way to 1350 West. She estimated the lot sizes in that area to range from 11,000 to 15,000 square feet. She stated the main concern is the change to the neighborhood due to the amount of homes proposed. She felt the residents didn’t mind the property being developed, but rather the main concern was the amount of homes in that area.

Ms. Hansen explained Ritter Drive divides the neighborhood in half. She explained she fought with Weber County School district to move a bus stop that used to be on 1350 West and Ritter Drive. She discussed accidents she has witnessed in that area. She discussed children crossing Ritter Drive to go to friend’s houses. She reiterated the main concern were the current traffic patterns and the amount of homes being proposed in that area.

Mr. Eggett thanked the residents for expressing their concerns regarding Ritter Drive, but explained the Planning Commission do not have the discretion to address issues with Ritter Drive. He further explained the City Administration, as well as the Mayor and the City Engineer have been actively pursuing possible solutions for traffic calming measures along Ritter Drive. He explained the conceptual design plan is not set in stone at this point. He reminded the residents that change to the neighborhood due to the amount of homes proposed. She felt the residents didn’t mind the property being developed, but rather the main concern was the amount of homes in that area.

Mr. Beckstead explained this is just the first step in the rezone process. They have done their market studies. They want to make this subdivision work for the neighborhood and provide better road connectivity.

Jane Hall readdressed the Planning Commissioners regarding her earlier comments pertaining to infrastructure. She asked who made sewer and water infrastructure improvements. Mr. Eggett explained the Public Works Director, Shawn Douglas, would oversee the sewer and water infrastructure needs. Mr. Eggett further explained the sewer and water infrastructure would be discussed/addressed during the site plan review of this subdivision in the future.

MOTION: Commissioner Fleming made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Wingfield seconded the motion; and all voted in favor.

b. Make a Zoning Recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Roubinet asked if the rezone request could be contingent upon impact and traffic studies. Mr. Eggett believed the Planning Commission could recommend what they like to the City Council, and it would be at the City Council’s discretion as how to proceed with the recommendation. Vice-Chair Jones further explained the Planning Commission tonight is only making recommendation on the rezone, not the conceptual design or any street layouts. Mr. Eggett added this is solely rezone. A resident spoke out and stated if they zone the R-1-6 the applicants would be able to build on 6,000 square foot lots. Mr. Eggett confirmed.
Commissioner Gailey disclosed he lives along Ritter Drive and discussed the difficulty of backing out of his driveway. He further explained that tonight’s discussion should be regarding the legal rezone request.

Commissioner Fleming stated she is a real estate agent. She stated her biggest concern would be in regards to 1250 West. She expressed concern regarding water and sewer to meet the neighborhood’s needs. She didn’t feel there was enough information at this point to make the decision in rezing this property R-1-6 without knowing what the City will do with Ritter Drive. She stated she understands that Ritter Drive is not the topic of discussion, but she felt this subdivision would impact Ritter Drive. She acknowledged and agreed with the applicant’s earlier market research in relation to the lot sizes and home styles that current buyers are seeking, but felt this rezone was premature without knowing the impact of Ritter Drive.

Mr. Eggett clarified with any development of the Coleman property regardless of the lot size minimum, the full road would need to be completed and it would be the developers responsibility. The City would not install curb, gutter sidewalk, but the developer would. Which in turn would create a safer access through this area. He further explained the development of the Coleman property would be a part of the overall solution to make that area safer for Ritter Drive.

Commissioner Fleming discussed Ritter Drive in relation to the assisted living facility that is developing as well as the discussion as to whether or not to open Ritter Drive (in relation to the section that is one way street). Commissioner Fleming disclosed she lives in the area and will eventually inherit a property along Ritter Drive. She inquired about the Homeowners Association that was referenced by the applicants for this development. Mr. Eggett explained all roads within the development are City roads and will be maintained as City roads per the City ordinance. There will not be private roads within this subdivision.

Commissioner Fleming referred to the concept designs of the homes and asked about the square footage. Mr. Heyman responded 1900 square feet for the first floor and confirmed it would meet the cities set-backs. Commissioner Fleming asked what the anticipated cost for homes would be and asked if the applicants would build the homes. Mr. Beckstead responded there will be CC&R’s to mitigate the design standards. He stated with regards to pricing it would range from $300,000 to $350,000 for the smaller homes. He stated it is difficult to know the exact price at this moment in time.

Commissioner Fleming discussed a home on 1350 West down the street that is 4400 square feet and explained the owners had difficulty selling the property for $389,000. She expressed concern regarding the type of buyer for these proposed homes might attract. Mr. Beckstead discussed the study done for this area by a company called Metro, which was the driving factor behind the mixed lot sizes for this development. Commissioner Fleming discussed another property in Riverdale that is located on the east bench that is 1900 square feet being listed as $240,000 which is struggling to sell. She wanted to ensure the developers are looking out for the neighbors. Mr. Beckstead stated they would adjust the lot sizes for the buyer’s market. Mr. Beckstead stated they will be phasing the subdivision.

Mr. Heyman discussed his conversations with the Public Works Director, Shawn Douglas, in relation to road connectivity and explained he is relying on Mr. Douglas’s knowledge to help improve the area. Commissioner Fleming asked if 1250 West would be widened. Mr. Heyman explained the widening of the road has not been part of the discussion and they are working closely with the City to meet the requirements for that area. There was a discussion regarding widening 1250 West. Mr. Heyman reemphasized the road adjustments will be made during the design application. This was a conceptual drawing only. Commissioner Fleming asked if the applicants were prepared to reduce their lot sizes to accommodate road infrastructure. Mr. Heyman stated there still needs to be a water flow study, which may impact how many lots they propose.

Commissioner Roubinet discussed the difficulty of making a recommendation for this rezone in relation to meeting the needs of the residents and the applicants. He asked about the possibility of tabling the discussion. Mr. Eggett stated if this was tabled the next available meeting would be November 22, 2016, due to the Election on November 8, 2016.

Commissioner Fleming asked if there would be more information presented to the City Council than what was given to the Planning Commissioners to make a decision. Mr. Eggett stated what was provided in the packet meets the City’s ordinance for a rezone application; so unless the applicant wished to present additional information it would be virtually the same. Mr. Eggett stated the recommendation made by the Planning Commission would also be presented to the City Council.

There was a clarification for lot size minimums in relation to developments. Mr. Eggett stated the Planning Commission could recommend to make a different zoning recommendation to the City Council if they felt the lot size minimum was too low. Commissioner Fleming discussed the option of recommending the rezone as R-1-8. Mr. Eggett clarified the applicant would still be requesting the R-1-6, but the Planning Commission’s recommendation of the R-1-8 would also be presented to the City Council. The City Council has the final decision regarding this matter. Commissioner Fleming didn’t feel they had enough information to make a recommendation, but perhaps the City Council will have additional information as well as the advice and assistance of the City Attorney to help them in making a final decision. Mr. Eggett explained the difference between a rezone application versus a subdivision application and the different required information as they pertain to the applications.

MOTION: Commissioner Gailey moved to recommend approval to the City Council regarding the rezone for properties located at approximately 1378 West Ritter Drive from Agricultural
The General Plan use for this area is currently set as “Planned Commercial Districts); the applicant should be directed to adhere to this Code when contemplating updated or new signage.

In addition to the Amended Site Plan documentation, there is an updated interior building design and layout, a packet of the amended site plan drawings (that were updated on October 20, 2016), and a Wasatch Front Kia Design Guide packet illustrating required updated styles and design elements for the updates to the Cutrubus Cadillac building and site area.

Signage for the site is regulated per City Code 10-16 (specifically section 8.(B.) for Commercial and Manufacturing Districts); the applicant should be directed to adhere to this Code when contemplating updated or new signage.

General Plan Guidance (Section Reference)
The General Plan use for this area is currently set as “Planned Commercial - High” and this proposed project would comply with this land use.

Mr. Eggett explained the Design Review Committee provided a favorable review of this project. Mr. Eggett noted the comments made by the City Attorney in relation to the number of outstanding items and specified the issues would need to be addressed prior to approval of this project. The City Administrator had similar comments. Mr. Eggett referred to the outstanding items as shown in the site plan review and the department staff reports. Mr. Eggett highlighted the public works director staff report regarding outstanding items. Mr. Eggett stated he has been given updated drawings, which were retained for the record.

Commissioner Fleming clarified this application was a remodel, not a new building. Dave Pierson, representative for the applicant, confirmed it was a remodel. He discussed the needs for the Kia Dealership remodel. Commissioner Roubinet asked if the applicant was aware of the outstanding items, and Mr. Pierson confirmed. Mr. Pierson explained the time frame for this development in relation to working with H&P Investments and the Kia Dealership. Mr. Pierson stated they are actively working to address the City’s concerns. Mr. Pierson discussed water retention standards and explained his plans for retention improvements. He felt confident the application would be ready for City Council in relation to staff’s
concerns, as most have been addressed since the packet submittal.

Mr. Pierson discussed the site lighting and provided clarification regarding the proposed plan. There was a discussion regarding whether this car dealership would include Cadillac and the answer was unknown.

MOTION: Commissioner Fleming moved to recommend approval to the City Council for the Site Plan Amendment for Cutrubus Wasatch Front Kia located at approximately 770 West Riverdale Road, Riverdale, Utah 84405, contingent upon all the outstanding items being addressed. Commissioner Wingfield seconded the motion.

There was no discussion regarding this motion.

CALL THE QUESTION: The motion passed unanimously in favor of recommending approval to the City Council.

F. Discretionary Items

Commissioner Gailey commented on the conceptual subdivision that was included in the rezone request and discussed access for fire trucks. Mr. Eggett discussed the conversations taken place with the Coleman Family Representatives, the City Engineer, and other City staff in relation to Ritter Drive and traffic calming measures. He further explained this design presented was conceptual and the City staff will continue working with the applicants to ensure all the traffic issues are addressed. Commissioner Fleming felt the conceptual site plan would have been helpful to be included in the packet. Mr. Eggett stated for the record that City Staff did not make a recommendation to the applicants regarding which zone they should apply for. Mr. Eggett stated he did not receive any phone calls or written concerns regarding this rezone request. Mr. Eggett stated he directed caution to the applicants regarding the zone they requested indicating the residents may not like the lot sizes.

G. Adjournment

MOTION: There being no further business to discuss, Commissioner Fleming moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Roubinet seconded the motion; all voted in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 7:33 PM.
AGENDA ITEM: E

SUBJECT: Consideration of conditional use permit for Maverik, Inc. located at 4104 South Riverdale Road, Utah 84405.

PRESENTER: Mike Eggett, Community Development

ACTION REQUESTED: Consideration of approval.

INFORMATION:

a. Executive Summary

b. Application

c. Elevation and Building Plan

BACK TO AGENDA
Maverik, Inc, as represented by Elizabeth Hunt, has filed for a conditional use permit to request a conversion of the current Lighthouse Chevron Convenience Store and Fueling Station at 4104 South Riverdale Road to a Maverik Convenience Store and Fueling Station. This property is located in a Community Commercial Zone (C-2) and, per the listed permitted and conditional uses of the zone, this conversion is subject to a conditional use review as a gas island and convenience store use. This required review allows the Planning Commission to look at any outstanding health, safety, and welfare concerns that may exist in association with the continued use in a C-2 zone. The previous owner and establishment of the Lighthouse Chevron has received a Conditional Use Permit approval for this location; however, the City Attorney requested that the new owner follow through with a Conditional Use Permit review to check for any updated concerns or impacts to neighboring residential areas due to the proposed changes to the current business establishment and building. Following the presentation and discussion of the proposal, the Planning Commission may make a motion to approve the requested Conditional Use Permit request, approve with proposed amendments, or not approve the Conditional Use permit request for this ownership transition and building conversion, subject to the application of appropriate findings of fact for supporting the decision.

This Conditional Use Permit request is regulated under City Code 10-10A "Commercial Zones (C-1, C-2, C-3)" and 10-19 "Conditional Uses".

This property has historically been used as the Lighthouse Chevron Convenience Store and Fueling Station. Maverik, Inc is in the process of purchasing the property from the current owners and will transition the site and building to a Maverik Convenience Store and Fueling Station, as noted above. Documentation showing the proposed building and site conversion plan has been provided in this packet following this executive summary document. The application for conditional use review and the applicants reasoning to support the approval have also been provided in this packet.

City Staff is not aware of any concerns with the current operation of the site as a Chevron Convenience Store and Fueling Station. There also does not appear to be future concerns associated with the transition of the site to a Maverik Store.

The Planned Commercial zone standard outlining the need for a conditional use permit is as follows (for more information regarding this zone please defer to City 10-10B):

**10-10B-2: USE REGULATIONS:**

Any permitted use or any conditional use allowed in the C-1, C-2 and C-3 zones shall be a conditional use in their respective CP-1, CP-2 or CP-3 zone; provided, that a conditional use permit is obtained as provided in chapter 19 of this title. Such uses shall be indicated on the final development plan. (1985 Code § 19-24-2)
The Conditional Use Permit outlines the criteria for issuing a Conditional Use approval as follows:

10-19-5: BASIS FOR REVIEW OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

The planning commission shall review a conditional use permit with evidence presented to establish that:

A. A conditional use shall be approved if reasonable conditions are proposed or can be imposed to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards.

B. If the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of a proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated by the proposal or the imposition of reasonable conditions to achieve compliance with applicable standards, the conditional use may be denied.

C. The proposed use of the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the community; and

D. Such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case and the conditions imposed, be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of persons nor injurious to property or improvements in the community, but will be compatible with and complementary to the existing surrounding uses, buildings and structures when considering traffic generation, parking, building design and location, landscaping and signs; and

E. The proposed use conforms to the goals, policies and conditions specified in this chapter for such use; and

F. That the proposed use conforms to the goals, policies and governing principles and land use of the master plan for the city; and

G. The proposed use will not lead to the deterioration of the environment, or ecology of the general area, nor will it produce conditions or emit pollutants of such a type or of such a quantity so as to detrimentally affect, to any appreciable degree, public or private property, including the operation of existing uses thereon, in the immediate vicinity or the community or area as a whole. (Ord. 656, 8-19-2008)

Staff would encourage the Planning Commission to review this matter and then discuss these matters with the petitioner. Staff would then recommend that the Planning Commission act accordingly to make a motion to approve the requested Conditional Use Permit request, approve with proposed amendments, or not approve the Conditional Use permit request for this ownership transition and building conversion, subject to the application of appropriate findings of fact for supporting the decision.

General Plan Guidance (Section Reference)

The General Plan has this area listed for Planned Commercial - High uses.

Legal Comments - City Attorney

__________________________
Steve Brooks, Attorney
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
APPLICATION

DATE 8/31/2016
ADDRESS OF SITE 4104 RIVERDALE ROAD
APPLICANT'S NAME MANERIK INC
ADDRESS
PHONE NUMBER

NOTE: Plans: Detailed location, site and building plans shall accompany the completed application forms provided by the city. For structures in existence, only a location plan need be provided.

✓ SITE PLAN RECEIVED  BUILDING PLANS RECEIVED

Present Zoning of the Property: C2 Present Use of the Property: C STORE
Acreage of the Property: 1.81 AC Width of Property on the Street: 
Proposed Conditional Use of Property: C STORE

SIGNED: Todd Meyers DATE: 8/31/16

I authorize Todd Meyers to act as my representative in all matters relating to this application.

OWNER

AGENT AS AUTHORIZED BY OWNER

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHEDULED TO HEAR THIS APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL USE ON:
DATE: 11/22/2016 DECISION OF COMMISSION:
SIGNATURE OF CHAIRPERSON:  DATE:

PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING:
DATE:  DECISION OF COMMISSION:
SIGNATURE OF CHAIRPERSON:  DATE:

Fee $50.00  Date Paid: 11/17/2016  Receipt No. 15-506860

Receipt Submitted: 11/11/2016
RIVERDALE CITY CORPORATION  
4600 SOUTH WEBER RIVER DRIVE  
RIVERDALE UT 84405  

Receipt No: 15.506860  
Nov 17, 2016

MAVERIK, INC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Balance</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS - CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-36-9000 SUNDRY REVENUE</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $50.00

CHECK  
Check No: 190704  
Total Applied: $50.00

Change Tendered: $0.00

Duplicate Copy

11/17/2016 11:00AM
Maverik Store with Fuel Sales
4104 Riverdale, Riverdale Road, Utah

Project Description: The purpose of the application is to change the ownership of an existing retail store with fuel sales to Maverik, Inc.

10-19-5: BASIS FOR REVIEW OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

The planning commission shall review a conditional use permit with evidence presented to establish that:

A. A conditional use shall be approved if reasonable conditions are proposed or can be imposed to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards:

The current use will remain, therefore there aren’t any imposed detrimental effects of the proposed use.

B. If the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of a proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated by the proposal or the imposition of reasonable conditions to achieve compliance with applicable standards, the conditional use may be denied:

There will be no increase of impact on the neighborhood due to the continued use.

C. The proposed use of the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the community:

There will be no change of use to negatively affect the general well-being of the community.

D. Such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case and the conditions imposed, be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of persons nor injurious to property or improvements in the community, but will be compatible with and complementary to the existing surrounding uses, buildings and structures when considering traffic generation, parking, building design and location, landscaping and signs:

There will be no change in site plan layout, parking, building design and location or traffic generation to create any safety and general welfare of person, injuring property or improvements in the community or be a detriment to anyone’s health.

E. The proposed use conforms to the goals, policies and conditions specified in this chapter for such use:

There will be no change in use to deter from goals, policies and conditions specified.
F. That the proposed use conforms to the goals, policies and governing principles and land use of the master plan for the city; and

There will be no change in use to deter goals, policies and governing principles, and land use of the master plan for the city.

G. The proposed use will not lead to the deterioration of the environment, or ecology of the general area, nor will it produce conditions or emit pollutants of such a type or of such a quantity so as to detrimentally affect, to any appreciable degree, public or private property, including the operation of existing uses thereon, in the immediate vicinity or the community or area as a whole. (Ord. 665, 8-19-2008)

There will be no change in use to lead to deterioration of the environment, or ecology of the general area, nor will it produce conditions or emit pollutants to detrimentally affect public or private property.
MAVERIK, INC.
4104 Riverdale Rd
Site Improvement Plans
RIVERDALE, UT
SEPTEMBER 2016

Sheet Index
Sheet C1 - Cover/Index Sheet
Sheet C2 - Legend Existing/Demolition Site Plan
Sheet C3 - Proposed Grading/Utility Site Plan
Sheet C4 - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Exhibit

Engineer's Notice To Contractors

Developer Contact:
Reeve & Associates, Inc.
4104 Riverdale Rd
Riverdale, UT
Ph: (801) 995-5557

Call Underground Locating Services
Prior to Construction