

BOUNTIFUL CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA Tuesday, April 6, 2021 6:30 p.m.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Bountiful City Planning Commission will hold a meeting in the Conference Room, Bountiful City Hall, 795 South Main, Bountiful, Utah, 84010, at the time and on the date given above. The public is invited. Persons who are disabled as defined by the American with Disabilities Act may request an accommodation by contacting the Bountiful Planning Office at 298-6190. Notification at least 24 hours prior to the meeting would be appreciated.

Bountiful City Planning Commission meetings, including this one, are open to the public. In consideration of the COVID-19 Pandemic, Bountiful City will be observing social distancing and may limit the number of people at the meeting. If you would like to submit a comment for the public hearing listed on the agenda below, please e-mail that comment to <u>planning@bountiful.gov</u> prior to the meeting and indicate in the e-mail if you would like your comment read at the meeting; you are also welcome to attend the meeting in person.

- 1. Welcome
- 2. Minutes for March 16, 2021 to be approved at next meeting.
- 3. Conditional Use Permit for a vehicle service business for Take 5 located at 293 West 500 South, Charles Openshaw, owner *City Planner Curtis Poole*
 - (Public Hearing took place on February 16, 2021)
 - a. Action
 - b. Consider drafted approval in written form
- 4. Amended site plan review for Take 5 located at 293 West 500 South, Charles Openshaw, owner *City Planner Curtis Poole*
 - a. Action: Consider forwarding a recommendation to the City Council
- 5. Variance for 30% slope and retaining walls greater than 10' for 27 Bountiful Blvd, Allen Clemons, owner *City Planner Curtis Poole*
 - a. Public Hearing
 - b. Action
 - c. Consider drafted approval in written form
- 6. Adjourn

Planning Commission Staff Report

Subject:	Amended Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit
	Review for a Vehicle Service Business
Author:	Curtis Poole, City Planner
Address:	273 West 500 South
Date:	April 6, 2021



Background

The Applicant, Charlie Openshaw on behalf of CJO Holdings, LLC, requests a conditional use review for a vehicle service business, an express oil change, located at 273 West 500 South. The proposed use will be located within the 5th South Plaza, which is located within the C-G (General Commercial) subzone. 5th South Plaza does not include the Chase Bank property or the Panda Express property. The subject property is surrounded by other commercial uses in the C-G subzone. The new business would be located adjacent to the Panda Express building and across 500 South from the Sinclair convenience store.

The Applicant previously applied for an amended site plan review in 2016. That proposal also showed demolition of the Barbacoa building and replacing it with a 4,000 square foot office building. The Applicant requested a reduction in parking from 201 to 112 stalls. That site plan was reviewed by the Planning Commission and the City Council in December 2016. The Council approved the site plan and reduction in parking. Since that time, no further action was taken by the Applicant on that approval and the application has expired. Bountiful Land Use Code states that site plan approvals expire within one (1) year of the final decision.

The Applicant recently submitted and updated application. The Commission reviewed this item and held a public hearing at its February 16, 2021 meeting. After a discussion of the parking reduction and nonconforming landscaping on the site, the Commission voted to table the item and directed Staff to review the Code to ensure whether it provided the flexibility to approve a nonconforming site plan that decreased the level of nonconformity. The staff report for that meeting is located <u>here</u>.

Staff reviewed the current Code and found the Code did not provide flexibility for applications that would reduce the degree of nonconformity to be approved. Based upon significant research and internal discussions, Staff developed parameters for altering nonconforming uses. This text amendment was presented to the Planning Commission at its March 16, 2021 meeting and was forwarded to the City Council with a positive recommendation on a 6-0 vote. The Council reviewed and approved the text amendment at its March 23, 2021 meeting.

Analysis

The current layout of the property substantially matches what was originally approved as the Fashion Village Mall in 1977. Based upon available information, Staff finds the development met the standards of the 1965 City Code. Other than interior building tenant remodels Staff has found no permits or approvals indicating changes or alterations to landscaping, parking or to change the footprint of the buildings since the development was completed.

During the February 16, 2021 meeting, Staff noted the existence of the landscaping and parking nonconformities for the site. In addition to these nonconformities, Staff has found additional nonconformities that would be eliminated by the alterations proposed by the Applicant. For example, the drive aisle to the east of the Barbacoa building is approximately five feet (5') narrower than is permitted by code and multiple ADA parking stalls do not meet current standards. These nonconformities would be eliminated with the proposed amendment to the site plan.

The amended Land-Use Code states the following regarding nonconformities:

14-2-402 GENERAL PROVISIONS

- A. Continuation. A nonconformity in any zone may be continued as provided so long as no additions or enlargements are made thereto and no structural alterations are made therein, except as provided in this Chapter or as may be required by law. If any nonconformity is removed from the property on which it was located, it shall not be replaced unless it conforms to the current provisions of this Title.
- B. Maintenance and Repair. Repairs and structural alterations may be made to any nonconformity within the existing footprint thereof provided that the degree of nonconformity is not increased.
- C. Alteration and Modification. Any expansion of a nonconformity that increases the degree of nonconformance is prohibited. Alterations, modifications or changes to a noncomplying structure or site or nonconforming use may be allowed only if the proposed alteration, modification or change reduces and mitigates the degree of the existing nonconformity, is in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood and is consistent with the General Plan. When considering if an alteration, modification or change may be approved, the Planning Commission shall consider whether all the following factors are reduced or mitigated, where applicable:
 - 1. Setback restrictions,
 - 2. Height restrictions,
 - 3. Aesthetics,
 - 4. Landscaping,
 - 5. Parking,
 - 6. Traffic and pedestrian circulation

An application to alter, modify or change a nonconforming use or site shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission. For purposes of this Section, the addition of a solar energy device to a building is not an expansion.

Staff finds the following nonconformities pertaining to the 5th South Plaza site:

- 1. Landscaping (currently 7% of the total site should be 15%)
- 2. Drive aisle width (currently 12' should be 15')

...

- 3. Parking requirement (currently 109 stalls should be 210)
- 4. ADA parking (6 stalls do not have minimum 96" access aisle)

Staff further finds the amended site plan application mitigates the degree of the existing nonconformity, is in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood and is consistent with the General Plan and finds the proposal submitted by the Applicant makes substantial improvements to the site because of the following:

- 1. Setback restrictions there are no current setback nonconformities on the site and the proposed structures comply with the current setback standards in the Code.
- 2. Height restrictions there are no current height nonconformities on the site and the proposed structure comply with the current height standards in the Code.
- 3. Aesthetics the proposed application improves the aesthetics of the site by demolishing an old, dilapidated building and provides a new structure that uses building materials that are consistent with the adjacent properties and neighborhood. Additionally, the Applicant proposes an additional 1.5% landscaping to the site.
- 4. Landscaping the proposal does not meet the requirement of fifteen percent (15%); however, the Applicant proposes a 1.5% increase in landscaping and an addition of trees on the site.
- 5. Parking the application decreases the nonconformity in both parking (adding 5 stalls) and provides better ADA compliant stalls. The proposal also includes a change in the parking layout from angled parking to 90-degree parking which would improve circulation. Although the Applicant does not meet the current 215 parking stall requirement under the Code, it does propose 114 stalls, which is an increase of five (5) stalls for the site. Additionally, section 14-18-104, E of the Code authorizes the Land Use Authority to reduce the parking requirement based upon mixed-use or staggered parking intensities. The Applicant has provided a parking study that states the proposed number of 114 stalls exceeds the necessary amount of parking stalls for the site as the study found a peak parking demand of ninety-one (91) vehicles.
- 6. Traffic and pedestrian circulation the proposed traffic circulation would be a substantial improvement because it removes one of the small inefficient drive approaches, eliminates the current one-way traffic flow, eliminates a nonconforming drive aisle and provides better ingress/egress to 500 South. Additionally, the Applicant has suggested a willingness to provide an easement to

the City to the south of the existing building that would provide pedestrian access from 200 West to a park that will be built at the old Washington Elementary School site.

Department Review

This proposal has been reviewed by the Engineering, Planning, Police and Power Departments and by the Fire Marshall and City Attorney.

Significant Impacts

This proposed use is located in an area with urban levels of infrastructure already in place. Redevelopment of properties along the 500 South corridor is critical to the economic stability of Bountiful as it represents a significant portion of the City's commercial inventory. The Applicant proposes to eliminate or reduce nonconformities associated with the site and mitigate ongoing nonconformities.

Recommendation

<u>Conditional Use:</u> Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review and approve the conditional use request for a vehicle services use with the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to applying for a building permit the Applicant shall:
 - a. Show plans to add one (1) street tree between the two (2) proposed drive accesses on 500 South.
 - b. Add shrubs or additional plant material to the landscape buffer between 5th South Plaza and the Panda Express property.

<u>Site Plan and Parking Reduction</u>: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the amended site plan and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the amended site plan, including the parking reduction, with the following conditions:

- 1. Complete all redline correction.
- 2. Coordinate final easement location with Bountiful Light and Power.
- 3. Dumpster enclosure shall match the building material of the proposed Take 5 Oil Change building.
- 4. Receive construction permits and approvals from UDOT prior to applying for a building permit.
- 5. Pay fees and post an acceptable bond in the amount determined by the City Engineer.
- 6. Provide an easement along the south of the existing building for public access to/from the future park to be built at the Washington Elementary School site.
- 7. Sign a Public Improvement Development Agreement.

Attachments

- 1. Aerial photo
- 2. Site Plan
- 3. Utility and Demo Plan
- 4. Landscape Plan
- 5. Building Elevations
- 6. Architectural Rendering
- Parking Study
 5th South Unit Legend

Aerial Photo



















EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HALES DENGINEERING

The following are the key findings and recommendations from this parking study update:

- With the proposed changes to the parking, the 5th South Plaza will still have 112 stalls
 Adjacent businesses an additional 89 stalls
- Bountiful City would require 210 parking stalls for the 5th South Plaza businesses
- A peak simultaneous parking demand of 91 vehicles was observed at 5th South Plaza with 130 vehicles total between 5th South Plaza, Panda Express, and Chase Bank:
 - The City would require 47 stalls for the new and vacant businesses, which when added to the observed demand would equal 138 parking stalls for 5th South Plaza and 177 parking stalls for all businesses
 - 177 parked vehicles in the area with all suites and businesses operational would still leave 24 parking stalls available total assuming crossover between areas
- While the intent of this study is <u>not</u> to state that the adjacent parking should be counted toward the 5th South Plaza, the adjacent parking areas are, in reality, used by patrons of the 5th South Plaza, and vice versa; patrons are not aware of the property lines or parking agreements
- The time of day analysis indicates that there is excess parking at the 5th South Plaza and surrounding businesses throughout the day
- It is recommended that a reduction in parking requirements be granted to the 5th South Plaza based on the low actual parking demand and the excess parking supply in the area

Introduction

This memorandum discusses the parking study completed for the 5th South Plaza located in Bountiful, Utah. The 5th South Plaza is located on the southwest corner of the 200 West / 500 South intersection. The study identifies actual parking demand data and City parking supply rates to identify a recommended number of parking stalls for the area. This study serves as an update to the parking study completed for the same site in December 2016.

1

Project Description

The proposed redevelopment of the 5th South Plaza site includes removing the previous Barbacoa restaurant building and replacing it with a Take 5 Oil Change business. A site plan for the proposed redevelopment is provided in Appendix A. The Take 5 Oil Change will include a building with 1,423 square feet of floor area and three service bays. The proposed site plan calls for a restripe of the angle parking stalls in the vicinity. After completion, it is anticipated that the 5th South Plaza area will have a total of 112 stalls plus 50 stalls at the Panda Express / Check Smart building and 39 stalls at the Chase Bank, for a grand total of 201 parking stalls. This is equal to the existing parking supply at the study site.

The following business changes have occurred since the completion of the previous parking study:

- Suite 7: Kid to Kid is now CosmoProf
- Suite 12: Fifth Avenue Tuxedos is now vacant
- Suite 13: Light RX Spa will soon be Queens of Ink
- Suite 17: Formerly vacant space is now The Aloha Spa
- Suites 22 & 23: Red Rock Financial and Mo' Bettahs office will soon be a Thai Restaurant

The other suites not mentioned here have kept the same businesses / tenants from when the parking study was completed in 2016.

Bountiful City Parking Code

The Bountiful City parking ordinance (Chapter 18 of the City code) specifies parking rates for various land use types. The City parking rates related to 5th South Plaza are provided in Table 1. Hales Engineering calculated the required parking for each suite and the total 5th South Plaza, as shown in Table 2. As shown, 207 parking stalls are required by City code. However, this does not account for actual local demand or shared parking use based on time-of-day. The required parking for the new Take 5 Oil Change and the currently-vacant suites (Suites 1, 12, 13, 18, 22, & 23) is equal to 47 stalls. It was assumed that Take 5 Oil Change would need an additional three (3) stalls for cars in repair.

Land Use	Parking Rate
Shopping Center / General Business	1 stall per 200 square feet
Professional Office	1 stall per 300 square feet
Restaurant	1 stall per 2.5 seats
Automobile Service and Repair Center	3 stalls per service bay plus parking for cars in repair

Table 1: Bountiful Parking Requirements

Suite(s)	Land Use	Туре	Size (SF)	Other	Stalls
1	New: Take 5 Oil Change	Auto Service Center	1,423	3 Service Bays	12
2	Cold Stone Creamery	Restaurant	1,200	4 Seats	2
3 & 4	Mo' Bettahs	Restaurant	2,700	70 Seats	28
5 & 6	GameHaven	Shopping Center	3,300	-	17
7	CosmoProf	Shopping Center	2,400	-	12
8&9	Crazy Beautiful Salon	Shopping Center	2,640	-	14
10	Plato's Closet	Shopping Center	4,570	-	23
11	Vapor Dreams	Shopping Center	1,000	-	5
12	VACANT	Shopping Center	1,000	-	5
13	Queens of Ink (NOT IN YET)	Queens of Ink (NOT IN YET) Shopping Center 1,500			
14	Smokeys	Smokeys Shopping Center 1,600			
15	H&R Block	H&R Block Professional Office 1,000			
16	TruMotion Martial Arts	Shopping Center	1,000	-	5
17	The Aloha Spa	Shopping Center	1,000	-	5
18	VACANT	Shopping Center	1,000	-	5
19	#1 Nails	Shopping Center	1,000	-	5
20	Infusion Yoga & Pilates	Shopping Center	3,134	-	16
21	Bountiful Lash	Shopping Center	1,211	-	7
22 & 23	Thai Restaurant (NOT IN YET)	Restaurant	3,500	50 Seats	20
24	Spectrum Credit Union	Professional Office	1,500	-	8
	TOTAL		37,678		210

Table 2: Required Parking – Bountiful City

Parking Demand Data Collection

5th South Plaza Businesses

Hales Engineering collected parking counts for the previous parking study on November 14, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. These parking counts were broken down by business, to provide a detailed snapshot of the parking needs for each business during a typical weekday. Additional parking counts were collected for this study update at the new businesses on November 19, 2020 to get an updated parking demand count. Knowing that the counts in November 2020 were taken during the COVID-19 pandemic, the counts were multiplied by a factor of two (2) in order to estimate normal parking conditions. Detailed parking counts are provided in Appendix B.

A summary of the peak parking demand data by business from both days is shown in Table 3. As shown, the sum of the peak demand of each business is equal to 155 parked vehicles. However, the total simultaneous parking demand was observed to be only 91 parked vehicles. Therefore, there were still 21 stalls available in the 5th South Plaza area even at the peak.

Suite(s)	Business	Peak Demand	Peak Time		
2	Cold Stone Creamery	11	4:30 PM		
3 & 4	Mo' Bettahs	33	6:15 PM		
5&6	GameHaven	14	5:45 PM		
7	CosmoProf	8	10:00 AM		
8&9	Crazy Beautiful Salon	10	12:30 PM		
10	Plato's Closet	4	3:00 PM		
11	Vapor Dreams	4	7:00 PM		
12	VACANT	-	-		
13	Queens of Ink (NOT IN YET)	-	-		
14	Smokeys	3	6:30 PM		
15	H&R Block	2	SEVERAL		
16	TruMotion Martial Arts	15	7:30 PM		
17	The Aloha Spa	4	6:30 PM		
18	VACANT	-	-		
19	#1 Nails	10	3:30 PM		
20	Infusion Yoga & Pilates	25	9:30 AM		
21	Bountiful Lash	4	1:00 PM		
22 & 23	Thai Restaurant (NOT IN YET)	-	-		
24	Spectrum Credit Union	8	9:30 AM		
	SUM TOTAL	155			
	SIMULTANEOUS TOTAL	91	6:15 PM		

Table 3: Peak Parking Demand Summary – 5th South Plaza

A comparison of the City required stalls and the peak parking demand of each business is shown in Table 4.

Adjacent Businesses

The 5th South Plaza does not have any parking agreements with the adjacent businesses on the corner of 500 South and 200 West. The intent of this discussion is not to state that they should be counted as parking for the 5th South Plaza, or that the adjacent areas were used to tabulate a reduction for the 5th South Plaza. However, the adjacent parking areas in reality are used by patrons of the 5th South Plaza, and vice versa. Patrons are not aware of the property lines or parking agreements. Therefore, it makes sense to include the adjacent areas in a parking analysis to ensure that there will not be overflow from one area to another. If one area experiences a parking problem, the adjacent areas will be impacted.

Suite(s)	Land Use	City Required Stalls	Parking Demand				
1	New: Take 5 Oil Change	12	-				
2	Cold Stone Creamery	2	11				
3 & 4	Mo' Bettahs	28	33				
5&6	GameHaven	17	14				
7	CosmoProf	12	8				
8 & 9	Crazy Beautiful Salon	14	10				
10	Plato's Closet	23	4				
11	Vapor Dreams	5	4				
12	VACANT	5	-				
13	Queens of Ink (NOT IN YET)	8	-				
14	Smokeys	8	3				
15	H&R Block	5	2				
16	TruMotion Martial Arts	5	15				
17	The Aloha Spa	5	4				
18	VACANT	5	-				
19	#1 Nails	5	10				
20	Infusion Yoga & Pilates	16	25				
21	Bountiful Lash	7	4				
22 & 23	Thai Restaurant (NOT IN YET)	20	-				
24	Spectrum Credit Union	8	8				
	TOTAL 210						
SIMULTANEOUS TOTAL							

Table 4: Parking Comparison – 5th South Plaza

Hales Engineering had previously collected hourly parking counts on September 15, 2016 from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the adjacent Panda Express and Chase Bank properties. Since the adjacent businesses' parking interconnects with the 5th South Plaza, there is some parking overlap that occurs. A summary of the parking counts throughout the day at the adjacent businesses is shown in Table 5 alongside the 5th South Plaza counts shown previously. As shown, at peak demand during the day, Panda Express had at least 18 stalls available and Chase Bank had at least 19 stalls available.

Time	5th South Plaza	Panda Express	Chase Bank	Total
8:00 AM	21	0	1	22
9:00 AM	63	19	7	89
10:00 AM	61	31	10	102
11:00 AM	50	22	20	92
12:00 PM	63	28	14	105
1:00 PM	72	21	10	103
2:00 PM	64	20	11	95
3:00 PM	62	19	11	92
4:00 PM	55	23	13	91
5:00 PM	82	14	9	105
6:00 PM	91	31	8	130
7:00 PM	66	32	1	99
8:00 PM	38	20	3	61
MAX	91	32	20	130
SUPPLY	112	50	39	201

Table 5: Parking Demand with Adjacent Businesses

Conclusions

Though the 5th South Plaza with 112 stalls does not meet the minimum Bountiful City requirement of 210 stalls, it is recommended that a reduction in parking requirements be granted for the 5th South Plaza based on the following:

- A peak simultaneous parking demand of 91 vehicles was observed at 5th South Plaza with 130 vehicles total between 5th South Plaza, Panda Express, and Chase Bank:
 - The City would require 47 stalls for the new and vacant businesses, which when added to the observed demand would equal 138 parking stalls for 5th South Plaza and 177 parking stalls for all businesses
 - 177 parked vehicles in the area with all suites and businesses operational would still leave 24 parking stalls available total assuming crossover between areas
- While the intent of this study is <u>not</u> to state that the adjacent parking should be counted toward the 5th South Plaza, the adjacent parking areas are, in reality, used by patrons of the 5th South Plaza, and vice versa
- The time of day analysis indicates that there is excess parking at the 5th South Plaza and surrounding businesses throughout the day



APPENDIX A Site Plan





APPENDIX B

Parking Counts

	Parking Demand by Suite									Total										
Time	2	3/4	5/6	7	8/9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22/23	24	Demand
8:00 AM	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	1
8:15 AM	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	3
8:30 AM	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	3	0	-	0	6
8:45 AM	0	1	3	0	4	0	1	-	-	1	0	0	0	-	0	5	0	-	6	21
9:00 AM	0	5	4	0	4	0	1	-	-	1	0	0	0	-	0	22	0	-	7	44
9:15 AM	0	7	4	4	5	0	2	-	-	1	0	0	0	-	0	24	0	-	8	55
9:30 AM	0	5	0	2	5	0	2	-	-	1	0	0	0	-	5	25	0	-	8	53
9:45 AM	1	5	0	8	7	1	2	-	-	1	0	0	0	-	5	25	0	-	8	63
10:00 AM	1	5	2	8	7	2	1	-	-	1	0	0	0	-	5	22	0	-	7	61
10:15 AM	2	6	0	6	9	2	1	-	-	1	0	0	0	-	6	19	0	-	5	57
10:30 AM 10:45 AM	2	6 6	0	2	9 7	1	1	-	-	1	0	1	0	-	6 5	11 11	0	-	5 4	45 41
10:45 AM 11:00 AM	2	7	0	2	8	1	1	-	-	1	0	1	0	-	5	10	0	-	4	41
11:15 AM	3	9	1	0	7	1	1	-	_	2	0	1	0	_	5	10	0	-	1	41
11:30 AM	2	11	1	6	8	1	1	-	-	2	0	1	0	-	4	10	2	-	1	50
11:45 AM	3	11	2	2	9	1	2	-	-	1	1	1	0	-	4	10	2	-	1	50
12:00 PM	2	13	3	2	9	2	3	-	-	1	1	1	0	-	4	7	2	-	1	51
12:15 PM	1	14	1	0	9	2	2	-	-	1	2	1	0	-	4	7	2	-	1	47
12:30 PM	3	16	3	0	10	1	3	-	-	2	2	2	0	-	4	7	2	-	2	57
12:45 PM	4	15	2	2	10	2	3	-	-	2	2	3	0	-	4	7	4	-	3	63
1:00 PM	3	20	2	2	8	2	4	-	-	1	2	3	0	-	7	7	4	-	4	69
1:15 PM	4	24	1	0	8	3	3	-	-	1	2	3	0	-	7	7	4	-	4	71
1:30 PM	5	25	3	2	8	3	2	-	-	1	2	3	0	-	3	7	3	-	4	71
1:45 PM	5	29	4	0	8	1	1	-	-	3	2	3	0	-	2	7	3	-	4	72
2:00 PM	5	25	3	2	8	1	1	-	-	1	2	2	0	-	3	7	1	-	3	64
2:15 PM 2:30 PM	6	13 9	3	2	10	2	1	-	-	1	2	2	0	-	3	7	2	-	2	56
2:30 PM 2:45 PM	6 8	9	3	0	8 8	4	1	-	-	2	2	2	0	-	2	6	2	-	2	50 51
3:00 PM	6	10	4	0	8	4	1	-	-	1	2	2	0	-	7	2	2	-	2	51
3:15 PM	7	12	4	4	8	1	0	-	-	1	2	1	0	-	9	2	2	-	2	55
3:30 PM	9	12	5	6	8	1	1	-	-	1	2	1	0	-	10	2	2	-	2	62
3:45 PM	8	10	6	4	8	1	1	-	-	1	2	2	0	-	9	2	2	-	2	58
4:00 PM	9	11	8	4	8	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	0	-	5	0	2	-	2	55
4:15 PM	8	16	6	2	8	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	0	-	3	0	2	-	2	53
4:30 PM	11	17	5	0	7	2	1	-	-	2	1	2	0	-	3	0	2	-	1	54
4:45 PM	7	10	8	2	7	2	2	-	-	1	1	2	0	-	2	0	2	-	0	46
5:00 PM	7	5	8	4	6	2	2	-	-	2	1	1	0	-	5	0	2	-	0	45
5:15 PM	8	16	10	0	6	2	2	-	-	2	2	2	0	-	4	0	2	-	0	56
5:30 PM	7	14	11	2	6	1	3	-	-	2	2	4	0	-	2	8	3	-	0	65
5:45 PM	6	22	14	0	6	2	3	-	-	2	2	9	0	-	2	11	3	-	0	82
6:00 PM	6	25	8	0	6	2	2	-	-	2	1	11	2	-	2	14	3	-	0	84
6:15 PM	6	33	8	0	6	1	3	-	-	2	1	10	2	-	2	14	3	-	0	91
6:30 PM 6:45 PM	3	31 23	9 7	0	6 6	1	3	-	-	3	0	10 11	4	-	3	15 15	2	-	0	90 79
6:45 PM 7:00 PM	3	18	6	0	4	1	4	-	-	1	0	8	4 2	-	0	15	3	-	0	66
7:15 PM	2	18	5	0	4	2	4	-	-	0	0	。 14	2	-	0	6	3	-	0	56
7:30 PM	7	17	4	0	0	2	4	-	-	0	0	14	2	-	0	1	3	-	0	55
7:45 PM	4	17	3	0	0	3	2	-	-	0	0	15	2	-	0	0	2	-	0	48
8:00 PM	4	13	3	0	0	0	1	-	-	0	0	13	2	-	0	0	2	-	0	38
8:15 PM	2	11	6	0	0	1	0	-	-	0	0	13	2	-	0	0	2	-	0	37
8:30 PM	1	6	5	0	0	1	0	-	-	0	0	13	2	-	0	0	2	-	0	30
8:45 PM	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	2	2	-	0	0	2	-	0	15
MAX	11	33	14	8	10	4	4	-	-	3	2	15	4	-	10	25	4	-	8	91
Note: Count	ts for su	uites 7 (and 17	were r	nultipli	ed by c	a factoi	r of 2 to	ο αςςοι	int for	decrea.	sed CO	VID-19	volum	es.					

5TH SOUTH PLAZA



312 East South Temple & SzitzLake City, Utthe 84111 Affire 801456.8890 www.mtnwest.com

Crazy Beautifu

25,438 ADT 200 W

his statement with the information it contains is given with the understanding that all negotiations relating to the purchase, renting or leasing of the property described above shall be conducted through this office. The above information while not guaranteed has been secured from sources we believe to be reliable.

Aloha Sp

Conditional Use Permit

A public hearing was held on February 16, 2021, at Bountiful City Hall to consider a Conditional Use Permit for a vehicle service business located at the following location:

Parcel: 03-035-0092 273 West 500 South, Bountiful City, Davis County, Utah

The Bountiful City Planning Commission heard the matter and considered the statements of the Applicant, the City Staff and the public. As a result, the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

- 1. This matter is properly heard before the Planning Commission.
- 2. Appropriate public notice has been provided and a Public Hearing held.

The Bountiful City Planning Commission hereby grants this Conditional Use Permit approval on April 6, 2021 at 273 West 500 South, Bountiful, Davis County, Utah, with the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to applying for a building permit the Applicant shall:
 - a. Show plans to add one (1) street tree between the two (2) proposed drive accesses on 500 South.
 - b. Add shrubs or additional plant material to the landscape buffer between 5th South Plaza and the Panda Express property.

The Conditional Use Permit was approved on April 6, 2021, and this written form was approved this 6th day of April, 2021.

Sean Monson, Planning Commission Chairman

ATTEST: Darlene Baetz, Recording Secretary

Planning Commission Staff Report

Item:	PUBLIC HEARING – Request for a variance to allow for encroachments on slopes greater than thirty percent (30%) and retaining walls greater than ten feet (10') in height.	
Address:	873 East Highland Oaks Drive	BOUL
Author:	Curtis Poole, City Planner	ES
Date:	April 6, 2021	

Description of Request

The Applicant, Allen Clemons, has requested a variance to allow for encroachments on slopes greater than thirty percent (30%) and retaining walls greater than ten feet (10') in height. The property is located at 873 East Highland Oaks Drive, which is in the R-F (Residential Foothill) Subzone. The requested variance would allow for construction of a new residence.

Authority

Section 14-2-111 authorizes the Administrative Committee to be the review body for variance requests within the R-F Subzone related to encroachments on slopes greater than thirty percent (30%) and retaining walls greater than ten feet (10') in height. Section 14-2-104 authorizes the Chairman of the Administrative Committee to assign any item designated for Administrative Committee review to the Planning Commission, in which case the Planning Commission acts under the same authority granted to the Administrative Committee.

Analysis

In 1994 the Highland Oaks Subdivision Plat A was approved. The Applicant's property at 873 East Highland Oaks Drive, or Lot 107, was part of the approved subdivision. The plat shows a twenty foot (20') wide utility easement which cuts through Lots 105, 106, and 107 of Plat A and Lot 211 of the Highland Oaks Subdivision Plat B. The land use code which defined parameters for building in the R-F Subzone was updated in 2006. Approvals for building in the foothills prior to 2006 were done through site plan review, not a variance to the Code. Although both residences on Lots 105 and 211 were under construction in 2005, only site plan approval for Lot 105 could be found by Staff. Lot 106 was granted a variance by the Planning Commission to build a new residence in September 2019 on a 6-0 vote.

The Applicant has submitted a site plan for a new residence to be built on the lot. The site plan indicates the footprint of the home would be built within twenty-three feet (23') of the front property line. The land use code requires a twenty-five foot (25') front yard setback; however, section 14-4-105 (A), permits a home to be built up to twenty feet (20') from the property line if there is a ten foot (10') minimum difference in elevation between the curb

and the ground when measured at a point fifty feet (50') behind the property line, at the center of the lot, which applies to this property.

Although the new home would disturb slopes greater than thirty (30%) the long, narrow design of the footprint seeks to contain the disturbance as much as possible. The site plan also indicates there would be at least one retaining wall on the southwest corner of the garage that would be greater than ten feet (10'). Additional retaining along the proposed driveway which accesses the lower garage is not shown but should be expected due to the steep slope immediately adjacent to the street level. In addition, the Applicant will need to modify this approach to meet requirements of 14-4-115 (C).

The Applicant has indicated the property owner was unable to have their signature notarized on the application, because they live outside the United States; however, the Applicant has provided a real estate purchase contract for the property. Granting of the variance would be contingent on the Applicant completing the purchase of the property.

Variance Findings

Utah Code 10-9a-702 establishes the criteria for review of a variance request and stipulates the applicant "shall bear the burden of proving that all of the conditions justifying a variance have been met." In order to grant a variance <u>each</u> of the following criteria must be met:

(i) Literal enforcement of the ordinance would cause an unreasonable hardship for the applicant that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the land use ordinances;

Staff Response: The purpose of the building standards in the R-F Subzone is to preserve the hillsides and manage erosion. Standards for building on steep slopes require any development to be minimal and reasonable. Staff determines the disturbance to be reasonable within the constraints of the property.

(ii) There are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same zone;

Staff Response: Many of the properties in the R-F Subzone have steep slopes similar to the Applicant's property which limit the buildable area and require steep driveways, tall retaining walls and disturbances of slopes greater than thirty percent (30%). The Applicant's property is unique to most other properties in the R-F Subzone because of the utility easement which further constrains the buildable area. The variance has been the process for which these properties can develop.

(iii) Granting the variance is essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone;

Staff Response: Other properties in the R-F Subzone with approved buildable lots have

been allowed some reasonable disturbances of the slopes greater than thirty percent (30%) and construction of retaining walls greater than ten feet (10'). Granting the variance will allow the Applicant to enjoy similar property rights which have been given to other properties in the R-F Subzone through the variance process. Denying the variance will allow other properties a right not extended to the Applicant's property.

(iv) The variance will not substantially affect the general plan and will not be contrary to the public interest;

Staff Response: Granting the variance for the Applicant will not have a substantial effect to the General Plan as other properties in the R-F Subzone have been treated similarly regarding development on steep slopes. It is an interest to the City to have all buildable lots developed as opposed to remaining vacant.

(v) The spirit of the land use ordinance is observed and substantial justice done.

Staff Response: The purpose of the Code that requires development to be located on slopes less than thirty percent (30%) is to preserve the hillside and manage runoff and erosion on properties located in the foothills. The Code anticipates that there are existing lots within approved subdivisions in the R-F Subzone with special circumstances and the variance process provides a way for those lots to be developed. However, Section 14-4-101 of the Code also stipulates that the alteration of sensitive lands should be the minimum necessary to allow for reasonable use of the property. The proposal submitted by the Applicant, demonstrates there has been an effort to reasonably reduce the impact development will have on the steep slopes of the property.

Department Review

This variance request has been reviewed by the Engineering and Planning Departments and the City Attorney.

Recommended Action

Based on analysis of the required criteria from State law included in the findings above and the materials submitted by the Applicant, Staff recommends the Planning Commission grant the requested variance related to encroachments on slopes greater than thirty percent (30%) and for the construction of retaining walls greater than ten feet (10') with the following conditions:

- 1. The Applicant will continue to work with City Staff to ensure the final plans submitted for the residence and retaining walls will have a reasonable impact on slopes greater than thirty percent (30%).
- The Applicant shall obtain a separate permit for retaining walls taller than four feet (4') in addition to a obtaining a building permit.
- 3. Revise the driveway to the lower garage to meet the standards of 14-4-115 (C).
- 4. Subject to the Applicant finalizing the purchase of the property.

Attachments

- 1. Aerial Photo
- 2. Proposed Site Plan
- 3. Proposed Rendering
- 4. Applicant's Narrative

Aerial Photo







TYPED RESPONSES. - 873 East Higland Oaks Drive Lot #107

City Ordinance:

Requesting a variance to construct and excavate in the +30% downslope of the lot and construct a retaining wall over 10' at the Second corner of the main level garage in addition to building a two story home on a 12' basement on lot #107.

The proposed variant meets all of the criteria:

-Not receiving the variance will prevent a hardship of not being able to construct a residence in the given allowable area not in 30%.

-The PUE and the grade combined are special circumstances to this lot.

-Without the variance the property can not be enjoyed by the building of a home in a subdivision of homes.

-The proposed approximate home elevation and site plan attached do not change the general plan and is not contrary to the adjacent homes in the subdivision.

-The spirit of the land use ordinance will still be observed and substantial justice done by allowing the proposed home construction and approximate grading as shown.

BOUNTIFUL CITY PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS

APPLICANT: Allen Clemons

APPLICATION TYPE: Request for a variance to allow for encroachments on slopes greater than 30 percent (30%) and to build retaining walls taller than ten feet (10') in height.

I. DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST:

The Applicant, Allen Clemons, has requested a variance to allow for encroachments on slopes greater than thirty percent (30%) and retaining walls greater than ten feet (10') in height. The property is located at 873 East Highland Oaks Drive, which is in the R-F (Residential Foothill) Subzone. The requested variance would allow for construction of a new residence.

II. LAND USE ORDINANCE AUTHORITY:

Section 14-2-111 authorizes the Planning Commission as the review body for variance requests related to encroachments on slopes greater than 30 percent height of retaining walls.

III. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Bountiful City Land Use Ordinance section 14-2-108 states that an applicant, board or officer of the City, or any person adversely affected by a Land Use Authority's decision administering or interpreting a land use ordinance or ruling on a request for a variance may, within fourteen calendar days of the written decision, appeal that decision to the Appeal Authority. No other appeals may be made to the Appeal Authority.

The appeal must be in writing and specifically allege that there is an error in an order, requirement, decision or determination by the Land Use Authority. The appellant shall state every theory of relief that it can raise in District Court.

IV. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

- **A.** The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the staff report, which is attached as **Exhibit A** and is incorporated herein.
- B. The minutes of the public hearing held by the Planning Commission on Tuesday, April 6, 2021 which are attached as Exhibit B summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby incorporated herein.

V. FINDINGS OF FACT:

Based upon the information presented and oral testimony given at the public hearing the Planning Commission made the following findings:

A. The literal enforcement of the land use ordinance would cause an unreasonable hardship for the applicant that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the land use ordinance;

The purpose of the building standards in the R-F Subzone is to preserve the hillsides and manage erosion. Standards for building on steep slopes require any development to be minimal and reasonable. The Planning Commission determines the disturbance to be reasonable within the constraints of the property.

B. There are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the district;

Many of the properties in the R-F Subzone have steep slopes similar to the Applicant's property which limit the buildable area and require steep driveways, tall retaining walls and disturbances of slopes greater than thirty percent (30%). The Applicant's property is unique to most other properties in the R-F Subzone because of the utility easement which further constrains the buildable area. The variance has been the process for which these properties can develop.

C. Granting the variance is essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the district;

Other properties in the R-F Subzone with approved buildable lots have been allowed some reasonable disturbances of the slopes greater than thirty percent (30%) and construction of retaining walls greater than ten feet (10'). Granting the variance will allow the Applicant to enjoy similar property rights which have been given to other properties in the R-F Subzone through the variance process. Denying the variance will allow other properties a right not extended to the Applicant's property.

D. The variance will not substantially affect the general plan and will not be contrary to the public interest;

Granting the variance for the Applicant will not have a substantial effect to the General Plan as other properties in the R-F Subzone have been treated similarly regarding development on steep slopes. It is an interest to the City to have all buildable lots developed as opposed to remaining vacant. E. The spirit of the land use ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done

The purpose of the Code that requires development to be located on slopes less than thirty percent (30%) is to preserve the hillside and manage runoff and erosion on properties located in the foothills. The Code anticipates that there are existing lots within approved subdivisions in the R-F Subzone with special circumstances and the variance process provides a way for those lots to be developed. However, Section 14-4-101 of the Code also stipulates that the alteration of sensitive lands should be the minimum necessary to allow for reasonable use of the property. The proposal submitted by the Applicant, demonstrates there has been an effort to reasonably reduce the impact development will have on the steep slopes of the property.

VI. DECISION AND SUMMARY

The Planning Commission granted the requested variance by a vote of 6-0 with the conditions as follows:

- 1. The Applicant will continue to work with City Staff to ensure the final plans submitted for the residence and retaining walls will have a reasonable impact on slopes greater than thirty percent (30%).
- 2. The Applicant shall obtain a separate permit for retaining walls taller than four feet (4') in addition to a obtaining a building permit.
- 3. Revise the driveway to the lower garage to meet the standards of 14-4-115 (C).
- 4. Subject to the Applicant finalizing the purchase of the property.

FINDINGS OF FACT APPROVED BY THE Bountiful City Planning Commission this 6th day of April 2021.

Sean Monson, Chairman Bountiful City Planning Commission