

Planning Review for DR 2014-02  
March 11, 2013

Dr. Paul Mackley,

In preparing to review your recent application for the warehouse storage at 2803 N Highway 89, it may be best to establish some of the recent history and approvals for the site.

- In working with your contactor Chris Thurgood in 2013, there were concerns on the status of approvals for the site. As the site was part of proposed development it required approval and compliance to the existing code. This site had not received any approval or licenses previously from The Western Weber Planning Commission, and an existing file for a site plan did not exist. An option was offered to establish a record of permits and approvals of the site through Pleasant View City, or a request for approval of the entire site from the Western Weber Planning Commission as most of the site could meet code requirements.
- The application was submitted and Planning Review 1 was sent back to your representative. The application had included a building to the front of the lot which was proposed as a Night Watchman's Dwelling. This building did not meet the required 50 foot front yard setback from Highway 89. Once this was determined, staff received a response dated May 9, 2013 stating that the "owners plan on having this building removed." With the building being removed and the other proposed uses of the site not requiring a conditional use the project was amended to be only a design review.
- The plat that has been submitted continues to show that this building does not meet the required 50 foot setback. To be able to be approved at this location any of the following 3 options will need to occur. 1) The building would be altered to meet the setback, 2) a variance be granted by the Board of Adjustment, or 3) proof of nonconformity from a previous municipality. I understand that this building may have been approved and permitted when the property was within Pleasant View City. If documentation or confirmation from the city can be submitted the Planning staff would review it and consider if it could qualify as a noncomplying structure.
- If the building is permitted then a Conditional Use Permit meeting the following additional requirements should be applied for:
  - Dwelling unit for proprietor or employee, who also serves as night watchman, and their immediate family, provided that an additional 3,000 square feet of landscaped area is provided for the residential use. As a conditional use, the township planning commission, for the jurisdiction in which the application is made, shall have the discretion to approve either an attached or a detached dwelling, based upon the primary manufacturing use and architectural design to protect the noise levels and privacy of the residents.
- One requirement is that besides the 20 percent landscaping requirement (Sec. 108-1), an additional 3,000 square feet is provided for the residential use. Please show this additional area and required 20 percent of landscaping for the 5.23 acre site.
- If options 1 or 2 above a desired, then plan and profiles of the proposed building are required as per the Design Review requirements (Sec. 108-1-2 and 108-1-4-4 and as noted in the application).
- As previously approved the site plan included 16 pages of plans and notes. The plans now submitted are 2 pages and contain a significant number of differences to the approved set of plans. With the approval of an amendment the most recent set of plans should be submitted.
- How does this site match up with adjacent sites both to the north and south in regards to cross access for vehicular and pedestrian traffic circulation? I have been contacted by Pleasant View City and an adjacent land owner who wishes to have access to the UTA station. The Weber County Land Use Code requires that road safety improvements such as curb, gutter, side walk and landscaped park strip are to

be installed along roadways and public parking areas for business such as this.(Sec. 108-9-2-6, 108-8-12) Where you the applicant, Pleasant View City, UDOT, and the surrounding owners have preferred that cross access not occur on the highway but by cross access, the Planning Commission was able to preserve the public welfare and exempt this requirement. The Planning Commission decision to at minimum preserve pedestrian access with the 10 foot pathway allows your proposal to comply with the requirements of Sec. 108-1-4-1. Your request to remove this pathway results in requiring the standards of the code. The Planning Commission may be able to not require this only if a different proposal could provide adequate traffic circulation.

- The plans that you recently submitted still show that there will be a 10 foot paved pathway in the rear of the parcel. Is that still really desired?
- The plans also show the detention pond to be built over the utility easement. Why was this changed from the approved plans? I would suspect that the Engineering Division will want to review this change.
- Ultimately a land use permit and annual business license will be required; neither of which has ever been issued in the approximately 10 years since this property left Pleasant View City.
- It doesn't appear that all landscaping has been installed for this site particularly 2 pines by the open storage and 3 along the property line behind the dwelling.
- It appears that a new location for the dumpster is proposed, will it be on a concrete surface? Screening of the dumpster would be appreciated by the surrounding owners and uses.
- The plans show fencing to cross the property at the east end of the storage units. How will access occur there, is a gate proposed? What will the relocated gate look like? The plans are not clear as to the other fencing to be used around the property. When and where will fencing occur and will it be uniform or many different styles of vinyl and metal as have been used?

Please review the requirements of the code and your proposed plans prior to being scheduled before the Planning Commission. If you have any questions please let me know or please submit the missing information for review. We look forward to working with you through this process, and seeing a successful business at this site.

Sincerely,  
Ben Hatfield

Planner  
Weber County  
Planning Division  
801-399-8766  
[bhatfield@co.weber.ut.us](mailto:bhatfield@co.weber.ut.us)  
2380 Washington Blvd., Ste. 240  
Ogden, Utah 84401-1473