

**Gravel, Curb & Gutter – Subcommittee meeting  
July 24, 2019, 10am, Rm A102 City Hall**

P&Z Commissioners/Board Members Present: Tom Beehm, Stacey Kemp, Cole Johnson,  
Absent: Alex Reichert, Peter Kuhn

Staff Present: Andrea Edwardson (Planning) , Al Grasser (Engineering), Stephanie Halford (Planning), Jonathan Olson (Engineering)

**Main Take-A-Ways / Summary:**

- Good with pursuing aggregate use in I2 Heavy Industrial areas for storage areas, lay down yards, and heavy truck maneuvering areas.
- Required off-street parking stalls and drive aisles to those stalls should be paved with hard surface, and the drive aisle shall reach from the right of way to the parking stalls.
- Curb and Gutter does not need to be required for I2 required parking areas, unless property is located along major corridors.
- Corridors should be aesthetically maintained with some combination of pavement, curb and gutter required. Propose solutions on how to ensure aesthetics if a gravel area is to be located on corridor. Consider modifications to landscaping requirements to address that.
- Landscaping options should be included, such as high plantings of shrubs to establish a line or barrier that limits the potential of gravel creeping from its originally approved areas.

**Meeting Minutes:**

Edwardson began the meeting by providing a brief overview of the topic. A local business has asked staff to review current codes in relation to the use of aggregate/gravel materials, and curb and gutter for industrial properties. Currently, Land Development code requires that all parking areas be required to be paved and provided with adequate surface drainage. In addition, buried in our landscaping section, we require that all landscaping is protected from vehicular traffic with curb and gutter. Curb & Gutter is only referenced in the landscaping code, making it challenging for those reading code to find it.

Edwardson provided a list of all properties that have received a variance for paving or curb and gutter over the past ten years. Approximately 16 sites have received variances and typically the requests are approved, though there may be one or two instances in which it wasn't approved. The approvals typically coincide with a time delay for the paving with the option to come back in and ask for an extension through the variance process.

Edwardson stated that other ND communities allow gravel in their industrial areas for storage, lay down, vehicular movement areas, but require any required off street parking and drive aisles to those required stalls be paved. Other communities have a few special tweaks, she referenced West Fargo who requires a 50ft area from a street be paved where gravel areas meet the street to help with tracking of gravel onto city streets and into city storm system. West Fargo also references curb and gutter requirements along major corridors.

Edwardson explained that staff is seeking input from the subcommittee on staff's thoughts so far. Staff feels limiting the use of aggregate materials to I2 areas would be ideal as I1 areas are typically located in the center of town, next to major corridors, and within close proximity to residential areas which staff does not wish to disturb. I2 areas is by its nature where the heavy industrial users with typically large lots and complexes reside, making paving large areas a costly and often temporary endeavor. Edwardson stated that she is seeking input on limiting the gravel to I2.

Kemp stated that he generally agreed with the I2 area. He asked about limiting the types of product that would be allowable. He commented that there is a crushed asphalt product that eventually bonds to itself to create a hard surface after so much use. He stated that there are various products out there that would be better for dust control and maintenance.

Grasser stated that Engineering would look into various product options and would plan to modify their specifications accordingly to fit the intent of what the code change would be proposing.

Grasser commented on concerns with maintaining clean aesthetics around town. He cautioned to be cognizant of protecting City storm system and provided the example of BNSF rail yard along Demers ave and how it tracks into ROW. Visually that is also not something to replicate.

Edwardson stated that the BNSF example is why staff is suggesting limiting the aggregate use to I2 areas which currently exist on the periphery of town. BNSF is currently I1 and as they make improvements to the site, staff will seek additional pavement be added.

Kemp asked what the requirements are for sweeping when tracking, like what happens on Demers, occurs. Grasser stated that in theory it should be the property owner or business that's doing the tracking that sweeps, but often it gets over looked or only is caught on a complaint basis.

Johnson asked how the proposed changes would impact the Corridor Overlay areas and the Interstate corridor. Edwardson said that corridor overlay code references building requirements and where parking can be located on site, but doesn't currently make any

reference to gravel or curb and gutter requirements. She said that staff had not yet researched specific changes for the corridor overlay areas but would provide alternates for the committee to weigh in on at the next meeting.

Beehm stated that he approved of requiring a 50ft area off streets before gravel begin to help protect streets and storm system. He commented that it should be more of a 50ft radius rather than just 50ft straight into a gravel area to help catch sediment from all accessed sides.

Kemp agreed and stated that when gravel areas are allowed, protections should be made for storm water catch basins so they don't clog and become ineffective. Grasser stated that this was another element that Engineering would develop new specifications for. They required Iron Hide to install a sump within their catch basins in their gravel areas, but stated that the sumps will still require additional maintenance.

Edwardson asked the committee to provide feedback as to whether curb and gutter should be required for hard surfaces in the I2 areas. She sited PS Doors parking lot as one that operates in the Industrial park without curb and gutter. Their storm system tips the concrete inward towards catch basins, so C&G is not needed for directing storm water.

Grasser stated that he hesitated to have any reference in code that would have Engineering listed as being able to require C&G as there are so many other solutions that you can pursue to address storm water instead of curb and gutter. He stated from his point, C&G becomes more aesthetic desire.

Olson stated that during the site plan review process, before a permit is issued, plans are reviewed by staff for storm water. Staff looks to see that if no C&G, grading is tipped in for runoff to be collected on site, not to ROW and not to neighboring properties.

There was general consensus from committee members that C&G would not be necessary for Industrial properties. Johnson stated that for aesthetic reasons, C&G should be required for major corridors. Others agreed.

Edwardson asked if the code changes should include addressing alternative solutions to curb and gutter such as when roll over curbs are allowed. Grasser stated he thought it best to not get into that level of detail at this time.

Grasser commented that the code should clearly define and distinguish between what the required parking area is and what is considered to be lay down area/storage area for consistent interpretation and enforcement.

Johnson cited the Korynta Industrial land area north of Simplot by 27<sup>th</sup> Ave N and the Rocks and Blocks property, they only had 1 or 2 required stalls, he asked based on

recommendations that site would pave those 2 stalls and the rest would be allowed to be gravel? Edwardson stated that yes the stalls would be paved and typically in the past staff has required the drive way off of the right of way into the property has to be paved as well. Johnson stated that additional paving than that would be preferred. Discussion was held on options to consider. Edwardson said the change could stipulate the parking, drive aisles to the parking be paved all the way from the right of way. Johnson approved.

Johnson asked how the property line areas would be maintained so that gravel does not encroach into right of way, like how much of the Oscarville area on N 42<sup>nd</sup> St currently does. Grasser stated that he would like to see stipulations that protected the City system to prevent an Oscarville-like scenario as well. Edwardson stated that currently there are regulations in the off-street parking and landscaping codes that require a 10ft setback from the property line on fronts and 5ft on sides before paving/aggregate can occur. Those 10 and 5ft areas are the required landscaping areas with plantings as well.

Discussion was held as to how best keep gravel from encroaching being its originally established area as each year the property is graded and new gravel is put down. Beehm suggested double the bufferyard requirements when gravel is allowed. Grasser suggested a dirt mound to establish a raised identifier. Johnson suggested higher plantings of shrubs to establish a line as well. Edwardson stated that staff would look into landscaping options that would help to set a line for the gravel but at some point the code cannot make up for inspections and addressing errors through that avenue. But staff will propose alternatives at the next meeting.

Edwardson stated that staff intends to keep the requirement that curb and gutter be installed to protect landscaping areas, to include interior parking islands and required edge bufferyards, except where gravel areas are allowed in I2 districts. Staff feels this current requirement works for all other zoning districts – commercial, residential, and light industrial, and we do not wish to modify anything that is currently working in the other districts. Staff will recommend moving that requirement out of the landscaping code and into the off-street parking code so that parking lot construction information is located all in one place in code.

Edwardson ended the meeting by summarizing the main take-a-ways and direction received from the meeting (see list at beginning of document). She stated that staff will begin to work on solutions and actual code language that will be brought forward to another sub-committee meeting in the future.

Meeting adjourned.