



**DRC Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, July 14, 2020**

**DRC Members in Attendance:** Engineer Jon Lundell, Fire Inspector Taylor Sutherland, Public Works Director Wade Eva, Building Official Randy Spadafora, Community Development Director Jason Bond, Assistant City Manager Norm Beagley.

**Other's in Attendance:** Staff Planner Ryan Harris, Kevin Olson, John Smiley representing Orchard Hills II. John Money and Ryan Hatfield (engineer) representing 341 Townhomes. Derk Palfreyman and Rhett Brown representing Countryside Estates Plat E. Shawn Herring representing the Hills at Summit Ridge. Ben Reeves City Manager (Via zoom).

Mr. Lundell called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

**Orchard Hills II Preliminary Subdivision Review**

*A preliminary review of a 20-unit townhome and commercial development located at approximately 120 E. and Highland Drive.*

**Fire:** Mr. Sutherland explained that if the road is over 150 feet from John Boulevard to the dead end, either a hammer head turn around or a bulb will be required. Mr. Olson and Mr. Smiley stated that they believe that the radius is at 150 feet exactly, and they will provide verification. Mr. Sutherland added that the residential/commercial ("live/work") buildings will need fire sprinklers.

**Public Works:** Mr. Eva asked that street signs be provided for the private roads. Mr. Lundell asked that the developer provide proposed addressing for review. Mr. Eva asked about the waterlines. Mr. Lundell explained that they will have a 4-inch meter vault off of unit 7 and a 2-inch meter vault coming off of unit 8. The 4-inch meter would service 14 units and the two-inch meter would service the remaining 6 units.

**Police:** Chief Hurst explained that when the previous Orchard Hills units were built, staging materials were often put in the City streets and right of ways. He noted that at one point it was so bad traffic was going through the school parking lot to avoid it. Chief Hurst asked that the developer ensure that this does not happen with this project. He recognized that the sub-contractors don't always get the message that the developers do in DRC, but asked that this is communicated with them.

Mr. Bond asked the developers if they are planning to phase this project. Mr. Olson indicated that they would like to phase the project and work together regarding phasing and staging. Mr. Beagley stated that the project will be shut down and cited if staging/materials block the public right of ways.

**Engineering:** Mr. Lundell noted that the plans show 18-foot deep parking stalls. He clarified that

if the developer would like their parking stall depth to be lowered to 18 feet; they need to provide the appropriate six-foot wide sidewalk. He indicated that the plans are also missing the required 5-foot landscaping buffer along the sides of the building. Mr. Lundell stated that the fence details need to be provided. He clarified that all multifamily developments require fencing per code. He added that the architectural plans need to be provided for the Architectural Review Committee to review. Mr. Lundell also asked for details regarding the proposed pavilion.

**Planning and Zoning:** Mr. Bond explained that square footage for the commercial spaces needs to be provided in order to verify required parking. Mr. Harris clarified that 5 parking stalls are required per 1000 square feet of commercial space. Chief Hurst asked if parking will be allowed on 120 E? Mr. Beagley indicated that the road will be red curbed along highland drive and then around the corner to the South West of unit 8 to ensure the clear view area.

**Engineering:** Mr. Lundell stated that the private sewer line needs to be labeled as such. He explained that road cuts will require an overlay that extends 15 feet on either side of the trench. He reminded the developer that the Mail Box location needs to be coordinated with the Post Office. Mr. Lundell expressed concern regarding the storm water access point onto 120 E. and asked that it is addressed. He noted that the storm drain report for the development needs to be submitted. He also informed the developer that the side setbacks on the south side need to be 15 feet.

No comments from Building or Administration.

**Motion:** Mr. Bond motioned to table the Orchard Hills II preliminary plan until the missing information is provided and the redlines are addressed. Mr. Sutherland seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

### **341 Townhomes Final**

*A final review of a 3-unit town home subdivision located at 341 E. 100 S.*

**Police:** Chief Hurst expressed his preference that the green space in the right of way be converted into parking rather green space.

**Engineering:** Mr. Lundell indicated that the CC&R's still need to be submitted. Mr. Money answered that he brought the CC&R's with him today. Mr. Lundell asked that they are uploaded to Citizen Serve. Mr. Bond explained that they would like the CC&R's to indicate that the garage must be used for parking and not storage. Mr. Lundell explained that verification for the right of way still hasn't been obtained. Mr. Hatfield (the project engineer) explained that he is in the process of verifying this with a surveyor. Mr. Lundell explained that per City Standards and specs a multifamily development of 3 units or more requires a single common culinary water meter. The current plans don't meet the standards because three meters are shown.

**Planning and Zoning:** Mr. Harris asked Mr. Money when he will be submitting the architectural

plans. Mr. Money answered that he is currently waiting for the renderings, but he will submit them as soon as he has them.

No comments from Fire, Public Works, Building, or Administration.

**Motion:** Mr. Beagley motioned to forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission that the 341 Townhomes be approved with the following conditions: That the right of way verification be provided, that the CC&R's be reviewed and addressed, that ARC approval be obtained, and that the meters be updated to meet the City standards and specifications for multifamily developments of three units or more. Mr. Eva seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

### **Countryside Estates Plat E**

*A final review of a 3 lot subdivision located at approximately 200 E. and 820 S.*

**Engineering:** Mr. Lundell noted that the utilities are already existing on the lots. However, if utility trenches are needed, a full overlay will be required. He explained that the infiltration area needs to be located within an easement. Mr. Lundell indicated that there are additional storm drain comments on the storm drain report. He clarified that the bottom of the curb inlet box needs to be a minimum of 36 inches deep.

No comments from Fire, Public Works, Building, Administration, Planning and Zoning or Police.

**Motion:** Mr. Bond motioned to grant final approval for Countryside Estates Plat E with the condition that the engineering redlines be addressed. Which include; that the services be verified, that the sump be located within an easement. Mr. Spadafora seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

### **The Hills at Summit Ridge Plat C Final Review**

*A final review of a 35 lot subdivision located at approximately Sawtooth Boulevard and Windmere Road.*

Mr. Lundell explained that the developer has requested to provide another point of access within the Hills of Summit Ridge Plat C. He explained that phases C and D3 will need to be constructed concurrently in order to have the appropriate waterline looping and required accesses. Mr. Beagley suggested that this is added as a plat note and acknowledged by the developer and contractor. Mr. Herring indicated the note is on the plans.

**Planning and Zoning:** Mr. Bond asked when the public amenities will be provided. Mr. Herring explained that they would be installed and ready with the subdivision improvements.

**Police:** Chief Hurst stated that there are city code rules/details associated with the dog park that

need to be addressed prior to the park being opened. Mr. Harris noted that the developer is proposing to finish the park with crushed rock rather than sod. Mr. Beagley expressed concern regarding the dog park not having at least a portion of the surface being sod. He asked that a different proposal be provided for review. Mr. Herring stated that he isn't opposed to sod but explained that it usually gets ruined in a dog park. Mr. Beagley noted that P.I. will need to be stubbed to the dog park whether there is sod or not, in order to water the trees, shrubs, etc.

No comments from Fire, Public Works, Building, Administration, or Engineering.

**Motion:** Mr. Beagley motioned to approved the Hills at Summit Ridge Plat C with the following conditions: That sod for the dog park is reconsidered. That two service connections, one for P.I. and culinary are provided. And that the trail and dog park be installed prior to the first C of O being issued. Mr. Bond seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

#### **The Hills at Summit Ridge Plat D3 Final Review**

*A final review of a 6 lot subdivision located South of Foxberry Drive and along Longview Road.*

Mr. Lundell explained that this phase that would connect phases C and D and provide the required access and waterline looping.

No comments from Fire, Public Works, Building, Administration, Planning and Zoning, Police or Engineering.

**Motion:** Mr. Bond motioned to approve the final plan for the Hills at Summit Ridge Plat D3. Mr. Sutherland seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

#### **Jasperson Stop Sign Request**

*The DRC will review a request for a three way stop at the intersection of Center Street and Highland Drive.*

Mr. Lundell explained that the request is to provide an additional stop sign (to create a three way stop) at the intersection of Center Street and Highland Drive. He informed the Committee that the future plans for this intersection are to re-design it and provide turn lanes for all 4 directions. He noted that the project includes extending the trail along the extension of Highland Drive, and putting stop signs at Highland Drive and Canyon Road.

**Fire:** Mr. Sutherland stated that he isn't opposed to this proposal due to the visibility issues at the intersection.

**Administration:** Mr. Beagley noted that the visibility issues will be addressed as best they can, with the intersection redesign project. He explained that the intent of this redesign is to align Highland Drive and Center Street better (more perpendicular) with Canyon Road.



**Public Works:** Mr. Eva stated that he wouldn't like to see a three way stop at this intersection.

**Police:** Chief Hurst explained that the residents are concerned about the amount of traffic on this street. He noted that the paving of the Frontage Road (which will be happening in the next 30 days) will decrease the amount of traffic at this intersection. Chief Hurst asked for a time line of the redesign project. Mr. Beagley answered that it will be designed this year and realistically constructed next year. Chief Hurst stated that he doesn't think the stop sign (i.e. a 3 way stop) is needed now specifically with the changes that will be coming in the near future. He noted that he may change his mind if the projects are delayed, etc.

**Planning and Zoning:** Mr. Bond explained that he doesn't see the need to have people get used to stopping at the intersection when the redesign will have Canyon Road be a through road in the future.

**Engineering:** Mr. Beagley referred to Chief Hurst's comment that this three-way stop isn't warranted right now; but with the redesign, and if traffic patterns change, it should be revisited.

**Motion:** Mr. Bond motioned to deny the three way stop sign request at the intersection of Center Street and Highland Drive. With the intention that the intersection will be improved within a year and a half and may be revisited if circumstances change. Chief Hurst seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

**Administration:** Mr. Beagley explained that there was a second request made for signage informing drivers of a deaf child that lives in the area (Canyon Road, near Highland Drive). He expounded that he has done some research and found that signs that inform drivers of a special needs person in the area are not recognized by the Federal Highways Administration as official traffic control devices. Mr. Beagley stated that these signs can provide a false sense of security that it is safe for children to play in the road. He also noted the potential tracking issues these signs could cause if the family moves or when the child grows up, etc. Mr. Beagley indicated that he doesn't believe that the sign is warranted.

**Police:** Chief Hurst expressed concern that if this sign is provided it will set a precedent all over the City and could result in a sign overload.

Mr. Beagley clarified his desire to support those with special needs. He explained that there are studies that indicate that these types of signage can create a decrease in safety.

**Motion:** Mr. Beagley motioned to deny the request to install a deaf child in area sign in the requested area. Mr. Spadafora seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

#### **Spencer Street Light and Clear View Request**

*The DRC will review a request for a street light on the corner of 900 South and Center Street.*

Mr. Lundell explained that this request is to provide a street light at the corner of 900 South and Center Street. He noted that there are additional requests regarding clear view problems at this corner which will be reviewed outside of the DRC. Mr. Lundell explained that current code requires any new subdivision to install a street light at each intersection or a maximum distance of 500 feet apart. He noted that when this subdivision was installed that requirement didn't exist.

**Administration:** Mr. Beagley stated that he thinks it makes sense to install a light here. He noted that there is sufficient power, a pole and transformer on the corner to make it happen.

**Engineering:** Mr. Lundell explained that there is a possibility to coordinate with Rocky Mountain Power and SESD to have a pole mounted light installed on the existing power pole. He added that installing a street light at this location would bring the area up to current City code.

**Motion:** Mr. Beagley motioned to explore the option of installing a pole light at the corner of 900 S. and Center Street with RMP and SESD and if feasible to install it. Mr. Eva seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

#### **Villegas Street Sign Request**

*The DRC will review a request for additional signage at the intersection of South Center Street and Canyon Road.*

Mr. Lundell explained that this request is for additional signage at the intersection of Highland Drive and Canyon Road.

**Administration:** Mr. Beagley clarified that to the North of the freeway is Center Street and South of the freeway it becomes Canyon Road. He explained that currently the signage shows Center Street to the South of the freeway. Mr. Beagley suggested that a directional sign be provided for Center Street northbound and for Canyon Road southbound. He explained that he doesn't see a solution for the part of Center Street that extends South of 900 South.

**Public Works:** Mr. Eva suggested that a request is made for google maps to change the street map so it is labeled as South Center Street (south of 900 South) instead of Pine View Circle. Since the homes on this street are addressed off of (South) Center Street and not Pine View Circle this would clear up some of the confusion. Mr. Beagley suggested that the residents make this request to Google Maps.

Mr. Beagley proposed that a double directional sign is installed on Highland Drive and Canyon Road. The committee discussed the confusion that the directional signs could cause. Mr. Bond stated that the directional sign doesn't meet the applicants request. Mr. Eva suggested that a Center Street sign doesn't have directional arrows and that a Canyon Road sign be added as well. Mr. Bond Agreed with Mr. Eva. Mr. Beagley and Mr. Spadafora stated that signifying that Center Street continues South will cause confusion for those looking for Canyon Road and

Center Street to the south. Mr. Bond suggested that the best thing to do would be leaving the signage for Center Street ambiguous since it goes both North and South and signifying that Canyon Road only continues Southbound.

**Motion:** Mr. Spadafora motioned that no additional signage be provided at the intersection of South Center Street and Canyon Road in order to avoid further confusion. Mr. Eva seconded. The motion passed 5 votes to 1 with Mr. Bond voting Nay.

#### **Approval of Minutes for Meeting Held**

June 23, 2020


**Motion:** Mr. Beagley motioned to approve the minutes from June 23, 2020. Mr. Eva seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Reeves asked the DRC members if they have any issues with relinquishing the City owned property at the intersection of Main Street and 500 East, just south of the Grocery store. Mr. Beagley recommends that it be relinquished back to the developer who originally gave the land to the City. Mr. Reeves noted that it is an unbuildable parcel.

No action was taken on the aforementioned item.

#### **Adjournment**

Mr. Bond motioned to adjourn at 11:45 a.m.

  
Jon Lundell, City Engineer

  
Kira Petersen, Deputy Recorder