



**DRC Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, October 29, 2019**

**DRC Members in Attendance:** Engineer Norm Beagley, Fire Inspector Taylor Sutherland, Building Official Randy Spadafora, Community Development Director Jason Bond, Public Works Director Wade Eva, and Police Chief Rod Hurst.

**Other's in Attendance:** Planner Ryan Harris, Engineer Jon Lundell, Building Inspector Jared Shepherd, Post Master Jon Mendenhall, Clint Ercanbrack representing the Ercanbrack Subdivision, Rob Horlacher, Curtis Levitt, Greg Hawes and representing Summit Ridge Townhomes and Josh Nixon representing Chisholm Dental.

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

**Ercanbrack Subdivision**

*A concept review of a three lot subdivision located at approximately 605 E. and 400 N.*

Mr. Beagley explained that Mr. Ercanbrack would like to subdivide his property into three parcels. Mr. Ercanbrack clarified that he would like to add two buildable lots, in addition to the existing home, therefore this proposed subdivision would result in 3 total lots, from one existing parcel. He noted that the existing shed and outbuildings will be torn down. Mr. Beagley informed the Committee members that since this is a concept review, feedback from the Committee to the applicant is needed to see if he then feels this plan is feasible.

**Engineering and Planning and Zoning:** Mr. Beagley explained that once subdivided, parcel one, with the existing home, must still meet the setbacks for the R-10 zone. Mr. Harris illustrated that, as shown, in the future, subdividing parcel three would be difficult, because any lot in this zone requires 80 feet of continued frontage. Mr. Ercanbrack noted that he will be selling 10 feet of property to the east to the McMullin's next door. Mr. Beagley directed Mr. Ercanbrack to include the McMullin's lot information including, property boundaries and signatures from the land owners. He clarified that a separate quit claim deed will also be required.

Mr. Beagley asked that a legend is provided on the plat. He noted that the existing right of way and all neighboring parcels need to be shown on the plat. Mr. Beagley asked how the sewer will be taken care of for the new lots. Mr. Ercanbrack answered that the lots will have septic tanks. Mr. Beagley reminded him that when sewer comes to this within 300' feet of any home), the lots will need to connect to it. Mr. Beagley also stated that frontage improvements (curb, gutter, and sidewalk) will be required unless, the City Council approves a deferral agreement.

Mr. Beagley pointed out an issue with the waterline. He noted that City Code recently changed code to state that new lots can't be created on a dead end waterline longer than 500 feet. Mr. Lundell stated that the existing waterline is 1500 feet. Mr. Beagley clarified that the applicant would either need to approach the Council to see if they would grant an exception, or the

waterline would need to loop down onto the North end of Orchard Lane. He explained that the reason for this requirement is potential fire hazards (fire flow), as well as water quality issues. Mr. Beagley stated that the City may enter into a connectors agreement with the developer for reimbursement in the future if they loop the waterline, but it's not guaranteed. He also noted that water dedication will be required for each lot.

As this is a concept review, no action was taken by the Committee.

### **Summit Ridge Towns**

*A **concept** review of a 434-unit multifamily subdivision located at approximately Summit Ridge Parkway and 1200 W.*

**Fire:** Mr. Sutherland noted concern with the 26 foot private drives, and asked where the fire hydrants will be located. Mr. Hawes explained that the 26 foot roads are alleys and the hydrants will be located on the public streets Mr. Sutherland expressed concern with fire access and asked that it be clearly posted that there is no street parking allowed on the alley streets as it is still a fire access road.

**Post Office:** Mr. Mendenhall asked if there will be a clubhouse with this development. Mr. Levitt answered that there won't be. Mr. Mendenhall noted that he usually locates the mailboxes for these types of units at a clubhouse. He explained that if parcel lockers are installed, 27 MBU's would be needed, and it may be an eyesore. Mr. Beagley suggested that the developer consider this as they continue through the process. Mr. Mendenhall asked that the developer consider a plan and bring it to their preliminary review.

**Building Official:** Mr. Spadafora asked if the road on the East side will be connected to any of the adjacent roads. Mr. Beagley explained that it will connect to the Frontage Road.

**Public Works:** Mr. Eva voiced concern with the dead ends and snow removal. Mr. Lundell stated that page 2 of the plans show the proposed snow loading areas. Mr. Eva explained that the snow loading areas look fine, but not having turnarounds is difficult for the snow plows.

**Engineering:** Mr. Beagley reported that there are existing sewer lines in the property that need to be considered. Mr. Lundell noted that the sewer is fairly shallow in this area. Mr. Beagley explained that Staff will provide horizontal data for the sewer lines. Mr. Eva asked if the waterlines will be looped. Mr. Beagley explained that since this is a concept plan no utilities are shown yet, and there is no data to determine pressure zones. Mr. Hoffman stated that there is no P.I. Pressure Reducing Valve (PRV) for this area. Mr. Beagley stated that staff is working with a separate developer to relocate a CW PRV in the parkway and may install a P.I. PRV at the same time.

**Planning:** Mr. Bond explained to Mr. Levitt that all of the info needs to be submitted at the time of submission. Mr. Beagley noted that the DRC members haven't been able to review all of the

plans that were submitted for concept, because new plans came in after the submission date. He stated that there is a checklist available on the website listing the requirements for preliminary, final, etc.

Mr. Bond asked that the future commercial areas are shown on the plat. He also asked that the access into future commercial and or adjacent development is shown.

Mr. Bond stated that City Code no longer allows private roads however, because there was a development agreement in place prior to this change, some private roads may be allowed. He asked that maintenance for the private and public roads is clarified to avoid confusion. Mr. Beagley noted that the HOA will need to maintain the asphalt and snow removal any of the private roads, if allowed.

**Engineering:** Mr. Beagley stated that the roadway on the North West side needs to extend to provide connectivity to future properties. He noted that City Code requires units to front a public street, and some of the proposed units don't meet code. Mr. Bond emphasized that anywhere public streets can be implemented is better for the City. He clarified that the minimum public cross section is 55 feet. Mr. Beagley noted that the roadway to the South West needs to be reworked as a piece of it is shown on private property. He also mentioned previous plans to construct this roadway on part City and part developer property for dual access. He reminded the developer that they will need to discuss cost etc. with the City Council.

Mr. Beagley reported that when Summit Ridge Parkway was built, the storm drain was only stubbed out from the roadway. Since this development will be developed along the Parkway, that existing storm drainage will need to be addressed. He noted that some type of underground detention pond or detention basin may be needed. Mr. Beagley explained that a flood plain channel comes through the property and will need to be addressed.

Mr. Beagley described that the unit garage sizes will affect site parking, and he noted that open space requirements will be looked at holistically and determined for this project. Mr. Beagley explained that proper pedestrian connectivity needs to be shown between parking areas and the units. Mr. Bond asked that the amenities are specified more clearly. He stated that the details are needed for the Council, and Planning Commission review and to be include it in the development agreement.

Mr. Beagley expressed concerns with phasing, and asked that the developer ensures that each phase can stand on its own. Mr. Harris reminded the developer that parking requirements need to be met for each phase. Mr. Bond suggested that an additional ingress and egress is provided for phase two. Chief Hurst brought up concerns with phasing and explained that staging can't take place in the street. He also expressed concern with staging taking up parking stalls for residents living in previously completed phases. Chief Hurst asked about the plan for garbage. Mr. Beagley explained that in high density areas, the City Council has typically required private dumpsters rather than cans for individual units.

Mr. Beagley explained that private roads need City Council approval, he clarified that it can be done through the preliminary review with the Council. Mr. Beagley noted that utilities can't be located in private streets.

As this is a concept review, no action was taken by the Committee.

**Chisholm Dental Addition**

*A site plan review of an addition to the existing dental office located at approximately 10 S. and 300 W.*

Mr. Beagley explained that this proposed extension would extend the existing dental building to the North, toward Main Street.

**Police:** Chief Hurst asked why this proposal needs to come to DRC. Mr. Bond explained that because of the size of the extension, planning and zoning reviews are needed and it is being treated as a site plan.

**Planning:** Mr. Bond reported that articulation is needed for the building extension. He clarified that what has been submitted won't meet architecture requirements and referred the developer to the code. He explained that when the developer requests it, and plans are ready, an Architectural Review Committee meeting will be scheduled to review this plan. Mr. Bond explained that the plans also need to show how the area will be landscaped.

Mr. Bond explained that the shared parking agreement with High Park South will be needed to show that there will be sufficient parking for the extension. He asked that information is provided regarding the number of extra employees that this extension will generate. Mr. Eva noted the potential need for red curb along Main Street to prevent parking. Mr. Bond clarified that off street parking won't count towards parking requirements.

Mr. Lundell pointed out that the overhead power line may come into conflict with the extension. Mr. Beagley explained that it is the Cities understanding that the lines are dead. He asked if the developer will be required to remove the lines. Mr. Sutherland clarified that 30 feet is required for fire clearance above the gable. Mr. Nixon stated that they may want to remove the lines regardless.

**Motion:** Mr. Bond motioned to table the Chisholm Dental Addition until more information is provided regarding the number of additional employees as it will affect parking requirements. And that the existing parking agreement is provided to justify that parking will still work on the site. Mr. Spadafora seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

**Approval of Minutes for Meeting Held**  
October 8, 2019

Mr. Spadafora motioned to approve the minutes from October 8, 2019. Mr. Bond seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

**Adjournment**

Mr. Bond motioned to adjourn at 11:19 a.m.

\*Approved on 12/10/2019

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kira Petersen, Deputy Recorder