



DRC Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, September 10, 2019

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

Other's in Attendance: Building Inspector Jared Shepherd, Staff Planner Ryan Harris, Infrastructure Drew Hoffman, Chad Rowley representing Cherries Dance Studio, and Blaine Guymon representing the Snell Storage Subdivision.

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

Cherries Dance Studio Commercial Site Plan

A commercial site plan review of a proposed Dance Studio located at approximately 575 N. State Road 198.

Fire: Mr. Sutherland noted that the west end of the parking lot needs to be 26 feet wide to meet fire code. He recommends moving the fire hydrant to the planter strip on the west end.

Public Works: Mr. Eva asked about the meter and sewer locations. Mr. Beagley explained that the dance studio will hook on to the existing water line. They plan to have a septic system since they are uphill from the closest sewer. Mr. Beagley explained to the applicant that State code requires buildings within 300 feet of sewer to connect to the sewer line. The site is currently more than 300 feet from the closest sewer. He suggests that they prepare the sewer/septic system for when the sewer is run within 300 feet to prepare for their future sewer connection. Mr. Beagley also noted that the septic system needs to be approved by the County Health Dept.

Building Official: Mr. Spadafora indicated that a proposed address hasn't been provided yet. Please provide a proposed address for the building.

Engineering: Mr. Beagley explained that elevations need to be approved by the ARC. He reported that a lighting and photometric plan is required per City code, this includes the parking lot and building lighting.

Planning: Mr. Bond informed that developer that city parking code requires one space per two patrons. According to the square footage of the building and the expected occupancy of the building (which is 98) 49 parking spaces would be required. Mr. Bond stated that part of the proposed sidewalk shown on the plans at the south end isn't part of the developer's frontage, and is not required. He explained that the proposed dumpster location measurements don't work out. Mr. Bond pointed out that while the plans show a one-way parking lot, there is room for a two-way parking lot if the developer desires. Mr. Bond informed the developer that the retaining wall shown between the freeway needs to be engineered per building code, as it appears to be shown

taller than 4' in height. He also noted that staff would prefer that the landscaping trees by the entrance be removed for line of site and safety issues. Mr. Harris clarified that the parking lot landscaping is currently shown at 3%, but 6% is required.

Engineering: Mr. Beagley stated that a storm drain report with calculations and volumes is required. He suggested that if the developer doesn't want to connect to P.I. for their landscaping (because it is so minimal), they could use culinary water for their landscaping. He clarified that if they do this, an above ground double check valve is required for the onsite irrigation system. Mr. Beagley notified them that the private water line they are planning to connect to is high pressure. A Pressure Reducing Valve will be needed at the intersection of Cherry Lane and Highway 198. He explained that this will be discussed with all those connecting to or already connected to the private waterline, and the City will more than likely participate. Mr. Beagley explained that it is his understanding that there is an existing storm drain easement along the inside of the fence that runs along I-15. He recommended that a surveyor makes sure that the proposed rock wall won't impede the storm drainage easement. Mr. Beagley instructed that the parking lot island must be a minimum of 6 feet wide.

Mr. Bond noted that landscaping redlines will be provided. He also explained that fencing and berming are required along the rear property line. Mr. Beagley instructed that the trash enclosure requires screening per city code.

Motion: Mr. Bond motioned to table the Cherries Dance Studio Commercial Site Plan until the redlines are addressed. Mr. Eva seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Snell Storage Landscaping Waiver Request

The DRC will consider a landscaping exception request received from the Snell Storage Subdivision developer.

Mr. Bond reported that at the last DRC meeting it was indicated that more landscaping was required for this subdivision. However, the City Code notes that an exception can be granted by the land use authority, who in this case is the DRC.

Mr. Guymon explained that he is requesting a landscaping waiver for several reasons, one of which is due to the large elevation difference between Highland Drive and the Freeway. Because of the elevation difference, he doesn't believe landscaping will provide screening for residential uses. Mr. Beagley disagreed and believes that landscaping would provide some screening and noise protection from the freeway. He acknowledged that the south end has a high elevation difference, but the north end doesn't. Mr. Bond noted that while landscaping might not visually screen the use, he believes it is needed along the slope to retain the soil.

Mr. Guymon pointed out that the south west portion slopes, and would be difficult to maintain. He is also concerned with the overuse of water for site irrigation purposes, and doesn't feel that the required amount of trees are necessary. Mr. Guymon acknowledged that the landscaping is important along the east side, particularly between the school and the units. Mr. Beagley pointed out full landscaping plans haven't been submitted. He also explained that they are encouraging

trees, shrubs, etc. rather than grass to conserve water. Mr. Guymon stated that he feels that the original landscaping plan was over zealous with the number of trees shown. He indicated that they would prefer the majority of the landscaping to be along the east side. Mr. Beagley feels that the trees and shrubs along the west side should remain, but he agreed that the slope could cause issues to the south and an exemption may be appropriate.

Mr. Guymon asked if building A can be utilized as a fence along the west side. Mr. Beagley noted that fence is required per code as a residential buffer. Mr. Bond indicated that using the wall as a buffer can be looked into, and noted that landscaping will be required to break up the wall. He shared his perspective that he doesn't feel that slope means that landscaping shouldn't be required, but rather that landscaping is needed to retain the slope. Mr. Eva pointed out that landscaping could be washed out on the slope. He explained that there is an increased flooding potential with the nearby Summit Creek facilities.

Mr. Guymon expressed concerns about putting trees over the irrigation ditch, and having roots invade the system and causing damage. Mr. Bond suggested that they choose specific tree types to help eliminate this concern.

Mr. Guymon argued that since the home on the corner isn't owned by the developer it isn't fair to impose landscaping requirements on them. Mr. Beagley explained that the home is still part of the subdivision and will be subject to the subdivision requirements.

Mr. Beagley indicated that the DRC is open to some changes and exceptions, and recommended that the entire landscaping plan is submitted so it can be reviewed holistically. Mr. Eva suggested that the DRC review it onsite in order to view the elevation, etc. He also recommended that the areas that are known to have flooding issues, should be carefully looked at.

Motion: Mr. Bond motioned not to grant the proposed waiver and exception. But to instead request that the applicant submits their completed landscaping plan so the DRC can review it and possibly grant a waiver and exception to specific areas of the plan. In order for the DRC to review the plans in a site specific manner, it is proposed that the DRC members find a time to meet at the site. Mr. Reeves seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Mr. Bond asked that Mr. Guymon propose dates to meet onsite with the DRC members. Mr. Reeves suggested that the meeting is scheduled on a Tuesday at 10 a.m. when DRC is not being held.

Approval of Minutes for Meeting Held

August 27, 2019

Motion: Mr. Bond motioned to approve the minutes from August 27th 2019. Mr. Reeves seconded. The vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Adjournment

Mr. Bond motioned to adjourn at 10:54 a.m.