



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 14, 2014

The Development Review Committee held a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 14, 2014 in the City Council Chambers, 45 West 100 South, Santaquin, Utah. Dennis Marker called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

Committee Members Present: City Manager Ben Reeves, Community Development Director Dennis Marker, Infrastructure Inspector Jared Shepherd, Building Official Randy Spadafora, Engineer Norm Beagley, Public Works Director Wade Eva, and Public Safety Director Dennis Howard.

Others Present: Scott Peterson, Taylor Smith, Mark Wells.

Park View 4-plexes

Review of a site plan for two 4-plexes located at approximately 200 South 300 West. Scott Peterson was present to address issues with the site plan.

Infrastructure: Jared Shepherd questioned whether the sewer line was sufficient for drainage. Norm Beagley suggested the line be upsized to 6". Mr. Peterson agreed to put in a 6" line. Separate lines are needed if the units have individual owners (condominiums). Mr. Shepherd clarified that the units would be rentals. The condominium approval process was discussed. Mr. Peterson said the plan was to keep the units as rentals long-term. He said he will keep the pressurized irrigation account in his own name, and apply for separate utility accounts for each unit. Mr. Beagley said a 1" PI service is noted. He suggested a 1 ½ or two inch meter would be more appropriate for such a large amount of landscape area. All main lines are 2 inches. Mr. Peterson said he will put in a larger meter.

Public Works: Wade Eva said he had no further concerns with the project.

Building: Randy Spadafora said the developer needed to show addresses for the units and addresses for surrounding parcels. He said addressing the units as 1, 2 etc. are preferable to Unit A, B, etc. Phase 1 addresses will be on 300 West, and Phase 2 on 200 South. Mr. Spadafora discussed a sidewalk connection from the parking lot to the unit entrances facing the streets.

Public Safety: Dennis Howard presented comments from Fire Chief Stephen Olson. The developer was asked to post signs advising no parking for 15' on both sides of the existing fire hydrant, and to paint the curb red. Electrical utilities are to be buried. The Fire Department requires two sets of structural plans, which they will review before construction begins. Mr. Peterson said he had spoken to Greg Peterson, a representative for Rocky Mountain Power, regarding the undergrounding of overhead power.

Engineering: Norm Beagley said the final site plans need to be stamped, signed and dated, and the owner/developer name address and phone number be placed on all sheets. The developer was asked to provide a table with the parcel size, building area, parking lot area and landscape area in square feet.

Curb, gutter and sidewalk along 300 West and 200 South will not be required at the time of development. The developer was asked to sign and record a waiver of protest with the Utah County Recorder's Office. This waiver of protest would cover any future Special Improvement District that may be formed and would run with the land. The developer was asked to show street center lines and intersections, to determine if city right-of-way requirements can be met. Mr. Peterson said he understood the City might be changing setbacks in the core area.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 14, 2014 – Page 2

Park View 4-plexes, continued:

Dennis Marker said an amendment reducing setbacks was currently under review by the Planning Commission. He indicated the setbacks would not be changing in the near future. Mr. Beagley clarified the proposed access to the units from the parking lot, and discussed sidewalk and ADA requirements. An ADA parking stall will be required with these units. Mr. Peterson said he will check with his architect to see what is needed. Randy Spadafora will also review the ADA requirements for this size of building.

Wade Eva said this area was a flood channel, and the ground entry units should be elevated. Mr. Beagley recommended an eastern berm, and said curb and gutter will help with flooding. After some discussion on storm water paths, it was agreed the developer would need to address the issue of storm water coming from 200 South and 300 West.

Mr. Beagley recommended that both sewer laterals be 6". He asked the developer to show and call out sewer lateral cleanouts within 5 feet of each building, as required by the Santaquin City Code, and to show existing topography with minimum 2' contours.

A site storm drain plan was discussed. Mr. Beagley said he has not had a chance to review the plan as yet. A percolation test will be needed for the calculations. City infrastructure inspector Jared Shepherd will witness the test. The site storm drain plan needs to show sufficient storage to provide for a 100 year storm event in the sump near the garden entry units, as there is no outlet in that area for such an event. The only outlet for overflow would be into the units. It appears that during a storm event there would be about a foot of water in the parking lot with no drain, and that water will pond and freeze in the winter within the lot. Mr. Peterson agreed to dig the basin sides out for additional water storage.

The developer was asked to change the wording indicating one existing tree would be maintained to note that several trees would be maintained. Trash removal for the site was discussed. Mr. Peterson indicated he was planning for each unit to have an individual trash receptacle. After some discussion, Mr. Peterson said he would use one dumpster for all the units, set within a fenced enclosure.

Mr. Beagley said it appeared there were possible gaps or overlaps of parcel lines with adjacent properties. He recommended boundary line agreements or lot line adjustments be entered into. Mr. Peterson said he can get clear title because they are not creating any overlaps. Mr. Beagley asked that the developer verify there are no overlaps.

Mr. Beagley recommended the PI lines within the development be laid so that there is no danger of it being ripped up during Phase 2 construction. Mr. Peterson said he will show the line going in during Phase 1.

Community Development: Dennis Marker reviewed the setback requirements. The minimum north setback is 20 feet, the east 30 feet, the south 30 feet, and the parking area setback is 20 feet. Two additional guest parking spots are required, one of which should be to ADA standards. Curb inlet details for storm basins are needed. Mr. Peterson said he will pour everything in concrete, sloped so water runs off the edge. Mr. Marker said if the lot has a six foot concrete sidewalk, the parking stalls need to be only 18 feet deep.

Mr. Marker said the units in Phase 2 that face south will be required to have 30% masonry on each elevation facing the street. Plans for the buildings will need to be reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee, and landscaping plans will be reviewed as well.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 14, 2014 – Page 3

Park View 4-plexes, Community Development, continued:

Mr. Marker asked what site lighting was anticipated. Mr. Peterson said in the past they have done lighting on the buildings, but additional lighting will be needed in the parking lot. He plans to install footings for overhead parking and wait to see if a parking cover is financially feasible. It was suggested that lights be put in the parking cover. Mr. Peterson said he will address the lighting issue. Mr. Beagley said a note should be added to the plans indicating there would be covered parking in the future.

Mr. Marker said the landscaping comments would be sent to Mr. Peterson. Details are needed on the tot lot, such as the kind of play equipment, and pavement markings need to be provided.

Dennis Howard made a motion to approve the Park View 4-plexes site plan, contingent on the implementation of the items raised in this meeting. Jared Shepherd seconded the motion. The vote to approve the Park View 4-plexes site plan was unanimous. Mr. Marker said he will route the revised plans to the Committee members when he receives them.

Apex Storage

Review of an amended storage site plan at 625 North SR 198. Taylor Smith and Mark Wells were present to discuss issues with the site plan.

Public Safety: Dennis Howard said he had no concerns with the site plan.

Public Works: Wade Eva said he had no concerns with the site plan.

Engineering: Norm Beagley said he had not reviewed the corrected plans provided earlier today. Mark Wells said the situation for the old plans had looked good on paper, but it turned out they were fighting the natural lay of the land, so they had done a revision. The caretaker unit has been moved to where the utilities are located. They have replaced the two story unit idea with back to back units, as too much fill was needed. A retaining wall will be designed for the units when the buildings are constructed. The developers would like to do Building G as soon as possible, as well as the new caretaker residence.

Mr. Beagley clarified that his previous comments regarding tabulation boxes, number and striping of parking stalls, turning radii for public safety vehicles, public utility easements and the monument sign had been addressed. One firewall is shown on Unit I. Mr. Beagley said he would prefer a firewall on both sides of the east end of building "J". Mr. Wells said the retaining wall will be integrated into the building, which is planned for later this year.

Mr. Beagley said there had been an issue with the failure of a water line in the past. Mr. Wells said the water line will bend and go back to the north. The water line is being re-located to the drive aisle. Although the line is private, it is connected to the City's culinary water system and must be inspected and tested by City personnel. Mr. Eva said Jared Shepherd had scheduled an inspection for the line on January 15.

The necessity for another fire hydrant was discussed. The commercial code will be checked and the fire chief consulted on this issue. An address is needed for the caretaker unit. Building lighting was discussed. Mr. Wells said a standard commercial light package was used on the storage units, with lights placed every 100 feet.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 14, 2014 – Page 4

Apex Storage, Engineering, continued:

There is 10% drainage along Unit G, and it was suggested that the underground storm drain system be moved to the south where the ground is more level. Mr. Wells agreed with this suggestion. He said the drive aisles have a low spot in the center. Mr. Beagley asked that updated storm drainage calculations be provided.

The caretaker home was discussed. Mr. Wells said the mobile unit is set in the ground with a concrete pier and anchor setting system. He said it will appear as a regular home with no skirting. The building will require a separate permit and the plans must be approved by the Building Official.

Mr. Marker said the landscaping plan should include shrubbery. Mr. Wells said there was an issue with having the area landscaped, as eventually there would be further access through that area, and they would prefer to have landscaping only around the residence. Mr. Marker suggested showing how the area would be eventually extended, and, in the meantime, ensuring the area was graded and kept clean of weeds.

Mr. Beagley asked the developer to check with the fire department on the need for an additional hydrant and on the steepness of the ramp. Mr. Marker clarified a vertical curve is necessary on the slope transitions.

Norm Beagley made a motion to approve the revised Apex Storage site plan, contingent on addressing issues raised in this meeting, finalizing comments, storm drain calculations, landscaping, and firewall issues. Dennis Howard seconded the motion. The vote to approve the revised Apex Storage site plan was unanimous.

Oak Summit G1 and G2

Review of two 10 lot subdivisions split off from Oak Summit G at approximately 150 South 1030 East.

Dennis Marker said final plans had been submitted for Oak Summit, and had been stamped by JUB Engineering. One address on the plans needs correction. Norm Beagley made a motion to approve the finalized Oak Summit G1 and G2, subject to correction of the previously mentioned address. Wade Eva seconded the motion. The motion to approve Oak Summit G1 and G2 was unanimous.

Minutes

Dennis Howard made a motion to approve the minutes of October 22, 2013, as written. Wade Eva seconded the motion. The vote to approve the minutes of October 22, 2013 was unanimous.

General Business

Mr. Marker said there is a concern that the City is requiring some items that are not in the standards. Wade Eva said some of the standards need to be revised. Mr. Marker asked Mr. Beagley to set up a meeting to discuss the changes needed.

Dennis Howard said there are no standards set for a percolation test. Mr. Beagley said developers are required to retain water on site, and the test shows what will happen to the water that is retained. The results are used for storm drain calculations. The City inspector who watches the test is certifying that the rate used for calculations is correct.

Adjournment

Dennis Howard made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 11:24 a.m.


Dennis Marker, Committee Member


Linda Midgley, Deputy Recorder



SANTAQUIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

POLICE

FIRE

EMS

275 West Main Street, Santaquin, Utah 84655*Office 801-754-1070*Fax 801-754-1697

January 14, 2014

Development Review Committee
Park View Subdivision, Site Plan Review
Version 12/20/2013

Please address and provide clarification regarding the following issues.

- 1-Private vehicle parking on street sides (3W & 2S)
- 2-No parking posted 15' on both sides of existing fire hydrant, curb painted red.
- 3-Electrical Utilities to be buried.
- 4-Structural plans (2 sets) required for Fire Dept. review before construction begins.

Stephen Olson
Fire Chief
Santaquin Fire & EMS

**ENGINEERING REVIEW COMMENTS
PARK VIEW 4 PLEXES
150 SOUTH 300 WEST**

| SITE PLAN REVIEW # 1 | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| PROJECT # | 50-13-039-06 | DATE DEVELOPER WAS CALLED 1: | |
| PLAN RECEIVED DATE: | JANUARY 9, 2014 | 2: | |
| PLAN REVIEW DATE: | JANUARY 13, 2014 | 3: | |
| RETURN TO CITY DATE: | JANUARY 13, 2014 | DATE PICKED UP FOR DEVELOPER: | |

City Engineer's Comments:

All Sheets

1. The final site plans will need to be stamped, signed & dated by a professional land surveyor or engineer.
2. Please provide Owner/Developer name, address and phone number as required by Santaquin City on all sheets.

Cover Sheet

1. Please provide adjacent property owner names and addresses as required by Santaquin City review standards.
2. Please provided a table with the following information:
 - a. Parcel size in square feet
 - b. Building area in square feet
 - c. Parking lot area in square feet
 - d. Landscape area in square feet

Site Plan

1. Discuss curb, gutter, and sidewalk. If these are not going to be required at the time of development we recommend a waiver of protest be executed and filed with the Utah County Recorder's Office.
2. Please show street centerlines and intersections.
3. Discuss street ROW dedication requirements, if any (also related to comment below regarding Boundary Survey Description).
4. Discuss access from the parking lot to each unit.

Will there be rear entries and rear stairs for all units?

Will upper units have access in both the front & the back?

Does there need to be a sidewalk from the parking lot area to the fronts of both buildings?

Would this sidewalk meet ADA requirements (south 4-plex)?
5. Discuss ADA requirements, if any (i.e. ADA parking requirements, signage, parking lot access to onsite sidewalks, etc.).

6. Discuss having only a 1" PI service. For such a large amount of landscape area would a 1-1/2" or 2" meter be more appropriate? The Irrigation Plan indicates that all main lines are to be 2".
7. Discuss 4" sewer lateral size for 4 units.
We recommend that both sewer laterals be 6".
8. Please show & call out sewer lateral cleanouts within 5' of each building as required by Santaquin City Code.

Grading Plan

1. Please show existing topography with minimum 2' contours.
2. Please provide a storm drain plan for review including calculations and a percolation test witnessed by a City representative. This storm drain plan also needs to be stamped and signed by a professional engineer.
3. Discuss sump in the Garden Level area.
The site storm drain plan needs to show that there will be sufficient storage to provide for a 100 year storm event for this small sunken area. This is due to there being no outlet to control a 100 year event as required by Santaquin City Code. Should excess storm water accumulate in this area the only outlet for overflow would be into the Garden Level units.
4. Please clarify the approach to storm drainage in the parking lot. It appears that during a storm event there will be about 1' of water in the parking lot with no drain.
This approach does not seem to make sense to us.
The design shows that water will pond and (freeze in the winter time) within the parking lot.
This raises safety concerns as well as long term maintenance concerns.

Landscape Plan

1. Note #1 indicates "Existing Tree...to be maintained".
Should this read "Existing Trees... to be maintained"? Or is just 1 tree planned to remain?
2. Please show and label site obscuring fencing for garbage can storage areas.

Boundary Survey Description

1. As we compared the proposed Boundary Survey Description with available Utah County Parcel data there appears to be possible gaps or overlaps of parcel lines with adjacent properties to the north and east.
We recommend either Boundary Line Agreements or Lot Line Adjustments be entered into between this parcel owner and the adjacent property owners.

**ENGINEERING REVIEW COMMENTS
APEX STORAGE SITE PLAN
(APPROX. 600 NORTH) HWY 198**

| (Revised) SITE PLAN REVIEW # 3 | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--|
| PROJECT # | 5013039-010 | DATE DEVELOPER WAS CALLED 1: | |
| PLAN RECEIVED DATE: | JANUARY 7, 2014 | 2: | |
| PLAN REVIEW DATE: | JANUARY 8, 2014 | 3: | |
| RETURN TO CITY DATE: | JANUARY 8, 2014 | DATE PICKED UP FOR DEVELOPER: | |

City Engineer's Comments:

Revised Plans (with a revision date of January 7, 2014)

The revised plans we received on January 7, 2014 have significant changes from the previous version of the plans we received on September 12, 2013 (with a revision date of 8/30/13).

Below we provide comments and or ask questions regarding these significant changes and other items found during our review of the revised plans.

- Several of the tabulation boxes on the cover sheet are missing.
Please show "Site Tabulation", "Sheet Index" and "Parking Tabulation" boxes, similar to what was previously shown.
- The previous version of the plans showed a small grass landscape area adjacent to the Office & Caretaker Home.
Is landscaping still planned adjacent to or near the Office & Caretaker Home?
Are there City requirements for such landscaping?
- The revised plan shows one less parking stall.
Does 7 parking stalls meet City Code requirements for this facility?
- The previous plan called out for striping of 4 parking stalls north of the existing septic tank (east of the existing units).
The current plans show the same stalls but no note. Have these 4 stalls been striped or do they still need to be?
If these stalls are still required and are not currently striped, please add a note for striping them.
- At the very north end of west building (labeled as "G" on the previous plan set, not labeled on the revised plan set) the culinary water line stub is still being shown right next to (it appears to be nearly touching) the future building.

There has already been one water line failure in this vicinity in the past. Future failures need to be avoided during construction as well as after construction.

Discuss shortening this stub to the east & re-capping and appropriately thrust blocking the line.

6. The monument sign has been removed from the revised plans.
Is a monument sign still going to be installed?
7. The previous plans called for a 2 hour rated fire wall on the south end of building "I".
Is a 2 hour fire wall still required with the new configuration of that building (appears to possibly affect 3 units)?
8. A new proposed building with additional units (not shown previously) is now being shown west from the proposed Office & Caretaker Home location.
This new building is directly south of and connected to the previously proposed building that is labeled as a 2 story building.
Is the intent still to build a 2 story building?
If so, a 2 story building connected to another building does not seem to make sense from an access standpoint.
Please explain this configuration.
9. Discuss existing fire hydrant spacing for the newly proposed building west of the proposed Office & Caretaker Home.
It appears there may be greater spacing than what is allowed by City & Fire Codes.
10. At a previous DRC meeting discussion was had regarding some type of a physical break in the middle of the long building west of the Office & Caretaker Home.
Is a physical break planned for this building?
Is a physical break required by Code?
Please discuss.
11. Please show appropriate signage in front of the proposed handicapped parking stall.
12. The previous design showed and called out for a 6' chain link fence south of the new units.
Is a fence still planned to provide security for the new units?
13. The previous plan showed and labeled turning radii for the driveways.
Please show turning radii information for fire access.

14. The previous plans included a grading plan that included storm drainage infrastructure.

Please provide a grading plan as well as proposed storm drainage infrastructure.

15. The previous plans showed P.U.E.'s.

Please show appropriate P.U.E.'s on the plans

16. The previous plans showed building lighting.

Is building lighting still planed?

Discuss City lighting requirements.

17. Please show a proposed address for the Office & Caretaker Home.

18. The previous plans showed a portion of the culinary water line in a different location than what the revised plan shows.

It is our understanding that this segment of the water line has been relocated by the Owner.

Was the relocated water line installed, inspected and tested per Santaquin City Standards?

If no testing was conducted it will need to be done per Santaquin City Standards.

Santaquin City also needs to GPS the physical location of the water line, fittings, etc. so they have that for their record.

Although this water line is considered by the City and the Owner as a private water line, it is connected to the City's culinary water system. As such, this line must be installed, inspected & tested per City Standards in order for the City to show and certify that the City's culinary water system meets State drinking water rules.