Mapleton City

Planning Commission Staff Report

August 22, 2019

Item 3

Applicant: Harvest Park Commercial, LLC

Location: Approx. 826 S Hwy 89

Prepared by: Sean Conroy, Community Development Director

Public Hearing: N

Zone: GC-1

Attachments:

1. Application materials and preliminary plans.
2. Parking & Traffic Studies.
3. DRC Comments.
4. PC minutes dated 1/25/18.
5. Previous plans presented on 1/25/18.

REQUEST

Consideration of Preliminary Plat, Project Plan and Conditional Use Permit applications for the Harvest Park Condominiums Plat "A" subdivision consisting of two mixed use buildings with commercial on the ground floor and residential above located in the General Commercial (GC-1) zone.

BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The subject property is a 1.75 acre parcel located on the southwest corner of Highway 89 and Harvest Parkway (800 South). The property is zoned General Commercial (GC-1). Property to the north, east and south is zoned commercial, while the property to the west is zoned residential.

On January 25, 2018 the Planning Commission reviewed an application for two mixed use buildings on this site and received public comment. Much of the public comment focused on traffic and parking concerns and the architectural compatibility of the proposed buildings with the existing Harvest Park commercial buildings to the north (see attached minutes). The Planning Commission continued the application with a request for changes. The requested changes are discussed in more detail in the evaluation section of this report.

The applicant is now proposing the following:

- Create two mixed use buildings connected by an elevator tower;
- Building "A" (north bldg.) includes approximately 7,200 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor and eight condominium units on the upper stories (four 3-bed units, four 2-bed units);
- Building "B" (south bldg.) contains approximately 9,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor and 10 condominium units on the upper stories (four 3-bedroom, six 2-bedroom units);
- A roof top deck; and
- 104 parking stalls.

The Planning Commission is responsible for making recommendations to the City Council on this application.

EVALUATION

Planning Commission Discretion: Subdivision, conditional use permit and project plan applications are all considered administrative in nature. If an application complies with adopted City standards, the City is obligated to approve the request. The City may apply conditions when necessary to ensure compliance with City standards and/or to address reasonably anticipated detrimental effects.

Concurrent Review: MCC Chapter 18.92.070.F indicates that if multiple applications are required (i.e. subdivision, conditional use permit, project plan, etc.) that they may be submitted and reviewed concurrently. However, if the City Council is the final decision-making body for any of the application types, that it shall be the final decision-making body for all applications being reviewed concurrently. While the planning commission is typically the final decision-making body for conditional use permits, since the proposed subdivision requires City Council approval, the City Council shall be the final decision-making body for all of the proposed applications.

General Plan: The General Plan designates the property as General Commercial "GC-1". Uses characteristic of this designation include retail, services, professional offices, mixed use and other appropriate commercial development. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and with the existing commercial uses in the area.

Planning Commission Review: Below is a summary of the items requested by the Planning Commission when it continued the application in 2018, followed by a staff response.

1) Does the Harvest Park Development Agreement and the Harvest Park CC&Rs apply to this property?

Response: It appears that during the initial design phases of Harvest Park that the commercial parcels were intended to be part of the overall project. However, the Development Agreement was never recorded on the subject property or on the other commercial parcels. As a general rule of law, an unrecorded agreement is binding between the original parties, but subsequent purchasers of property are not bound by the agreement because they wouldn't have proper notice of its existence. It is the city attorney's position that the development agreement can not be enforced on this property.

2) Please revise the traffic study to include more traffic counts.

Response: The traffic study reviewed by the Planning Commission in 2018 determined that the project would not create significant impacts on the adjacent streets. However, there was some concern expressed by the Commission, and the public, that the traffic counts were only done on one day. The Commission asked that additional traffic counts be taken.

The traffic engineer collected traffic collected additional as requested by the Commission. The traffic counts were lower than the original counts and the engineer determined that the conclusions of the original report were justified (see attachment "2").

3) Please address how snow removal will be accomplished.

Response: The applicant has submitted a plan indicating that the snow would be pushed into the adjacent planters.

4) Please address how construction traffic will be handled and whether access from Hwy 89 would be possible.

Response: The applicant has submitted a conceptual traffic plan that would include the possibility of construction vehicles accessing the site off of Highway 89. A final traffic control plan will be required prior to construction.

5) Please revise the building designs to be more compatible with the existing Harvest Park commercial buildings, preferably with pitched roofs.

Response: The applicants have redesigned the buildings to address the Commission's concerns and have eliminated the flat-roof designs. While the buildings do not have roof pitches as steep as the existing buildings in Harvest Park, they do have a pitch of 8:12. The materials and design are much more compatible with the existing Harvest Park commercial buildings and with the Abbington across the street to the east.

6) Please update the parking study.

Response: MCC chapter 18.92.030.K establishes the off-street parking requirements for commercial projects. This code identifies a range of uses, and parking requirements based on those uses. The requirements range from one space for every 150 square feet of floor area to 1 space for every 600 square feet of floor area, depending on the use.

The applicant has not yet identified what type of uses may occupy the commercial spaces, therefore to be conservative staff has assumed the requirement to be one space for every 200 square feet of commercial area, for a total requirement of 81 commercial paces. The residential parking requirement is 36 spaces. If you combine the total commercial and residential uses, the total requirement would be 117 spaces.

A common characteristic of undesirable suburban commercial development is the provision of excessive parking, much of which remains unused for all but the busiest days of the year. Allowing uses that don't necessarily share peak demand at the same time to share parking spaces is one way to avoid creating large amounts of unused parking. Subsection "K" states the following:

> *"The Mapleton City Planning Commission may permit up to twenty-five (25) percent of the parking required for one building, structure or use to be supplied by the off-street parking spaces provided for another building structure or use."*

The current site plan shows 104 park spaces. If it is assumed that the commercial units will be occupied by uses that require at least one space per 200 square feet, then the Commission would have to authorize the sharing of 13 spaces, or 11% of the total required parking. A parking study by Hales Engineering has been updated to evaluate the shared parking request (see attachment "2"). The evaluation indicates that it is generally good practice to have approximately 10% additional spaces above the estimated max demand as a buffer to avoid vehicles being unable to find a space. The evaluation concludes that during most of the average day, there would likely be more than 10% additional parking to meet demand. However, during the peak time of parking demand, it is estimated that only 5% of the parking spaces might be available, if the commercial spaces are occupied by uses that require one space for every 200 square feet of floor area.

Staff notes that the evaluation is based on average demand from similar uses and cannot predict exactly how the parking demand will turn out for this project. Parking is a concern at this location because of the lack of on-street parking (no on-street parking on Harvest Parkway or Hwy 89). If parking demand exceeds capacity, the only options are to park in the commercial parking lot across the street to the north or within the Harvest Park neighborhood streets, neither of which are acceptable outcomes.

The Commission may consider at least the following options:

- *Authorize 13 spaces to be shared as proposed*. The Commission could include a condition limiting the proposed commercial uses to only those uses that would not exceed 81 total parking spaces based on City code.
- *Deny the request for shared parking, and only allow commercial uses that would require 68 parking spaces or less based on City code*. If, for example, the commercial spaces were limited to professional offices, which the applicant has indicated is likely, the commercial parking requirement would be 65 spaces, not 81, for a total of 101 total spaces required.
- *Reduce the number of residential units.* MCC Chapter 18.64.040 indicates that the Commission may limit the total number of residential units in excess of 10 based on health, welfare and safety concerns.

7) Work out access issues with the Harvest Park HOA.

The Harvest Park HOA controls a strip of land between Harvest Parkway and the subject property. The property owner and the HOA have come to agreement to ensure legal access to the property. They have also discussed the potential of having the residential units be part of the Harvest Park HOA.

Conditional Use Permit: Mapleton City Code (MCC) chapter 18.64.040 requires a conditional use permit for mixed-use structures. Below are the requirements outlined in chapter 18.64.040 followed by a staff response to each requirement.

1. Single-family residential dwelling units shall be located directly above the commercial use on the second or third story of the building. No basement units shall be permitted. No residential units shall be permitted above or below another residential dwelling unit.

Response: The applicant is proposing to have commercial space on the main level with residential units on the second and third levels. The application complies with this requirement.

> *2. All residential dwelling units must meet all applicable requirements of the International Residential Building Code as adopted by Mapleton City. Each dwelling unit will be of sufficient size to provide for a salubrious environment for the enjoyment of the residents who will occupy it. Each dwelling unit shall have a kitchen suitable for cooking and preparing meals, a bathroom with shower and bathing facilities, a living room and a bedroom. Studio*

apartments are permitted so long as they provide space for the amenities as described in this section.

Response: The proposed units comply with these requirements.

3. There shall be no density restrictions for single-family residential dwelling units. Rather, the site and parking requirements will be the limiting factor to the overall number of residential dwelling units. However, the Planning Commission, based on concern for health, safety and welfare, may limit the total number of proposed residential dwelling units in excess of ten (10).

Response: See parking discussion above.

Project Plan: Mapleton City Code (MCC) Chapter 18.92.070.D requires a project plan review for all new structures in the commercial zones. The purpose of the project plan review is to ensure that new commercial development is consistent with the City's commercial design standards.

Commercial Design Standards: The City Council adopted the new commercial design standards (MCC Chapter 18.92) on April 19, 2017. Staff has included a discussion of each relevant chapter of the standards below followed by a brief response. The full standards may be reviewed on the City's website at:

http://mapleton.org/departments/community-development/commercial-district-rfp/.

18.92.030 – Site Standards: One of the key components of the design standards is the requirement to locate buildings close to the street and to locate parking areas to the side and/or rear of the buildings. This creates a more aesthetic commercial environment from the road and emphasizes buildings rather than parking lots. The applicant has complied with these standards.

Subsections "I" and "J" of this section require trash enclosures to be consistent with the architecture of the main building, at least one pedestrian bench per building, and a bike rack with a least four stalls. The applicant has addressed these requirements on the plans.

18.92.040 – Buildings: This chapter is meant to encourage high quality, aesthetically pleasing buildings. Section "A" indicates that the maximum allowed height is 45 feet and the minimum allowed height is 24 feet on corner lots. Decorative elements such as towers and elevator shafts may exceed 45 feet. Both buildings are built to the maximum height of 45 feet with only the elevator shaft exceeding 45 feet.

This section also requires covered entrances, variation in roof lines, and quality building materials (50% or more of stone, wood or hardy board, brick, etc., and no more than 49% stucco). The applicant has designed aesthetically pleasing buildings that follow the design standards and are consistent with the materials on adjacent commercial projects.

18.92.050 – Lighting: This chapter requires a street light for every 150 feet of frontage on a city street. The applicant will pay a fee to the City and the City will have the lights installed by Rocky Mountain Power. This chapter also requires that all parking lot lights have cut off shields and that light poles be between 12-16 feet in height.

18.92.060 – Landscaping: This chapter requires a minimum of 20% of the site be landscaped and that no more than 60% of landscape area to be turn grass. The plans include approximately 23% of the site in landscaping. The applicant's plan includes a variety of planting materials, street trees and the 10-foot landscape buffers. However, due to the location of power lines along Highway 89, the applicant will need to plant trees other than the desired London Sycamores, due to their height at maturity. The proposed plan will allow for an aesthetically pleasing landscape.


Condominium Plat: The applicant is proposing a condominium subdivision plat. The plat will include two commercial spaces and 18 residential units. The parking and landscape areas will be "common" areas. Condominium plats are subject to the standards found in MCC Chapter 17.03 and require review by the Planning Commission and final approval by the City Council. The proposed plat is consistent with the subdivision ordinance.

STAFF RECCOMENDATION

Recommend approval of the project to the City Council with special conditions.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. The applicant is allowed to share 13 parking spaces between the residential and commercial uses. The uses that occupy the commercial building spaces shall be limited to those uses that would not exceed 81 total parking spaces based on City code.
2. Solid fencing shall be installed along the west and south property lines.
3. A separate sign application shall be submitted for all signage proposals.


Attachment "1"
Application Materials
HARVEST
GOLDEN LEAF
MOTTRAM
ELM
HARVEST
CRESCENT
HEATHER
YARROW
SEGOLILY
LOWER
1350 WEST
Subject Property


















1 A001 ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1"=20'

BUILDING A - 7,187
BUILDING B - 8,995 SQFT
TOTAL - 16,182 SQFT
CIRCULATION - 719 SQFT
TOTAL 16,901 SQFT

16,182 / 200 = 81 COMMERCIAL STALLS REQ.
18 RES UNITS * 2 = 36 RES STALLS REQ.
81 x 0.25 = 20 SHARED COMMERCIAL STALLS
81+36-20=97 STALLS REQUIRED
104 STALLS PROVIDED

117 REQUIRED-104 PROVIDED=13
13/117=11.1%

PROGRESS SET

PRINTED DATE
12.21.2018

LAYTON DAVIS ARCHITECTS
2005 EAST 2700 SOUTH | SUITE 200
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84109
P.801.487.0715 | WWW.LAYTONDAVISARCHITECTS.COM

HARVEST PARK
MIXED USE

Mapleton, UT

CHRONOLOGY

PROJECT NO
18.112

DWN BY/ CHK BY
__ / __


TITLE
ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN

24X36 SHEET #
A001

The drawings, designs, ideas, arrangements and plans indicated or represented are the sole property of Layton Davis Architects and are subject to the copyright of Layton Davis Architects or its assigns. They were created, evolved and developed for use on, and in conjunction with the specified project. Any use of the drawings, designs, materials or information contained herein, including but not limited to copying or reproduction, which is not expressly authorized by Layton Davis Architects, is strictly prohibited as an infringement of its copyright and may result in liability.


HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 16,
TOWNSHIP 8 SOUTH, RANGE 3 EAST,
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN



LEGEND AND ABBREVIATIONS

- SECTION LINE
- FOUND SECTION CORNER
- EXISTING ROW CENTERLINE
- FOUND STREET MONUMENT
- SET 5/8 REBAR AND CAP (WILDING ENGINEERING)
- (BOUNDARY LINE)
- ADJACENT PROPERTY / ROW LINE
- FOUND REBAR AND CAP



VICINITY MAP

NOT TO SCALE
MAPLETON, UTAH

NOTE:
ALL EXTERIOR AREAS ARE COMMON AREA.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

1. PURSUANT TO UTAH CODE ANN. 54-3-27 THIS PLAT CONVEYS TO THE OWNER(S) OR OPERATORS OF UTILITY FACILITIES A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG WITH ALL THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES DESCRIBED THEREIN.
2. PURSUANT TO UTAH CODE ANN. 17-27a-603(4)(c)(ii) ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER ACCEPTS DELIVERY OF THE PUE AS DESCRIBED IN THIS PLAT AND APPROVES THIS PLAT SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THAT THE PLAT CONTAINS PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENTS AND APPROXIMATES THE LOCATION OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENTS, BUT DOES NOT WARRANT THEIR PRECISE LOCATION. ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER MAY REQUIRE OTHER EASEMENTS IN ORDER TO SERVE THIS DEVELOPMENT. THIS APPROVAL DOES NOT AFFECT ANY RIGHT THAT ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER HAS UNDER:
   - A. A RECORDED EASEMENT OR RIGHT-OF-WAY
   - B. THE LAW APPLICABLE TO PRESCRIPTIVE RIGHTS
   - C. TITLE 54, CHAPTER 8a, DAMAGE TO UNDERGROUND UTILITY FACILITIES OR
   - D. ANY OTHER PROVISION OF LAW

APPROVED THIS____ DAY OF_____,
A.D. 20___.

_____
ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

DOMINION ENERGY QUESTAR CORPORATION

DOMINION ENERGY QUESTAR CORPORATION APPROVES THIS PLAT SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THAT THE PLAT CONTAINS PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENTS. DOMINION ENERGY QUESTAR CORPORATION MAY REQUIRE OTHER EASEMENTS IN ORDER TO SERVE THIS DEVELOPMENT. THIS APPROVAL DOES NOT CONSTITUTE ABROGATION OR WAIVER OF ANY OTHER EXISTING RIGHTS, OBLIGATIONS OR LIABILITIES PROVIDE BY LAW OR EQUITY. THIS APPROVAL DOES NOT CONSTITUTE ACCEPTANCE, APPROVAL OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ANY TERMS CONTAINED IN THE PLAT, INCLUDING THOSE SET FORTH IN THE OWNERS DEDICATION AND THE NOTES AND DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A GUARANTEE OF PARTICULAR TERMS OF NATURAL GAS SERVICE. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT DOMINION ENERGY QUESTAR CORPORATION'S RIGHT-OF-WAY DEPARTMENT AT 800-366-8532.

APPROVED THIS____ DAY OF_____,
A.D. 20___.

BY:_____

TITLE:_____
DOMINION ENERGY QUESTAR CORPORATION

CENTURY LINK

APPROVED THIS____ DAY OF_____,
A.D. 20___.

_____
CENTURY LINK

COMCAST CABLE TELEVISION

APPROVED THIS____ DAY OF_____,
A.D. 20___.

_____
COMCAST CABLE TELEVISION

PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED THIS _____ DAY OF _____, A.D. 20____ BY THE MAPLETON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION.

_____ _____
PLANNING DIRECTOR CHAIRMAN, PLANNING COMMISSION

SHEET 1 OF 4

WILDING
ENGINEERING
14721 SOUTH HERITAGE CREST WAY
BLUFFDALE, UTAH 84065
801.553.8112
WWW.WILDINGENGINEERING.COM

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

I, KAGAN M. DIXON, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM A PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR AND THAT I HOLD A LICENSE (NUMBER SHOWN BELOW) IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS LICENSING ACT FOUND IN TITLE 58, CHAPTER 22 OF THE UTAH CODE. I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT BY AUTHORITY OF THE OWNERS, I HAVE CAUSED TO BE MADE UNDER MY DIRECTION THIS CONDOMINIUM PLAT OF HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 57-8-13(1) OF THE UTAH CONDOMINIUM OWNERSHIP ACT. I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE BUILDING AND THE PROPERTY ARE SHOWN CORRECTLY.

BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

A TRACT OF LAND BEING SITUATE IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 16, TOWNSHIP 8 SOUTH, RANGE 3 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, HAVING A BASIS OF BEARINGS OF SOUTH 00°17'02" EAST BETWEEN THE EAST QUARTER AND THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 16, SAID TRACT OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE WEST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF U.S. HIGHWAY 89 (ALSO KNOWN AS 1600 WEST STREET), SAID POINT ALSO BEING NORTH LINE OF BARLOW SUBDIVISION, ON FILE WITH THE OFFICE OF THE UTAH COUNTY RECORDER AS MAP NO. 7154, SAID POINT ALSO BEING SOUTH 00°17'02" EAST ALONG THE SECTION LINE A DISTANCE OF 287.19 FEET AND WEST 68.25 FEET FROM THE EAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 16, AND RUNNING THENCE SOUTH 87°10'40" WEST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE A DISTANCE OF 300.36 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT L53, AMENDED HARVEST PARK PHASE "1" PLAT "A", ON FILE WITH THE OFFICE OF THE UTAH COUNTY RECORDER AS MAP NO. 11277; THENCE ALONG SAID SUBDIVISION THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) COURSES, 1) NORTH 00°12'43" WEST 235.15 FEET TO THE ARC OF A NON-TANGENT 750.00 FOOT RADIUS CURVE TO THE RIGHT, 2) ALONG SAID CURVE A DISTANCE OF 229.96 FEET THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 81°12'58" (CHORD BEARS NORTH 81°12'58" EAST 229.06 FEET), 3) EAST 74.49 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID U.S. HIGHWAY 89; THENCE SOUTH ALONG SAID LINE A DISTANCE OF 255.34 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINS 1.752 ACRES, MORE OR LESS

JANUARY 11, 2019
DATE

KAGAN M. DIXON, PLS
LICENSE NUMBER: 9061091

OWNERS' DEDICATION

KNOW BY ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT WE THE UNDERSIGNED OWNERS OF THE TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED HEREON AS HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS, A CONDOMINIUM PROJECT LOCATED ON SAID TRACT OF LAND, HAVE CAUSED A SURVEY TO BE MADE AND THIS RECORD OF SURVEY MAP TO BE PREPARED, DO HEREBY GIVE OUR CONSENT TO THE RECORDATION OF THIS RECORD OF SURVEY MAP AND SUBMIT THIS PROPERTY TO THE UTAH CONDOMINIUM OWNERSHIP ACT.

UTILITY DEDICATION

OWNERS OF THE PARCEL OF LAND WHICH IS SHOWN UPON THIS PLAT, DOES CONSENT TO THE PREPARATION AND RECORDATION OF THIS PLAT AND DOES HEREBY OFFER AND CONVEY TO ALL PUBLIC UTILITY AGENCIES AND THEIR SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS A PERMANENT EASEMENT AND RIGHT-OF-WAY AS SHOWN BY THE AREAS MARKED COMMON AREA (UTILITY EASEMENT) ON AND WITHIN THIS PLAT FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF SUBTERRANEAN ELECTRICAL, TELEPHONE, NATURAL GAS, SEWER AND WATER LINES APPURTENANCES, TOGETHER WITH THE RIGHT-OF-WAY ACCESS THERETO.

RESERVATION OF COMMON AREA

THE OWNER, IN RECORDING THIS PLAT OF HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS, HAS DESIGNATED CERTAIN AREAS OF LAND AS COMMON AREAS, INTENDED FOR THE USE BY THE OWNERS OF THIS CONDOMINIUM FOR INGRESS, EGRESS, RECREATION, AND OTHER RELATED ACTIVITIES, THE DESIGNATED AREAS ARE NOT DEDICATED HEREBY FOR USE BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC BUT ARE RESERVED FOR THE COMMON USE AND ENJOYMENT OF THE CONDOMINIUM OWNERS, AS MORE FULLY PROVIDED IN THE DECLARATION OF THIS PLAT WHICH SHALL BE RECORDED CONCURRENTLY WITH THIS RECORD OF SURVEY MAP AND WHICH SHALL BE EFFECTIVE UPON SUCH RECORDING WITH THE UTAH COUNTY RECORDER.

IN WITNESS HEREOF WE HAVE HEREUNTO SET OUR HANDS THIS _____ DAY OF _____, A.D. 20___.

_____ _____ MANAGER
SIGNATURE PRINT NAME HARVEST PARK COMMERCIAL, LLC

OWNER'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

STATE OF UTAH)
COUNTY OF UTAH) S.S

ON THIS ____ DAY OF _____, A.D. 20____, PERSONALLY APPEARED BEFORE ME _____, WHO BEING BY ME DULY SWORN, DID PROVIDE TO ME ON THE BASIS OF SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE TO BE THE PERSON(S) WHOSE NAME(S) IS/ARE SUBSCRIBED TO THE WITHIN INSTRUMENT, AND ACKNOWLEDGED TO ME THAT HE/SHE/THEY EXECUTED THE SAME IN HIS/HER/THEIR AUTHORIZED CAPACITY(IES), AND THAT BY HIS/HER/THEIR SIGNATURE(S) ON THE INSTRUMENT THE PERSON(S), OR THE ENTITY UPON BEHALF OF WHICH THE PERSON(S) ACTED, EXECUTED THIS PLAT WITH FULL AUTHORITY OF THE OWNER(S).

WITNESS MY HAND OFFICIAL SEAL.

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF UTAH THAT THE FOREGOING PARAGRAPH IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

NOTARY PUBLIC FULL NAME: _____

COMMISSION NUMBER: _____

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: _____

A NOTARY PUBLIC COMMISSIONED IN UTAH

APPROVAL BY LEGISLATIVE BODY

THE CITY OF MAPLETON, APPROVES THIS CONDOMINIUM AND HEREBY ACCEPTS THE DEDICATION OF ALL UNITS, EASEMENTS, AND OTHER PARCELS OF LAND INTENDED FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES FOR THE PERPETUAL USE OF THE PUBLIC THIS _____ DAY OF _____, A.D 20___.


_____, ATTEST _____,
CITY MAYOR CITY RECORDER (SEE SEAL BELOW)

_____
ENGINEER (SEE SEAL BELOW)

HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS

LOCATED IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 6 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

SURVEYOR'S SEAL




CITY ENGINEER SEAL

CLERK-RECORDER SEAL


SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW ONLY

HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 16,
TOWNSHIP 8 SOUTH, RANGE 3 EAST,
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN



FLOOR 1



FLOOR 2

NOTE:
ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED UPON ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS PROVIDED BY OTHERS. NO CONSTRUCTION HAS TAKEN PLACE AT THE TIME OF THIS PLAT. ALL DIMENSIONS, AREAS, ELEVATIONS, ETC... SHOULD BE FIELD VERIFIED.

LEGEND

- COMMON AREA
- LIMITED COMMON AREA
- PRIVATE OWNERSHIP (RESIDENTIAL)
- PRIVATE OWNERSHIP (COMMERCIAL)

SHEET 2 OF 4


WILDING
ENGINEERING
14721 South Heritage Crest Way
Bluffdale, Utah 84065
801.553.8112
www.wildingengineering.com

HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS


LOCATED IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 6 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 16,
TOWNSHIP 8 SOUTH, RANGE 3 EAST,
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN



FLOOR 3



ROOF

LEGEND

- COMMON AREA
- LIMITED COMMON AREA
- PRIVATE OWNERSHIP (RESIDENTIAL)
- PRIVATE OWNERSHIP (COMMERCIAL)

SHEET 3 OF 4

WILDING
ENGINEERING
14721 South Heritage Crest Way
Bluffdale, Utah 84065
801.553.8112
www.wildingengineering.com

NOTE:
ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED UPON ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS PROVIDED BY OTHERS. NO CONSTRUCTION HAS TAKEN PLACE AT THE TIME OF THIS PLAT. ALL DIMENSIONS, AREAS, ELEVATIONS, ETC... SHOULD BE FIELD VERIFIED.

HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS

LOCATED IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 6 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

HARVEST PARK CONDOMINIUMS

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 16,
TOWNSHIP 8 SOUTH, RANGE 3 EAST,
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN




NORTH ELEVATION



WEST ELEVATION


WILDING
ENGINEERING
14721 South Heritage Crest Way
Bluffdale, Utah 84065
801.553.8112
www.wildingengineering.com

NOTE:
ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED UPON ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS PROVIDED BY OTHERS. NO CONSTRUCTION HAS TAKEN PLACE AT THE TIME OF THIS PLAT. ALL DIMENSIONS, AREAS, ELEVATIONS, ETC... SHOULD BE FIELD VERIFIED.









SCALE: 1"=20'-0" ON 24X36 SHEET

DECIDUOUS TREE LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL NAME/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY
	ACER GRANDENTATUM BIGTOOTH MAPLE	2" CAL	19
	ACER TRUNCATUM X A. P. `KEITHSFORM` NORWEGIAN SUNSET MAPLE	2" CAL	
	CERCIS CANADENSIS EASTERN REDBUD	1 1/2" CAL	2
	GLEDITSIA TRIACANTHOS INERMIS `SHADEMASTER` TM SHADEMASTER LOCUST	2" CAL	6
	MALUS X `SPRING SNOW` SPRING SNOW CRAB APPLE	2" CAL	13

EVERGREEN TREE LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL NAME/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY
	PICEA OMORIKA `WELLS RIVERSIDE` WELLS RIVERSIDE SPRUCE	7` TALL	2
	PICEA PUNGENS GLAUCA `BABY BLUE EYES` TM BABY BLUE EYES COLORADO BLUE SPRUCE	7` TALL	4

LANDSCAPE NOTES

1. LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING QUANTITIES OF ALL MATERIALS FOR BIDDING AND INSTALLATION PURPOSES. IF DISCREPANCIES EXIST, THE PLAN SHALL DICTATE.
2. PLANT MATERIAL TO BE INSTALLED PER PLANT LEGEND. ANY SUBSTITUTIONS TO BE APPROVED BY OWNER AND/OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.
3. NEW AUTOMATIC UNDERGROUND IRRIGATION SYSTEM TO BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO LANDSCAPE INSTALLATION TO ENSURE PROPER WATERING OF ALL LANDSCAPE AREAS. REFER TO IRRIGATION PLANS FOR SPECIFICS.
4. NEW LAWN AREAS TO BE SODDED WITH 100% KENTUCKY BLUEGRASS (MINIMUM OF 3 DIFFERENT VARIETIES). FINE LEVEL ALL AREAS PRIOR TO LAYING SOD. SEE SOD LAYING NOTES FOR MORE INFORMATION
5. SANDY LOAM TOPSOIL RECOMMENDED TO BE INSTALLED AT THE FOLLOWING DEPTHS: 6-12" IMPORTED SANDY LOAM TOPSOIL (INCLUDING MIN. 15% HIGH GRADE DECOMPOSED ORGANIC MATERIAL (SOIL PREP FROM MILLER COMPANIES - FLOYD 435-757-2416 OR COMPOSTED BARK FINES FROM THOMPSON LOGGING - TERRY 435-640-3604) MIXED INTO TOPSOIL PRIOR TO SPREADING IN ALL NEW PLANTER AREAS. INSTALL 4" DEPTH OF SANDY LOAM TOPSOIL (INCLUDING MIN. 15% HIGH GRADE DECOMPOSED ORGANIC MATERIAL MIXED INTO TOPSOIL PRIOR TO SPREADING) IN ALL NEW LAWN AREAS.
6. PLANTER BEDS TO BE EXCAVATED AS NECESSARY IN ORDER TO ALLOW FOR TOPSOIL, AMENDMENTS AND MULCH. THE FINISHED GRADE OF LAWN AREAS SHALL BE APPROX. 1" BELOW TOP OF LAWN EDGING, SIDEWALK OR OTHER PAVED AREAS. FINISHED GRADE OF PLANTER AREAS SHALL BE APPROX. 1" BELOW TOP OF CURB, SIDEWALK, OR OTHER PAVED AREA.
7. INSTALL PRE-EMERGENT HERBICIDE AFTER INSTALLING PLANTS AND PRIOR TO INSTALLING MULCH. AFTER INSTALLATION OF THE MULCH THE CONTRACTOR SHALL EVENLY BROADCAST A SECOND APPLICATION OF SLOW-RELEASE PRE-EMERGENT HERBICIDE. APPLY PRE-EMERGENT HERBICIDE PER MANUFACTURERS RECOMMENDATIONS.
8. COLORED WOOD MULCH TO BE INSTALLED AT THE FOLLOWING DEPTHS: 3" IN ALL TREE AND SHRUB PLANTER AREAS, 1" UNDER ALL PERENNIALS, GROUNDCOVERS AND ANNUALS. PULL MULCH MIN. 3" AWAY FROM BASE OF ALL PERENNIALS AND SHRUBS AND MIN. 6" AWAY FROM ALL TREES.
9. TREES LOCATED IN LAWN AREAS SHALL HAVE A GRASS FREE TREE RING AROUND BASE OF TREE WITH 3" DEPTH OF WOOD MULCH. THE GRASS FREE RING FOR FLOWERING TREES SHALL BE 4' DIAMETER AND UP TO 6' DIAMETER FOR SHADE TREES WHERE APPROPRIATE.
10. IF HIGH WINDS ARE FREQUENT ON SITE, ALL TREES TO BE STAKED AT TIME OF PLANTING. SEE DETAILS FOR SPECIFICS. REMOVE STAKING WITHIN FIRST YEAR OR WHEN TREE IS ESTABLISHED.
11. SEE ARCHITECT AND CIVIL PLANS FOR ALL BUILDING AND SITE INFORMATION.
12. ADJUST LOCATION OF TREES AND SHRUBS AS NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE LIGHT POLES, FIRE HYDRANTS, SIGNS, ETC. SEE ELECTRICAL AND CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR ALL LIGHTING AND UTILITIES.
13. ADJUST QUANTITY AND LOCATION OF SHRUBS TO ACCOMMODATE AC UNITS, GAS METER, AND ELECTRICAL PANELS ALONG BUILDING FACADE.

SOD LAYING NOTES

1. LAY SOD WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BEING LIFTED.
2. LAY SOD IN ROWS WITH JOINTS STAGGERED. BUTT SECTIONS CLOSELY WITHOUT OVERLAPPING OR LEAVING GAPS BETWEEN SECTIONS. CUT OUT IRREGULAR OR THIN SECTIONS WITH A SHARP KNIFE.
3. LAY SOD FLUSH WITH ADJOINING EXISTING SODDED OR PAVED SURFACES.
4. AFTER SODDING HAS BEEN COMPLETED, ROLL HORIZONTAL SURFACE AREAS IN TWO DIRECTIONS PERPENDICULAR TO EACH OTHER WITH A 150 POUND SOD ROLLER. REPAIR AND RE-ROLL AREAS WITH DEPRESSIONS, LUMPS OR OTHER IRREGULARITIES. HEAVY ROLLING TO CORRECT IRREGULARITIES IN GRADE IS NOT PERMITTED.
5. WATER ALL SODDED AREAS IMMEDIATELY AFTER SOD LAYING TO OBTAIN MOISTURE PENETRATION THROUGH SOD INTO TOP 4" OF TOPSOIL.
6. PROVIDE ADEQUATE PROTECTION OF SODDED AREAS AGAINST TRESPASSING, EROSION AND DAMAGE OF ANY KIND. REMOVE THIS PROTECTION AFTER SODDED AREAS HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE OWNER.
7. REPLACE DAMAGED AREAS AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO OWNER.

LANDSCAPE AREA CALCULATIONS

TOTAL SITE AREA = 76,337 SQ. FT.
TOTAL LANDSCAPE REQUIRED: 20% (15,267 SQ. FT.)
TOTAL LANDSCAPE PROVIDED: 22.75% (17,369 SQ. FT.)

TOTAL LAWN AREA ALLOWED (60% MAX.) = 10,421.4 SQ. FT.
TOTAL LAWN AREA PROVIDED WITHIN PROJECT = 46.4% (4834 SQ. FT.)
TOTAL LAWN AREA IN PARKSTRIP OUTSIDE PROJECT BOUNDARY = 12.6% (1312 SQ. FT.)
TOTAL LAWN AREA PROVIDED (INCLUDING PARKSTRIP) = 59% (6,146 SQ. FT.)

EVERGREEN SHRUB LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL NAME/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY
	BUXUS MICROPHYLLA ASIATIC `WINTER GEM` WINTER GEM BOXWOOD	5 GAL	4
	JUNIPERUS HORIZONTALIS `BLUE CHIP` BLUE CHIP JUNIPER	5 GAL	7
	MAHONIA AQUIFOLIUM COMPACTA COMPACT OREGON GRAPE	5 GAL	29
	PINUS MUGO MUGUS `SLOWMOUND` SLOWMOUND MUGO PINE	5 GAL	6
	TAXUS X MEDIA `DARK GREEN SPREADER` DARK GREEN SPREADER YEW	5 GAL	26

PERENNIAL & GRASS LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL NAME/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY
	CALAMAGROSTIS X ACUTIFLORA `KARL FOERSTER` FEATHER REED GRASS	5 GAL	26
	HEMEROCALLIS X `STELLA DE ORO` STELLA DE ORO DAYLILY	1 GAL	139
	MISCANTHUS SINENSIS `GRAZIELLA` GRAZIELLA MAIDEN GRASS	5 GAL	3
	PENNISETUM ALOPECUROIDES `HAMELN` HAMELN DWARF FOUNTAIN GRASS	5 GAL	44
	KENTUCKY BLUE GRASS (INCLUDES PARK STRIP)	6,147 S.F.	SOD

DECIDUOUS SHRUB LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL NAME/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY
	BERBERIS THUNBERGII ATRO `CONCORD` DARK RED-PURPLE BARBERRY	5 GAL	9
	CORNUS ALBA `BAILHALO` TM IVORY HALO DOGWOOD	5 GAL	18
	CORNUS SERICEA `KELSEYI` KELSEYI DOGWOOD	5 GAL	29
	FORSYTHIA X `COURTASOL` TM GOLD TIDE FORSYTHIA	5 GAL	24
	PHYSOCARPUS OPULIFOLIUS `SUMMER WINE` NINEBARK	5 GAL	8
	RHUS AROMATICA `GRO-LOW` GRO-LOW FRAGRANT SUMAC	5 GAL	43
R	ROSA MEIDILAND SERIES `RED` RED MEIDILAND ROSE	5 GAL	10
	SPIRAEA X BUMALDA `GOLDFLAME` GOLDFLAME SPIREA	5 GAL	33
	SYRINGA MEYERI `PALIBIN` DWARF KOREAN LILAC	5 GAL	14
	VIBURNUM OPULUS NANUM DWARF EUROPEAN VIBURNUM	5 GAL	15

In Site DESIGN GROUP
Landscape Architecture Land Planning
17 North 479 West American Fork, Utah 84003
801-756-5043 www.in-sitedesigngroup.com

CONSULTANTS:

STAMP

LICENSED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT # 4884514 Cory B. Whiting STATE OF UTAH

PROJECT:

HARVEST PARK
SOUTH COMMERCIAL
MAPLETON, UT
PRELIMINARY PLAN - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

SHEET TITLE:

LANDSCAPE PLAN

DRAWN BY: JLH
CHECKED: CBW
DATE: 12/18/17
REVISIONS: 12/20/18
1/7/19
JOB NO. 17-179

SHEET:

LS1.1

THIS DRAWING IS THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF IN SITE DESIGN GROUP. DO NOT COPY OR REPRODUCE IN ANY WAY WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN PERMISSION OF IN SITE DESIGN GROUP. COPYRIGHT© 2006

Harvest Park Commercial South Parcel Construction Plan


#3 “How construction traffic would be handled.”

Firstly, a traffic control plan for the construction of the Harvest Park Commercial property must provide a clear path for vehicles and pedestrians to travel safely and effectively through the construction area while minimizing confusion and congestion. In addition to pedestrian and vehicle travel, it is equally important to maximize worker safety and mobility throughout construction.

A thought-out vehicle and pedestrian traffic plan will be submitted to the city any time construction activities require a detour event. This plan will include any road signs needed, the locations of each sign placement, detailed detour paths as well as the duration of such an event. Plans will be submitted to the city prior to any hindrance in traffic flow. In the event that a complete shutdown of a city road is deemed necessary, these events shall occur only during low traffic times and days in order to minimize the impact to local residents.

Harvest Park Commercial believes the construction traffic impact shall be minimal due to the location of the property as well as the proximity to a main arterial road. The ability to import/export materials needed for construction shall occur during business hours using the main arterial roads adjacent to the project. All construction materials shall be stored on-site and shall be stored in a safe and orderly fashion to allow for quick and easy access on and off the site for construction deliveries. Any contractor working for or on behalf of the Harvest Park Commercial project shall don all necessary PPE and shall be trained accordingly.

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SEC
TOWNSHIP 8 SOUTH, RANGE 3 EAST,
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN



N POWER	DOMINION ENERGY QUESTAR CORPORATION
-27 THIS PLAT CONVEYS UTILITY FACILITIES A ALL THE RIGHTS AND	DOMINION ENERGY QUESTAR CORPORATION APPROVES THIS PLAT SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THAT THE PLAT


3D
Google

Attachment "2"
Parking & Traffic Studies

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 25, 2019

To: Susan Palmer

From: Hales Engineering

Subject: Mapleton – Harvest Park Commercial Parking Study Update

UT17-1169

Purpose

This memorandum discusses the shared use parking study completed for the proposed Harvest Park Commercial project located in Mapleton, Utah. A vicinity map of the proposed development is shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1 Vicinity Map of the proposed development in Mapleton, Utah

Background

The proposed Harvest Park Commercial project is a mixed-use site with office and residential space.

The proposed land use for the development has been identified as follows:

- Office 16,182 square feet
- Multi-family residential 18 dwelling units

Mapleton City Parking Rates

According to the Mapleton city planner, parking rates for the project are as shown below:

- Office 5 stalls / 1,000 sq. ft.
- Multi-family residential 2 stalls / dwelling unit

As stand-alone land uses, the office would generate a need for 81 stalls, and the multi-family residential would generate a need for 36 stalls, for an overall demand of 117 stalls on-site to service the parking needs of the project (see Appendix A – Weekday Parking Demand). Since each land use is not a stand-alone project and this project is a mixed-use site, a parking analysis is being completed to review the time of day parking needs.

Parking Analysis

Parking supply for the Harvest Park site is 104 parking stalls.

Current state of practice is to evaluate the amount of required parking stalls by time of day for the various land uses in a mixed-use site to ensure that adequate parking is provided without overparking the site and building expansive parking lots that go underutilized. Considering the peak time of day parking needs for the project, the office would require 81 stalls, and the multi-family dwelling units would require 18 stalls for a total of 99 stalls (demand).

Generally, it is good practice to have approximately 10 percent additional parking to ensure that patrons can find a parking space. During peak demand around 10:00 a.m. 95 percent of parking is anticipated to be occupied. During the morning and evening hours it is anticipated that at least 10-30 percent of the parking stalls will be available to facilitate turnover and parking lot circulation under typical conditions.

Conclusions

The findings of this study are as follows:

- Parking supply for the project is 104 stalls
- Weekday parking demand accounting for time of day needs would require 99 parking stalls at the peak time, leaving 5 stalls for oversupply at 10:00 a.m.
- It is projected that the Harvest Park Commercial parking supply will meet the demand for all times of the weekday and weekend (when the professional office will have a very low parking utilization), and have an adequate oversupply of parking, based on the City rates provided by the Mapleton City planner.

If you have any questions regarding this parking study, feel free to contact us at 801-766-4343.


Appendix

Mapleton Harvest Park Commercial Parking Demand and Supply

ITE Code	Land Use	Intensity	ITE (Weekday)	Red. Stall #	
701	Office	16.2 1000 sq. ft.	5.00	81	Professional Office
931	Apartment	18 1000 sq. ft.	2	36	weekday parking demand => 85%-tile (1.94)
	Total			**117**	

104 Project Supplied Parking On-site

Time of Day			Office	Apartment	Total	Oversupply	Percent Vacant Stalls
6:00 AM			1	33	34	70	67%
7:00 AM			48	27	74	30	28%
8:00 AM			64	23	87	17	16%
9:00 AM			77	18	95	9	9%
10:00 AM			81	18	99	5	5%
11:00 AM			79	18	97	7	6%
12:00 PM			73	18	91	13	13%
1:00 PM			62	18	80	24	23%
2:00 PM			68	18	86	18	17%
3:00 PM			66	18	84	20	20%
4:00 PM			58	16	74	30	29%
5:00 PM			37	21	59	46	44%
6:00 PM			20	25	45	59	57%
7:00 PM			8	24	32	72	69%
8:00 PM			0	27	27	77	74%
9:00 PM			0	28	28	76	73%
10:00 PM			0	33	33	71	68%
11:00 PM			0	34	34	70	67%



MEMORANDUM



Date: February 7, 2018

To: Mapleton City

From: Hales Engineering

Subject: Mapleton Harvest Park Commercial TIS Counts Discussion

UT17-1169

This memorandum discusses the traffic volumes used for the Mapleton Harvest Park Commercial TIS, completed by Hales Engineering. The traffic volumes for the TIS were collected on Wednesday, December 20, and Thursday, December 21, 2017. Based on conversations with Mapleton City, there are concerns that the volumes collected on these dates were low compared to other times in the year due to the holiday season.

Based on the concerns of the City, Hales Engineering collected weekday morning (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and evening (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) peak period traffic counts on Thursday, February 1, 2018, to compare to the December count data. The counts were performed at the Harvest Parkway / US-89 intersection. The morning peak hour was determined to be between 7:30 and 8:30 a.m. and the evening peak hour was determined to be between 4:45 and 5:45 p.m. The evening peak hour counts were approximately 6 percent higher than the morning peak hour counts.

The turning movement counts were compared with the counts performed in December 2017. As shown in Figure 1, the evening peak hour entering vehicles (volume) in December was approximately 98 more than the entering vehicles in February, however, the reverse is true for the morning peak hours, e.g., the entering vehicles (volume) in December was lower than the volume in February by 82 vehicles. However, since the evening peak hour counts in December were greater than all other peak hour volumes from December or February, the peak hour analyses were completed for a "worst case" scenario, therefore, there is no need to re-evaluate the February data.

It was noted that the morning, afternoon, and evening peak hour volumes on Harvest Parkway were approximately equal. This is due to the high traffic volume of school traffic in the morning and afternoon peaks. Although the volumes on Harvest Parkway were

approximately equal during those peaks, the overall intersection volumes were much higher during the evening peak hour at US-89.




Figure 1 US-89 / Harvest Parkway Entering Vehicle Volume Comparison

Hales Engineering makes the following conclusions and recommendations based on the additional data collection:

- The evening peak hour counts collected in December 2017 are higher than all other peak hour counts from December 2017 or February 2018. These volumes were used for the original analysis and, therefore, represent the "worst case" traffic volume conditions for the study area. Therefore, it is not recommended that additional analyses be completed for the proposed Harvest Park Commercial project.
- Though the morning and evening peak hour volumes were approximately equal on Harvest Parkway based on the tube counts, the evening peak hour volumes at the Harvest Parkway / US-89 intersection are much higher than the morning peak hour volumes.

Please contact us if you have any questions regarding this memo.

Attachment "3"

MAPLETON CITY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 29, 2019 at 8:30am
125 West Community Center Way (400 North), Mapleton, Utah 84664

On January 18, 2019 revised plans were submitted for the Harvest Park South mixed-use project consisting of two commercial buildings and 18 apartments. The items below include 1) requested changes to the submitted plans, 2) other items required as part of the application and/or 3) informational items regarding city standards.

Community Development Division

Sean Conroy, Community Development Director, Phone: (801) 806-9101
Email: sconroy@mapleton.org

Please submit revised drawings and/or address the following:

1. The plat doesn't label the parking area or area around the buildings as common area.
2. Please include the address of 826 S 1600 W next to "Harvest Park Condominiums" at the top of the first page of the plat.
3. Each unit will need its own meter. No master meters will be approved.
4. Max parking lot light pole height is 16'. Plan shows 16' but table on sheet esp100 shows it as 20'.
5. Provide verification that access issues have been resolved with Harvest Park HOA.
6. Provide a written response to the Planning Commission's questions regarding:
   -Snow removal
   -Construction access

Engineering and Public Works Division

Steven Lord, P.E. Public Works Director/City Engineer, Phone (801) 489-6253
Email: slord@mapleton.org

Storm Water

1. Storm Drain calculations are required to show that underground chambers re sufficient to retain 100-year storm.

Details

1. Please use APWA standard drawings for curb and gutter, sidewalk and 3' waterway including transition structures.
2. 8" UTBC section is required under curb and gutter and concrete flatwork.
3. Please provide parking lot pavement cross section.
4. Please include details on drainage facilities.

Fire

1. The location of the fire hydrants should not be behind the trash area. Ideally our engine should be able to park in the center of the buildings parking lot and within a short distance access a hydrant, the FDC and see the PIV / OS&Y.

2. Provide a Fire Department Knox Box for keys.

General

(These items are intended for reference purposes only. Notice to proceed with construction will not be given until these items are either noted on the plans or discussed in a pre-construction meeting).

1. An excavation permit, available online at www.mapleton.org will be required for all work performed in the city right-of-way.
2. All utility crossings will be marked with etchings in the back of curb.
3. Please follow APWA standards and specifications unless otherwise identified in the Mapleton City Supplement to APWA Standards and Specifications available online at www.mapleton.org.
4. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) permit will be required. Please contact JD Shepherd at Mapleton City Public Works with questions.
5. Electronic As-Built drawings of any and all utility connections and appurtenances will be required prior to the approval of final inspection.
6. Any work on Mapleton Irrigation Company ditches will be approved by the Irrigation Company.
7. Any work on dry utilities including but not limited to power, gas, and communications will be coordinated and approved by the relevant utility company and must be installed within the public utility easement.
8. Concrete Collars will be required on all valves and manholes in the roadway.
9. The applicant must submit plans to RB&G Engineering (801-374-5771) to be added into the City's water model. The applicant shall be responsible for the cost of this review.
10. The applicant must submit a Storm Drain report certifying that the proposed Storm Drain design will accommodate the 100-year storm.
11. The applicant must submit a geotechnical report per Mapleton City standards.
12. Any work in UDOT Right-of-Way will require a separate UDOT access and encroachment permit.
13. Please ensure 10' separation between culinary water and sanitary sewer lines.
14. A maintenance plan and agreement will be required and recorded for all storm drain retention basins.
15. A note must be placed on the plans to identify any existing fences and/or improvements on adjacent properties. If construction requires the removal of or results in damage to these items, they must be replaced before the final development inspection can be completed.
16. A stamped and signed plan set will be delivered electronically to the City Engineer prior to commencement of any construction.

FYI, After Planning Commission approval and prior to plat recording:

- Revise drawings to address any outstanding issues raised in the DRC comments and/or project conditions.
- Submit Final Plat for each phase, and receive DRC approval of Final Plat.
- Applicant may choose to either 1) establish a performance bond and durability bond agreement prior to plat recording (amount to be determined by City

Engineer) or 2) to install any required improvements (i.e. utilities, roads, curb, gutter, sidewalk, etc.) without a performance bond (durability bond still required). If option 2 is selected, the plat will not be recorded until the City has accepted the improvements**.**

- Payment of residential impact fees of $2,155 per unit at plat recording. An additional impact fee of $3,145 per unit will be required at the time of building permit issuance. See Commercial Impact Fee Schedule for commercial fees.
- Water rights/shares are required at .45 acre feet per unit and 2.5 acre feet per irrigable acre of landscape area prior to plat recording. Water dedication for the commercial uses will be required at the time of building permit issuance and will be based on the proposed uses.
- Payment of engineering inspection fees of $400.
- Payment of street light fee $4,000 ($1,000 per light).
- Submit a SWPPP and Land Disturbance application and fee ($500). Contact JD Shepherd at Public Works (489-6253) to review this requirement.
- Submit final mylar with all required signatures.
- Submit a check made out to Utah County Recorder ($30 per page and $1 per lot).
- Coordinate with the Postal Service regarding location of cluster mailbox (CBU).

Attachment "4"
Previous Plans

HARVEST PARK MIXED USE

RIDGEPOINT MANAGEMENT

MAPLETON, UTAH

PROJECT NUMBER: 17038

SITE PLAN SUBMITTAL

12/14/2017















DRAWING INTENT NOTES:

IT IS THE INTENT OF THESE DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS, AND OTHER CONTRACT DOCUMENTS TO DESCRIBE ALL LABOR, MATERIALS AND EQUIPEMENT REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE WORK CALLED FOR, INDICATED OR REASONABLY IMPLIED BY THEM, INCLUDING PARTITIONING, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL WORK, AIR CONDITIONING AND ALL OTHER ITEMS DESCRIBED. FAILURE TO SHOW DETAILS OR REPEAT ON ANY DRAWINGS THAT FIGURES, NOTES OR DETAILS GIVEN ON ANOTHER DRAWING SHALL NOT RELIEVE THE CONTRACTOR OF THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PERFOORM THE WORK (AT NO ADDITIONAL COST) AS IF SHOWN ON EACH AND EVERY DRAWING.

ALL WORK SHALL BE IN A FIRST CLASS WORKMANSHIP MANNER, NEAT AND COMPLETE IN ACCORDANCE WITH DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE, THE STATE ENERGY EFFICIENCY CODE AND ALL AUTHORITIES HAVING JURISDICTION. CONTRACTOR SHALL ENDEAVOR TO PROTECT THE OWNER'S AND ADJACENT OWNER'S PROPERTY FROM DAMAGE DUE TO THE CONSTRUCTION PROCESS AT ALL TIMES AND REPAIR AT NO COST TO THE OWNER AY DAMAGE THAT DOES OCCUR.

CONTRACTOR SHALL ARRANGE FOR INSPECTIONS AND TESTS SPECIFIED OR REQUIRED BY THE CITY/ COUNTY BUILDING DEPARTMENT AND SHALL PAY ALL FEES AND COSTS FOR THE SAME. IT SHALL BE THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SECURE AND PAY FOR ALL PERMITS AND UPON COMPLETION OF THE WORK (PRIOR TO FINAL PAYMENT) DELIVER TO THE OWNER A CERTIFIED CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FROM THE CITY/COUNTY BUILDING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT.

CONTRACTOR SHALL BE REQUIRED TO CARRY COMPREHENSIVE LIABILITY INSURANCE IN THE AMOUNT OF THE CONTRACT AND WORKMAN'S COMPENSATION INSURANCE AT HIS OWN EXPENSE. THE A.I.A. GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE CONTRACT FORM A201 (LATEST EDITION) ARE HEREBY MADE A PART OF THIS CONTRACT AS IF WRITTEN ON THE DOCUMENTS.

ARCHITECT IS IN NO WAY RESPONSIBLE FOR JOBSITE SAFETY OR SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION AS THESE ARE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONTRACTOR.

SHEET INDEX

-	#	DESCRIPTION
SITE SUBMITTAL		
	A.01	COVER SHEET / 3D RENDERINGS
	A.02	2-STORY - GROUND FLOOR PLAN
	A.03	2-STORY - UPPER FLOOR PLAN
	A.04	2-STORY - ELEVATIONS
	A.05	2-STORY - ELEVATIONS
	A.06	2-STORY - BUILDING SECTIONS
	A.07	3-STORY - GROUND FLOOR PLAN
	A.08	3-STORY - SECOND FLOOR PLAN
	A.09	3-STORY - THIRD FLOOR PLAN
	A.10	3-STORY - ELEVATIONS
	A.11	3-STORY - ELEVATIONS
	A.12	3-STORY - BUILDING SECTIONS
	A.13	3-STORY - BUILDING SECTIONS

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

DEIV ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

DEIV ARCHITECTURE
1492 SOUTH 800 WEST SUITE A
WOODS CROSS, UT 84087
P 801.683.8123
http://www.deivarchitecture.com

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

HARVEST PARK MIXED USE
RIDGEPOINT MANAGEMENT
MAPLETON, UTAH
SITE PLAN SUBMITTAL

REVISIONS

#	DESCRIPTION	DATE
01	TESTING	4/15/2016 10:54 AM

PROJECT #:	17038
CHKD BY:	
DRAWN BY:	
ISSUE DATE:	12/14/2017

COVER SHEET / 3D RENDERINGS

PRELIMINARY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

A.01

Copyright DEIV Architecture and Design © 2017

10:54 AM, Thursday, December 14, 2017

Attachment "5"

MAPLETON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
January 25, 2018

PRESIDING AND CONDUCTING:	Chairman Golden Murray
Commissioners in Attendance:	Therin Garrett Christy Nemelka
Staff in Attendance:	Sean Conroy, Community Development Director
Minutes Taken by:	April Houser, Executive Secretary

Chairman Murray called the meeting to order at 6:30pm. An invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance was given.

Items are not necessarily heard in the order listed below.

Alternate Commissioner Christy Nemelka was seated as a voting member this evening.

Item 4. Consideration of a Preliminary Plat application for the Harvest Park Commercial South Plat "A" subdivision consisting of two commercial lots located in the General Plan Commercial (GC-1) Zone. The request also includes a Project Plan and Conditional Use Permit for two mixed use buildings.

Sean Conroy, Community Development Director, went over the Staff Report for those in attendance. The lower level of the building will be commercial with upper level residential apartments consisting of one and two-bedroom units. The property is zoned for commercial. The Planning Commission is the decision voting body on this item. The City Code does require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for mixed use buildings. Single family units must be located above commercial units in this zone designation. The Planning Commission can limit the number of residential units beyond 10 if they feel it is needed to meet safety needs. The City code parking requirement would require 99 spaces for the two buildings being proposed. The applicant is only proposing 87 spaces. The City code does allow for a shared parking agreement, or a reduction of parking up to 25%, if there are shared parking times. The proposed 87 spaces would equate to a 12% reduction. This request required a traffic study from a traffic engineer to ensure the proposal would meet sufficient parking stalls for the site. The study recommended 80 parking stalls. There is no on-street parking for Highway 89 or Harvest Parkway. Staff went over the approved Commercial Design Standards for the Commission. A 3D rendering of the proposed buildings

was included in the presentation. Some concerns have been addressed to staff, which included traffic, parking and architectural compatibility with the existing Harvest Park Commercial standards. The Home Owners Association (HOA) has a concern with the north facing roof pitch, which they can speak to this evening during public comment. **Commissioner Garrett** asked if there were any red flags that Staff found when reviewing this proposal. Staff stated that most of the issues have been addressed.

Susan Palmer and Justin Johnston, the applicants, have been working with Staff for a few months now to meet the standards the City would want for this area. Susan is a resident of Mapleton, and wants to ensure this is a beautiful development. They want to create sufficient parking, and keep it where it can be used as a buffer from the residential units already in the neighborhood. Justin Johnson stated that there is a need for one and two-bedroom units. Some of these units may be occupied by individuals with only one vehicle, verse family units. The commercial space will be built out with tenant finishes finished to the type of business occupying the unit. The applicants feel there could be 5-6 separate businesses between the 2 units. This would allow them to accommodate various uses. They feel if they get the right mix of uses to keep their proposed parking stall total sufficient. **Chairman Murray** stated that the parking topic would need to consider if there are uses that extend past the 7pm stated time in the traffic study. Justin Johnston mentioned the possible policing of the parking stalls in the beginning to make sure residents of the Harvest Park development did not park in these stalls that are reserved for the residents and tenants of these buildings. The design of the buildings came from the Commercial Design Standards, and does not know if 2 to 3-bedroom residential units would be the right fit. Mr. Johnston feels the elevations they have provided would beautify the area. There are separate CC&R's for the north commercial area then those of the Harvest Park SDP-1 area.

Chairman Murray opened this item up for public comment. **Ron Zundell**, President of the Harvest Park Homeowners Association (HOA), wanted clarification as to the number of bedrooms in each unit, and was told that these can vary from 1 to 2-bedroom units. They believe the commercial area has restrictions that require the applicants to work with the HOA. These would define the standards of the building regarding elevations and landscaping. The HOA feels the traffic study is inadequate. They believe Harvest Park could become a major thorough-fare to Spanish Fork Parkway. Overflow parking was a concern that individuals parking in these units may extend into the rest of the development in the area. Site lines to dumpsters was a concern, and the type of fencing that would go in around this project. They feel coordination between the applicant and themselves should be required. Adequate water lines and utilities have been a problem with the current commercial area, as well as issues with landscape maintenance. **Mike Hendron**, a resident of Harvest Park for about 10 years, has been on the HOA on and off during his residency in the development. He feels it would be important for the applicant to work in harmony with the HOA. The parking is a concern, and Mr. Hendron would like to make sure it gets taken care of before it becomes an issue. The dumpster location next to the residential homes, instead of against the units, are not felt to be appropriate. Mike felt residents would like the applicant to explore the possibility of an additional access on to Highway 89, but understands that this would require UDOT approval, which is not always easy to obtain. He would expect these

developers to attribute something to this development, as they will have access to the parks, trails and amenities in the subdivision. **Joy Rollingshouse** has a concern with the access coming in through Harvest Park. The parking study gave an assumption that most of the parking units would only utilize one stall, which was concerning to her. Harvest Park has a lot of children, so the additional traffic was a worry for the safety of those in the area. **Steven White** has lived in Harvest Park for about 11 years. They are against the proposal for apartments as part of this proposed project. He did not feel that apartments were even part of the Master Plan for this area. If allowed it would change the atmosphere of the development. He does not like the flat roof lines, and feels they would not be consistent with the current buildings within the development. **Paul Newton** is a resident of Harvest Park would oppose this development, and recommended denial of this item. He does not feel the agreement put in place years ago would be consistent with the City's agreement when the Harvest Park Subdivision was approved. These units would take away from privacy at those homes around the proposed buildings. **Chris Flinn** is a new resident in Harvest Park. He was not aware that this type of project could be built in the area. He has concerns with traffic, and what type of businesses will go in these units. **Gary Dockter** has lived in Harvest Park for about 10 years, and is also a realtor for the development. They have a beautiful subdivision with amazing architectural detail. These standards have been carried through the current commercial units in the development, along with the Club House. There is a cottage type feel here, and Mr. Dockter felt the proposed units are contrary to what the development is about. He is not opposed to the commercial and residential units, but does have concern with the density. Getting out on to Highway 89 is already an issue, and this would increase the traffic utilizing the area. He would like to keep continuity of the area in harmony with what already exists. **Alan Nielsen** has lived in Harvest Park for 11 years. There is a long and laborious history in Harvest Park. He does not feel the elevations of the development are very pleasing. Mr. Nielsen has concerns with safety, and the traffic already going through Harvest Park. He feels that unless there is a traffic light installed off Harvest Parkway there will be major accidents in this area. **Roxanne White** expressed her gratitude to the Commission for listening to their concerns. She echoes many of the comments shared tonight. She is opposed to this request, and felt that many the residents in this area would agree with the comments made this evening. Mrs. White feels the one car per apartment assumption would not be sufficient. She serves on the HOA, and on the PTA for Maple Ridge Elementary. There are concerns with traffic in the area, and she worries about the additional problems that could arise if this is approved. **Brian Bradley** agrees with most things that have been said this evening. The lack of direct access off Highway 89 is an issue. As a resident of Harvest Park, he is in favor of only allowing parking on one side of the street. **Ann Earl**, resident of Harvest Park, has concerns with the look of the proposed buildings. They have issues with the high-density units, feeling that they may lower the standards in the area. She encourages the denial of this proposal. **Nancy Pettal** has lived in Harvest Park for 5 years. She is not so much opposed to the development, but does not like the elevations, nor the idea of the one-bedroom apartments, feeling that it will cause a decline in property appeal if they are allowed. **Robin Conover** is a direct resident behind this proposal. For all the reasons given tonight he has major concerns. Privacy is a concern, and these types of units do not seem to be in conjunction with what is needed in Mapleton. Mr. Conover felt this development would go against what is desired in the area. Egress was also a concern. He would like to see something that adds to the community, and that

the citizens would agree with. **Alice Brinkerhoff** has lived in Harvest Park for 5 years. They went through a great deal of work to meet the HOA standards for this development, and do not feel that the proposal is appropriate for the area. She feels the flatter roof lines are due to cost savings, not visual appeal. She has a concern with the fact that residents in Harvest Park plan to live there for many years, were the developers just plan to build and sell the property. This project will become the face of Harvest Park, and will define the development behind it. It would be ideal to have both accesses off Highway 89. Alice feels the project needs to be more compatible with the surrounding area. **Katherine Cook** represents the 10 homes on her street on Sunflower Lane. There are many problems caused by developers without boundaries. Residents east of Highway 89 have made comments about the Harvest Park development citizens as white trash. They have enough problems with lack of City support, and feel they are not important to residents outside their subdivision. Mrs. Cook would ask for less density in this area. To add to the already dense area would not be appropriate. **Miles Decker** has lived in Harvest Park for nearly 11 years. They saw the difference in this area when looking for homes, and chose to build here. He is happy to live in Harvest Park, but is disappointed with several things that have not happened in the development. They like the amenities that were offered at Harvest Park. They chose a lot at the corner of Elm Street and Silver Leaf Drive. There is a stop sign located there, and it is surprising how many people to not stop at this location as is, which would only become more dangerous if this proposal was approved. Mr. Decker would ask the Commission to vote no regarding this proposal. **Scott Folster** lives right next to the development, and is 100% against it for all the reasons that have been stated this evening. The streets are so narrow, and traffic safety is a huge issue. He cannot imagine having one egress into this development. **Misty Wright** has lived in Mapleton a little over 5 years, and has served on the HOA. She would like to echo what has been said. She does not feel this is ready to be approved since the applicants have not met with the HOA. There needs to be some type of agreement to help maintain the landscaping in these commercial areas. She feels the number of parking spaces are being underestimated. The traffic study would not be accurate if it was only done over the course of one day. Mrs. Wright feels it would need to be done over different hours and times of the day. No additional comments were given and the public comment was closed.

Chairman Murray asked if the current CC&R's apply to this project. Based off the Development Agreement, it does not stipulate this area. Even the CC&R's for the north Harvest Park Commercial project are greatly different that the Harvest Park Subdivision ones. The CC&R's were never recorded on either of the commercial pieces, even when they were amended in 2017. The commercial project on the north side had no participation with the HOA when it was approved. This is something that needs to be addressed. **Commissioner Garrett** would like to see some legal information as to if this project would be subject to any of the regulations set by the HOA. UDOT requires 300' spacing between entrances/exits onto Highway 89, which cannot be met by this development. The City has approached UDOT about a traffic light at this location. When the traffic meets their standards, a light will go in. They are very rigid that their standards be met. **Commissioner Nemelka** felt that the December 21, 2017 traffic study would have been done when traffic could have decreased due to the lack of school for the Christmas Holiday Season. She feels another study should take place that would better represent a true traffic situation in the area.

Commissioner Garrett would like clarification to the Conditional Use Permit section of the code regarding single family residential units on the 2nd or 3rd floor of the building. These are 2-story units, so additional units would not be allowed above any residential unit. The City Engineer could give his opinion as to if the proposed landscaping would be sufficient to maintain and store snow, even in heavy precipitation times. Staff stated that our code does not allow us to decipher between condos or apartment units. There is no differentiation between the two, which is standard for most cities. Chairman Murray had a concern with the parking stalls, since there are not defined businesses going in the project. Staff stated that the city recommendation is restrictive, so if parking is a concern the residential units should possibly be reduced. Even medical buildings could extend into the later evening hours, so the possible sharing of parking stalls may not be appropriate. Because there is no on slated businesses for these units, the commission felt inclined to require more parking stalls. Large construction and commercial vehicles could have a problem gaining access through this area, especially during the construction portion of project. Commissioner Garrett is torn on the elevation concern. He can see that it is near Harvest Park, but this is also a commercial zone, that is in line with the Commercial Design Standards. Commissioner Nemelka did understand the comments made that the higher pitch roofs do bring down density, and serves as a buffer area from commercial to residential. One option would be to have the corner building built like those in Harvest Park Commercial as a buffer to the residents living here. Direction could be given to have the architect bring back their reasoning for this type of project elevation.

Motion: Commissioner Garrett moved to continue the Preliminary Plat application for the Harvest Park Commercial South Plat "A" subdivision consisting of two commercial lots located in the General Plan Commercial (GC-1) Zone and the Project Plan and Conditional Use Permit for two mixed use buildings, with the recommendations listed below:

1. Legal interpretation of the CC&R's & Development Agreement be given to validate that they do not apply to this property.
2. Provide another traffic study over the course of multiple days and times for a more realistic evaluation.
3. A determination be made as to if the proposed landscape buffers are sufficient to hold any snow removal needed.
4. Construction access plan be provided.
5. Proposal on a possible pitched roof for the north building as a buffer to the rest of the Harvest Park development.
6. Determination on more business profiles, and how they compare with the estimated residential parking, giving a best/worst case situation. Return with a proposal that would be sufficient to a worst-case scenario.
7. Where the entrance crosses the HOA strip of property, as well as the commercial landscape areas, be addressed to help ensure maintenance of these areas.

Second: Commissioner Nemelka
Vote: Unanimous

Item 5. Adjourn.

April Houser, Executive Secretary _____ Date _____