

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
JULY 31, 2019**

Members Present:

Steve Bench, Chairman/Zoning Administrator
Chris Breinholt, City Engineer
Marc Christensen, Community Services Director—excused
Paul Fulgham, Public Works Director—excused
Shawn Warnke, City Manager
Linsey Nessen, Recorder

Chairman Bench called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. The meeting was held July 31, 2019 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Steve Bench, Engineer Chris Breinholt, City Manager Shawn Warnke, and Recorder Linsey Nessen were in attendance. Director Fulgham and Director Christensen were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Warnke to approve the July 31, 2019 agenda. Motion seconded by Administrator Bench. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

2. Approval of minutes—July 10, 2019

Motion by Engineer Breinholt to approve the minutes of July 10, 2019. Motion seconded by Administrator Bench. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

The July 17, 2019 minutes were tabled.

3. New Business:

a. Final Approval for Holmgren Estates – Phase 5

Administrator Bench said we have talked about the final approval, but it has expired. Since then nothing has changed. Engineer Breinholt said secondary water requirements are probably not on there; let us review it first. The Committee agreed to table it.

Items b. and c. were discussed together.

- b. Concept Plan for T & M Subdivision at 1600 W 1000 N – Jim Flint, Hansen & Associates
- c. Site Plan Review for office building at T & M Manufacturing

Mr. Flint said this is a 14-acre parcel and we are looking at splitting 2.8 acres for an office building. Mr. Travis Scott had planned to build the office and the plans were approved, but his business grew so much that he was in desperate need of the space and discontinued the office pursuit. Engineer Breinholt said the lay down yard is not part of this submission. If he is going to use this as such, it ought to come in as a site plan. What about the right-of-way and what is the future of that road for the City? Since our main collector road to the south is going to line up with this intersection, should we be widening that to a standard collector? If that connection is made, how is this going to work together? I am not sure it affects anything right now, but maybe the configuration of the curb. I need to look at it.

Manager Warnke wondered about public infrastructure associated with the subdivision (sidewalk, curb, and gutter). Engineer Breinholt said the property widens out. There is enough to put those improvements in, but it squeezes it a little bit. Curbing follows the pavement all the way along. Manager Warnke said we need to look and come up with a solid plan for this whole area even though the network is not fully built out. The City was going to participate on the eight-foot sidewalk with T&M, but decided there was not enough space. It would be good to know where we are going to make the transition. There are power lines on both sides of the corridors. Engineer Breinholt said on 1000 North we need to look at a standard street width. There might be some asphalt widening that needs to happen. Manager Warnke said in the other development we need to determine where the edge of asphalt is versus where his property line is. How do we fill that gap? When talking about the width of that pavement, Engineer Breinholt said I think it should be a standard road width. You cannot add curb and gutter to a 24-foot asphalt section; it is too narrow. The sidewalk would be four feet wide or eight feet wide with the City participating half of that for the trail.

Manager Warnke said the office would fit, but the lay down portion might need a rezone. Engineer Breinholt said 1000 North is a 66-foot right-of-way and the road section would need to fit that (two travel lanes, center turn lane, shoulders, and no on-street parking). Mr. Flint said could those improvements be deferred to the development stage? Mr. Scott wants to get this recorded quickly, but the office is going to be put off until spring. Engineer Breinholt said we have done that with others where the improvements come with the site plan not the subdivision. You need the PUEs around the backside, not on the remainder since it could be divided differently in the future. This is just a one-lot subdivision. Mr. Flint said in a residential subdivision they want all the utilities in front and have abandoned rear yard PUEs. Engineer Breinholt said I see no reason for side and rear yard easements. I cannot think of a time where we have gone in, put a utility in the PUE, that is usually done before hand, and we dedicate a specific easement for storm drain and sewer. However, it is in the current City code so we cannot necessarily waive it. We need to see the site plan—you cannot start building on the remainder parcel without making it part of the subdivision. This is just a concept and I would like a chance to look through it.

Manager Warnke asked about the site plan, including landscape, storm drain, and a pond. Mr. Flint said it is a huge retention for the whole site—it is design for the 15

acres. Mr. Scott has done the soils report and hired a good architecture firm. They have done the plans and it looks good. They are ready to build tomorrow. The Committee brought up landscape islands and parking stalls, which need to be 10 by 20 feet. Engineer Breinholt said Mr. Scott needs to record an easement for that detention pond if dividing this off. I know he owns it all, but he could sell part of it. Manager Warnke said when someone subdivides they are required to add fencing between the canal and their property. This is a remainder parcel, but it looks like it will have a developed use. Engineer Breinholt said if it is a laydown yard there ought to be a site plan. I do not worry about the storm drain pond—there is no need to fence now. Manager Warnke said we could hold it and say it would be part of the future development.

The Committee discussed ditches on the site, roadside drainage, flow, and slope. Mr. Flint said all those are being collected and piped independent to the pond. It is a good improvement that will allow water to flow from point a to b. Curbing is only proposed in the side area. Existing culverts and the borrow ditch drains into the canal. Manager Warnke asked if the remainder parcel would be developed. Mr. Flint said the office is a big endeavor and will be more for business purposes than a traditional site plan aspect.

Manager Warnke said the number of stalls requires one additional ADA. We need to look into widening to the edge of the property line. The Committee said the eight-foot sidewalk and trail section would need to be on the south side of 10th North where residential starts. They discussed the intersection and how that network connection should be dealt with. Manager Warnke said it is nice when there is a controlled intersection for pedestrians. Engineer Breinholt said we should let Director Fulgham give his opinion. We have many questions we need answered.

They talked about the dimensions of the pond and Engineer Breinholt said the maximum water depth is four feet. Retention ponds are limited to 2.5 feet. Manager Warnke said Garland's drainage runs through there and Engineer Breinholt said it would be nice to connect to that. At five-feet deep, you will hit groundwater. You could make a couple of holes and check it out. When discussing potential fill drains in the area, the Committee said the Soil Conservation has a map showing where they are believed to be located. They advised Mr. Flint not to worry about them, but to reroute and keep their integrity if found.

Manager Warnke said we need a 10-foot buffer next to a parking lot on the street side. Mr. Flint said it is an onsite subdivision and no neighboring property owners. Engineer Breinholt said but it could be sold. Manager Warnke said there will need to be landscaping. When the office was proposed on the other parcel, Mr. Scott talked about landscaping the corner of 1000 West and adding signage to beautify the area as part of his development. We hope he still has that vision to improve that corner, which could be addressed when you do the landscaping plan. You could also coordinate signage with the site plan (building sign, a pole, or monument).

Engineer Breinholt said water shares need to be submitted for the landscape. Xeriscaping does not deduct that number and it is calculated as one share per irrigable

acre. Manager Warnke said Mr. Scott is looking to move quickly with a site plan to follow. We need a development agreement that says the public improvements are going to occur at the site plan. Mr. Flint asked about timing on the plat and what all is involved. Administrator Bench said this is just a concept so get your preliminary all drawn up. Work on the final plat and get it to us so we can get you back on the agenda. We will need time to the review it.

d. Walk ins:*

Mr. Jim Flint, Mr. Max Mills, and Mr. Micah Capener were in attendance to discuss development at 950 East Main Street. Mr. Capener asked about the recommended streetlight. Does the City have power there? Administrator Bench said in a subdivision a developer runs a line and the power company puts a pole in. Mr. Capener said so a streetlight or just lights along the front? There is no sidewalk and nobody is going to be walking there. Engineer Breinholt said when this street is constructed that is when it would go in. If you are not making the improvements, we just calculate the cost. I would like to see it shown as future or fee in lieu in the development agreement. The Committee also addressed the future sidewalk width as well as the fee in lieu.

Engineer Breinholt said how far back from the intersection are you? Mr. Capener said 50 to 60 feet. There is lots of parking, but the stall sizes will need to be reconfigured. We would like to potentially have drive-thrus here. When discussing the detention volume on the proposed 1.3 acres, Mr. Capener wondered if they would not be required to have a detention if they were under one acre. Manager Warnke said you might need to expand it. Mr. Capener said I would like to, but my neighbors would not be in favor of signing off on the plat to modify it. Could we do away with the big pond on the corner? I would rather move the building up front with the pond here if we can make it flow that way. State Farm and Western Ag Credit have no storm ponds what is the difference. Engineer Breinholt said lot size and they have a storm drain system to go to by dumping in the curb. There is none of that here. You have to handle your own storm water on site. They had somewhere to go.

Engineer Breinholt said your parking stalls and drive isles do not fit City standards. The backing also needs to be 25 feet. Administrator Bench said there are 65 spaces, but you will lose 10 if you do the drive-thrus in the future. The highest amount of stacking is for a restaurant and that would be four car lengths or 80 feet. When discussing buffering requirements Administrator Bench said, parking area to public streets is 15 feet and commercial to a single or multi family is 10 feet. Mr. Capener said we were going to make the building nicer on the corner to offset the 10 feet to 7.5. Administrator Bench read code and explained that the DRC may reduce buffers when a site plan shows extraordinary improvements. Manager Warnke said they would want to keep the buffer on the residential side. Mr. Capener said if I have a big fence, no one is going to see it. It is landscape between a building and fence. Manager Warnke said it is a buffer and a place to stack snow. It also beautifies the overall development. Mr. Capener said he would prefer to do the landscape on the front and have zero maintenance in the back. The vision comes down to what we can do. If the cost is great, we have to make the

building cheaper and then we lose the versatility of the building. Manager Warnke said if the site were larger, you could expand and accomplish everything you wanted and still have the buffers. If not then the site becomes over built.

Administrator Bench said come up with a site plan showing the building and extraordinary part. Make common sense adjustments and reductions on the site as a whole and then bring it in for our review. They also talked about a sign plan and would calculate what water shares are needed for the proposed landscaping.

4. Comments/Reports: none.
5. Public comments: Comments limited to five minutes.

No public comments.

6. Adjournment:

Motion by Engineer Breinholt to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

The undersigned duly acting and appointed Recorder for Tremonton City Corporation hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Development Review Committee Meeting held on the above referenced date. Minutes prepared by Jessica Tanner.

Dated this ____ day of _____, 2019

Linsey Nessen, City Recorder

*Utah Code 52-4-202, (6) allows for a topic to be raised by the public and discussed by the public body even though it was not included in the agenda or advance public notice given; however, no final action will be taken.