

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 30, 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
Diana Doutre, City Councilmember
Cynthia Nelson, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Bench called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. The meeting was held October 30, 2019 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Bench, Engineer Breinholt, City Manager Warnke, City Councilmember Doutre, and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance. Directors Fulgham and Christensen were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Engineer Breinholt to approve the October 30, 2019 agenda. Motion seconded by Manager Warnke. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

2. Approval of minutes—no minutes to approve at this time

The following items were discussed out of order.

3. New Business:

- a. Review and make recommendation to City Council for disposal of real property located at 100 South 700 West

Chairman Bench said this is the stubbed street and part of the realigning on 600 West for Crump Reese Motor's redo. Manager Warnke said we need to declare this as significant or insignificant and determine if we need to schedule a public hearing. Chairman Bench said in our ordinance if the City gives away public property then it has to be a public hearing even though it only affects two homeowners. We will set that up with the City Council.

Motion by Chairman Bench to recommend this to the City Council as insignificant property. Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, and Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

The Committee continued to discuss what is written in the code under different circumstances and which board would review it. Manager Warnke said let us do the public hearing and include that we are considering disposing of real property and vacating the right-of-way.

b. Site Review for M & M Commercial Building at 1020 East Main – Micah Capener

Developer Capener said this has been revised to accommodate a buffer for the resident there. He showed where the retention would go, as well as drive-thrus and stacking for potential businesses. He said there seems to be a lot of demand for that and there is not a lot of places we can put them without stacking into roadways. We might have to lose some parking to make that width. I think I should tear out these trees now because they are dying and the roots have created havoc for the neighbor, who tore his out. Chairman Bench asked about the current width of the driveway, which is 66 feet. You have to maintain 24 feet for a private lane with 12 feet of hard surface, which is already established. Mr. Capener said I am thinking of tearing that out. What if we expand it all the way back and I put additional parking along the back of the building and then have an access through the drive isle with an easement or something without modifying the plat? Chairman Bench said it seems like you want a lot of parking, do you have something in mind for that? Mr. Capener said no, but this is a two-story design. I want to maximize parking because businesses are driven by people being able to get in there. It is not a deal breaker; I just do not want to pay to landscape all of that. It has higher value as commercial than it does as a driveway and 66 feet is hard to maintain. If I have to put a big fence on the back of it, there is nothing to beautify in there because you are not going to see it. Manager Warnke said I know you are hesitant to go through amending the subdivision plat, but I do not think you have to get the neighbors to sign it; there would be a public hearing.

Mr. Capener said I want to maximize that front piece. The ditch will have to be buried. I would like to have overhead doors along the back and a sidewalk with parking on one side, a 25-foot drive isle, and parking on the other side. Manager Warnke asked how this would work once he sold his house. Mr. Capener said we could put an easement through there or leave it owned by the house with an easement for the building. It is currently a dedicated fire lane. Engineer Breinholt said it makes a lot of sense to shrink that access down to at least what is required in the code—you do not need 66 feet. Mr. Capener said I would have 90 feet, which is plenty of room to do a 6-foot sidewalk, 20-foot parking, 25-foot drive isle, and another 20-foot parking area. I would use the drive isle as my official easement to get through and not affect the commercial. I would put a gate here to separate the two and still have 20 feet. Chairman Bench said your parking lot needs to meet the ordinance and if you do a two-story building then you need to double that. Parking is based on businesses and square footage.

Manager Warnke read the State Code for adjusting lot lines without a public hearing. They determined it might only be the lot owners who have to sign, but Manager Warnke

said he would read it more thoroughly. Chairman Bench said if you could get more parking and still meet all the requirements, then draw it up and let us take a look. Manager Warnke said do we need any additional right-of-way on 950 East in order to make an intersection there? We do anticipate a traffic light at some point. I tried to line those up and they are off a bit. Engineer Breinholt said he would take a look and report back. Manager Warnke said there is some allowance, if you dedicate that, to shrink the landscape buffer. Also, I wondered about fee-in-lieu or if we can build the frontage improvements. In the past, UDOT has left those things up to the cities to exact or have improvements made. Engineer Breinholt said the problem with curb and gutter is that you are then collecting storm water and need somewhere for it to go. I like fee in lieu for curb because I like to have the curb design be continuous rather than sectional. You could do the sidewalk though. Widening the road for that one section does not make a lot of sense. Manager Warnke said does it make sense to try to plan where the base would be for the traffic light? Engineer Breinholt said it would not hurt. I can call UDOT and find out how much space you need for an easement for a traffic light and the right-of-way width. Manager Warnke will review and send comments to Mr. Capener who was asked to complete some drawings. Mr. Capener said when I have the comments, we can do one final revision of what we are going to do and then I will dial it all in.

c. Review and consideration of River Valley 4-plex Subdivision amendment

Chairman Bench said this is their landscaping which has been prepared by a landscape architect. This is a four-plex/multi-family subdivision that was recorded 15 years ago. They are doing an amendment to that subdivision and adding a couple units. This is making it better as far as accessibility. The Committee would take time to review this and discuss it at a future meeting.

d. Walk-ins

Mr. Capener said this is the next phase of Tremonton Place and it meets the master plan that was originally setup. It has 13 lots, but there are 28 lots total in seven acres. This street will loop and fix their water pressure and make their access better. Chairman Bench said at the next meeting this would be preliminary, just get us some construction drawings so we have an idea of what is going on and then we can get it on the agenda. Mr. Capener said I told the developers we need to get the water pipes in now and we have the retention basin resolved. It is over half an acre. There will be 17 to 20 lots in phase 1. Manager Warnke said when I asked about making a connection between the two subdivisions, the developers shied away from that because of the cost. They already crossed the canal once on the north end. This got me thinking about the trail and having an access point across there. Impact fees could be used to do a small pedestrian bridge. The developers would construct it and use impact fee credits. Engineer Breinholt said it might make more sense for this to happen at the next intersection so it is center of the trail. Manager Warnke said we need to consider if the benefit is worth the expense.

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 10:14 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.