

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 11, 2019**

Members Present:

Steve Bench, Chairman/Zoning Administrator
Chris Breinholt, City Engineer
Marc Christensen, Community Services Director—excused
Paul Fulgham, Public Works Director
Shawn Warnke, City Manager
Diana Doutre, City Councilmember
Cynthia Nelson, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Bench called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:11 a.m. The meeting was held December 11, 2019 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Bench, Engineer Breinholt, Director Fulgham, City Manager Warnke, City Councilmember Doutre, and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance. Director Christensen was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Director Fulgham to approve the December 11, 2019 agenda. Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Director Fulgham – aye, Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

2. Approval of minutes—November 6, 2019

Motion by Engineer Breinholt to approve the minutes of November 6, 2019. Motion seconded by Chairman Bench. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Director Fulgham – aye, Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

The following items were discussed out of order.

3. New Business:

- a. Concept discussion of Tremont Center apartments – Bracken Atkinson and Brent Skinner with Wasatch Development

Mr. Atkinson said some of your requests caught us off guard. For parking stalls, bigger cities only require them to be eight feet wide. Manager Warnke said the 10x20 is our City standard. Director Fulgham said we are a farm community and have bigger vehicles. Mr. Skinner said we are putting something new here, which is evolving the City so we hope to take that into consideration. Higher density areas are tighter and more constrained. Mr. Atkinson said let us talk through this and come to a compromise. The 10-foot parking stall width could be accomplished—we would just have to eliminate several stalls. We like to have an abundance of stalls because garages are usually used for storage and are not a true stall. Having the 10-foot requirement would

eliminate a good number of those, but we can absorb that. We have found we have never had an issue with eight-foot stalls and have never done a stall wider than nine feet. We feel confident in the 18 feet versus the 20 feet requirement and having a 26-foot drive isle down the middle. That extra foot of drive isle is way more important. The size of a stall is less important than the ability to pass cars and get by. We will modify if we need to stay with your dimensions, but it would be a lot of redesign. Engineer Breinholt said it could make sense to have different standards for a housing complex like this versus a commercial site. Would that be fair? Mr. Atkinson said the density is self-contained and with multi-family areas, you are creating mini cities. Manager Warnke said a 10x20-parking stall functions well. I would rather give up some green space to have something function. It is nice to pull into a stall and be able to get in and out. Mr. Atkinson agreed and said before I change anything is there a compromise? A 9x18 dimension would be ideal. The ADA stalls are not an issue and would have signs. The trash enclosures and pillars for the covered parking will eat up some stalls, too.

Mr. Atkinson said this is our first rendition, but we are trying to keep the site self-contained and limit visibility from neighbors, especially around the pool. We will create screens and buffers, and the garages will help with that. The Committee discussed some of the City's buffers and setbacks, as well as bump outs for dead end parking lots and location of garbage enclosures. Mr. Atkinson said we have always done a five-foot bump out with no issues, but could bump that to 10 feet. We can go back and play with this to see how the suggested requirements will impact us. Mr. Skinner said we need 360 stalls and currently show 400, but we will lose some of those.

Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Skinner called their engineer to weigh in on the landscape buffers and dedicated road on 400 West. They explained that their property setback is currently over 30 feet. Their engineer said do we have to be 15 feet from the dedicated right-of-way? If so, we have to shift everything to the west 12 feet, which will really affect us. Manager Warnke said we do need the road dedicated, which is 28 feet. The sidewalk/trail would be eight feet wide and there is a 4.5 park strip too. However, we have room to play with this buffer. There is flexibility especially when continuing the same improvements. That will offset the buffer requirement, as will landscaping. Engineer Breinholt said we have gone down to a 7.5-foot buffer, have we ever done five feet? Mr. Atkinson said let us play with it and see what five does. We could make that work without having to shift buildings.

The Committee also discussed the main entrance width, which is 34 feet. They wanted to ensure there would be enough depth. Manager Warnke asked about snow stacking. The downside of having garages on the parameters is that you lose places to push it. Mr. Atkinson said we could stack along the buffer areas until we expand and bring in a front-end loader to clean it up.

Engineer Breinholt said what are you doing with storm water that goes to Micah Capen's project? Mr. Atkinson said we are going to do underground storage so everything is collecting like a bowl and then would go through and tie into the storm

drain that is already stubbed. We have done the geo tech. It looks good and we will get that to you. Engineer Breinholt said the outfall for this whole area is limited. It has a slower release rate than the rest of the City. Let your engineer know about it. This one is more restrictive than anywhere else because of our outfall.

Trash enclosures, which will have blocks and gates, were discussed as well as an enclosure and safety measures for the pool area. They would work on pinpointing locations for trash. Mr. Atkinson said Phase 2 would trigger access to 350 North. Mr. Capener will figure out how to get people out through his project. We will do a monument sign and come up with a name. Manager Warnke said it would be nice to have a walkway to help get kids to school. Mr. Atkinson said he would make sure they have a connection to that intersection for pedestrians. They also discussed secondary water shares. Director Fulgham said water is based on irrigable acres. Mr. Atkinson asked the Committee to review their exteriors and to get a decision on the parking stalls so they could get started. April is our ideal time to construct.

Director Fulgham said we need to look at extending our secondary line to be able to service this complex. We could pick up the other Harris subdivision too, which would pick up quite a few homes. Driving down 350 North I noticed most of those apartments have little dumpsters. The newer ones facing 350 North did have individual cans. In driving around 450 North in River Valley, most of those do have dumpsters.

b. Concept discussion of Aspen Ridges Subdivision– Ryan Rogers

Mr. Rogers was not in attendance and would be put on next week's agenda.

c. Final plat amendment for River Valley Subdivision Phase 6, Lots 160 & 161 – Matt Nielson and Jessica Prestwich with Sierra Homes

When asked about garbage, Chairman Bench said the code has a lot of interpretation. Director Fulgham said it states, when there are more than three units, the property owner takes care of the garbage. Chairman Bench said getting the truck in and out can be tough in some areas. The HOA on this one would make sure they take their individual cans in from the road. Manager Warnke said in our land use code and revised ordinances, it says less than four units can have individual cans, otherwise a trash enclosure is required. I am always worried about sites being over built and we have standards that address those issues. Mr. Nielson said this is already approved and being built. The foundation and footings are in. All we are doing today is turning them into townhomes. The way it is right now, do you see an issue with that? Are we okay to move forward? The Committee said they would provide them with a spec showing the required trash enclosure. Mr. Nielson said we need to do the cans; we do not have space for the enclosure.

Motion by Director Fulgham to approve lot 160 and 161. Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Director Fulgham – aye, and Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

- d. Preliminary review of Tremont Place Subdivision – Micah Capener

Director Fulgham said we talked about them extending the sewer across and they did not show this happening on the drawings. They could lose a sewer manhole in the middle, put one in the end, and I would take care of that. Mr. Capener was not in attendance so they will put him on next week's agenda.

- e. Tremonton City's 2020 Priority List for the Box Elder County Local Transportation Corridor Preservation Fund

Manager Warnke said every year we have to submit a list to the County for corridor preservation projects that we can work on during that year. They have construction and maintenance, but I do not know if we want to consider maintenance. From a preservation standpoint, it would be good to figure out our priorities. I will submit these to the Council so we know what we are focused on. We are finishing up 1650 West. A couple that are not on here that we have talked about are the BR Mountain Road continuation and Converse Way, which is a bypass road. Engineer Breinholt also suggested 1000 North and 2650 West, while Director Fulgham brought up the expansion of River Valley.

- f. Walk-ins: There were no walk ins.

4. Comments/Reports: none

5. Public comments: none

6. Adjournment:

Motion by Director Fulgham to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 11:13 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 _____, 2020

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.