

NOTICE OF MEETING
HILLSIDE REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ST. GEORGE
WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

PRESENT:

James Dotson
Dave Black
Jeff Mathis

EXCUSED:

James Sullivan
Russ Owens

CITY STAFF:

Assistant Public Works Director Wes Jenkins
Planner III Dan Boles

APPLICANT:

Adam Allen
Wayne Rogers
Nathan Peterson
Todd Smith

The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

1. Consider a request for a Hillside Development Permit on Netta's Knoll. The property was originally considered for hillside approval in 2005 and again in 2018 but to this point has not been developed. The property is generally located on the south-east intersection of Riverside Drive and Foremaster Drive. The property is currently zoned R-2 (Residential multi-family). The owner is Sierra Health Services. Case No. 2021-HS-004.

Adam Allen – We are looking at it a bit differently than the previous people, it's currently zoned R-2, others were trying to put a denser development in there. We are trying to keep the amount of stuff up there to a minimum. We will be disturbing as much or more than before. I want to talk about the most dramatic stuff we're doing on the bottom end. We want to cut the top off and use that dirt to fill down here, to try and make it step up the hill. It will look a lot like Stone Cliff at this angle, so it isn't creating a lot of extra ridgeline. Along the top we went as high as we could go, making sure we could maintain this intersection and then come around and tie this back in.

Jeff Mathis – That was one of the questions I had, can you get your site distance on those?

Adam Allen – I'd have to look at the site distance coming up the hill, but from the intersection going in and out you'll have your site distance. There will be some restrictions on how much landscaping they will be able to have down there.

Jeff Mathis – Site distance intersection with retaining walls and slopes is 260 feet, that's what the hillside ordinance says.

Adam Allen – Yes, we might have to cut that slope back and change it into some retaining so that we can see in there. So, we will raise this up almost 8 to 10 feet. As of right now, we are trying to maintain the look of the ridgeline, my thoughts were, that if that top is gone it's not going to really change the look of it. And that's why it will be built up there to kind of try to maintain a continuous ridgeline.

Wayne Rogers – So it is just easier for us to knock it out, but we're trying to maintain some of the hillside look and so forth at this point.

Jeff Mathis – So is that why you've gone over the 40% in all these areas? Because of what you just said?

Adam Allen – I am going through a specific elevation of 30, there is a little bit of that where it's a little steeper and you touch those rocks. Coming down farther it's cutting down so much that there is 20-foot steps and that's why I didn't come right here and cut an extra 20 feet off of this portion right there.

Dave Black – I think from a Hillside Committee standpoint, that would be hard to say no to because it kind of buffers it. If it is going to be there on the plans then we would agree to it, I just want to make sure it happens because it looks a little problematic. It's going to be fairly expensive to put those walls from the back and can you in reality put the walls with stacking block without some other things behind it. So, you probably need to look at it and see if it's feasible to construct it. How could we say no from a Hillside but if we say yes then we have to be there for the construction. It would be easier just to pull it off.

Wayne Rogers – How would you feel about that? Would that be an issue?

Discussion on what is agreed to and that it will follow through with construction.

Dave Black – When you are cutting and getting close to these slopes, the tendency is for the guy on the dozer or whatever is to go over the top and we get materials push into areas which are to be undisturbed, so all that stuff has to be pulled back, because all that stuff needs to be prevented from going over. Because as soon as it goes over how do you address it?

Todd Smith – We could probably put a silt fence at the no disturb line that absolutely cannot be touched, or we will fine the contractor.

Dave Black – Is there a mitigation or something in place to address a condition oops happened?

Wayne Rogers – There is a bonding thing or whatever it is that goes with the hillside ordinance, and that's part of the restoration. I guess you could tie that to it. Whatever that bond is.

Discussion continued on working on the edges and keeping the ridgeline aesthetic on the other side.

Dave Black – I don't think 18 feet is feasible.

Wes Jenkins – What is the concern?

Wayne Rogers – Right now these are being cut back into the edge of this hill, so instead of chopping that off flat, we have left a ridge up and over right there.

Jeff Mathis – What is our guiding principle as the Hillside Board? Do we try to maintain a ridgeline, or do we not care?

Wes Jenkins – Whatever the ridgeline is, it's established. The City years ago established a ridgeline map. On the map that was approved by City Council they did certain areas where the ridgeline has a 50-foot setback.

Jeff Mathis – Oh, ok, so the rule doesn't apply to this because this is a plateau of 30 feet.

Wes Jenkins – What happened is, if it doesn't show up on that map, which this isn't then it goes to the 30 feet.

Wayne Rogers – I think if we leave the conglomerate ridgeline alone, then you'll see a housetop but not the whole back yard.

James Dotson – So what are we talking about, as far as the pad versus what that ridge is going to be left at?

Adam Allen – These top two lots I'm cutting the ridge at the pad, because it's pretty much just a little bit above the top of that conglomerate. You can tell right here that I can't go up any higher. And then here at this pad it is about 18 feet lower than that top ridge, at what I've currently got designed and that's what we're talking about maybe doing a little different. From a visual standpoint this ridgeline will look like it's continuing on down.

Discussion on where there really isn't a ridgeline.

Wayne Rogers – When we ran the stability analysis we were below the 1.5 if we just do nothing to the ground and fill on top of it. We will have to go in and over ex down to the clay and put a reinforce zone through there to make that stability get up to the stable point.

Discussion on material to use to reinforce the walls.

Wes Jenkins – Let me give you a little feedback, we took the one we just did off of Sunset to Council and it was tabled, they were concerned about that slope. It was all about aesthetics, they want to know what it is going to look like. It will be a very visual thing here; the Council is probably going to want to see what this looks like.

Jeff Mathis – I think Dave is right on the money, you don't make it straight, you don't make it flat, you undulate it and make sure it blends in.

Dave Black – And you can do that with concrete or natural, but you have got to pick the right stuff and the right colors. I think you are going to need a few color illustrations.

Todd Smith – That's no problem, we can do that. We can build a 3-D model so they can look at it.

Discussion of how to show what they will do with the walls.

Wayne Rogers – These are walk outs on this side, there has been a real tendency for some people to say I just want a slab on grade and not build a walk out. That has to be mandatory, unless we change how we prep the lot and the stability of it. That much more fill weight on top of the edge right there is a whole different design for how we do it. If they do come back and want a slab on grade, that has to be reevaluated or you just draw the line.

Todd Smith – I think that is much simpler than reevaluated, it's just sorry if this doesn't work for you we understand, there are tons of other places you can buy ½ acre lots and build.

Dave Black – We will have to have the contingency in a motion that they must be able to meet the 1.5 factor of safety. It's a stability issue if in the future they want to fill in walk out basement lots, plus it makes the rear retaining walls higher.

Wayne Rogers – I have reviewed and went over them all, we can do a sub grade treatment and make the less than 1.5 to come up and if we get that to a higher strength it will easily come into the 1.5. We just didn't show it because at that point we know we can make it work, we just didn't know how we wanted to do it.

Dave Black – So is the City comfortable with that?

Wes Jenkins – So does a walk out option then get you to a 1.5 easier than a slab on grade?

Wayne Rogers – Yes.

Wes Jenkins – So then I think we just hold to that.

Todd Smith – We will make a note on the plat. It is the agent making the right representation to the buyer, you absolutely cannot change this, I don't care if you're building in 2 years or 5 or 12. It's never going to get approved.

Dave Black – Whatever we do on the other side will need to be reflected by the agent.

Wayne Rogers – And that can be notes on the plat that Adam puts on there. That can guarantee.

Todd Smith – And so at the end of the day, we will have covenants and so we will make it a function of the covenants as well. If the architectural committee doesn't sign off on the plans then they don't get a building permit so we can make sure those stay intact.

Wayne Rogers – Great, those are good mechanisms.

Dave Black – What do you think the City Council is going to want to see concerning the hill illustrations? Are they going to just want this view? Are they going to want a view that is coming off Foremaster? Are they going to want a view on the other side of Riverside Dr?

Todd Smith – I think we will do several.

Dave Black – On some of the lots on the side lots, there is quite a bit of elevation change, and I think any wall that is 4 feet or greater, should be built with the development.

Todd Smith – We are building all the walls, every single wall that's on here. And that will be another thing, whatever we decide on material whatever we decide we are ok with, all of them will be that.

Wayne Roger – The other thing to is that these lots are big enough that if there is a subgrade treatment that needs to happen from a Geotech standpoint, we are not going to do it upfront until we know where the house goes. Like an over ex or piers, whatever.

Wes Jenkins – So you are going to mass grade this to the elevations right?

Wayne Rogers – There may be some areas that aren't quite perfectly level. We will get the walls built and then get it up to grade, and then when they do their house...

Discussion continued on grading.

The Hillside Review Board and Dan Boles took a truck to look at the lay of the site, the conversation in the truck was not pertinent to this item.

Dave Black – We could recommend for approval, recommend denying or recommend approval with conditions.

Discussion surrounding walls.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion to recommend approval of the Knetta's Knoll project as presented with the following conditions: 1. That they demonstrate that they can obtain a safety factor of at least 1.5 on the east side of the development with the tall retaining walls. 2. Where they show walk out basements, that needs to be a mandatory walk out basement, needs to be on the plat identified, otherwise it affects the stability of those lots, so they need to stay as designed. 3. The contiguous 40% slope areas need to be avoided, mainly on the south side and south-west side on lot 10 and 11. 4. That they will build interior side walls at the time of construction. 5. The retaining walls on the east side of the project should have renderings to look at aesthetics. That is a key issue and concern for the Hillside. They should do what they can to break up long continuous walls, that they match color and they come up with an aesthetically pleasing material that is approved by the Council. 6. On the interior of the project there are some isolated areas of 20%, 30% and 40% slopes. They are in the opinion of the Hillside Review Board not contiguous and may be disturbed as part of the development.

SECOND: James Dotson

AYES (3)

James Dotson

David Black

Jeff Mathis

NAYS (0)

Motion carries.

2. Consider approval of the meeting minutes from April 21, 2021.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion to accept the minutes.

SECOND: Jeff Mathis

AYES (3)

James Dotson

David Black

Jeff Mathis

NAYS (0)

Motion carries.