

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
JULY 28, 2021**

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

Cynthia Nelson, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Bench called the Development Review Committee Meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. The meeting was held July 28, 2021 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Bench, Engineer Breinholt, Director Fulgham, Manager Warnke, and Deputy Recorder Nelson were in attendance. Director Christensen was excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Director Fulgham to approve the July 28, 2021 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—April 7, 2021

Motion by Director Fulgham to approve the minutes of April 7, 2021. Motion seconded by Chairman Bench. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Director Fulgham – aye, Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

3. New Business:

a. Discussion of Spring Hollow Phase 3 – Ben Johnston

When asked about construction plans being approved, Director Fulgham said it was one phase that has been broken into three. Engineer Breinholt said here are the approved construction drawings for all the phases. Manager Warnke said we need to do a review of the plat. Did the County review it? Mr. Johnston said he would follow up with them. The curb, gutter, sewer and secondary are all in. All that is remaining is the asphalt. We are waiting to have a few utilities stubbed through. Blake Christensen said this is the phase that finishes everything. The walking path is in. Engineer Breinholt said was escrow setup for this one? Chairman Bench said we have one for Phase 1, cash for Phase 2, but will have to figure that one for Phase 3. Mr. Christensen said these two are under contract. I paid for the permit and we are starting to build here. There is a huge elevation change so we created these switchbacks up to it.

When asked about other amenities, Mr. Christensen said the pickleball court has been installed. Some things have changed from the original proposal that was done in 2015 and 2017. We realized we needed to scale this back and chop it into phases. The amenities are a clubhouse and a pickleball court. There was talk of a pool, but we have shut that down because of the maintenance. There is not room for the basketball and tennis courts, or shuffleboard area. The fencing did not make the cut either. The HOA does not want the fencing because there are huge elevation differences. This is all residential and the trail is about eight feet below the back porch area. The front and side yards will still have landscaping requirements. We did not realize the elevations gains that were involved. These switchbacks chewed up a lot of space. There is only room for the pickleball court and it is on an elevated pad and will be fenced. Engineer Breinholt said we need a new timeline for completion of the clubhouse. Chairman Bench suggested they review the Overlay Zone Chapter.

Mr. Johnston said all the common area would be dedicated to the HOA, along with the trail. That will be noted on the plat. They are designated as a parcel. Engineer Breinholt said I have not reviewed it yet, but it is what it is. It has always been this. The Committee agreed they could approve it now and then review it since it is just a continuation. It would not be recorded until it is all in. Mr. Johnston said I will send all the plat and construction drawings showing what is going in and what is existing.

Motion by Director Fulham to approve Spring Hollow Phase 3. Motion seconded by Engineer Breinholt. Vote: Chairman Bench – aye, Engineer Breinholt – aye, Director Fulham – aye, and Manager Warnke – aye. Motion approved.

Mr. Johnston asked about a lot split. Chairman Bench said the owners would have to come up with a water share if they do that. Mr. Johnston said this is a lot at 1000 North and is currently zoned with a 100-foot frontage minimum and is 20,000 square feet. If I split this, it leaves them 12 feet between their homes. They still want to get a septic truck back there. Chairman Bench said 10 feet is the minimum. Mr. Johnston said could I jog the line so I have 20 feet and then come back here and make up the 20,000. It would create irregular lots. Chairman Bench said whomever builds here would tie into the sewer and provide a water share based of the calculations of irrigable acreage. You would have to plat things out and present it, but they would have to provide the water share and hook to sewer.

Manager Warnke asked about the data for the fill slope easements. Engineer Breinholt said it is a 66-foot road and 33 feet would be half so they would need a 60 foot setback. That is for the slope easement to widen the 1000 North road. We have to work around the originals. It would be better for them to be back further and makes for a better driveway when the road gets done. Chairman Bench said before they spend a lot of money on engineering, make sure they know what they are up against.

Chairman Bench said this would be a two-lot subdivision. It was in the County years ago and was then adopted into the City. The zoning is R1-20. Have them talk to a realtor to see what they can get out of it and if it is worth what they will be required to do. Mr. Johnston asked if he could have some flexibility on the required feet for the frontage in order to avoid an irregular lot. Manager Warnke said I would rather have the regular shape lot than the 100-foot frontage. The current owners would also have to connect to sewer if we subdivide, right? Engineer Breinholt said yes, because they are within 300 feet of the sewer. State code says they need to be connected now. Director Fulgham said if you make an exception here then you have to do that down the road for someone else. We have been lenient because some would have to put pumps in.

b. Concept plan for townhome project at 400 West 200 North – Danny Macfarlane

Mr. Macfarlane said for the setback this zone says that is determined by this group. It is important to know what that is as I design. I am proposing 10 feet from the property line. I know there is a dedication that will be required, but I am not sure if that has been determined. Manager Warnke said I was hoping we could look at the entire corridor and the right-of-way we need dedicated and then determine the setback based on those.

Mr. Macfarlane said the other question I had was on the frontage improvements. If it were conducive to be built at this time, we would prefer that. We could design it and build it as long as there are no connectivity problems. Engineer Breinholt said that road is set for 66 feet. Mr. Macfarlane said looking at the Wasatch project there is another 7 to 10 feet that would need to be dedicated to get that. Engineer Breinholt said there would be no on street parking and the sidewalk could be a standard four-foot. Manager Warnke said would we do a four-foot walk with a monolithic curb and gutter to have extra room on the east side? Chairman Bench said the main walkway would be on the west. Manager Warnke said we need to squeeze as much road to accommodate bike lanes in each direction. Maybe lay it out to see what is reasonable. Engineer Breinholt said if you did a four-foot sidewalk up against the curb that leaves you with 12-foot travel lanes and a 10.5-foot parking lane. It needs to be 11.5 feet if it is shared with a bike lane. You could put the sidewalk right on the property line. If you want on street parking, it would have to be shared parking with the bike lane or have no on street parking, then you would have plenty of room. Mr. Macfarlane said could we have no on street parking and do a park strip and bike lane? I would prefer a park strip; it beautifies it a bit. We can iron out the details. Engineer Breinholt said I am fine with bike lanes and a park strip with no parking on either side of the road.

Mr. Macfarlane said we have two stalls per unit plus parking for visitors. We could mark the street as no parking. It will be professionally managed and will be rentals. If we do a seven to ten foot dedication, what would the setback be? I show 10 out front and do not know the back setback. Chairman Bench said a 20-foot setback offers good green space, but could go down a bit and still meet the buffer and accommodate for everything. Mr. Macfarlane said having them up close makes a nice street presence, but

I could do 20 feet if we have to. If we lose seven feet up front, we may not be able to do the 20 feet in the back, but could do 15. Manager Warnke said it is nice to have some trees that break up the sod a bit. Having greater setbacks allow for that, but they could be planted in a park strip. Chairman Bench said the back to curb and property line would be 9.5 feet plus 10 feet for the MUE, which is 19.5 feet from the back of the curb. You are 20 feet from the road the way he is showing it. The MUE would be at the foundational wall. All the utilities are out front. Mr. Macfarlane said we could do 12 feet out front so the MUE has a clear space and still have street trees.

Mr. Macfarlane asked about water shares. Chairman Bench said he would have to find some to buy and give over to the City. Review the zoning site plan chapter. The site plan is approved by this group. Mr. Macfarlane said how long do we have to build it? Chairman Bench said a typical subdivision has a year. A one-year extension can be granted.

c. Discussion of Spring Hollow Phase 4 – Jim Flint

Mr. Flint asked about the extension of the storm drain. Director Fulgham said the lower part can go there, but the other will have to come in. Since there is no storm drain up there, you will have to cut the road and go down and tie into Spring Acres Phase 2. They will have to run a pipe down to the last box to get it out or get an easement around. Blake Christensen said the idea was to run the easement around. There are 15 feet there and we would propose a land swap in exchange for that easement going to the pond through the backside of Phase 2. Could we do that? Director Fulgham said you would need some maintenance and access points. That may be cheaper than cutting the asphalt and putting it in the road. Mr. Flint said is that City maintained? Director Fulgham said it would be once you have it done. The biggest thing is getting in to maintain it. I can shoot 600 feet with our equipment, but that is close to 900 feet. It would be easier for me to maintain if it was through the street. Have your engineer tell you how much that would cost to go in the asphalt. Sooner or later you would have to get that out. It is best to take this out now. Engineer Breinholt said you would have to do detention further up the hill. You have storm drainage in the area that has to be released. The pond at the bottom was expanded in part for this area. A future phase will need a retention basin.

Mr. Christensen said how many water shares do we need to come up with? Chairman Bench that is calculated on lot size. Director Fulgham said we have a chart in our development standards that gives you a general idea.

Director Fulgham said people put their fences through the original drain line that went through and caused problems. Manager Warnke confirmed they would abandon that line. If you do the easement, it needs to be 20 feet and include an access. Director Fulgham said yes, at least at the top and bottom where we clean we would need the accesses. We could maintain from the bottom and top, but would require a manhole

midway. Engineer Breinholt said it would be better in the roadway. Manager Warnke said future phases would need to come this way so should it be upsized? Director Fulgham said with the slopes it could be one size then they would have to retain and control to match what the pipe can flow with a detain on the other side.

d. Walk-ins:

Mr. Flint was also a walk-in. When asked about the protection strip, he said we have it under contract. I am not sure if it is for the whole strip though. I told them these are collector streets and they cannot back up into them; they would have to be internally accessed. Chairman Bench said the fronts would be street side. Are these going to be garages with a driveway? Mr. Flint said yes they are 25x51. It is popular to have a limited common area that is eight feet wide across the back. Chairman Bench said the problem here is that the zone would have to be changed and the Planning Commission has had enough of multi-family housing. Within reason they will look at things, but I think they will turn it down and then the City Council would have to say one way or another. We have a lot of multi-family housing right and areas that are already zoned for that. Manager Warnke said I am concerned with 400 West and trying to de-emphasize that. Chairman Bench said they are welcome to go to the Planning Commission to see if they will entertain it. You could do the single-family homes and they would sell like hot cakes.

Mr. Flint asked about the area north of Aspen Ridge's development. Director Fulgham said there are some mixed feelings. Manager Warnke worries about traffic. Going west is limited, but east to Tremont Street is better. Chairman Bench said we are looking at too much density there. They could do it on the south end because it is wider. Director Fulgham said that is probably the best use for that property because no one wants to live between the canal and the tracks. Chairman Bench said we are averaging about nine units per acre in the ones we have done. I can see the hesitation with the Planning Commission especially right here. If you want to talk to the Planning Commission you can, if not then I would proceed with what you have going with the single-family. Mr. Flint said on the Canfield property is there an issue with going through a private development to the south? Director Fulgham said that was the plan at first, but now there is an issue. They are private streets. Chairman Bench said if that develops, they would need a bridge to 600 South and an access to 1200 South.

Walk-in Garth Day said I sent the road dedication for Rocket Road. Manager Warnke said I was hoping he could break out the ownership showing the acreage per owner. We own this, but I am not sure where the canal company owns land. There will be a PUE and MUE across this portion. It is ideal to get the utility easement and have it be continuous. This shows the dedication, but not the easements. Mr. Day said that was included in the road dedication, right? Engineer Breinholt said show it on the plat. The dry utilities are outside the road and behind the sidewalk. There is a 40-foot dedication for half of this. It seems like there is already some right-of-way there. I wonder why he

is doing the full 40 feet when on Mr. Christensen's side we only have to do another 13.5 feet to get to 80 feet total. To the right we are doing a full 40-foot and I wonder if that has not already been dedicated. Manager Warnke said on the survey notes add how much right-of-way you are dedicating. We do have some of our own language for the owner's dedication. I will email that to you.

Mr. Day said with our final plat for Harvest Acres I need your development and escrow agreement forms. Chairman Bench said we have the escrow agreement form, but the other has to be filled in. Manager Warnke said I have a few items to cross off based on submitting a new plat. We have reviewed it, but have not seen some of the updates. Engineer Breinholt said I need to see a cost estimate from your engineer. Chairman Bench said the development agreement has to have copies of the plat, engineers estimate, street signs, fees, and more. There are some things I have to do to it before I can send it to you. Once we have the estimate I can get that taken care of. Manager Warnke said I was hoping to get the plat to verify a couple things. Chairman Bench said get us a site plan and we will start the discussion.

4. Comments/Reports: None
5. Public comments: No public comments.
6. Adjournment:

Motion by Engineer Breinholt to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Committee. The meeting adjourned at 11:18 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 1st day of December, 2021

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.