

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

Public Notice

Notice is hereby given that the Hillside Review Board of the City of St. George, Washington County, Utah, will hold meetings at the referenced site on **Wednesday, January 26, 2022**, commencing on-site at approximately 8:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

James Sullivan
Dave Black
Jeff Mathis
James Dotson

EXCUSED:

Russ Owens

CITY STAFF:

Assistant Public Works Director, Wes Jenkins
Planner III, Dan Boles
Planner III, Carol Davidson
Development Office Supervisor, Brenda Hatch

The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

Chair James Sullivan called the meeting to order at 8:52 am.

1. Consider a request for a hillside development permit at the Divario Subdivision. The applicant is proposing to construct in the area shown on the slope map labeled 20-29% and 30-39%. This is specifically in the PA-4 area which is situated in the far south west corner of the Divario development. The property is currently zoned Single-Family Residential, minimum lot size 8,000 square feet (R-1-8). The applicant is 730 St George, LLC. Case No. 2022-HS-003.

Wes Jenkins – As you remember, the whole Divario Development, called The Lakes at that time, went through the hillside approval process. In certain planning areas they said if these areas that are highlighted in pink are going to be disturbed then you need to bring the Hillside Review Board back out and have them look at it and see if they are comfortable with it or if portions of that need to be saved. Like in PA-14 where you asked to save those waterfall areas. This one was highlighted on the wash here. We need to walk it and make sure there isn't some aesthetic value to the wash.

Dave Black – It seems like these washes in these corridors were preserved for trails, is there anything planned, master planned for the trail on this wash where we would lose connectivity to something else.

Wes Jenkins – Not that I know of.

Jeff Mathis – I think there are probably steep slopes on either side of this wash, right? But they were saying they were non-contiguous, so it doesn't fit that requirement?

Wes Jenkins – They must have said that. Obviously they thought that if this was going to be disturbed that it would need a second look through Hillside.

Dave Black – It kind of fell into the aesthetics and trying to preserve some of the natural features. There is not a lot of natural rock outcrops except within the drainages and so if there was something significant then we probably check it and if there's not then we would be ok to disturb it.

Jeff Mathis – And that's what would happen if we say ok, then it will be gone, there won't be a wash here?

Wes Jenkins – They piped that down, you can see on the map there is a little developable area here that was included as part of PA-14 and the wash divided the 2 parcels. Their hope is to fill this wash in and bring them both together. I suggest we walk up there a little bit and see what you think.

Dave Black – Is this BLM or private?

Wes Jenkins – I think it's BLM, it is on the north side.

Discussion continued on the property boundaries and what might be surrounding it.

James Dotson – See the contours on the map, they would probably lose 10 lots.

Discussion on how they could change the access so that the wash could be kept.

Jeff Mathis – I think it is pretty significant here.

James Sullivan – I think it is pretty significant.

Dave Black – If we look at what don't want to lose maybe this lath would be acceptable, we say this would be the limit.

Wes Jenkins – This boring marker right here?

Dave Black – Yes, that's just an idea. It may take us down further or to those other rocks we were standing on.

James Dotson – I think that point right there on that rock is a good spot because it's kind of insignificant and there is no cliff face.

Dave Black – Alright, let's walk down to that one. We are about 175 feet east of that lath.

Jeff Mathis – What's the limits on the top of the wash? Is it where it crest over?

Dave Black – Yes.

James Sullivan - If we are preserving this wash, what's our limit?

Wes Jenkins – You could have them come out and put in some stakes to give us an idea of where it would be.

James Sullivan – We would like to see this wash preserved from here up. Our next question is how do we know where the rims are? Where do we stop, do we get a slope map?

Mark Teeppen – We have a slope map; it doesn't define the whole wash. We did this years and years ago.

Jeff Mathis – You understand the challenge of what we are trying to preserve. Could you guys propose your disturbing line, and then we come and look at it from that point? If you give us an idea based on our design, this point and this will be a fill of 5 ft will be a cut of a foot. Roughly, right.

James Dotson – Yes, stakes on the edges so we can make out where.

Jeff Mathis – The rim gets more defined the higher up you go, but with this one the rim is undefined.

Mark Teeppen – Yes that is the hard part. You really have to come out and get a feel for it. Maybe we will just do that, stake what I think will be the rim and then have you guys come and look at it.

Dave Black – If this was a 5 foot or a 10-foot cut right here, and that cut might come over a certain distance and then everything past that is a no disturb line. But if it's a 10-foot fill that's encroaching on the wash then that is a different scenario.

Mark Teeppen – The rock walls we build, no matter where it's at, it's going to really look good.

Jeff Mathis – I think the general guidance would be the top of the wash. So that is fuzzy there. Generally, it goes up and then starts to level out.

Dave Black – Within the wash we have these natural rock outcrops and they've got the desert varnish and stuff like that; I think that's kind of the intent is to preserve those. Above those it probably is not as critical.

Mark Teeppen – Let's do that, we'll stake it. I just walked this last week. We were questioning what we were doing. If I can get the value off the lots the loss of lots won't matter. Can we leave it up to staff or do you guys want to come back out again?

James Dotson – My concern has always been fill slopes and that we don't push dirt and it ends up here all disturbed.

Mark Teeppen – So we find a non-disturbance line.

James Sullivan – Do you think we have seen enough, or do we need to come back out?

Dave Black – Somebody needs to come out and look at it. Does the City want to do it or do they want us to?

Wes Jenkins – It's up to you, like Mark said if you want them to stake it we can come out and walk it, take some pictures and send them to you, with an aerial like you suggested or you can come back out here and convene if you want.

Mark Teeppen – As long as we can get on the next agenda, I don't want to push it 2 months.

Dan Boles – I think we will be out here next month looking at PA-18.

Dave Black – We can look at it then.

MOTION: Jeff Mathis made a motion to table the item to the next meeting.

SECOND: Dave Black

AYES (4)

James Sullivan

Dave Black

Jeff Mathis

James Dotson

NAYS (0)

Motion carries.

2. Consider a request for a hillside development permit at the Tech Ridge development. The applicant is proposing to put in a storm drain with a concrete trail above it and a pedestrian bridge all within the Hillside Overlay. The property is generally located southwest of 475 Donlee Drive and is zoned Planned Development Mixed Use (PD-MU) and Open Space (OS). The applicant is Isaac Barlow and the representative is Mike Bradshaw. Case No. 2022-HS-002.

James Sullivan – Basically we are looking at the storm drain coming off the hill with the stair, pedestrian trail coming down.

Craig Coats – Let's start with the location, the location of the stair and the storm drain, if you see the shadow of the crest, the old over fill there just to the right, a low point? The stairs run right up that edge. That's where the stairs are coming off. With the Tech Ride development, we have to get the storm drain down to this detention pond and originally our plan was to bring just the pipe down and have it above surface and not have any disturbance. Working with Isaac, it makes sense with the amenity to bring the stairs, cover that pipe down the hillside, and make it blend it with the current hillside there.

Isaac Barlow – And connect it to the trails on both sides.

Craig Coats – You can see this is kind of where the trail is going to be, right where we are standing along this edge, and it ties into a future City trail that is the old cut that goes all the way to the top and then there will be the trail on the west rim of Tech Ridge. And so there will be a connection between the two trail systems. To give you a bearing on where

the bridge is located, it's located directly east of us. There are stakes up there, you can barely see them in orange, right where the shadow is overcasting, it's in between that ridge. It's a 100-foot span bridge and it would be the same span bridge that is all around the City trails.

James Sullivan – What about ADA compliance?

Mike Bradshaw – Trails aren't necessarily ADA compliant.

Jeff Mathis – I think they have to provide certain things at the trail heads, but not the entire trail.

Dave Black – I like it.

James Dotson – I think the video was great.

Dave Black – The only comment that I had was when we met out here on the development, I think you guys have done an excellent job of tying things in and blending. You have established a really good track record. It's exactly what we'd hoped for. And what you are doing here, I think follows that.

Jeff Mathis – What is the finish of the concrete? Will it be natural concrete, just gray?

Isaac Barlow – Our goal is to try to do what the City recommended, to try to have some sort of color to darken it a bit to try and blend in.

Mike Bradshaw – I don't think it will be black, but we would probably go with a darker color.

Dave Black – It looked like you had some disturbed areas and I have seen that you used a mulch that blends in.

Mike Bradshaw – Either that or you can see where we've mulched the rock on the entrance here, maybe we'd mulch it like that, and probably put some native plants back in there.

Isaac Barlow – I think the disturbance area would be as much as 24 or 25 feet, we want to build the steps 12 feet wide to make sure there is enough room on each side for someone to pass someone if they are running. We want to get 6 feet on each side of the rail. That should make where the disturbance on each side is only 6 feet.

Jeff Mathis – Does the natural drain stay in place?

Mike Bradshaw – We are above the natural drainage because it would cause erosion.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion to recommend this project for approval as presented.

SECOND: James Dotson

AYES (4)

James Sullivan

Dave Black Jeff Mathis James Dotson NAYS (0) Motion carries.
--

3. Consider a request for a hillside development permit at the South Rim at Foremaster Ridge Phase 4 development. The applicant is proposing to allow structures in the 30' ridgeline setback in anticipation of the construction of a residential home on lot 83. The property is generally located at 1687 Ridgeline Circle and is currently zoned Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 10,000 sf (R-1-10). The applicant is Jordan Wood. Case No. 2022-HS-001.

James Sullivan – We are reconvening on lot 83 at Foremaster Ridge.

Wes Jenkins – I think we were going to look at these 3 lots.

James Sullivan – The drawing we've got is for this lot, the one lot.

Wes Jenkins – Yes, but we were going to look at these 3.

James Sullivan – So for the hillside overlay was it 30 feet back from the property line, or was it from some other point?

Wes Jenkins – To give you some background, the one on the south didn't come to hillside. Basically, Alpha drew a ridgeline and said this is where your ridgeline is both here and on the north side and on the south side. We're going to hold everything back 30 feet, everything that is going to be developed is going to be less than 20%. They established a ridgeline and a setback, nothing on top was above the 20% that was going to be disturbed. That's why we didn't take it to hillside. Jordan is now coming back; I have printed out maps so you can see what it looked like in 2017 before it was disturbed. Jordan's question is he felt like there really is no ridgeline setback here that Alpha disturbed, so he is requesting to go back to the property line and not have the 30-foot ridgeline setback. The question is, is there a ridgeline, do they need to have a 30-foot setback? That's why I had them stake the 3 lots. It didn't make any sense to look at 1 lot individually and then have the others come in. The question is are we comfortable with him creating a ridgeline? What are you going to build here? Two walls?

Jordan Wood – We are just pushing the retainer wall that is existing right there onto the property line. I talked to the lot next to us and they are planning on doing the same thing.

Dave Black – Is that elevation on top of that fill slope where those stakes are?

Jordan Wood – Yes.

Dave Black – What happens between the elevation of that wall and the pad elevation?

Jordan Wood – This is being built up and we'll have a basement portion on that higher tier, it's a walk out basement.

Wes Jenkins – So is the plan to move the 8-foot rock wall right here to the property line?

Jordan Wood – Yes.

Jeff Mathis – So we end up with an 8-foot wall on the property line.

Wes Jenkins – So in essence the question was they are kind of creating a ridgeline based on building a rock wall. The ordinance has changed, it used to be that we didn't allow any disturbance within that 30-foot ridgeline set back. Needless to say, we got a lot of pushback. People were saying, we want to put a pool, we want to landscape it, so the ordinance was changed in 2019 to allow disturbance within that 30-foot set back but no structure. You could build a pool with a wrought iron fencing and things like that, but we never anticipated rock walls. In essence that would be creating what we would consider a ridgeline by allowing them to fill this in and put a rock wall there.

Jeff Mathis – So the approved Alpha plan was to build this little, shorter wall here on the edge and then go back the 30 feet and build another wall?

Wes Jenkins – No because when they came in it was before the ordinance had changed so it was supposed to be a non-disturb area. That was the ordinance back then.

James Dotson – So the wall that was built with the pads, with the infrastructure, is the one that is back, and now they have come and pushed this out, they'll get another 30 foot. So that wall ties into that ridgeline like they show on that plan, but the lower wall is going to bend back around.

James Sullivan – It's happened all the way along that ridge.

Wes Jenkins – Just so you are aware, when Foremaster came in and developed, I think they stuck with it. They were required to paint their walls, they had a less of a set back then. I don't remember what the setbacks were then. We may have an application from an individual on the east side of Foremaster also, it is similar to this, it's establishing the ridgeline setback.

James Dotson – At this point it is disturbed. It has been pretty consistent across there; they've done those walls. As long as we don't have fill slopes that are left without a wall, I think we are better off.

James Sullivan – Yes, I'd rather see a rock wall than a dirt slope.

Jordan Wood – When they built the original development this was already disturbed as well.

Dave Black – So on top of the 8-foot wall is there another privacy wall?

Jordan Wood – We we're planning on it; we would just do wrought iron. So, it doesn't disturb the view or anything.

Jeff Mathis – I think that’s a good idea, it’s what these guys have done over there. So, you don’t end up with a 14-foot face.

Dave Black – That could be part of the motion, that they keep it wrought iron, so we are not putting a direct fence on top of a block wall.

Jeff Mathis – Can you dictate the color, so it matches the wall?

James Dotson – What about the face of the wall, the rock wall, does it need to be stained or painted?

Dave Black – It looks pretty good over there.

James Dotson – It’s not natural, they sprayed an emulsion on those.

Discussion continued on coloring the rock wall.

MOTION: James Dotson made a motion to recommend for approval this project, building out to the property line with an 8-foot rock wall with the contingency that there is no solid privacy wall above the rock wall, it has to be view fencing also the 8-foot rock wall be stained or painted to match the ridgeline rock and that there be no exposed fill slopes. It applies to lots 82, 83 and 84.

SECOND: Dave Black

AYES (4)

James Sullivan

Dave Black

Jeff Mathis

James Dotson

NAYS (0)

Motion carries.

4. Consider approval of the meeting minutes from September 29, 2021.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion to approve the minutes from September 29, 2021.

SECOND: James Dotson

AYES (4)

James Sullivan

Dave Black

Jeff Mathis

James Dotson

NAYS (0)

Motion carries.