

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, March 23, 2022**, commencing on-site at approximately 8:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Dave Black
Jeff Mathis
James Dotson
Russ Owens

EXCUSED:

James Sullivan

CITY STAFF:

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

Dave Black nominated Jeff Mathis to be the Pro-tem Chair.

James Dotson Seconded

AYES

Dave Black
James Dotson
Russ Owens
Motion Carries

Jeff Mathis called the meeting to order at 8:30 am.

1. Consider a request for a hillside development permit at the Commerce Point Development. The applicant is proposing to construct in the area shown on the slope map labeled 20-30%, 30-40% and 40% and above. The property is located at Southeast quadrant of the intersection of Auto Mall Drive and Blackridge Drive. The property is currently zoned Highway Commercial (C-2). The applicant is Commerce Point, LC. Case No. 2022-HS-005. (*See 'Meeting Place' exhibit below*).

Wes Jenkins – There are some areas here on the analysis map, the dark red is the 40% then the other is the 30 to 40%. Their proposal is to disturb all of this area over here. The question is, has it already been disturbed, is it consistent or should they not be disturbing the 40% and make sure they comply with the 30-40%. The way I understand it is their proposal is to disturb all of this with the argument that it is not consistent with the

topography that is around it and it is really disturbed material from the construction of Blackridge Drive.

Dave Black – I might make a suggestion that we break this up into at least 2 parts. And that we talk about that first and then we vote on that and decide on that. And then we can look at the overall plans and address that separately.

Jeff Mathis – It appears to me those 40% slopes are coming off the fills for the road, aren't they?

Dave Black – I would agree that mostly that is the case. Personally, I don't see any issues with disturbing the areas that they have planned, and I think we've made similar motions in the past, what do we call that? Non-contiguous?

James Dotson – Or man-made even.

Dave Black – Yes, so they are man-made slopes, they are non-contiguous slopes and so I don't see an issue of disturbing those.

Russ Owens – I agree, I don't see anything.

MOTION: Jeff Mathis made a motion that we approve the areas on the packet that are shown to be disturbing over the 40% slopes, they are non-contiguous areas and man-made areas. We recommend they be allowed to affect those areas. SECOND: Dave Black AYES (4) Dave Black Jeff Mathis James Dotson Russ Owens NAYS (0) Motion carries.

Dave Black – The second part is that in the plans they have submitted to us, they have indicated the cut slopes are 40 ft high against Blackridge Drive. That in itself goes against the hillside ordinance. The question I have is how do you mitigate that? That will leave a big scar, are there plans to address the cut slope? Is it going to be decorative rock? Stacked rock, is it going to be just left disturbed? How would plan to mitigate the scars left behind?

Austin Akin – It's in our scope to landscape or otherwise improve everything up the hill that we can. We're not going to leave a big scar. Chris and I have talked about it a little bit and it would be a good idea to stack rock up. We are more than happy to make sure it looks nice.

Jeff Mathis – So you're not going to use that access?

Austin Akin – It is just too steep, that was before I was around, but it seems like a pretty mutual decision not to use that access. We just have the one major road that comes through here.

Russ Owens – In the technical report that we were given to review it talks about minimal cuts with 3:1 slopes and kind of keeping the overall slopes to what it is now, that seems to have not been followed in a lot of this. I know the City is requiring a landslide study, which I guess this is the result of that. So, we haven't had time to review that at all. I think that will be a big issue out here, not only visually but with stability but also with landslide so I would think that needs to be addressed.

Dave Black – I would think that if the Landmark report is not going to be used, that there needs to be a separate updated report from GTS that addresses stable cut and fill slopes and retaining walls and there are expansive soils at this site, maybe revisit the recommendations for foundations.

Discussion continued on what reports will be used.

Dave Black – I don't know that we have enough information for us to review right now and give approval. We probably need to get with GTS and give them the opportunity to tell us what's in their report and any issues or concerns that they have seen.

Chris Volksen – Geotechnical Testing Services did a grading plan for this, and unfortunately our grading report for this portion of this development was not included in the packet. It did address slopes in there.

Wes Jenkins – So it's different than this?

Chris Volksen – Yes, it's a grading report. The purpose of the grading report was just to prepare rough pads.

Austin Akin – So we could go in and do mass grading because we don't know exactly what we are going to build.

Chris Volksen – It's a grading report, so there is a difference between a grading report and a geotechnical report. Once the buildings are established, once they have a tenant, once they know exactly everything with the building then we will do the geotechnical investigation. The intention was to basically to make the site look good so a tenant could come look at it and say that's a nice site we want to be here.

Wes Jenkins – Would your grading report address what Dave is talking about, the cuts and stabilizing those and all of that?

Chris Volksen – Yes, and so we have done some follow up which is what I just gave you here, after we had a 3rd party review with the City on the proposed cuts and the overall stability of the slopes. There was very little affect a .006 affect on the overall slope. What we will do is look at the grading report and I think it addresses slopes in there, it's just been a year since we've done it. It addresses the slopes and the drainage on the slopes and landscape on the slopes. Then we would do a geotechnical investigation for each structure as they are going to be done.

Dave Black – I do think we need to a portion of it now until we receive the report and then if anybody had any comments or anything they wanted to address we could do that in the next meeting.

Wes Jenkins – But you are saying you've done that report, it just wasn't in here?

Chris Volksen – Yes, and if it needs to be updated, I'll update it.

Russ Owens – So can you do a grading study not knowing what they are going to build here? Are you just going to say these buildings have to fit this pad?

Austin Akin – Yes, with the grading that we have planned it's going to narrow what we can do a bit, but it's not setting in stone.

Dave Black – So if you were to grade it now, you would use this plan and have the cut slopes that are on the drawing and then it would be mass graded.

Austin Akin – So the things we would be committing to would be the buildings will be here, the underground utilities here, the driveways here.

Jeff Mathis – So you are going utilities and surface improvements?

Austin Akin – Yes, we would like to. As much as we can.

Russ Owens – So if you did rough grading and it took 3 or 4 years for a client to come in then what would you do with the site?

Austin Akin – We would make sure it was maintained properly.

Chris Volksen – So I know that some of the discussion was that there is going to be a retaining wall along the backside over there, they are not planning on putting that in right now, they are just going to grade that down and just leave the slope.

Dave Black – So that could be a concern. Say you leave a cut slope for 4 years and it sits there.

Wes Jenkins – It has to be treated as a permanent slope, you can't say that it is temporary because the problem is say they sell it off to someone else, they need to understand that it is permanent.

Dave Black – So the landscaping would that go in now?

Wes Jenkins – Not the landscaping but the slope and the treatment of it would need to be dealt with at the initial phase.

Discussion on what the slope would look like and how it should be treated.

Wes Jenkins – From a City standpoint we would require it to be in permanent condition when they walk away from here. So, whatever that slope is, it would have to be in a condition that it could remain in forever.

Dave Black – I understand that, but we would also want the slope dressing on it to mitigate the exposed cut.

Wes Jenkins – Yes it would need to be treated so that the erosion is addressed, and the slope stability is addressed, all of that would have to happen. As far as landscaping around the buildings it won't have to be in.

Jeff Mathis – I think that is understood, what we are concerned about are these 40 ft cuts. It sounds like it's going to be phased, mass grading and so forth anyway.

Austin Akin – We are not planning on this sitting for 3-5 years.

Wes Jenkins – So I'm assuming with your mass grading you are going to come in and pad it out, parking lots established and everything?

Austin Akin – Yes. We are happy to address the cut slope stuff, we can get with Chris and talk about it. I know we don't have any intention of putting water in there, not even for landscaping or anything like that.

Dave Black – Do you have maybe a tall building that could hide something like that, or will they all be single story?

Austin Akin – The ones in the front, we're not doing any retaining. The idea is that yes, we have taller, bigger buildings back here. If you look on the drawings there will be bigger buildings where we are doing the retaining.

Dave Black – So when you come back, that might be part of your mitigation strategy. Address the slope and put taller buildings.

Discussion on how taller buildings will block the cut slope from the road and what type of treatment can be done to the slope.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion that we table the rest of it. SECOND: Jeff Mathis AYES (4) Dave Black Jeff Mathis James Dotson Russ Owens NAYS (0) Motion carries.

2. Consider a request to amend the hillside overlay map by adding approximately 23 acres to the existing Middleton Ridge hillside overlay area. The property is generally located

north of Red Hills Drive and Middleton Drive and approximately 2200-2300 East. The applicant is the City of St. George. Case No. 2022-HS-009.

Wes Jenkins – We are wanting to revise the hillside overlay zone. If you look on the packet, the hillside overlay zone does not come into this area here on top. For some reason they left out this area right here. The proposal is to amend the hillside overlay zone to incorporate this parcel into the hillside overlay zone.

Jeff Mathis – In essence it would come down to the frontage road and then all the way along St. George City's boundary behind here.

Wes Jenkins – Yes.

Jeff Mathis – Is there a reason that you didn't stop at this road, and you took it clear out to there?

Wes Jenkins – I think we took it to the property lines.

Russ Owens – Have you got a development that is looking at building on this? Is that going to impact their overall scheme of things?

Wes Jenkins – Years ago they submitted an application, and it was for a water park, basically they stayed off of that and the slides came off a pole, so there was no disturbance. I'm not even sure if they have submitted anything. Some of their discussion now is to take the slides and put them up on the slope and disturb the slope. So, we got into that, and the City felt like that was a prominent enough hillside feature that it should be protected because it falls within the slope categories. So that is kind of the question, is it a prominent feature that you would like to protect?

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion that we recommend approval for the addition of the area indicated in the packet.

Jeff Mathis – I have one more discussion item, they had a grading permit they had all their things in place, right? So, are we doing something that going to change what was?

Wes Jenkins – No because whatever they had before has now lapsed.

Jeff Mathis – So at that point they were going to put things on poles and now you've heard discussion they want to come in and put things on the slopes.

Wes Jenkins – Yes and that alerted us to A. this is a prominent feature and should be protected because it's not in the hillside. We always thought it was in the hillside. We were caught off guard.

Russ Owens – Say they want to go up there with a landing pad, walk up there and come down?

Wes Jenkins – They would have to go through the hillside, if they wanted to disturb it they would have to do a slope analysis and would have to go through that process and see if there are portions of it that could actually be disturbed. We just want to make bring it in to make it part of the hillside review.

SECOND: James Dotson

AYES (4)

Dave Black

Jeff Mathis

James Dotson
Russ Owens
NAYS (0)
Motion carries.

3. Consider approval of the meeting minutes from February 23, 2022.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion to approve the minutes from the February 23, 2002, meeting.
SECOND: James Dotson
AYES (4)
Dave Black
Jeff Mathis
James Dotson
Russ Owens
NAYS (0)
Motion carries.

Jeff Mathis made a motion to adjourn.