

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, August 24, 2022**, commencing on-site at approximately 8:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Chair Sullivan
James Dotson
Russ Owens
Jeff Mathis

EXCUSED:

Dave Black

CITY STAFF:

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

Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order.

1. Consider a request for a hillside development permit at the Divario Development. The applicant is requesting that the Hillside Review Board consider the unimprovable open space designated on the Divario land use map to be improvable on PA-1 (Planning Area 1). The property is currently zoned PD-R (Planned Development Residential). The property is generally located south-east of the Gap Canyon Pkwy and 1790 West intersection (*See 'Meeting Place' exhibit below*). The applicant is St. George 730, LLC. Case No. 2022-HS-014.

Rick Rosenberg – This sewer easement goes across the site and serves Las Palmas. The site has been disturbed from the sewer easement down. It's shown as open space on the general plan, they would like to do some improvements on it. It has been previously disturbed like I said. It extends this way down to the next property line and into the next planning area. The slope analysis is in your packet.

James Dotson – What plan improvements were you thinking?

Rick Rosenberg – I don't think there are a lot of improvements, they just want improvable open space.

Dan Boles – The applicant has an approved zoning on this property for a PD. This is open space and we told them they need to keep out of the open space. The one thing that they did show is a trail that will come through here and maybe a corner of a building. Improvable open space can have amenities like trails and things like that. I anticipate seeing an application for an amendment to the approval. They are wanting to do some different architecture, layout their site a little different, more inline as opposed to staggered and that kind of thing. They are still proposing that trail that would come through here.

Rick Rosenberg – Their plan shows a trail on the slope to the east of us then it comes up and across the top and ties back down to Gap Canyon Pkwy. It's on the plan inside the packet.

Russ Owens – So the slope will still remain the same?

Rick Rosenberg – Yeah, I think they've got a building down into here and there are some buildings that come into the edge of it, so you will have buildings here in front of us but as far as the slope goes, there is a sewer easement that goes right up in there that they can't do anything with and the trail kind of loops around the whole thing.

Jeff Mathis – So the trail doesn't fall within the easement?

Rick Rosenberg – No.

Dan Boles – The other thing with the unimprovable vs improvable status is, and Wes correct me if I'm wrong, unimprovable they cannot count as part of density. They can with improvable. That said, they were approved for 500 units in here. Their new plan shows 463 I believe. They haven't made that application yet, but I think they're going to at any time now. Just know that is another aspect of unimprovable vs improvable open space.

Wes Jenkins – Most of these unimprovable were the washes that we looked at in PA-4, there's the one over here on PA-6, the big one Gap Canyon. They were listed as unimprovable for obvious reasons because they had a beautiful and aesthetic value. The applicant wasn't sure how this became unimprovable and not improvable to be allowed to be disturbed with certain things. That is the argument.

Dan Boles – Still to remain open space, but there may be some minor improvements like a trail.

Rod Packer – The actual line of the open size is not going to change, just the designation.

Jeff Mathis – So will there be some landscaping, or will it be this natural with a trail and get rid of the garbage?

Rick Rosenberg – All of the above.

MOTION: Jeff Mathis made a motion to recommend approval of the change from unimprovable open space to improvable open space as listed in the request.

SECOND: Russ Owens
AYES (4)
Chair Sullivan
Jeff Mathis
James Dotson
Russ Owens
NAYS (0)
Motion carries.

2. Consider a request for a hillside development permit at the Divario Development. The applicant is requesting that the Hillside Review Board consider the unimprovable open space designated on the Divario land use map to be improvable on PA-2 (Planning Area 2). The property is currently zoned R-1-10 (Single Family Residential, 10,000 sq ft minimum lot size). PA-2 is generally located south-west of the Gap Canyon Pkwy and 1790 West intersection (*See 'Meeting Place' exhibit below*). The applicant is St. George 730, LLC. Case No. 2022-HS-013.

Rick Rosenberg – It is basically everything from the toe of this slope over to Gap Canyon Pkwy where we were just at. A lot of it has been previously disturbed, there was a gravel pit out here and you can see the remnants of the CATs and some of the earth moving that happened back when Green Valley, when the resort was being developed. That's when this pit was active, it hasn't been active since the 80's except for people dumping out here. Their request is similar to the one on PA-1, it doesn't involve the slope that is right in front of us, this is going to be preserved. Everything at the bottom that is included in the site plan they put together for PA-2 so they would like to go in and do some improvements on that, there is some really steep stuff between PA-3 and there will be some preserved on this top slope and then it will be into PA-2. It's not real well defined. They are proposing to channelize the wash and better define it with some open space around it, so it takes that flood plain and narrows it from about 600 ft down to 150 ft or so, it lets it be reduced. The flood plain was shown as open space FEMA has updated their map since the original development agreement and master plan was done. They would like to continue the channelization that was started down at Tonaquint Center approved up through the property between us and Tonaquint Center by FEMA and the State. They want to extend that up through this canyon the same way.

Wes Jenkins – So if it was left unimprovable you couldn't go in there and do all those improvements and channelize it. If it's changed to improvable then it allows you to go in and channel and so forth and still leave it open space but do some improvements.

Rick Rosenberg – It's really important for the bridge. Gap Canyon Parkway crosses it, where that power pole is, there is a well right there. Gap Canyon Parkway is just beyond that, and it crosses the Gap Wash. It takes the bridge from a 600 ft span down to 4- or 5-barrel box culverts like you see on Dixie Drive coming out here. But we have to be able to do the improvements to be able to do that.

Chair Sullivan – Once again we are not changing the boundaries of the open space, we're just changing the designation of it.

MOTION: James Dotson made a motion to change the open space from unimprovable to improvable on Item 2.

SECOND: Jeff Mathis

AYES (4)

Chair Sullivan

Jeff Mathis

James Dotson

Russ Owens

NAYS (0)

Motion carries.

3. Consider a request for a hillside development permit to adjust the location of the ridgeline and ridgeline setback on lot 89 of the South Rim at Foremaster Ridge Phase 4 subdivision in anticipation of the construction of a residential home. The property is generally located at 1751 Ridgeline Circle and is currently zoned Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 10,000 sf (R-1-10). The applicant is MG Homes, LLC, Carl Ford. Case No. 2022-HS-015.

Mike Gubler – Our thoughts are that this point represents the ridgeline more than this point here. It keeps us more inline with these two corner property lines. In all of these back in here which really pinches our house to get our entrance way, our living room and a back deck that is going to look over here. We have really tried to squeeze it as skinny as we can, but I think this represents more what the ridgeline is. We are proposing that we draw a straight line from that property corner to that property corner.

Discussion on where the property corners are located.

Scott Woolsey – The way this was originally done, we just kind of surveyed the top of it and we determined the boundary and that is how we divided that out. We didn't do really precise, this little part of it could have easily been moved out. That is why the boundary was done the way it was.

Jeff Mathis – So we are talking the setback line, a 30-foot setback from this line?

Mike Gubler – Correct.

Wes Jenkins – Within that 30-feet you can't have a structure which would be a retaining wall, a privacy wall or a house.

Jeff Mathis – So they could slope it out, but they can't do a retaining wall?

Mike Gubler – We actually need a deck so we can see that beautiful view. We would have some pillars for a deck, if we can't have that then the house isn't worth building.

Chair Sullivan – Looking up from the bottom I was looking at the big rocks. It seems a lot more obvious from down there then it does up here.

Russ Owens – Are you going to have a rock wall up here?

Mike Gubler – No, I understand that I can't have a rock wall. We're just going to have landscape up through here and up to the house.

Discussion continued on walls.

James Dotson – How close to grade is this here to what the walkout is?

Mike Gubler – This would be my yard right here.

James Dotson – So if it was fill, it's not going to be 10 ft up from here? Which is great.

Russ Owens – So basically, you really won't past here other than the landscape with the grade, it's just your setback for the building.

Mike Gubler – And it's just this pinch corner too. I'm curved on the front, so my house has to come back because of the curve on the front.

Jeff Mathis – On this one Scott you are showing going to the very next property corner with a straight line, but you're anticipating it was going to the actual property corner of this lot. So, are we talking the next angle point over on the next lot or are we talking your lot corner?

Mike Gubler – My lot corner.

Chair Sullivan – So basically we are taking this angle point out and there is still going to be an angle point in the ridgeline setback right there.

Discussion on the lines shown on the presentation and the property corners.

Jeff Mathis – I'm inclined to believe it does meet the ridgeline setback, but again I want to see the straight line from lot 89 property corner to property corner and not extend that line out to the next one over.

Mike Gubler – Yes, I don't think that was the intention.

Discussion on the fact that the property line isn't moving just the ridgeline where the setback is measured from.

Jeff Mathis – I guess we are moving it 10 ft.

Wes Jenkins – What sticks out further the deck or the house?

Mike Gubler – It's the same.

Wes Jenkins – You could cantilever the deck 4 ft into that setback, but your columns couldn't be in the setback.

Discussion on whether the deck can cantilever into the setback.

Dan Boles – So no cantilever.

MOTION: Jeff Mathis made a motion to approve moving the setback line, the ridgeline, the 30 ft setback line on the back property line which would be like the northwest line of lot 89 to continue between the two north westerly corners of lot 89. So a straight line between the two corners on the edge and allow them to do a 30 ft setback from that line.
SECOND: James Dotson
AYES (4)
Chair Sullivan
Jeff Mathis
James Dotson
Russ Owens
NAYS (0)
Motion carries.

4. Consider approval of the meeting minutes from August 3, 2022.

MOTION: Russ Owens made a motion to approve the minutes.
SECOND: James Dotson
AYES (4)
Chair Sullivan
Jeff Mathis
James Dotson
Russ Owens
NAYS (0)
Motion carries.

5. Jeff Mathis made a motion to adjourn.