

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 25, 2023**, commencing on-site at approximately 9:00 a.m.

PRESENT:

James Sullivan
Dave Black
Jeff Mathis
Russ Owens

EXCUSED:

James Dotson

CITY STAFF:

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

The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

1. Consider a request for a hillside development permit to build a new townhome development on the property located at 1100 W Curly Hollow Dr. **Meeting time is approx. 9:00 am**

Jared Bates – This is for the proposed Rosewood Townhomes project. We have 134 units. It slopes generally from north to south towards Curly Hollow Drive. Our goal is to stay out of the northeast corner completely that is in the 30 – 40%. It looks like a little bump there that we would be getting into but that is a retaining wall, so if we needed to adjust the retaining wall we could. Jared showed the grading plan and the cross sections.

James Sullivan – Do you have the wall specs?

Jared Bates – No, no wall specs, just grading.

Jeff Mathis – It looks like you have the recreation area in a 4:1.

Jared Bates – Yes, we will flatten that out.

Dave Black – What type of walls?

Jared Bates – I’m guessing they will be rock, that’s usually the cheapest option. There might be some concrete in here where we are close to the buildings.

Russ Owens – So how high is this wall?

Jared Bates – Probably 8.

James Sullivan – Is there no retention?

Jared Bates – No because we are going to send it through.

Wes Jenkins – Is any of this area here part of what you are disturbing?

Jared Bates – No, we will be well below that. There is just this bit here that is yellow.

Dave Black – So in the motion we may want to address that these 3 here are isolated and noncontiguous. The motion probably ought to address the retaining walls as far as the color matching the natural terrain and that the cut slopes be matched with (can’t hear on the tape)

MOTION: Jeff Mathis made a motion to recommend approval of the Rosewood Townhomes as presented with the conditions that the 3 areas in the top north side where the cut slopes go in, they don’t touch steeper than 20% the other areas are noncontiguous slopes so they shouldn’t present a problem, any retaining walls need to be a color that matches the existing landscape and that all the steep cut slopes 4:1, 2:1 slopes have landscaping cover to match the natural landscape.

SECOND: Russ Owens

AYES (4)

James Sullivan

Dave Black

Jeff Mathis

Russ Owens

NAYS (0)

Motion carries

2. Consider a request for a hillside development permit to make modifications to the ridgeline along the southeast slope of the Tech Ridge Development. **Meeting time is approx. 10:00 am**

Mike Bradshaw – What the intent of this ask is to continue, all the way south on the east side and the west side of this mesa is a ridge cap that has held fast, that is there. It creates a ridgetop that is definable, that you can look at, that you can set your buildings off set. Our intent is to put a trail in on the ridge. Our ask is to create that ridge and continue those aesthetics along the east face and define a ridge cap, put a trail against it and ultimately get a pedestrian bridge over the top of this future road that we intend to build for the southeast access. To create this pedestrian loop along the top of the ridge. That is the basis of what this ask is. To create that ridgeline aesthetic and continue that look. We feel like it defines the edge. It mitigates a lot of the buildings right now, the effects

of the buildings that are up here. I think it creates a nice atmosphere to finish this ridge off. So that you don't see the retaining wall or the edge of the building.

Russ Owens – How do you define that?

Mike Bradshaw – There is a spot that kind of maintains that ridge and we will just extend it out. It's somewhat arbitrary. It's more of when we staked it, and when we got there it felt like the most logical place.

Russ Owens – So there are stakes?

Mike Bradshaw – There were, it's been about a year.

Isaac Barlow – It's important to the pedestrian trail experience that we do around the edge. It allows for the pedestrian experience to connect without having to get them across the main access road.

Dave Black – I think we probably ought to table this particular item but we can continue on with further discussion about the things that we like about it. I think we will need a Geotech report that addresses that, the report you submitted doesn't address the walls and the location. Specifically, I think they would want to state, and what we don't want to happen, at least in my mind is that the base of the wall extend on top of the landslide in any location. We want to make sure that the base of the wall is back from what they determine as landslide. We don't want to add more weight or fill to the landslide. I think the Geotech report should look at the location, you will probably have to look at your rocky wall ordinance and look at the heights you have proposed.

Mike Bradshaw – They are 8 ft. tiers. A 16 ft. total.

Dave Black – I like the idea, and they have already proven that they can make things look really nice. We have done something similar on Foremaster Ridge, where some of those last lots we looked at. We had them build rock walls with the basalt and we extended that defined edge. We have done that before. I just think we need to be real careful about the location, that we don't impact the landslide and that we get a Geotech report, which you need anyway for your rock wall construction and your designs.

Wes Jenkins – Do you want them to stake it again so you can walk it?

Dave Black – Yes, it needs to be staked for the Geotechnical engineer as well. It needs address the location so we know that there is no impact to it. I personally don't think I could vote on it right now without having that. I like the idea and don't see anything wrong with it as long as we are matching the colors and it's similar to what they are doing up here.

Jeff Mathis – Obviously you are creating a very visual aspect for our City. I agree that the west side looks beautiful. On this side, this is why we have hillside ordinances. One question I have is there any part of our hillside ordinance that we talk about actually creating ridgelines? That is what were doing, creating a new ridge.

Mike Bradshaw – I think the clarity on that is this is a specific, the hillside doesn't address ridgelines per se. The ridgeline is here by default.

Jeff Mathis – There are certain defined ridgelines in the City, but it doesn't come down this far.

Discussion on what defines the ridgeline.

James Sullivan – The slope map that is the packet, it seems like most of it is in the 0 to 20%.

Jeff Mathis – Those are slope maps on existing slopes, right? If they are building those walls that really flattens this out. Is the overall intent to build commercial property on top of all those walls.

Mike Bradshaw – Yes, between the ridge and the 50 ft offset would be the ridge trail and then the intent would be to start the project outside of that.

Wes Jenkins – As I remember we have had projects where they were going to create a faux ridgeline to tie the two together, it's just that it's never been to this extent.

Jeff Mathis – The ones that we did, the ones that Dave mentioned. You can see them from here. You are starting to see that. The scope of this is so much larger, two tiered walls 16 ft roughly in height when we were talking about 4 or 5 ft over there. We're redefining the skyline.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion we table this item until we can get a project Geotech report that addresses the walls and any potential impact to the landslide and that when we meet next time that the proposed alignment of the walls have been staked in the field.

SECOND: Russ Owens

AYES (4)

James Sullivan

Dave Black

Jeff Mathis

Russ Owens

NAYS (0)

Motion carries

3. Consider a request for a hillside development permit to construct the southeast access road from 250 West St. to the Tech Ridge Development. **Meeting time is approx. 10:00 am**

Mike Bradshaw – We have the south access road for Tech Ridge coming off of 250 W, ultimately we plan on realigning 250 W so that this is the primary access to the south.

Jeff Mathis – And this is a City project?

Mike Bradshaw – Right, it's in an easement, so we are pretty tight on the location. The easement is imminent domain easement, so we don't have a lot of leeway as far as the location. We have taken the liberty to adjust the grades as tight as possible. I think our max slope is 2:1. Our task was to keep the road within the alignment and those slopes within that slope easement.

Craig Coats – We have some retaining walls that are higher than the ordinance allows, and we will need a variance for that.

Mike Bradshaw – And we were able to achieve that but to Craig's point we have some 9 ft retaining walls.

Craig Coats – It is 9 to 10 ft. down at the bottom.

Mike Bradshaw – In that road we have, the City is also requesting a 12 inch water line. The sewer line as well. The storm drain is primarily, dedicated to collect the water off of the road itself. We are not inducing any water from the top area here, all of that water is going to the west side of the property into the detention basin. This side the drainage pipe is exclusively draining the road itself. We will also have a power line running up that road. We've gone through JUC as far as the first submittal. We've had discussions with the Water Department and the type of line that they want to use. They are anxious to use standard bell and spigot, they don't want to use any welds in it. This side we used ductal but all of the waterline on this side was further south. We did bring a sewer line up which was an HTPE sewer line. We did an HTPE storm drain on that side which we will mimic on this side.

Craig Coats – So that is fused all the way top to bottom, the only penetrations are the inlet boxes and then it's fused all the way.

Mike Bradshaw – But the water line, the City does not want to use any kind of a welded pipe. We have expressed interest in using a welded PVC and they have shut us down, turned us down on that. Their concern with the welded PVC is if it cracks it continues to perpetuate and they don't know where to find the crack. With the bell and spigot the crack is at the end of the pipe.

Craig Coats – So on the sewer it's fused all the way through exactly what we did on Cloud Drive, they have manholes but they are not actually cutting into them unless they need to get into them. It will be a solid pipe until they need to, then they'll just cut out the top little piece. There is no access from the road, it will be from the top here and then it will be one fused pipe all the way down.

Mike Bradshaw – It's the same with the water, we don't anticipate, well in fact the City, the department is looking for a dedicated transmission line from bottom up to the tank on top here, so they are going to mandate no connections to that line as far as service lines or T's or anything of that nature.

Wes Jenkins – And you may recall when we did the hillside over there, we had flexibility with the road. You actually adjusted to get it in areas. On this one we don't have that

flexibility as Mike indicated. The City went in and did imminent domain so we really can't shift that road.

Craig Coats – The thing we can try and do is on the upper end as we get higher, we can try to keep it pretty level in this middle section. There are big cuts on the north end when we tie in. But as we get to the top we try to get the road down as much as possible to limit the wall size that you would potentially see on that edge.

Mike Bradshaw – In fact, what we ended up having to do, to get that down as far as we could, is redo some of the existing Cloud Drive and lower it about a foot. So we will take out a little of Cloud Drive to reduce the elevation of that intersection. We think we've optimized the road as tight as possible. I don't think we have a lot of flexibility. We are constrained to the Right of Way and to the slope easements that we were given.

Discussion on where things would be located from where we were standing.

Mike Bradshaw – Without the use of this road the property is more or less undevelopable. The densities have been approved based on this road and the traffic studies with this road. When we did the traffic study, the top engineer thought that 65% of the traffic of this entire development comes on this road and hits the Bluff Street intersection. This is a critical infrastructure to this development.

Dave Black – The road itself on the alignment and the grades I think you've done an excellent job. They match, there are minimal cuts and fills, minimal disturbance. They've already demonstrated on the other side that they can put that road in with very minimal visual impact, it's going to look great. I have no concerns on the road alignment. The Geotech report that was submitted was prepared in 2018, so it's a little bit old. There is quite a bit of discussion in there that it probably needs to get out to Council. It talks about risk and there is some risk here. There is a little bit of education, and again, I don't think it's enough to not do the road but I think it's an education thing and that information needs to get out somehow. I don't know if AGECE or somebody comes and talks about it to Council. That's just an idea, but I think that needs to get out there. There are some concerns that I have, that we had on the other road. The specific recommendations by AGECE is that no water bearing utilities should be installed within the landslide area. We talked about that on this side. You are in an area that has some water risk. Putting water there, utilities, is not a wise idea. I understand the need of what you want to do, personally, I think you could probably take them through the landslide area but in my opinion it would be better to go perpendicular and get off the slope and down to the bottom as soon as possible and not take it along the road. A significant leak, a slow leak over a long period of time, could have some catastrophic impacts. You would be going against the recommendations of the Geotech report if you do that. According to your code, your ordinance you need to follow the Geotechnical report. I think that's a legitimate concern.

James Sullivan – What are the options available?

Russ Owens – They talked about having the water above ground, then you could see the leak. I don't know if that's possible.

Discussion continued regarding issues with water in the road and solutions that may be feasible.

Dave Black – Another thing is with the road is that you are building on blue clay, not just the landslide. If you're putting the storm drain in the road, the manholes and drop inlets really need to be watertight. Along Blackridge Drive, every one of those drop inlets is where we had problems with the road because the water got in.

Mike Bradshaw – One of the things we could do, and have done in the past on sewer manholes, is grout the seams and things. They come out watertight.

Dave Black – I love the road, but utilities in it are a concern for me.

Jeff Mathis – Is there anything they could do like with the one side of Bluff Street, just have an open channel on the one side where you are not trying to put it in the ground?

Mike Bradshaw – We do have an open channel and what it does, is catches the slope. So we have somewhat of an open channel but we can't get it big enough to convey all of the water and then you still have all the water that is in the street and then it just becomes overwhelming to convey it all to the bottom.

Discussion on how to catch road drainage.

Dave Black – Another option you would have is to get an updated Geotech report where they can spend some time with you looking at these things and maybe the recommendations may change. But right now, the Geotech report you submitted has very specific recommendations on it.

Mike Bradshaw – We could line it, we'll have a discussion maybe we could even grout it on that channel.

James Sullivan – I don't know that there is any other option of getting the road up here.

Discussion continued on the water and utilities in the road versus running it straight up the hillside.

I wonder if we can make two motions, one where we motion on the road alignment and then another to get an updated Geotech report to verify the grading complies with the report and to specifically address, now that there is a design, the water utilities and the stormwater management. To address it specifically in accordance with their recommendations.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion we recommend approval the alignment and grade of the proposed roadway off of the Black Ridge and any walls for the roads and the cut fill slopes we recommend for approval that portion of the property.

SECOND: Russ Owens

AYES (4)

James Sullivan

Dave Black

Jeff Mathis
Russ Owens
NAYS (0)
Motion carries

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion we recommend that the project Geotechnical investigation report be updated to verify that the proposed cuts and fills are as recommended in the report with minimal impact to the stability of the slope and that they specifically address stormwater management and the potential for water baring utilities in the road, that other options are considered by the City and the design engineers to see if those utilities can be moved out of the roadway.

SECOND: Jeff Mathis

AYES (4)
James Sullivan
Dave Black
Jeff Mathis
Russ Owens
NAYS (0)
Motion carries

4. Approval of the meeting minutes from the November 30, 2022, and the December 14, 2022, meetings.

MOTION: Jeff Mathis made a motion to approve the minutes for the last two meetings.

SECOND: Russ Owens

AYES (4)
James Sullivan
Dave Black
Jeff Mathis
Russ Owens
NAYS (0)
Motion carries

5. Adjourn
Russ Owens made a motion to adjourn.