

**Adopted Minutes  
Development Review Committee  
July 12, 2006**

The meeting was called to order at 10:03 a.m. by Richard Heap.

**Staff Members Present:** Richard Heap, Public Works Director; Dave Anderson, City Planner; Richard Nielson, Assistant Public Works Director; Dave Oyler, City Manager; Marvin Banks, Public Utilities Superintendent; Junior Baker, City Attorney; Bart Morrill, Parks Supervisor; Carl Johnston, Public Safety; Jeff Foster, Electric Superintendent; Sean Beecher, GIS Specialist; and Shelley Hendrickson, Planning Secretary.

**Citizens Present:** Blaine Quarnstrom, Resident of Village on the Green; Duane Koyle, Kirby Lane Building; Ryan Hall, LEI-Oak Ridge Cove; Brett McInelly, Resident of Oak Ridge Cove; Mike McCormick, Sky Properties - Oak Ridge Cove; Steve Maughn, Nebo School District; Lynn Patterson, Nebo School District Transportation; and Steve Smoot, Oak Ridge Cove.

Mr. Baker made a **motion** to approve the minutes of June 28, 2006, with the changes he noted. Mr. Anderson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

Mr. Baker made a **motion** to approve the minutes of July 5, 2006, with the changes he noted. Mr. Anderson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

**PRELIMINARY PLATS**

**Oak Ridge Cove**

Mr. Anderson explained the proposal and that it was a Master Planned Development. A chart was prepared in the last Development Review Committee meeting and it is Dave's understanding that the Committee felt comfortable with the proposal and he feels if the applicant can meet the city's requirements for developments in the R-1-30 zone and provided the chart meets the expectations of the City Council he feels the project is ready for action.

Mr. Heap said the chart reflected a \$55,000 dollar assessment go to recreation, and stay with a 10 foot trail meeting city standards. He asked if there were any questions from the developer.

Discussion was made between Mr. McCormick and the committee regarding the trail.

Mr. Anderson said in looking at the chart that the two main amenities are \$55,000 dollars for the pavilion and the construction of a trail. There are not any other physical improvements that the applicant is proposing to do and that they had discussed giving some bonus density for construction of the bridge.

Mr. Oyler asked about certain areas of the bonus density and if the safety zone for the gun club would be preserved. He expressed the challenges he feels the developer will face with the reservoir.

Mr. Heap asked if there was anything else discussion wise on the chart.

Mr. Anderson would like to clarify the wording in the chart regarding Spanish Fork Drive road.

Mr. Baker said to change the chart to say full road construction.

Mr. Anderson said he would like to discuss changes that maybe can or should be made with regard to amenities and that they are more commiserate with what developers have received for previous developments.

Mr. Oyler asked about the Phases of the development, what they include and the time frame.

Discussion was made with Mr. McCormick on Phase One of the development.

Mr. Oyler asked if there were any other questions on the Phasing.

Mr. Johnston feels that there should be sidewalks on both sides of all roads.

Discussion was made regarding sidewalks and storm drain retention ponds.

Steve Maughn

Mr. Maughn said that Nebo School District will not provide busing into this development and he feels it will be a problem for the safety of children if there are not sidewalks on both sides of the roads.

Lynn Patterson

Mr. Patterson explained why Nebo School District will not drive buses into the proposed area to be developed. He said that the State Office of Education transportation grade is 6 percent. Children are currently catching the bus on Powerhouse road and if 90 more homes are built it would increase the number of students that would need to access this stop. Where is a big enough turn around area that parents could safely pull off of the road and a bus could safely pull off of the road to access the students?

Discussion was made regarding the current bus stop on Powerhouse Road.

Mr. Oyler asked whether or not Nebo School District has determined an area that would work and does the District or the City determine the bus stop.

Mr. Patterson said they have not determined an existing location that would handle the volume of vehicles and that Nebo School District determines the location for bus stops.

Mr. Oyler asked if there was an area, maybe not existing, but is capable of handling the volume.

Mr. Patterson said he did not know.

Discussion was made regarding the Woodland Hills bus stop location.

Mr. Oyler said that the canyon park parking lot area might work as a solution.

Discussion was made regarding the Canyon Park parking lot area.

Mr. Maughn said that their purpose in coming to the meeting was not to stop the development but to voice the Nebo School Districts concerns.

Mr. Oyler asked if the developer had any insight with regard to busing issues in other hillside developments.

Mr. Smoot explained that in Bountiful there is a 12 percent grade and busing is not a problem. They provide busing there.

Mr. Maughn said he has not had time to do his research on the six percent grade and that he will look into it with the State.

Mr. Oyler said that from Brigham City to Payson there are a lot of hillside developments that occur and maybe the Nebo School District could look into how the other school districts have dealt with this situation.

Discussion was made regarding sidewalks.

Mr. Oyler said that the sidewalk issues do need to be resolved by all entities involved.

Mr. Anderson said (in going back to the chart) it was his understanding the streets were going to be standard City streets and if everyone was comfortable giving seven percent bonus density (5-6 lots) just for curb and gutter.

Carl Johnston

Mr. Johnston said that he feels there should be curb and gutter on both sides of the street.

Mr. Baker said that there would be a sidewalk on at least one side of the roads. They might not have sidewalk on both sides, but they all will have a sidewalk on at least one side.

Mr. Oyler asked if our standard did not provide for a sidewalk on one side.

Mr. Heap said our standards do not require a sidewalk on one side.

Mr. Oyler asked why we were giving an exception here.

Mr. Heap said it was due to the terrain in the area and that there would not be enough room to have sidewalks on both sides.

Mr. Nielson said that he thought the pavement section, curb, and gutter are the standard, and the only exception is dropping the sidewalk on one side of the street.

Mr. Oyler asked if the subject of sidewalks was addressed in the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Nielson said that in other City's they do have provisions for sidewalks to be on only one side of the street.

Discussion was made on the benefits of sidewalk on both sides of the roads.

Mr. Anderson asked if sidewalks are something that we have an exception to our standards on.

Mr. Oyler said that we do and that authority is given to the Engineer to make that determination.

Mr. Heap asked if there were any other questions.

Blaine Cornstrom

Mr. Cornstrom explained his concerns with the development and the neighborhood meeting. He is not against the development. He feels the number one problem is traffic and parking. He has a proposal he would like to have looked at that he feels would resolve the traffic problem.

Mr. Heap asked if this proposal was doing away with Powerhouse road as a main collector road.

Discussion was made with Mr. Cornstrom on his proposal.

Mr. Heap said he would look into Mr. Cornstrom's suggestions and get back to him. He then said there were a few things that had been addressed on the Geo Technical report. He explained them.

Mr. Foster said the developer ought to be aware that there might be some off side improvements on the electrical to accommodate the heavier loads.

Mr. Heap asked if there were any other questions and that traffic was an issue that was addressed in the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Oyler talked about the neighborhood meeting ordinance and the need to fine tune the ordinance with respect to adequate dates, times and locations.

Mr. Cornstrom expressed his frustration with the process of neighborhood meetings.

Mr. Heap said that we are still in the process of fine tuning the ordinance and that it is fairly new.

Mr. Oyler said meetings have not been required until now.

Mr. Banks expressed his issues with street names and the impact this development will have on the fire department.

Mr. Heap said the fire department cost issues are covered under the impact fees.

Discussion was made regarding fire issues.

Discussion was made regarding the entrance to the development.

Mr. Baker made a **motion** to approve the Oak Ridge Cove Preliminary Plat, located at 2650 South Spanish Oak Drive, with the following finding:

1. The Density matrix is in accordance with the ordinance and consistent with prior practice.

And with the following conditions:

1. That they meet the construction development standards.
2. That they meet the requirements of the Geo Technical study.
3. That they provide offsite electrical as dictated by the Electrical Department in order to provide service to that project.

Mr. Nielson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor except for Mr. Johnston voting opposed.

## **SITE PLANS**

### **Kirby Lane Business Complex**

Mr. Heap said he has reviewed the easements.

Mr. Foster said that the electrical might need to be relocated.

Mr. Anderson asked if there was a sidewalk on Kirby Lane.

Mr. Heap stated that earlier on we did not require sidewalk in industrial areas. URMMA indicated that they wanted it and he feels they should require sidewalks.

Mr. Koyle said he did not have a problem putting in the sidewalk except for a big power pole that is right in the way.

Mr. Heap said for Mr. Foster and Mr. Koyle to work out the power pole issue.

Mr. Anderson asked if we have any standards on architecture.

Mr. Oyler said we do not.

Discussion was made regarding the existing parking spaces.

Mr. Baker made a **motion** to approve the Kirby Lane Business Complex Site Plan subject to the following:

1. Work with the Power Department on the power line on the Southside of the building
2. Put in sidewalk on Kirby lane and granting an easement for the sidewalk if it needs to be on private property.

Mr. Banks **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **East Meadows Plat B**

Mr. Anderson said the final plat was approved over 180 days ago and they are getting ready to record the plat; so, do we grant an extension.

Mr. Baker said to put it back on the DRC agenda.

Mr. Anderson said there are two issues with Spanish Trails. The final plat C was approved on December 5, 2005 so it expired sometime in May of 2006 and the preliminary plat was approved on July 18, 2005.

Mr. Baker feels that it needs to be put on the council agenda for a six month extension.

Mr. Anderson said Staker Parsons has selected a site just north of the sewer plant for a concrete batch plant. They have proposed to do a zoning text amendment to make concrete batch plants conditional uses in the I-1 zone.

Mr. Baker feels that it would be best to rewrite the I-2 zone and shift some of the I-1 zone uses to the I-2 zone.

Mr. Anderson feels that more designation between zones would be better.

Discussion was made regarding I-1 and I-2 zones.

Mr. Anderson said that timing is a real issue for Staker Parsons.

Mr. Baker said that Staker Parsons would like something done by the first part of September 2006.

Mr. Oyler asked if a comprehensive analysis on the I-1 and, I-2 zone could be done in order to accommodate Staker Parsons time frame or would it be better to leave it I-1 for now.

Mr. Anderson feels it is worth the effort to try to get the I-2 zone.

Mr. Heap said for Mr. Anderson to get something together and bring it back.

Mr. Anderson said that the Planning Commission is concerned with Master Planned Developments. They have concerns about minimum lot sizes. Fieldstones last plat prompted the concern due to the fact that in an R-1-12 zone the developer was able to get basically all of the lots designed to fit the minimum 6,000 square foot lot size. They felt that the ordinance promoted or required a mixture of lot sizes. The Planning Commission would like to have a joint work meeting with the council to discuss this.

Mr. Oyler said the challenge is with the bonus density matrix items and that are they so liberal that the developer can get the density they want. He feels Mr. Anderson should research how other cities have dealt with Master Planned Developments.

Mr. Anderson said that he could put together some examples. He feels that right now our program is very good and would not suggest any big changes.

Mr. Oyler said that the challenge is that we do not have the flexibility to change the standard unless it is written in the ordinance that we do. If we vary a standard there has to be legitimate information to support our standards.

Mr. Nielson made a **motion** to adjourn. Mr. Banks **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Attest:

---

Shelley Hendrickson, Planning Secretary