

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 4, 1991

Present: Chairman Cheryl Okubo, Berwyn Andrus, Mick Johnson, Kathi Izatt, Jeff Chretien; Les Foy, City Council Rep.; Jack Balling, City Engineer; Jon Reed Boothe, Planning Director; Shirley Chevalier, Recording Secretary

Guests: City Manager Tom Hardy; Gene Carr, University of Utah; Wilford Sommerkorn, Davis County Planning Dept.

Absent: Mike Holmes, Elaine McKay, Dick Drescher Invocation: Jeff Chretien

Minutes of May 21, 1991 were amended as follows: Page 1, last paragraph, last sentence, 11 ..... cooperative use of city, school, (insert church and other) facilities." Jeff Chretien made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Berwyn Andrus; voting was unanimous.

Conditional Use:

6-4-91.5A 85-12C Spring Hollow at the Woods PUD, Formerly Newport Heights, 400 E. 4000 S., Clark Jenkins, Landforms

This property will be developed in single family PUD lots. Ordinance requires 30% of the gross area in common open space which must be either deeded to the city or provide a permanent easement over the property, or held in ownership by the owners in common who must provide the maintenance and upkeep. A PUD must meet all conditions of the Subdivision ordinance, other than those conditions that are modified in the PUD Ordinance.

Staff has reviewed the preliminary plat and it is deficient in the following areas:

1. The termination of the road in a 44 ft. radius cul-de-sac 1500 ft. from the public street is not in compliance with the Subdivision ordinance. Provisions must be made to allow traffic to exit/enter through the existing Newport Heights condos.

The Foothill Ordinance requires two entrances, and Mr. Jenkins indicated this would be done. Mr. Jenkins also stated there was an agreement with Newport Condominiums that this would be accessible for the public as well as emergency vehicles.

2. A Title Report is required before the plat can be recorded.

3. Lots 14, 15, and 16 do not appear to have enough buildable area in a useable place. (Ordinance requires 5,000 sq. ft.) Lots 6 and 7 must be carefully planned to avoid the unusable land.

The contours will have to be determined on the final plat.

4. The storm drain needs to be designed into the common area with adequate erosion control.

There is a master storm drain plan and hydrology study of the area. The Hooper Canyon has adequate ability to handle all the runoff from this project.

5. Common area needs to be included in plat.

6. The maximum slope for roads will be 12% in this project, which meets the ordinance.

7. There is a proposed cut of 10-12 ft. in front of lots 7 and 8, and proposed fill of 10-12 ft. in front of lot 22. This may need a variance.

8. Every PUD shall provide common open space accessible to all other lots or units. This common space must be at least 30% of the gross area of the development site. The entrance to the common area is approximately 18% downhill and is very hard to use. Final plans will have to show the development of this common area, with parking, access, and landscaping to be shown on the plans.

9. Items to be completed in the Grading and Drainage Report:

A. Provide a landscape plan. Location and identification (by species) of existing vegetation, and indication of vegetation for removal and revegetation proposal. Also, a planting plan showing proposed trees and shrubs for the entire site to be developed.

B. Final plans to show description of methods to be employed to achieve stabilization and compaction; i.e., roads, cuts and fills, grading, etc.

C. Location and capacities of proposed drainage, structures, and erosion control measures. (This is done.)

10. There is a 14 ft. public utility easement (7 ft. on each side of the lot line) between lots 4 and 5 of Hale Oaks Subdivision. The developers must obtain permission of the property owners to use this easement.

11. The pedestrian, vehicular, and school access (sidewalks, paths, etc.) needs to be shown on the plans.

12. The proposed access road exits Bountiful Blvd. in the floodway of Hooper Canyon and a 3611 culvert. The floodway needs to be preserved and the road entrance relocated so as not to conflict with the drainage culvert and the floodway.

13. A 611 water main has been stubbed into the property approximately 175 ft. north of the southeast corner of the development. The proposed entrance road should tie into Bountiful Blvd. at the location of the water stub.

14. All provisions of the Subdivision and Foothill ordinances must be applied to this development as required in PUD Section 7-100.

There are no side yard requirements in a PUD. This is determined by the Planning Commission, and is part of preliminary approval. Staff feels the same side yards should be maintained as in the

subdivisions to the east.

Mr. Jenkins plans on having side yards 15 ft. each side. A few lots may have to be 10 ft. minimum. Subdivision Ordinance requires 30 ft. front yard setbacks, but the developer has the right to petition for a staggered setback up to 20 ft. Variances can be granted to 30% of the lots. The height regulation is 35 ft. or 2- 1/2 stories. The lots will be deeded to property owners. They plan on building approximately 22 homes.

Regarding architectural plans, Mr. Jenkins said their intention is to bring in the first eight designs (sited) to show the Planning Commission, which will establish a design pattern throughout the development.

Snow removal will be stored on premise, probably on the common area. The common space will be provided in the lower portion where there is a level area that will be cleared out for a playground. Near the creek, picnic tables will be placed among the trees. Regarding sidewalks, they plan a walking path which will follow the terrain on one side of the road.

Protective covenants will not allow vehicles to be parked on the streets or in the front yard. Mr. Jenkins will provide a copy of the covenants to the Planning Commission.

Kathi Izatt made a motion to grant Conditional Use approval to Spring Hollow at the Woods, incorporating all the conditions outlined by staff; adding that we want to see the plans as they are finalized, a parking area placed at the top of the common area, a sidewalk of some sort on at least one side of the road throughout the development, preferably paved; side yards of not less than 10 ft., a front yard setback of not less than 30 ft., a height restriction of not more than 35 ft. or 2-1/2 stories; Les Foy seconded the motion. A discussion regarding modification of the front setback to allow reduced front yard setbacks on certain lots is provided by ordinance, which allows the building official to grant up to a 15 ft. setback if there is more than 20 ft. of rise or fall from the front property line. Kathi reaffirmed her motion to include this provision; seconded by Les Foy; voting was unanimous.

Subdivisions - Preliminary:

6-4-91.6A Sterling Heights Subdivision, 200 W. 3700 S. Kent Hoggan, Developer

This property is located on the east side of Davis Blvd. at 3700 So. adjacent to the Hooper Canyon drainage basin, and is in the Foothill Development Zone.

There are two detention basins on this property; the Hooper Canyon basin to the north which has been deeded to the county as a flood control measure, and a smaller detention basin in the center of this project, also deeded to the county. It is a detention basin for the Bridlewood development as well.

There are two access roads off Davis Blvd., one south of the smaller detention basin and one between the two detention basins. All roads are less than 12% grade. There is a small area

about 30 ft. wide that crosses the ravine, which will have about 10 ft. of fill. The other side will be at grade. All lots are 16,000 sq. ft. or larger. There is 12.9 acres of property, 28 lots proposed, and the average slope is 19%. Lot 7 shows 30% grade in the front, which is between the two contours, the rest of the lot is flat. There is adequate buildable area.

This project complies with all the provisions of the Foothill ordinance. Staff recommends preliminary approval to this subdivision.

Les Foy made a motion to grant preliminary approval to Sterling Heights Subdivision, 3700 S. Davis Blvd., according to the recommendations and stipulations received from staff; Berwyn Andrus seconded; voting was unanimous.

#### Subdivisions - Final:

6-4-91.7A Bridlewood Subd., Modification, Plat 6, 3900 S. 25 W. Clark Jenkins, Landforms

This subdivision was granted final approval May 7, 1991, but in the final plan review, provisions had not been made for a street tie to the west into the development of North Salt Lake, and the length of the block would be 3400 ft. This would be poor planning for emergency and service access to the area being developed.

When Plat 6 came in for approval, there was a stub road off Bridlewood Drive, but the topography and steepness was prohibitive. The reason for the stub road was to tie onto 3700 So. per an agreement with No. Salt Lake that it would be a collector road. When No. Salt Lake began developing their new golf course project, they wanted to change the alignment of 3700 So. in a direct route to serve the golf course area. It was agreed, in talking with No. Salt Lake, that it would be a proper alignment of 3700 So., however it left us with no tie between Bountiful City and No. Salt Lake. The rear of Bridlewood Subdivision backs up to No. Salt Lake, and it is a long block of 3800 ft. from the stub road into No. Salt Lake to Bountiful Blvd. Bountiful's ordinance states we should have blocks not longer than 1200 ft.

Staff recommends the stub street be planned to tie into No. Salt Lake midway between the tie below and Bountiful Blvd., which would create two blocks of 1900 ft. each. Collin Wood, No. Salt Lake City Manager, agrees with this plan and they will approve it as soon as they see the sketch that has been prepared, and upon approval by the Planning Commission.

Staff recommends final approval be granted with the modification to the last approval, by requiring the stub street to the west as shown on the plan.

Berwyn Andrus made a motion to approve the street modification to the final approval of Bridlewood Subdivision Plat 6, to add the stub street between Monarch Drive and the lower subdivision in North Salt Lake as per the drawing prepared by the Engineering Dept.; seconded by Kathi Izatt; voting was unanimous.

#### Miscellaneous:

6-4-91.11A Fence Variance for Sports Court, James Crawford, 118 E. 1000 S.

On May 14, 1991, Mr. Crawford appealed to the Board of Adjustment for a fence variance, which was denied for fence height. He wishes to build a sports court in the SW corner of his property, with a 4 ft. high brick wall to the top of the pilaster next to the sidewalk. In addition, to the east, a fence 10 ft. high to keep balls from going out into the street. Mr. Crawford is asking for an exception to the fence height requirement, which the Planning commission is empowered to do by ordinance if it relates to a sports court or tennis court.

Mr. Foy pointed out that on the property to the south is a pump house owned by the city, so it would not impact a neighbor there.

Ordinance allows a solid fence to be only 2 ft. high in front yards and 20 ft. back from front property lines. This design of a 4 ft. high wall was discussed with emphasis on the safety and traffic visibility with a wall this high on corner property. Mr. Crawford explained there is a two foot retaining wall with a 2 ft. solid wall on top of that, on top of which will be another 2 ft. of open wrought iron fence. The remaining wall will be 2 ft. high with 2 ft. open wrought iron on top, which they plan to eventually continue across the front of their property.

Berwyn Andrus said we do not have anything on paper that adequately shows how this is planned. He does not feel comfortable in granting the variance without a complete detail of what is going to go there. We need an actual drawing showing detail and south and east elevations, materials, distance for each section, etc. on the entire plan.

Kathi Izatt made a motion to table this item so Mr. Crawford can come back to the next Planning Commission meeting June 18, 1991; Mick Johnson seconded the motion; voting was unanimous.

6-4-91.11B Master Plan Revision Overview Discussion

Gene Carr, University of Utah and Wilford Sommerkorn, Davis County  
Planning Dept.

A discussion was held, with the Planning Commission, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Carr, and Mr. Sommerkorn participating, as to the procedure to use to begin work on revising the Master Plan.

Chairman Okubo is concerned that staff and Planning Commission do not have adequate time to spend on a project of this magnitude, and would prefer that a professional consultant, intern, or student practicum be retained to research all available data from numerous reports and studies that have been made, and compile this material for staff and Planning Commission review.

It was previously requested by City Council that the Planning Commission approach this project as a whole rather than chapter by chapter. However, in the discussion this evening it was determined that a chapter by chapter study would be the best approach, inasmuch as several sections in the Master Plan are updated on a regular basis; e.g., streets (Bountiful City's Master Street Plan is updated annually), water, power, etc. Areas where improvement or change in the Master Plan is indicated can easily be handled by staff, since they work with these matters every day. It was felt that Les Foy, as a member of City Council and Planning Commission

representative; Tom Hardy, City Manager; Jack Balling, City Engineer; and Reed Boothe, City Planner, should meet and discuss the areas of the Master Plan to be approached, in order of importance, by the Planning Commission in beginning the update.

Berwyn Andrus made a motion that staff will give the Planning commission direction on items 1 through 9 as to which item should be first, second, third, etc. Motion was seconded by Mick Johnson; voting was unanimous.

The tape of this discussion is on file in the Planning Dept., Bountiful City Hall, and may be checked out by anyone who wishes to hear it.