

March 7, 2006

Minutes of the Alpine City Planning Commission meeting held March 7, 2006 at Alpine City Hall. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 pm by Chairman Jannicke Brewer. The following commission members were present and constituted a quorum:

Chairman Jannicke Brewer

Commission Members: Jim Tracy, Steve McArthur, Kimberly Bryant.

Lincoln Watkins, Mike Mickelson and Brian Baxter were excused.

Staff: Charmayne Warnock, Shane Sorensen, Ted Stillman

Others: Gary Chadwick, Sonja Carey, Gary Webb, Dale Porter, Keith Wilson, Teri Wilson, Stan Adams, Craig Skidmore, Margeret Hinrichsen, Jed Morley, Richard Moss, Tracy Wallace, Thomas Whitchurch, Nick Olson, Mike Powell, Rebecca Whitchurch, Craig Carlisle, Steve Black, Doug Hall, Ron Madsen, Amberlee Buckner, Howard Jackson, Marcus Watkins, Mike Fenton, Brian Higbee, Taylor Smith

The prayer was offered by Jannicke Brewer.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

2. CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS FOR HOME OCCUPATIONS

Chadwick Construction – 885 S. Allegheny Circle – Gary Chadwick: Mr. Chadwick requested a permit for his construction business. He used a room in his home as an office.

Meridian Marketing & Processing – 581 W. Long Drive Court – Brad Goldston: Mr. Goldston requested a permit for business of mortgage lending and loan processing.

Grandslam Garages – 1005 N. Grove Drive – Don Watkins: Don Watkins requested a permit for garage flooring company. Marcus Watkins was present, representing his father, and said the business would be conducted in the barn. Jannicke Brewer said the ordinance did not allow home occupations to be conducted anywhere other than the home or an attached garage.

Corey's Kitchen – 640 Lupine Drive – Corey Bingham: Ms. Bingham requested a permit for her business of providing mixes for gluten-free products. She anticipated that no more than five customers would visit the home per week.

Chipman Interiors – 93 Bordeaux Lane – Jennifer Chipman: Ms. Chipman requested a permit for her free-lance interior design business. One or two customers would visit the home a week. A room in the house would primarily be used for office work.

MOTION: Steve McArthur moved to approve conditional use permits home occupations for the following:

Chadwick Construction – 885 S. Allegheny Circle – Gary Chadwick

Meridian Marketing & Processing – 581 W. Long Drive Court – Brad Goldston

Corey's Kitchen – 640 Lupine Drive – Corey Bingham

Chipman Interiors – 93 Bordeaux Lane – Jennifer Chipman

And deny a permit for Don Watkins dba as Grandslam Garages at 1005 N. Grove because the business was located in a barn rather than the home as required by ordinance. Jim Tracy seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Motion passed.

3. NORTH GROVE DRIVE SUBDIVISION – 655 N. GROVE DRIVE – MICHAEL AND CHRISTY FENTON: Ted Stillman said the 2-lot subdivision on 1.018 acres located in the TR-10,000 zone would need to go through the major subdivision process because it would be

necessary to dedicate a right-of-way on Grove Drive. Also, the plat for Mountainville Subdivision would need to be amended because of a previous land swap. The City Council would hold the public hearing on the plat amendment. The Planning Commission needed to hold a public hearing on the subdivision.

Neighboring property owner, Margaret Hinrichsen, was represented by her son. He said his mother had some concerns about the proposed subdivision and how it would affect her.

Shane Sorensen showed how the Mountainville Subdivision plat would be amended. Earlier property owners had traded pieces of land and built a home, but had not amended the plat.

Jannicke Brewer explained that they were cleaning up the records. The new subdivision would not change the Hinrichsen's lot line or setbacks.

MOTION: Jim Tracy moved to set a public hearing for the North Grove Drive Subdivision for April 4, 2006. Steve McArthur seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Motion passed.

4. MOUNTAINVILLE ACADEMY SITE PLAN – 300 EAST 100 SOUTH – RICHARD MOSS: Ted Stillman said two different plans had been submitted for the same piece of ground at 300 East 100 South. One was the Mountainville charter school site plan and the other was the Taylor Meadows Subdivision. City Attorney David Church said the City could process both applications. Whoever recorded first would build.

Richard Moss said the school would serve grades kindergarten through 8th. There would be 675 students. It was named after the old elementary school in Alpine that was torn down.

Ted Stillman said staff recommendation was to postpone approval of the plat until the following issues listed by Shane Sorensen were addressed:

- Traffic study
- Street design on 100 South
- Location of connection to the sewer system,
- Water system plans needed,
- Storm water and drainage plan,
- Alignment of Dry Creek channel and flood plain shown on site plan
- Construct a dike along Dry Creek at southwest corner
- Grading plan showing existing and proposed contours,
- Parking plan
- Landscaping plan
- Trash enclosure
- Parking lot lighting
- Meet the water policy for culinary and pressurized irrigation
- Bond for required improvements
- Fencing
- Subdivision plat be provided
- Boundary discrepancies be cleared with adjacent property owner

Jannicke Brewer said the submitted plan was not to scale. It had no contours and did not show the floodplain. It was hard to see what was going to happen.

Jim Tracy asked if the entrances were for one-way or two-way traffic. Mr. Moss said students would be dropped off and picked up since there was no bus service.

Shane Sorensen said 100 South was fairly wide and they proposed a center turn lane for traffic turning left into the school and a right-hand turn lane for traffic coming from the east.

Steve McArthur asked if there was adequate room to stack cars.

Jannicke Brewer said she had looked at the newer schools in town and they had space to fit about 15 cars in the stacking lane. That seemed to work okay for a limited number of cars in a 20 minute period. But in a school with no bus service where parents would be dropping off the students, there could be upwards of 220 cars in a 20 minute period. The stacking capacity needed to be doubled or tripled or the congestion would close down the road. They didn't want to have cars parking on the other side of the road and children crossing the street.

Shane Sorensen said they would not allow street parking.

Jannicke Brewer said she also had concerns about the parking. Charter schools relied on parent involvement, and if there was a parent in each classroom, there wouldn't be enough parking for faculty, staff and parents. If there were an event at the school, parking would be even more of a difficulty.

Jim Tracy asked if the school could widen the parking area. Richard Moss said they could.

Keith Wilson said he lived across the street from the proposed school. He appreciated the questions and concerns about the traffic and parking. The biggest issue was traffic flow when school was starting and letting out, and during evening activities. He said that even if the parking were doubled, it wouldn't satisfy the parking needs with that many students. He said he was also concerned about pedestrian safety, lighting and surveillance, noting that school sites tended to draw people after hours. Finally he asked if the public would have access to the grounds after hours since charter schools were funded by the public. There was a great need for activity fields and play areas, especially in that part of town.

Stan Adams said he lived in the cul-de-sac across from the proposed school. He was concerned about the number of vehicles that would pile up in the road. There could also be sight-distance issues for motorists coming out of 400 East. He didn't want to see cars parked in the cul-de-sac.

Landon Wallace said he lived in the cul-de-sac and was also concerned about traffic issues. He said he didn't see how they were going to get 675 students in and out of the school with the shown accesses.

5. TAYLOR MEADOWS SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY AND FINAL – 300 EAST 100 SOUTH – BRIAN HIGBEE: Ted Stillman said the 10-lot subdivision was located on the same parcel of ground on which the Mountainville Charter School was proposed. City Attorney David Church had said the Planning Commission should process them both.

Revised concept approval had been granted by the Planning Commission on January 17, 2006. The developers were seeking preliminary and final approval that evening. Staff said that many of the conditions imposed at concept had not been met, and they recommended that only preliminary approval be granted.

The developer was seeking a variance on side-yard setbacks for lots 1, 2 and 3. There was an existing home on lot 3 that the developer felt had historical value and wanted it to remain, but acknowledged that whoever bought the lot may not want to keep it. The side setback on the existing home was 10 feet. He was also requested variances on the side-yard setbacks for lots 1 and 2 which were narrow. Brian Higbee said that in order to build large home on lots 1 and 2, they would need variances on the side setbacks.

Jannicke Brewer disagreed with approving setback variances. She said it was questionable that whoever bought lot 1 would want to keep the old home. It was likely that it would be demolished and a new home built, in which case the east boundary line of lot 1 could be adjusted and lots 2 and 3 made wide enough to accommodate the desired size homes.

The building envelopes on lots 5 through 9 showed side setbacks of 15 feet. It was suggested that the setbacks be as stated in the ordinance having an aggregate of 30 feet with no less than 12 feet on a side. It would provide more flexibility for the buyer.

Ted Stillman said staff did not support variances on the setbacks because the situation was self-imposed. The developer created a problem on the width of the lots by trying to keep the old home. If the home was taken down, the east lot line could be adjusted, giving lots 2 and 3 adequate width. It was highly likely that whoever bought lot 1 would demolish the home. Because of the high price of land in Alpine, a number of older homes were being demolished and replaced with new homes. He added that if the charter school were approved, the home would be demolished.

Jannicke Brewer agreed with Ted Stillman saying that the home had been remodeled so many times, it was hardly original.

Shane Sorensen said concept approval had been granted with a number of conditions, many of which had not been met. He listed the conditions imposed at concept which were:

- The finished floor elevation be a minimum of 2 feet above the base flood elevation.
- The developer obtain the necessary permits and construct erosion protection in the vicinity of lots 5 and 9.
- A note will be placed on the plat concerning this area having a potential flood hazard. The street will be designed to carry flood hazards. Additional requirements as noted by Bowen Collins should be included.
- The flood plain be shown on the final plat.
- A minimum of 2 feet of freeboard be designed into the levee on the west side of the detention area.
- Special consideration be required in the design of the detention basin outlet works.
- Any openings that would allow water into the basement such as window wells, stairwells, garage openings, vents or walk-out basements shall have the same requirements as the finish floor, and all being 3 feet higher than the base flood elevation.
- The creek shall be cleaned out by the developer.

The Planning Commission agreed that basements would be permitted if the required conditions were met. Brian Higbee said they would also require perimeter drains in the basement. Jannicke Brewer said the requirement for perimeter drains should be listed in the CC&Rs as well as on the plat.

Regarding the trail/sidewalk, Craig Skidmore recommended it be six feet wide and have a center stripe for two-way bicycle traffic since it would provide access to Alpine Elementary. Jay Healey said it would be difficult to maintain the stripe.

MOTION: Steve McArthur moved to grant preliminary to Taylor Meadows Subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1. The developer obtain the necessary permits and construct erosion protection in the vicinity of lot. 5.
2. A note will be laced on the plat concerning this area having a potential flood hazard. The street will be designed to carry flood hazards.
3. The floodplain be shown on the final plat.
4. A minimum of 2 feet of freeboard be designed into the levee on the west side of the detention area.
5. Special consideration be required in the design of the detention basin outlet works.

6. The setbacks conform to city standards.
7. The trail/sidewalk be 6 feet wide.
8. Parcels A, C and D be landscaped and sprinkled.
9. The fire chief review the proposed fire hydrant locations.
10. Changes to the final plat and construction drawings be made as shown on the redlines and as outlined in this review letter.

Jim Tracy seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Motion passed.

6. JACKSON COURT SUBDIVISION – 600 SOUTH HIGH BENCH ROAD – MIKE

POWELL: Ted Stillman said the proposed development consisted of 8 lots on 7.56 acres and would be accessed by a cul-de-sac off High Bench Road at approximately 600 South. There would need to be a small right-of-way dedication along the west side of High Bench Road. Lot 6 had slightly less than 60 feet of frontage on the cul-de-sac, but a minor adjustment could be made bringing the lot line radial to the cul-de-sac and increasing the frontage.

Ted Stillman said the attorney for the Jaspersons who owned property to the south had written a letter to the city expressing concerns about the proposed development and how it would affect future development of the Jasperson's property.

Steve Black was present and represented the Jaspersons. He stated their three concerns which were: 1) Would Jasperson's have adequate frontage to develop their property. 2) Would the creation of the public road on the Jackson property create double frontage lots if the Jaspersons developed their ground? 3) Would a road into the Jasperson property be too close to the cul-de-sac on the Jackson property?

Shane Sorensen said frontage should not be an issue for the Jaspersons. They had 75 feet of frontage which gave them adequate room for a road. A road right-of-way would require 54 feet which would leave them 21 feet. The 21-foot strip of private property between the lots in Jackson Court and the Jasperson's road would prevent creating lots with double frontage. Regarding the distance between the two roads, the City required an off-set of 150 feet, and there would be at least that much room between roads.

MOTION: Jim Tracy moved to grant concept approval to Jackson Court Subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1. The street dedication for High Bench Road be shown on the preliminary plans.
2. The required 60 feet of frontage at the property line be provided for lot 6 in addition to the lot lines being drawn radial to the cul-de-sac.
3. The names of all adjacent property owners be shown on the plat.

Steve McArthur seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Motion passed.

7. VISTA MEADOWS SUBDIVISION: Ted Stillman said the proposed development consisted of 17 lots on 31 acres with approximately 17 acres of open space. It would be accessed by an extension of Lakeview Drive and 600 North. Because of the steepness of the terrain, extensive cuts and fills would be required.

Shane Sorensen said that the current design did not meet the requirements of Alpine City's cut and fill ordinance. It appeared that, with retaining walls, the fill slopes may be designed to comply with the ordinance. The developer was proposing to use Recon Blocks, an interlocking concrete block in various sizes, for their retaining walls if allowed by the City. Shane Sorensen said that the standard designs shown for the blocks would not work for the current situation in Vista Meadows. Possibly the wall could be designed and engineered in such a way that it would work.

Shane Sorensen said it was crucial to have good drainage behind retaining walls so the moisture did not build up and cause the wall to fail.

Retaining walls could not be more than 8 to 10 feet high. Anything higher than that would have to be stepped. Jay Healey asked if they would be fenced. Steve McArthur said code required anything more than 42 inches to have a guard rail.

Taylor Smith and his engineer said they would like the Planning Commission to approve the use of retaining walls so they could spend the money on a detailed design. If the city did not approve retaining walls, there was not point in designing the walls.

Jannicke Brewer said the next issue was fire flow and water pressure.

Shane Sorensen said that the building envelopes were right on or just below the 5350' elevation line, which was the highest elevation to which they could provide water service. But it was questionable whether or not the pressure at that elevation would be practically adequate. He didn't want someone with a two million dollar home coming back to the City, saying they couldn't take a shower. Fire flow and pressurized irrigation were major causes for concern. Current residents in the zone had problems with pressure. The City needed to take a long hard look at what kind of pressure they could actually deliver. He suggested they meet with the developers and see if a water system could be designed that would adequately serve the proposed development.

Jannicke Brewer said it appeared that water pressure was a more pressing concern than retaining walls, and suggested the developers meet with the City Engineer to discuss water before they went further.

Taylor Smith asked if the Planning Commission would approve the use of retaining walls subject to resolution of the water situation.

Steve McArthur said he felt they had given enough indication that they would be okay with retaining walls, but could they approve their use without a concept approval?

Ted Stillman said he felt there was enough precedence to indicate that the use of retaining walls would be acceptable, but staff preferred to wrestle with the issue of water before granting concept approval.

Steve McArthur said they could grant concept subject to resolution of the water issues. If the water pressure was not available, there would be no subdivision anyway.

MOTION: Steve McArthur moved to grant concept approval to Vista Meadows Subdivision subject to the developer being able to satisfy the city water requirements by providing sufficient water pressure for culinary water, pressurized irrigation and fire flow, and with the note that a retaining wall system would be allowed. Jim Tracy seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Motion passed.

8. HUNTERS RIDGE CIRCLE SUBDIVISION – GARY WEBB – PRELIMINARY: Ted Stillman said the 13-lot subdivision was located at approximately 300 North Main on about 5 acres in the TR-10,000 zone.

Shane Sorensen said the preliminary plat had been redrawn because the first one showed building envelopes with a rear setback of 25 feet. The TR zone required only 20 feet in the rear. All the requirements for a preliminary plat had been met.

Jannicke Brewer said she would like to see a third street light in the subdivision. Gary Webb said that would not be a problem.

MOTION: Jim Tracy moved to grant preliminary approval to Hunters Ridge Circle Subdivision subject to the street light locations being shown on the plat and adding an additional street light for a total of three. Steve McArthur seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Motion passed.

9. MADSEN OFFICE BUILDING SITE PLAN – 120 S. MAIN – RON MADSEN: Ted Stillman said the site plan showed phase 1 and phase 2. Phase 1 was the front part of the lot with the existing building, and phase 2 was the back part of the lot. A landscaping plan had been submitted with the site plan.

Ron Madsen said he did not have plans to develop phase 2 immediately, but he included it in the site plan in the event he did develop that back of the property.

The Planning Commission discussed parking. Jannicke Brewer asked if the second space by the handicap entrance could be moved to the other parking area so it would not be in the setback from 120 South.

Ron Madsen said he would like to eliminate that space altogether and have 7 spaces rather than 8. There would only be two offices. The third room would be a filing and copy room.

Shane Sorensen said that when he calculated the square footage they didn't take out for restrooms, etc. and 7 spaces would probably be okay.

Adjoining property owner Craig Carlisle was present and said his only concern was the fence between the properties. Ron Madsen said he felt the fence issue could be resolved in another time and place. He said he might sell the back part to someone else or perhaps build a bookstore.

MOTION: Jim Tracy moved to approve the Madsen Law Office site plan with the condition that the parking space located closest to 120 South be eliminated. Steve McArthur seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Motion passed. .

10. GENERAL PLAN: Ted Stillman said the transportation plan would be incorporated into the draft of the General Plan by April Riley. There was no further discussion.

11. TELECOMMUNICATION ORDINANCE: The Planning Commission reviewed the most recent changes to the proposed ordinance and made a motion to approve it.

MOTION: Steve McArthur moved to approve the Telecommunication Ordinance with changes noted that evening. Kimberly Bryant seconded. Ayes: 4 Nay: 0. Motion passed.

12. PRD ORDINANCE: The Planning Commission reviewed the changes to the PRD Ordinance and discussed different definitions for a homeowners association. A new draft would be available for the next meeting.

13. CONTINUING EDUCATION: Ted Stillman asked the Planning Commission to look at the chart on page 30 which talked about flexibility. He said the city had a lot of discretion on annexations and zone changes. They had less flexibility on subdivisions and variances.

14. APPROVE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 21, 2006

MOTION: Kimberly Bryant moved to approve the minutes of February 21, 2006 as corrected and adjourn. Jim Tracy seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 pm.