



**DRC Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, April 27, 2021**

**DRC Members in Attendance:** City Engineer Jon Lundell, Building Official Randy Spadafora, Public Works Director Jason Callaway, Police Chief Rod Hurst, Community Development Director Jason Bond, and City Manager Ben Reeves

**Others in Attendance:** Staff Planner Ryan Harris, Code Enforcement Officer Russ Woodland, and Assistant City Manager Norm Beagley (Attending Via Zoom).

Kevin Olson and Scott Peterson representing the Orchard Hills II Final Subdivision Review (Attending Via Zoom).

Paul Watson representing the Stratton Acres concept review (Attending Via Zoom).

Brandon Kirk and Ben Tuckett representing the Rute R.E. Commercial Subdivision (Attending Via Zoom).

Josh Madsen (Attending Via Zoom) and Rob Horlacher representing the Summit Ridge Commercial Subdivision.

Mr. Lundell called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

**Orchard Hills II Final Subdivision Review**

*A final review of a 19-unit townhome development, which will include commercial spaces on the 5 units fronting Highland Drive. Located at approximately 120 E. and Highland Drive*

Mr. Lundell explained that this is a proposed residential townhome development; the 5 units along Highland Drive are proposed live/work units.

**Fire:** Mr. Sutherland noted that units 8-12 don't show Fire Department Connections (FDC's) on the utility plan. He explained that mixed use buildings such as these require fire sprinklers. He added that these units need to be located within 100 feet of a fire hydrant.

**Building Official:** Mr. Spadafora stated that he has reviewed and set the addresses for this subdivision. He asked if the live/work units will need separate addressing for the commercial and the residential spaces. Mr. Bond stated that he thinks the separate uses should be addressed separately. Mr. Spadafora indicated that he will add separate addresses for the commercial portions. Mr. Bond suggested that the Postmaster be consulted on how the units are addressed.

**Public Works:** Mr. Callaway noted that both a 2-inch and 4-inch master meter are shown on the plans. He pointed out a note referring to a 1-inch culinary meter. He asked for clarification on which meters belong to the City. Mr. Lundell explained that the 4-inch meter and the 2-inch meter belong to the City. The 4-inch meter will service units 1-7, 13-16 and 17-19; and the



2-inch meter will service units 8-12. Mr. Lundell asked about the separate 1-inch meter? Mr. Peterson stated that it is a stray note that he will remove from the plans.

Mr. Callaway asked that the developer provide signage for the private streets. He suggested that the signs be blue and with white lettering to differentiate it from the public road signs which are green and white. Mr. Olson stated that they will provide signage for the private streets.

Mr. Callaway explained that there is a concrete irrigation pipe that runs through 120 E. He noted that the developer may run into issues with it, and they will need to locate it when excavation begins.

**Police:** Chief Hurst reported that no stop sign is shown coming out of the parking lot onto 120 E. He also asked about the parking situation on Highland Drive. Mr. Reeves noted that when the Council approved the preliminary subdivision, they provided a condition that the DRC conduct an analysis to determine whether parking should be allowed and if not to red-curb Highland Drive. Mr. Lundell indicated that Engineering will conduct this review.

**Planning and Zoning:** Mr. Bond stated that this project has received architectural approval from the ARC with a few conditions which have been provided to the developer.

**Engineering:** Mr. Lundell asked if the developer will be amending the existing CC&R's or providing additional ones for the second phase? He stated that they need to include a streetlight at the intersection of Highland Drive and 120 East. Mr. Lundell pointed out that a photometric plan needs to be provided for the parking lot lighting. He explained that the street names are not consistent between the sheets on the plan set and asked that the developer verify them. Mr. Lundell asked that the affidavits for the existing 17 units be coordinated with the County regarding required signatures, etc. Mr. Lundell also asked that the developer show that there is adequate right of way between Highland Dr. and the I-15 no access fence.

**Motion:** Mr. Bond motioned to table the Orchard Hills Townhomes II Final Review until the redlines are addressed. Mr. Sutherland seconded. The motion passed unanimously in the affirmative.

### **Stratton Acres Concept Review**

*A concept review of a 36-unit subdivision located at approximately 200 E. and Royal Land Drive.*

Mr. Lundell explained that this proposed subdivision is located North of Apple Valley Elementary and East of the Orchards Development. He noted that 200 E. would be extended to run through this development. Mr. Watson indicated that he is currently working with the School District to put storm water and road storm water on future school property. He noted that they would like to add an additional lot if they are able to do this. Mr. Lundell indicated that the City requires an easement for any right of way storm water that is detained on private property. Mr. Lundell noted that the storm water would need to be separate from the schools.

**Building Official:** Mr. Spadafora asked if the extension of 200 E. would match the existing road width. Mr. Lundell answered that the road widths will match for both the extension of 200 E. and Royal Land Drive.

**Public Works:** Mr. Callaway asked if the proposed retention pond can be tied into the existing storm drain for The Orchards? Mr. Lundell indicated that the storm drain pond is only sized for the entire Orchards development, and not any additional offsite water.



Mr. Lundell expressed some concern with the retention pond and stated that he would like to see other possibilities considered. Mr. Callaway indicated that there can be maintenance issues with retention ponds. Mr. Lundell stated that localized retention is preferred if possible. Mr. Watson explained that underground options are difficult to maintain and can fill up with dirt. He asked about individual catch basin/sumps. Mr. Lundell directed the developer to review the City's specs sheet SD1 regarding curb inlet requirements. Mr. Bond asked that the retention ponds be consolidated into one location if possible. There may be City Council members who would like to see dual purpose retention basins.

**Planning and Zoning:** Mr. Bond explained that since this is a concept plan a public hearing will be held and reviewed by the Planning Commission.

**Administration:** Mr. Reeves noted appreciation for the developer proposing single family homes and the enhancement of road connectivity this development would provide.

**Engineering:** Mr. Lundell stated that a storm drain report needs to be provided. He noted that it appears that most of the right of way is being pushed to the School District's property instead of split between the two adjoining properties. Mr. Watson explained that they want to continue Royal Land Drive further through to set up for the next phase of their project. He stated that they will work with the Nebo School District. Mr. Lundell asked that the developer keep the City updated and indicated that written approval would be required for any agreements made between the developer and Nebo School District. Mr. Beagley indicated that a dedication to the City of the proposed right of way would be required.

Mr. Lundell pointed out that there is a proposed sewer line shown through the North on Ginger Gold Road. He expressed concern regarding the sewer depth. Mr. Watson stated that currently there is no easement for the sewer line. Mr. Lundell explained that as part of the Orchards development agreement, once 200 lots are built the Ginger Gold right of way dedication needs to occur. Mr. Watson asked to see a copy of the agreement. Mr. Lundell indicated that it is a public record and can be found on the Utah County Recorders Parcel data.

No comments from Fire, or Police.

## **Rute R. E. Commercial Subdivision Concept Review**

*A concept plan review of a proposed 1 lot commercial subdivision located South of the intersection of Summit Ridge Parkway and South Ridge Farms Road.*

**Public Works:** Mr. Callaway asked that the utility line sizes that are installed are big enough to service the development.

**Engineering:** Mr. Lundell stated that this proposed subdivision is subject to the Summit Ridge Development Agreement. Mr. Bond clarified that the developer submitted a site plan for this subdivision in 2020 and it worked when the application was submitted. It wouldn't work with current zoning since the development agreement expired in December of 2020.

Mr. Lundell explained that the developer will be required to provide all the frontage improvements. He noted that the front property line and the Frontage Road appear to be both UDOT and/ or Utah County right of way. Because of this, there will potentially be two approving bodies who will need to approve the right of way width, improvements, etc.

Mr. Lundell explained that the utility lines will need to be extended to the Southern boundary of the property. He stated that the current standards call for a maximum length of 500 feet on a dead-end waterline. He referred to a recent code update which allows for a maximum of 750 feet on a dead-end waterline with Council approval. He indicated that this would need to be coordinated with waterline looping, etc.



Mr. Bond clarified that this commercial lot is adjacent to the next agenda item. And that this parcel is part of a larger parcel owned by HG Utah 1.

Mr. Tuckett stated that the current waterline comes from Summit Ridge Parkway down the Frontage Road and stubs near this property. He asked for clarification regarding the waterline requirements. Mr. Lundell explained that the waterline would need to be fully looped at the time that the subdivision goes through. He noted that they will need to provide an additional connection to the system, not just the property. Mr. Tuckett explained that the County has stated that they will defer to City requirements for the right of way.

Mr. Bond explained that a public hearing for this concept is on the agenda for tonight's Planning Commission Meeting.

No comments from Fire, Building Official, Police, Planning and Zoning or Administration.

### **Summit Ridge Commercial Subdivision Concept Review**

*A concept plan for a proposed 9-lot commercial subdivision located South of the intersection of Summit Ridge Parkway and South Ridge Farms Road.*

Mr. Lundell explained that this subdivision is on the same existing parcel as the proposed Rute R.E. subdivision, this one is just located further North.

**Planning and Zoning:** Mr. Bond stated that as the parcel continues to develop it will be important to maintain good access and avoid landlocked parcels to the west.

**Engineering:** Mr. Lundell asked what would happen with the existing building on lot 5? He explained that with the current truck traffic and proposed commercial uses, it is anticipated that a center left turn lane and right turn lane will be required to access each commercial lot. He reiterated that waterline looping will be required because of length requirements in code. Mr. Lundell noted that curb and gutter would need to be extended to the full length of lot 8. He explained that the asphalt has been re-done in the past few years, so any cuts made in the asphalt would require overlays. Mr. Lundell stated that this subdivision is subject to the C-1 Commercial zoning requirements. Mr. Reeves clarified that if the Summit Ridge Development Agreement is approved by the Council it would again be zoned as the Planned Community (PC) zone.

Mr. Beagley explained that there is roughly 48 feet of asphalt currently existing, and that there could be a large length of curb that would need to be replaced. This needs to be figured out as things move forward.

Mr. Madsen asked if the widening of the right of way could be done per lot, or if it needs to be done concurrently. Mr. Lundell answered that it will all need to be installed with the subdivision. He indicated that they could provide GIS information to the developer for the utility stub locations. Mr. Madsen stated that he is unsure of the standard laterals required for different commercial uses. And noted that the needs may differ depending upon the commercial use. Mr. Beagley stated that they will provide that standards to the developer, and suggested that when installing utilities, they do so in a way to make as few road cuts as possible.

No comments from Fire, Building Official, Public Works, Police, and Administration.



## **MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL**

Approval of Meeting Minutes from

April 13, 2021

**Motion:** Mr. Sutherland motioned to approve the DRC meeting minutes from April 13, 2021. Mr. Spadafora seconded. The motion passed unanimously in the affirmative.

### **Adjournment:**

Mr. Bond motioned to adjourn at 11:10 a.m.

DRAFT

---

Jon Lundell, City Engineer

---

Kira Petersen, Deputy Recorder