

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT
March 19, 2019

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Roll Call: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chairman David Fotheringham. The following were present and constituted a quorum:

Chairman: Dave Fotheringham

Commission Members: Bryce Higbee, Alan MacDonald, John MacKay, Jane Griener, John Gubler, Sylvia Christiansen

Staff: Austin Roy, Marla Fox, Jed Muhlestein

Others: Alan Cottle, Wally Western

B. Prayer/Opening Comments: Sylvia Christiansen

C. Pledge of Allegiance: McKay Taylor (a Scout)

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Major Subdivision Preliminary Plan Review – Montdella – Alan Cottle

Austin Roy said the developer was seeking approval of the preliminary plat and plans for the proposed Montdella Subdivision, a 55+ Community, which consisted of 25 dwelling units on 3.94 acres. Dwelling units ranged in size from approximately 2,400 square feet to 3,500 square feet. The property was located at approximately 242 South Main Street in the Business/Commercial Zone and Senior Housing Overlay. On August 28, 2018, a concept plan was brought before the City Council seeking approval of a Senior Housing Overlay. The City Council reviewed and approved the request for the Senior Housing Overlay. The developer was now returning to seek approval for preliminary plans. Business/Commercial Zone, Senior Housing Overlay, and Gateway/Historic requirements should all be taken into consideration when reviewing the preliminary plat and plans for approval.

Austin Roy stated that the lots met area and width requirements. He said the City setback requirements had been met with 30 feet off of Main Street, 20 feet on the side rear setbacks and 25 feet from the high water mark of Dry Creek. Dwelling units were spaced at least 10 feet apart. Mr. Roy noted that the property was located within a flood plain overlay zone and said Dry Creek ran a few months of the year.

Austin Roy explained that the City's Master Trail Plan showed a trail running through the subject property and alongside that stream. The developer had taken that into consideration and was proposing an eight-foot wide walking/jogging trail that ran along the course of the property

from Main Street, to the north, down to the south end of the property. This proposed trail was an extension of the existing Dry Creek Corridor Trail which would be paved.

Austin Roy said this development was required to follow the Gateway Historic Guidelines which were:

1. Mimic details of older buildings
2. Use similar materials as other buildings on Main Street
3. Make mundane uses look good
4. Include design features on blank walls
5. Include monuments along Main Street

Austin Roy said the design primarily called for brick and mostly masonry type design. As far as Staff was concerned, it looked like what they were doing did meet the Gateway Historic requirements. He said the building had a very traditional look to it and did not look out of place.

Austin Roy said the development had a lighting and landscaping plan and the developer complied with the City's tree guideline book. The plans met all the requirements and Staff did not have any concerns.

David Fotheringham asked if samples had been provided and Austin Roy explained that per City ordinance, colored perspectives and architectural renderings may be required, and the applicant provided both of these things. The ordinance did not specifically state that an applicant should also present physical samples, so at this time Staff had not asked them to provide those. They would still need to come forward for final site approval process, at which time the Planning Commission could request to see samples.

Jed Muhlestein explained that the plans had to comply with the Off-street Parking Ordinance (Article 3.24) which stated that no off-street parking could be within the setbacks. He added that an all-weather surface of asphalt was proposed. It was required to have all parking stalls dimensioned correctly and not located in a setback area. He said this development did comply with the requirements. A lighting plan was submitted and approved, and the property was graded to retain all storm water onsite. Storm drain calculations and plans were submitted and approved for the design of the parking lot.

Jed Muhlestein also reviewed the Fire Chief's Requirements, as follows:

1. 24-foot road needed to be 26 feet wide to meet the fire code
2. Round-about island needed to be reduced to accommodate placement of fire apparatuses in that area during a fire and address the turning radius negotiation of apparatus travel
3. Due to the close proximity of the housing units and the risk of fire exposure spread, at least one additional fire hydrant was required midway through the private street.
4. Based on limited access to the rear of the structures on the north side, the City would likely restrict the use of barbecue grills on ground floor rear patios

Jed Muhlestein said the applicant provided a traffic study with the application. The study showed very low traffic volumes generated from the development: 140 trips per day and only 12 trips during the peak hours of the day. The study offered ideas for restricting how traffic turned in and out of the development. The two optional ideas would not allow left-hand turns coming in

or out of the development. Staff did not feel that any restrictions should be imposed on the development in terms of traffic flow due to the following:

1. The overall daily low volume
2. The low volume expected during peak hours
3. Restricting northbound, left-hand turns would force northbound vehicles to more northward into the areas of congestion already created by the charter school
4. There was more than one exit within the development; residents would have more than one northbound option if traffic was congested on Main Street
5. A traffic study was recently done specifically for the charter school. One of the remedies for congestion was to re-stripe Main Street and add a center turn lane.
6. If the new center turn lane was painted from the round-a-bout to approximately 100 South, a safer area would exist for left-hand turning in and out of the development. This would be Engineering's recommendation.

Jed Muhlestein said the street master plan required a landscaping plan along arterial and collector streets (which included Main Street). The applicant had turned in a landscaping plan and they were adhering to it. He said the nice thing about having the City's tree guidelines was that now they had a list of trees that they could use to verify would be safe to plant by sidewalks.

Jed Muhlestein said as far as utilities were concerned, this development was right in the middle of several utilities in the middle of town. He said they had great connections for the water lines on two sides and would connect at both systems, thereby looping the system through. There was already access for secondary water. He said there were two existing homes that used to be on the property, and the development would reuse one of the previous home's secondary water connections for the common space area.

Jed Muhlestein said there was a main sewer line. Using the aid of an aerial map, he described the location of the line. He said this line was low enough that it would be able to sewer the entire site via gravity flow, so no pumping was needed. Jed Muhlestein said everything drained over to the southwest corner which would be their small detention pond. The pond would detain storm water, somewhat clean it, and then release it at slower rates to Dry Creek. He said all of this met the ordinance. He explained that a flood plain existed on the property; however, no homes, structures, or the proposed trail were within the flood plain. Retaining walls on the property would require approval and a separate building permit before building. A land disturbance permit would be required prior to construction which ensured a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) was followed.

Austin Roy said there were eight Gateway Historic Design Criteria and it looked like their design was striving to meet these criteria. The criteria were:

1. Relation to the Surrounding Area (Massing, Scale, Orientation)
2. Height
3. Exterior Walls and Surfaces
4. Windows and Doors
5. Exterior Trim and Decorative Detailing
6. Roofing

- 7. Materials (Texture, Color, Finishes)
- 8. Streetscaping

Alan Cottle, the developer, said there would be a sidewalk going from the interior circle connecting to the trail; it would most likely be cement. They would add another fire hydrant and were complying with the Fire Chief's requirements. Mr. Cottle said on the north side of the property he planned to build a pavilion by the trail system and said it would tie into the sidewalk.

Jane Griener asked about visitor parking. Mr. Cottle said each unit would have parking stalls for two cars, in addition to there being six overflow parking spaces.

Sylvia Christiansen asked how wide the garages were. Mr. Cottle said 22 feet wide and 24 feet long. Mr. Cottle said there would be an elevator for each unit at a cost of \$40,000. He believed 80% of the sales would come from within two miles of the property and said the units would probably sell in the high \$400,000 range. He would bring back samples so the Planning Commission could see the building materials.

Jane Griener asked if the developer needed permission or an agreement from the neighboring businesses for a second access. Austin Roy said he would ask the City Attorney about this but thought there was an easement already established for the access.

Sylvia Christiansen asked what the timeline was for building the units. Mr. Cottle said it would probably be about a year before there was a completed unit. He had plans to get the infrastructure completed this year. Sylvia Christiansen asked Mr. Cottle if he would have an issue with widening the road. Mr. Cottle said they had room to move some units around to get the extra space needed for the road.

Bryce Higbee was concerned that there would be sides of homes facing Main Street and said that could not happen. Mr. Cottle explained the sides were the fronts. There would be a lot of masonry with Beehive brick that looked smaller, like old pioneer brick. He also said they would have a lot of detail with four different color choices that looked good together. Mr. Cottle said they would build a fence along Main Street to make it feel like a community.

MOTION: Alan MacDonald moved to recommend approval of the Montdella Subdivision Preliminary Plan with the following conditions:

1. The Developer address redlines on the plat and plans.
2. The Developer address all concerns from the Fire Department.

John MacKay seconded. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:

Bryce Higbee
 Alan MacDonald
 John MacKay
 David Fotheringham

Nays:

None

Jane Griener
John Gubler
Sylvia Christiansen

IV. Communications

Jane Griener asked if the Planning Commission would meet during Spring Break. The group decided to cancel the April 2, 2019 meeting due to a lack of a quorum.

David Fotheringham asked if Staff had heard anything from Blue Bison and Austin Roy replied no.

Austin Roy reminded the Planning Commission to pick up their mail from their mailbox.

V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: March 5, 2019

MOTION: Bryce Higbee moved to approve the minutes for March 5, 2019, as written.

Alan MacDonald seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:
Bryce Higbee
Alan MacDonald
John MacKay
David Fotheringham
Jane Griener
John Gubler
Sylvia Christiansen

Nays:
None

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 pm.