

Action Summary

Desert Edge	Discussion
-------------	------------

MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WORK HELD 08/17/23. THE MEETING WAS HELD IN THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL AT 429 EAST MAIN STREET AND ON ZOOM.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present: Commission Chair: Jaime Topham, Vice-Chair: John Limburg, Rick Barchers, Kevin Hall, Derek Dalton.

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: City Attorney Brett Coombs, City Engineer Dan England, City Planning and Zoning Administrator Cavett Eaton, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Lanise Thompson. DRC specialist Gary Pinkham, Aqua Consultant Shay Stark

Citizens and Guests Present: Kaycee Foster, Fred C Cox, Jason Boal, Michael House, Brandon Babcock, Barry Bunderson, Spencer Connelly, Tracye Herrington, Matt Christensen, Ben Duzett

Commission Chair: Jaime Topham called meeting to order at 6:01 PM

AGENDA:

1. Discussion of PUD for Desert Edge

Jason Boal – I'll start. My name is Jason Boal. I'm an urban planner with Snell & Wilmer. We're extremely grateful for your time this evening, your willingness to meet with us. We do have quite a contingency here. The ownership team, design team are all here, so we can dive into a deep conversation, and work through some of the follow-up on the conversation that was had a couple of weeks ago, to get some resolution to some of these items we're really looking forward to. Maybe we'll just go around, and I can have the rest of the team introduce themselves.

Spencer Connelly – I'm Spencer Connelly, I'm with LGI Homes.

Tracye Herrington – I'm Tracye Herrington, I'm with LGI Homes, I work with Spencer, and I'm a Regional Vice President of Land and Development for this particular state.

Michael House – I'm Michael House with LGI Homes, I run land development here.

Matt Christensen – I'm Matt Christensen with Focus Engineering.

Ben Duzett – I'm Ben Duzett with Focus Engineering.

Craig Jensen – Craig Jensen with Snell & Wilmer, also representing LGI Homes. I'd like to start.

Jaime Topham – Okay.

Craig Jensen – Yeah. And thank you again commissioners. It's great to be back. I hope our presence here, and everybody coming and joining in to this meeting shows our interest, and how important this project is to our team, and to LGI, and the investment that we're putting into it. I just want to take a couple of minutes if I could, at the beginning of the meeting to kind of talk about why we're here, and what brings us to this point, and in the historical context, and our involvement with this project. I think it would be a beneficial to take a couple minutes for that.

And it kind of goes back a few years to an MOU, or memorandum of understanding that was submitted and approved, and signed by the city, and a prior owner, a developer on this project, related to, again, the mixed-use planning, and some density numbers, which if I remember correctly was north of 1200 units, that was signed, and entered into by the parties there. That did contemplate at a later time a development agreement that would be negotiated, and considered between the city and the developer.

That took place, and that process took place in 2021. In the end of 2021, the prior owner, our predecessor, and interest, CW Land, signed that development agreement, and the city signed it, approved it, signed it, and it was signed, recorded, and contemplated the MOU, but gave us a framework, or I guess I've been thinking about it, it gave us a destination for this project. It's kind of like getting here, and I punched in Grantsville City Office in my Google Maps, and it gave me about three or four different routes to get there. But the destination was Grantsville City offices, and here I am.

So that destination, or that framework given the DA, just to cover a few different points from our perspective, I think some important points, it confirms the zoning is mixed-use for approximately about 119 acres of residential, 29 acres of commercial. It vests, or entitles residential units at a maximum of 750 units.

I think an important point here is that vesting or entitlement of units is a property right. It is on a similar plane with a piece of land with a home. It may not be tangible, but it is an important property right that is considered a property right, and protected by the constitution. That's an important point I think to raise. The final point I wanted to raise is it vests a city code that was in place at the time of entering into, and the signing of the development agreement.

Those are a few points. I think as everybody knows, LGI Homes Utah acquired the residential portion of this project, and shortly after the approval of development agreement in December, 2021. That gives the destination of the framework. That leads again, to the question of why we're here. I think why we're here is to obtain that path of implementation, or the path, the route to that destination.

That's been subject to some uncertainty, I think. Even the development agreements itself left open some points, or items, in terms of that implementation. For example, the land use map that was attached to the development agreement was expressly not final. It was contemplated that the developer would come back with a preliminary plan, or preliminary plat to address some of the configurations, and the layout of the project. The phasing, which we've touched on, and we'll

touch on again, was left open. Location of open space, configurations, items were left open for, again, the developer to come back and work with the city towards that path. So, that's why we're here, was we're looking for the ideal path, and taking that ideal path that we think is most effective to get the city, to get the developer to that final destination.

Going back a few months, I think even around the turn of the year, we've put a lot of effort into this. The design team has put a lot of effort into this, including designing to the vested code under the development agreement, and having discussions with the planning commission at that point. Then it being determined that that may not be the ideal, most desirable way, so we kind of went back in discussions with the city, with staff, with those involved, determined that the PUD application would likely be the best, and most effective way to implement the framework of the development agreement.

A few different points on that is why that's beneficial, and I think why that was recommended to us, and ultimately why we decided to take that path is one, it allows for the use of the current code, which had changed in some aspects after the signing of the development agreement. It allows for that to the extent possible, again, with that end destination in mind, it allows us to work through with you all, some of those exceptions that come up in implementing the development agreement. It allows for that back and forth. I think getting to that final point where we want a great project, we want a great plan, a well-planned project, we want a project that's an asset to the community, an asset to the city, and all in mind, working with, and participating, or using the development agreement that's in place. And with that PUD application, as we all know, I think it's about 10 points have come up that are exceptions that we're looking to modify through certain aspects of the code that would allow for us to realize the rights within the development agreement, and allow each side to get to a great project, one that honors the agreement, recognizes the legal rights, but also provides a real benefit, and asset to the community.

I think we always consider alternatives, and we certainly have considered alternatives. I think we've shown that in working through this PUD application. I think it's important to state that an alternative in our minds is not no development. It's really the only acceptable angle is a great, well-planned project, that implements that destination that's set out in the development agreement. So, those are my two bits. I think with that, it makes sense for Jason to help to walk through those 10 points that I mentioned that have been considered and I think raised in the staff reports on the PUD application. I'll hand that over to Jason.

Jason Boal – With that background, I think I did have a couple slides we can kind of skim through. I mean, talking about where this project is, I think as Craig had mentioned, there's been numerous conversations. I think we're aware of the location of the project, the development agreement was entered into. That's kind of, as Craig mentioned several times, that framework. It's a little bit different than some of the other projects. You have actually a PUD on the agenda later this evening, and it's coming forward with a development agreement. You're establishing that framework with the PUD, as opposed to this project, which is unique in that we have this framework already in place. We're just working through the PUD process.

We did go through and kind of create a timeline of different meetings, and opportunities we've had to work with staff, to work with city council, and to work with the planning commission on

this project. This isn't... Again, hopefully you're familiar with it, and you have that background. We are ever grateful for staff, and their willingness to meet with us, and talk through the issues, as they've made themselves available, as you can see here.

Before we get to those 10 points, we do want to touch real quickly on some of the benefits. Oftentimes, as developers come before cities and counties, it's perceived that they're asking for something, and there's little or no return for the community. We've spent quite a bit of time, a lot of time actually, talking about the benefits, and how can we make this a beneficial project, and a partnership with Grantsville, that Grantsville is excited about it, that Grantsville is receiving this project, accepting this project, and the benefits that come with it. Some of the things that we feel are great benefit, starting with the tax revenue.

Based on the 2023 property tax estimate, the valuations from this property, and the benefit to the city goes from \$17,000 to \$2.4 million. Understanding that there's improvements and services provided, that number is a remarkable number. It's a substantial number that comes with this project.

There's also park space that's being improved, and granted to the city. There's a trail system. There's utilities that will serve this project, as well as other projects in the area with waterline and sewer. Then the impact fees, and the willingness to enter into agreements with the city to identify specific needs that the city may have, and offset those costs through impact fees. Then the PID negotiations, and conversations that have been happening around potential of the PID. We hope that there's this understanding that this project can be beneficial, and we're seeking to create a project that's beneficial to the city, as well.

As Craig mentioned, we're here to talk about the PUD, and in Grantsville city code, the planning commission does have, well, shall have the authority in approving any plan developments to change, alter, modify, or waive any provisions of the code as they apply to the proposed plan development. That's ultimately why we're here. We're here for a PUD, so that the planning commission can work through the alteration modification of provisions in the code.

There's 10 items that we've submitted in our PUD as a request for a modification, or a waiver of, and we'd like to go through, and ultimately that's the purpose of this work meeting. That's why we're here, is to be able to go through each of these items individually, and to discuss each of them, and find a resolution to each of them. As I mentioned at the outset, that we do have the ownership team, and the design team here so that we can talk through solutions, and that our proposed solutions, which we feel are adequate, can be considered and that we can work to an agreement on these 10 points.

This as a work session, we are here to solicit feedback. We want to understand your perspective, and we want to understand what you're comfortable with, and where we need to be to get your support to move forward with the PUD. Ultimately that's what we're shooting for, is we want your approval. We want to move forward with this PUD.

The first item is for an alteration of the minimum lot size. And this applies just for the town homes, where the code currently requires 4,000 square feet for single-family homes. We are

requesting a modification for the townhome lots to 1,000 square feet. We've included a couple diagrams to demonstrate what this looks like. And it's important to note that although the lot area is smaller in the town homes, there is public space around the lots. So, you can see on the lower right, how there is green space, and public space in front of the lots, and along the lots as well, that's not included in this. This is just the private property that the townhome lots would sit on. Does that request, does that make sense? Do you understand what it is we're seeking with that request? Okay. Do you have any feedback, any thoughts on that request?

John Limburg – So, this is kind of like the picture there below, you're not familiar with Daybreak here, but is it just a small drive between the two, that they can pull into the back of the home? Are these the front of the homes?

Jason Boal – Nope. So, you're absolutely right. They're rear loaded. The garages are in the back, so they would front on the public street. And so, the green space would be in the front of the homes.

Rick Barchers – To that point, if you get out the Webster's Dictionary, and look up front yards, it's going to be the space between the house and the street. A lot of these townhomes do not have a street in what is supposed to be the front yard. So, to call those rear loaded is just a super gigantic stretch for me. I'm sure these two have other things that they want to say too. If our minimum lot size is 4,000 square feet, and you said, "We want a variation of 500 square feet," you're talking about shaving off percentages. This is like whacking three quarters of that lot size. So, that's a hard sell for me.

I realize that in a lot of these things, the only way that you're going to get some of these items you request is for variations in other parts of the code that would be setbacks between the buildings, et cetera. That's the only way you're going to get that 1,000 square foot lot size. So, going to 1,000 square foot lot size affects a lot of other things, and I'm sure you're well aware of that.

What I'm not seeing in the request is how you're planning to mitigate all of those other things that come up. Okay? I don't have a problem with the density, personally. I really don't. If you want to build 750 units do it, that's fine. We have our code for a reason. We're happy to discuss things such as this going from 4,000 to 1,000, but there needs to be a reasoning behind it, and how you plan on mitigating such things as parking, et cetera. Anyway, go ahead, Jaime?

Jaime Topham – I thought that was well said. I guess my question would be, so your 1,000 square foot lot, does that include their parking spaces?

Jason Boal – No.

Jaime Topham – No. So, who owns the... What is white on our little map here? So, their parking space, who owns that?

Tracye Herrington – So that's a driveway right up to an attached garage. When we say rear loaded, we're really referring to the car, the garage, as opposed to it being a front load garage like

you would normally see. It's a rear loaded garage. So, there is a front yard, that is not part of the lot that we're showing here depicted, but it is aesthetically in what you would perceive it when you walk up to the home, it has its own front yard. So, what you're seeing is the driveway apron up to the garage.

Jaime Topham – And so who owns and maintains that?

Tracye Herrington – The HOA would own and maintain it as part of the common area that is not owned by the individual town home unit owner.

Jaime Topham – And how deep is that? How long is the driveway apron?

Spencer Connelly – 22 feet.

Rick Barchers – Do you have a picture of that entire townhome area, if you could show us?

Jason Boal – Yeah, and I think that's... As I'm scrolling back up to it, I think that's one of the things that is important to note, if I can just real quick, as I pulled this up.

Rick Barchers – Hold on, hold on to your point. Where's the front yard? Where's the front yard?

Tracye Herrington:
That's it. You're pointing at it.

Rick Barchers – The front? This is the front?

Tracye Herrington – That's the front yard.

Rick Barchers – So that's the main... When you walk up to that house, if I was visiting the person that lived right here, where am I going to park my car? I'm going to walk up to... This is going to be the front door?

Tracye Herrington – Yes, there's going to be a landscaped walkway just like you might have up to your front. Some houses have sidewalks that park the two yard sides, and walks up to the front door. It'd be a similar concept, where there would be a trail, sidewalk of some sort. We haven't gotten that far in our design, but that would then lead the pedestrian from a visitor parking spot along one of the roads, walk up to the front of the house.

Rick Barchers – You just said, "Walk up to the side of the house."

Tracye Herrington – No, well they would come in, I mean the houses are going to face each other. So, essentially as if houses that have a street that's split, they're going to face each other, and instead of having a street that splits the houses, you're going to have a green space, and a walkway. Someone's going to park at the end of the street there, and they're going to walk probably 50 feet to the front door. Maybe twice as far as it would be if you had somebody parked in front of your house, walk to your front door of a detached house.

Jason Boal – As was mentioned before, similar to Daybreak, and Daybreak has... This is a model that's worked within that development, is to have houses fronting on the green space, and having a common area for the front yard. It's a common housing model that's not only popular here in Utah, but nationwide.

Going to one of the other questions as far as, well I guess one with density, and two with mitigation. So, first with the density, the idea and the intent is to provide a variety of units. As opposed to just doing town homes to get to the density. The intent is to create a diverse product that has kind of been expressed as the intent and the interest of the city, and the market as well.

That's where we feel that this diversity, which would necessitate the deviation for the standards for just the townhomes. As far as the mitigation, the setbacks, that's one of the things that, it's on our list, but we have, and we can clearly demonstrate the setbacks will function perfectly well. We have a parking plan to meet the parking code, exceed the parking code so, we're adequately parked. We feel very comfortable that the impacts, the perceived impacts could be mitigated with the proposal that is in front of you.

Jaime Topham – Where is your proposed parking plan?

Jason Boal – I don't have it included. Can you come up and show exactly where the visitor and onsite? One of the things to keep in mind, the townhomes, they do have the two-car garage, but then also the 22-foot driveway. Then we have included the visitor parking areas.

Matt Christensen – So, as you can see, along the private driveways, private alleys, where there is a townhome here, there's white open space here, and those are parking stalls for people to... Visitor parking stalls for people to use, that wouldn't park in the driveway of the home. We have them spaced throughout the subdivision, throughout the townhomes, where people would likely park. There's one here, there's there, there, there, there. We went through, and made sure that there was enough parking in the open space to exceed the requirements in the city code.

Jaime Topham – How many parking spaces did you come up with?

Spencer Connelly – I think when we were in our meetings with Dan, we needed a minimum of 168. I believe we exceeded that by about 20. We worked with that with Dan.

Dan England – And that does include parking along the wider roads, the front end. They had street parking along those areas too.

Matt Christensen – Where the roads are wide enough to allow street parking, we're counting that as available parking for members of the community. Just as you would have someone pull up in front of your house, and park on the street, same thing. You would just have to walk to anybody that parks on the front of this street, and walks up the sidewalk to these townhomes, just as they would a detached home.

Ben Duzett – Because those are front loaded or rear loaded, rather, like someone parking right here, the front door is right there. And so architecturally, it does look like... They're architecturally done such that they look like the front of the house. Like anyone's front of the house would look. Parking along there would be the logical place to park. There's not a front door feel on any of those back driveways. And so, for all these townhomes here, it would be the easy spot to park, right there, so they have quick, easy access. All of these have a parking stall that makes logical sense for them to park.

Matt Christensen – And it provides an aesthetic feel with the townhomes, to have no driveways in front of the home. When people pull up, they only see front yards. They don't see cars parked in front. It's owned and maintained by the HOA. And so, there isn't stuff in people's yards. There isn't a crazy amount of stuff.

Spencer Connelly – This right here, this view is beautiful, because you don't have... It's all architecturally pleasing.

John Limburg – Is the thousand full that you guys are looking for, is that essentially the footprint of the unit

Tracye Herrington – Yes, the house.

Jason Boal – That's all the bigger we go, yep.

Tracye Herrington – Does not include the driveways.

John Limburg – Okay. Yeah, I own a condo at a ski resort, and I own the land right below my building. That's it. All the rest of it's community property.

Tracye Herrington – That's right.

John Limburg – I understand it. And when you say it's like Daybreak, it is like Daybreak in a way. The Daybreak does have separate homes. It's not townhomes, but the layout's the same. So, I get it.

Matt Christensen – Yeah, they have rear loaded single family homes.

Jaime Topham – Shay

Shay Stark – I'm going to point this out and I understand that we just approved the revised MU ordinance, and with that, we made some revisions for the townhouses in 4.34. Basically, what we stated in there was a minimum lot size of 2,400 square feet, but that was also including the front setback, and the rear setbacks, and a minimum width of 30 feet wide. Our footprint, minimum footprint size, which that was, I was glad you asked that question, because that's what I wanted to clarify too, is 1,000 square feet. I realize that that doesn't apply here, because that's been passed after the application. But, I just want to point out that in effect we've been contemplating something similar, it's not that far off from what they are proposing.

John Limburg – I think what would help is if you said, "If they were all separate lots and there wasn't any community land, if it wasn't shared land, what size would the lot be?" I think that... I don't know if that would help, that would you Rick? But it would help me.

Rick Barchers – As long as that isn't being included in the open space.

Tracye Herrington – Well, so it's instead of a trade-off. If we were to allow each individual home to have their own front yard, which we probably could come up with a 2,400 square foot lot in that case, then what it could do, and this is what we are challenged with every day, is it could affect the aesthetic of the whole front of the building. So, you've got a single permit for that building, and you've got a neighbor next to you, maybe doesn't mow their yard on the same schedule, and it could affect the front, how pleasing it is to look at that building. So, it is a mindful trade off, that we've thought about in order to just be able to maintain the aesthetic of the neighborhood, and the building. Any particular building.

Jaime Topham – So are those front yards considered part of your open space plan?

Tracye Herrington – I don't think so. Are they, the front yards, the common spaces?

Spencer Connelly – Yes. I mean, it's all common open space. Yes. There's no delineation saying what would not be, but if it were to all be in lot, it would change then, what the open space requirement would then be.

Jaime Topham – So, Shay, they're asking for modification of our setbacks. How do you see those setbacks? Does that look like it works with what our utilities do?

Shay Stark – Can we pull the numbers up?

Jason Boal – Yeah, I mean we have each of our requests through here.

Shay Stark – No, this is fine.

Jason Boal – Yeah, the second request is to modify the setbacks on the corner lots. There's a couple dealing with setbacks, but we can start here.

Shay Stark – Okay. So, I think that the first thing I want to point out is we had a 25-foot setback for the front of a house, or contemplating that there's a driveway in front of the house, so we can get two cars, or two vehicles parked in front of the driveway. As they have been working with staff and with the city, the one thing that the city doesn't really have tied down in the standards right now is this concept of an alleyway.

I'm going to call it an alleyway for lack of a better term. We have a definition for an alleyway, but there's nowhere in the code beyond that definition, and that definition's just very generic. There's nowhere in the code that really tells us what that looks like or what it is, but just if we call it that.

Recognizing that if we're going to have the garages in the back, and the fronts are going to be fronting a street, or fronting each other with the sidewalk down the middle, so there's no cars parked in front of there, that setback, as we've looked at it, they were requesting 22 feet. The staff, I think felt comfortable with that, with the fact that there wasn't going to be... You're not going to have pedestrians up and down that. You're going to have essentially the drive path with waterways on the edge to carry the stormwater away, and those driveways. So, there's a couple feet difference there. I believe their front yards, they're wanting a little bit smaller setback in the front.

If we look at it with what we've been contemplating, that was just approved, this 2,400 square feet for the property. One of the things that we talked about in that, was that could be owned and maintained by the HOA, those setback areas. To your point, it doesn't count as open space in the way we calculate our open space. So, that would have to be left out of the open space calculation. But anyway, so they're looking for a little bit smaller front setback.

Can we go back to that? I've got three or four of these subdivisions in my head right now, and I just want to make sure we're talking about the right numbers. What was your front setback that you were requesting?

Jason Boal – So yeah, in this shows on the townhome lots, it's a 12-foot front setback, and then 22-foot minimum setback.

Shay Stark – So your front setback would go from 25 feet to 12 feet, your rear setback, which would now be 22 feet, which I believe in our...so it'd be 22 feet, because of the driveways being there, versus the 20. So, yeah, you're losing 50% of the front setback.

Rick Barchers – Well, part of this whole complication in this discussion is, essentially a lot of the codes are addressing what I would consider to be the front yard, and those two are being switched. So, if we're calling them the backyard, and front yard, then we need 25 feet. And then if the street, which I'm calling the street, because those don't affront to any street, that they're going to be backing out into, is narrowed down to 27 instead of 30, you're losing six feet. I'm just trying to put this whole thing together here.

Then you want only five feet in between the driveways? Where are the trash cans going to go? How are people getting out? And I mean, it just sounds like a disaster to me. I've been in Daybreak, not at three in the afternoon, but 7:00 and 8:00 in the morning. I've been there in the evening, when people are coming in home, and it's a disaster. It is just a disaster. So, if I wanted that, that's where I would live. I could sell my house and move there. Do I have a problem with this? No, it just doesn't meet our standard of the code. So, all I've asked is that you mitigate all of those things that switching all these things, and variant... Where are these guys going to put their trash cans? Because if that's not a street, they're all going to be dragging them out to that street in the middle, that's supposed to be the street in front of their house.

Jaime Topham – Let's let them answer that question.

Tracye Herrington – Are you talking about for pickup? Like pickup day?

Jaime Topham – Yeah.

Tracye Herrington – In other communities like this, what we do is we contract with a private trash provider, and we sort all that out. In a case like this, because there's a 22 foot, what's essentially a driveway that comes back up to their garage that's in the back of the house, most likely the bins would go somewhere around that drive lane, and the trash truck would come up and pick it up from their driveway, which would effectively be like if it was from the front of the house, the regular street, if you were on a detached house.

Sometimes, if there's not space to do that, if there's no driveway, or if it's like a five-foot apron off of the garage, sometimes they have to drag it around to the side of the building, and then the trash truck comes along there and picks it up.

Jaime Topham – How wide are your driveways?

Tracye Herrington – Pardon?

Jaime Topham – How wide are your driveways for these townhomes?

Spencer Connelly – They're 20 feet wide.

Jaime Topham – And no division between the two of them?

Tracye Herrington – So it'd be 10 feet between the driveways. Between each driveway. The driveway is 20, the building's 25, the next building's 25. So that makes the 10 foot between each driveway.

Gary Pinkham – That's only five feet between the driveways.

Tracye Herrington – Oh, two and a half. Sorry. Yeah, that's why I'm not designing it.

Jaime Topham – That's doesn't sound like a lot of room.

Tracye Herrington – I'm not here for my math skills. Okay.

Jaime Topham – So back to Shay, and the questions I was asking, do these setbacks give enough room to get in everything that needs to be in?

Shay Stark – As I look at it, one of the things that we're always concerned about is our water and sewer connections, especially making sure that we don't have meters inside the driveways. The one way to address that, we always try to put our wet utilities, our water and sewer, underneath pavement, not just running those out through the grass, because we try to protect them. That helps protect those lines.

If you've got this five-foot area in between driveways, that's where your water meters are going to go. Your other utilities, where this gets to be a little bit of a challenge is when you start putting in power transformers, and communication pads, and all that type of stuff, more than likely those utilities are going to be run in the front yard. If it's between buildings, run down through there, or on the ones that are fronting a front street, you can handle those utility issues. In fact, on the ones that are on the public streets, that are running down the front street, the water and sewer can actually come out on that site, there's nothing there to cause any problems. There's plenty of space for the utilities.

From that perspective, these are probably fine. That's something that, just as we work through that, we just have to make sure. I know that's been brought up in comments, that they'll need corridors. The other part of this is how many units you've got connected together in that space in between units, which I believe you're asking for, again, if you need to go back to that, was it 12 feet, or 15 feet in between units?

Gary Pinkham – I don't know if you could read it.

Jaime Topham – So it's 15 feet on this.

Shay Stark – Okay, so 15. So, typically what we're asking for between those units is 15 feet per unit. So, it would typically be 30 feet between there. I guess part of that becomes a question of, if we have emergency services that have to access this, we have a fire in the home, they've got to get around the backside, or how are they going to address that?

And obviously, if we're only dealing with four or five, six units, the length of these, when you start to look at that, if you've got 25 feet long, if you've got five units that's 125 feet, that's typical to a single-family lot. So, it's not a stretch for emergency services to get around, if they need to get around the backside, for some reason. The other thing with having a rear loaded, you do have a front yard area in there, whether it has a sidewalk, or it's fronting a public street, you do have access literally from both sides.

Rick Barchers – On that point, what if the visitors are parked there, where the fire trucks go? That brings up another issue that's relative.

Dan England – But your firetrucks will park right in the middle of the road.

Jason Boal – Yeah, I mean we have identified visitor parking. It's the same as-

Rick Barchers – How wide is that road?

Spencer Connelly – Which road?

Rick Barchers – The actual street.

Jaime Topham – It goes through that.

Rick Barchers – The actual street. Just to the east of the one we had up there earlier.

Shay Stark – The public streets are standard. There's 66 feet. So those, that frontages.

Rick Barchers – All right.

Dan England – The other ones are 22 feet, which is enough for the cars to go.

Rick Barchers – There's a lot of detail like that that I just am trying to understand.

Dan England – Up here. If you include the curb and gutter on the sides. Yes. It's 26.

Rick Barchers – Okay. Okay. I want to go back to just real quickly, number one, 1,000 square feet. As they're defining it, how close would that be to what we've defined it as? I mean taking out-

Group – inaudible

Jaime Topham – Hold on. One voice.

Shay Stark – Again, and I realize the new code doesn't specifically apply it, in the old code it was 4,000 square feet, right?

Rick Barchers – Sure.

Shay Stark – But under the new code, our footprint requirement, minimum footprint requirement's 1,000 square feet. What they're asking for is the same there. The lot size around that. Ours is 2,400 square feet, and it was a simple calculation. It's 20 feet plus 25 feet. It's the front and rear setback, times 30 feet, because we were requiring a minimum width of 30 feet, if they're looking at a minimum width of 25 feet with this. But again, when I say that, I'm talking about a code that doesn't specifically apply here, but just to give you an idea of what you contemplated.

Rick Barchers – Yeah, well one of the things that I'm looking at here is our normal rear setback is 20 feet.

Shay Stark – Yes.

Rick Barchers – And what they're calling the rear is what? So it's actually just a little bit bigger. So, there's some somewhat of a trade there. So, anyway.

Shay Stark – So between their front and rear, they've got 34, and we've got 45.

Rick Barchers – Got it.

Shay Stark – So, if I take that, for instance, there are 34, times that by that width, if we were looking at how we apply this lot size, they would be 850 feet in it. So, their total lot size would be 1,850 feet, including the footprint. Ours is 2,400 feet. So, it just kind give you a difference.

Rick Barchers – What I'm getting at here is looking at the way it's presented, it's 4,000 square feet to a thousand square feet. So, it's a difference, but it's not that drastic, is what I'm getting at.

Jason Boal – Yep, and that's exactly why we have these work meetings, so we can talk through these issues and make sure we're on the same page.

Rick Barchers – Well, one of the things that I do want you to understand here is that you do have a density that's been guaranteed. If this had come in front of us now, there's no way this would pass. It just wouldn't. So, we're really trying to work with you here on this stuff.

Jason Boal – Yeah. And again, as we-

Rick Barchers – We just don't want it to be like 1,000 feet out bounds.

Jason Boal – Nope.

Rick Barchers – Does that make sense?

Jason Boal – Yep.

Rick Barchers – Thank you.

Jaime Topham – We're running out of time. I think we need to move forward onto maybe the public and private streets committed to extend 1,000 feet beyond an intersection. So, what is the reason for that?

Jason Boal – So, this demonstrates those areas that we're talking about, that do extend beyond that 1,000, or that we're requesting extend beyond that 1,000 feet, beyond the 750, to 1,000. As you can see, most of them, the long stretches, they do include cul-de-sacs, they do include turns, and then the private drive along the back also includes some of the public parking spaces along the way. That's ultimately the request. This meets the international fire code standards, as far as length. That's why we're comfortable proposing it, that emergency services will be able to access, there won't be an issue. The majority of those, with the exception of the townhomes, are all city right of way public roads, and meeting the standards.

Jaime Topham – So Shay, is there an issue with... They're asking, it's 750 feet in our code, they're asking for 1,000 feet.

Shay Stark – Well, so I'm going to go back to Wells Crossing. We had a similar situation there, and the way that was interpreted was that, as they were constructing those streets, the overall length of the street was longer than the 1,000 feet. But at the same time, they've got intersections at both ends. So, you can get people out one way or another. In Wells crossing, they constructed

half of the street at a time, and then just wrapped around to tie into another street, with a temporary road, so that we maintain that 750 feet. These looked to me, and it... Sorry, Dan's walked out, because I mean this is really more his call than mine.

Jaime Topham – Well, yes, I could-

Shay Stark – But just looking at it, every one of these has connections on both ends. It's not a dead-end street, it's not a cul-de-sac. If we were dealing with the cul-de-sac, it'd definitely be saying, yeah, 750 feet is...

Jason Boal – If that's how it's interpreted, and that's the understanding that deals with construction. We are happy to meet that standard when it comes to construction.

Jaime Topham – These are the two I actually wanted to ask a question of, but they weren't sitting here. So, Dan, and they are asking for the public and private streets permitted to extend a thousand feet beyond an intersection. And I think our code is 750 feet. Is the 1,000 feet acceptable? Give us some guidance here.

Rick Barchers – That's for both of you.

Jaime Topham – Yeah. Fire marshal.

Dan England – Okay, so you're showing the lengths of the ones that are less than a thousand feet?

Jason Boal – That are longer than the 750 feet standard.

Dan England – Oh, I see what you're saying. So, yeah, we have a code that says that every 750 feet you need to have another street, and these are some locations where it extends out past that.

Matt Christensen – So, I do have a question, and Dan you can help me. So, this street is one street, we have an intersection here, and it turns the corner, and turns to a new street name. Is this a new street, and we just have to be from here to here on our block line?

Dan England – No, I think the way they've got it-

Matt Christensen – Doesn't go all the way to this intersection.

Gary Pinkham – You've got an intersection, it's your lower right hand. Those are the two ends of your street.

Matt Christensen – Right. So, this is an end of the street, and this-

Dan England – I don't know for sure, but I think the concept is if somebody is stuck in the middle of the road, and we need to get someplace, we don't want to go down too far down a road without being able to turn. I think the way you've got it lined out there is the correct way of

measuring it. Do you have problems if you end up getting stuck and had to back up a different way around?

Jason Smith – Firetruck gets stuck right here, you can-

Dan England – I You're going to push the car out of the way with your truck.

Jason Boal – I'm sure the city would love that.

Dan England – The mayor says he'd do it all the time.

Rick Barchers – In particular, my biggest problem is that super skinny street they're wanting down here on the townhomes. It can be private, it can be whatever. I don't care. We've got to get a firetruck down that.

Jason Smith – I understand.

Rick Barchers – Is that going to work?

Jason Smith – When we've had this problem before, where they don't allow parking. But there's nobody to enforce the no parking, because our police don't have the time to enforce the no parking rule.

Dan England – Well, that'd have to be enforced by the HOA.

Jason Smith – Yeah, and that's my only concern is you could put up all the no parking signs you want. People are going to park there. But we've had this problem in other places, and we've dealt with it. It's nothing we haven't seen before. And as far as the other layout goes, I mean, I don't have any heartache about being able to get around that neighborhood in a firetruck. The narrow streets are always going to be a problem. They're always going to be iffy on whether or not somebody's parked on them or not.

Jaime Topham – So, do we want to require them to have to stick with the 750 feet on the more narrow streets?

Dan England – Personally, I'm okay with most of them. The one that I probably have the biggest heartburn with would be the big long one, that's 980 feet. That's a really long loop through there, with no place else to go. I wonder if there's a way of getting an emergency access out onto this right through. The U-shaped one. If there's a way to get emergency access out onto State Route 138. I don't know if UDOT would let you do that.

Matt Christensen – Could we have a temporary access that comes through right here?

Dan England – An emergency access that way?

Matt Christensen – Through the open space right there?

Rick Barchers – It's still going to leak it short on the other side.

Spencer Connelly – What if we put temporary access with a crash fire gate heading back out to the 138?

Jaime Topham – Okay, hold on. When you say temporary access, do you mean-

Dan England – Emergency access.

Jaime Topham – Okay, because I want to be clear that what you're asking for in the PUD are permanent changes, not temporary ones.

Spencer Connelly – Would something like that suffice? Would that work?

Jason Smith – If you can get UDOT to give it to you. Because that's a state road. I mean, I'm fine if we have a crash gate to go through. How wide is that opening that you were just pointing to before? Do you know how wide that is?

Matt Christensen – 20 something feet.

Jason Smith – Okay. 20 something feet, that works. I mean that's more than enough to get a fire engine through too.

Dan England – Yeah, it's just you still have the really long length on the other side. I'm not sure how long it is, and it's a narrow road, plus it's a really long road, and so you're only looking at 22 feet the whole way through there anyway. And then, so it's more likely to be blocked. All it takes is two cars to be parked and you're done. But if we end up putting something about midway down the street.

Matt Christensen – We can do something here, and something here, or something here.

Dan England – Yeah. Halfway down the street. Yeah. if you can do that, or if you want, can do the two corners, that works easier, that would be fine too.

Jason Smith – I would do the crash barrier on both, because we don't want... Because they'll try to use it.

John Limburg – So if you're talking, it's just a gravel road, and if there's snow on the ground.

Spencer Connelly – It would be part of the HOA maintenance.

John Limburg – What if we have a two-foot snowstorm? Would they plow a bunch of snow off? They'd have to give up some lots, but why not just put a lane down the middle of that last section, just split those homes up. I don't know why we're going to go way out of our way to

create an emergency access there, where you could have a different intersection, and that lane comes down.

Dan England – So turn it into a figure eight through there?

Matt Christensen – Put one through here?

Tracye Herrington – Yeah.

Rick Barchers – And spin those homes so that they-

John Limburg – They could figure out how they could still make work. If you look at the next section over, they've got lanes coming down, so you don't have that situation. You don't have that road going down the bottom.

Tracye Herrington – We'd be willing to do that.

John Limburg – Yeah. Why create something that we're going to have to maintain forever, and probably the firemen won't even know it's there when they get there.

Tracye Herrington – If we could probably reorient it where the unit loss doesn't...

Jaime Topham – So could you do that with all of the houses that have thousand foot or more stretch?

Tracye Herrington – So the townhomes, that particular section, that's doable.

Spencer Connelly – The other would not... It would be a much more significant loss to the density having to do that.

Matt Christensen – And where these are on the public streets, that are 66 feet wide, he's going to have plenty of room to get around a car.

Jaime Topham – Okay. Sorry, I don't mean to cut you off, but we're pretty much out of time on this work meeting. So, we're going to have to wrap up the work meeting. Obviously, you guys are on the agenda, so we can continue this conversation, there's a couple more that are probably more important.

Jaime Topham made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Rick Barchers seconded it. All voted in favor. Motion carried unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 7:00pm