

CEDAR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – NOVEMBER 7TH, 2023

The Cedar City Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, November 7th, 2023, at 5:15 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 10 North Main, Cedar City Utah.

Councilmembers in attendance: Craig Isom, Ray Gardner, Adam Hahn, Carter Wilkey, Jennifer Davis, John Webster, Tom Jett

Staff in attendance: Garth Green- Mayor, Jonathan Stathis-City Engineer, Randall McUne-City Attorney, Donald Boudreau- City Planner, David Johnson- Economic Development, Amber Ray- Executive Secretary

Others in attendance: Chanel Atwood, Lola Atwood, Neal Smith, Tim, L. Henderson, Paul Cozzens, Clayton Neilsen, Ann Clark, Sadie Hink, Michael Platt, Jonathan Pyne, Jim Rushton, Steve Jones, Ridley Griggs

ITEM/REQUESTED MOTION LOCATION/PROJECT APPLICANT/PRESENTER

- Pledge of Allegiance –led by Adam Hahn.

I. REGULAR ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes (October 17th, 2023)
(Approval)

Councilmember Isom motions to approve the minutes from October 17th, 2023; Jennifer Davis seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

Because of voting and Thanksgiving, the next Planning Commission will be November 28th.

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| 2. Street Name Change/
Addition
(Recommendation) | 896 N 2175 W
Happy Factory Lane | Smith/Cooley |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------|

Neal Smith: I have Tim McGuire with me. He is the facilities manager. We think it would be appropriate with what the Happy Factory does to add Happy Factory Lane to the street sign. There are 6 addresses on that street. I have talked with the Fire Department and Mayor. We have talked to all the property owners. It would still be 896 N 2175 W. It wouldn't change anything with addresses. It would be like Freedom Blvd or put it underneath.

Hahn: For staff, what rules do we have to follow.

Jonathan: Showed visual of city standard. If there is a name in addition to the number, the name is in smaller letters, under the numbers. This is how the street sign would have to be to meet the requirements. It needs to go through the process and to City Council. They would have to get a variance to use that exact

font that their exhibit shows.

Hahn: Freedom Blvd doesn't adhere to the standard.

Jonathan: There was a proposal several months ago for Red Peak Way. That was denied by the City Council.

Carter: The situation was a little different. They put in the street, and City Council still denied it. They said we don't give businesses road names.

Isom: I have no problem with it below the coordinates.

Neal: Happy Factory is an unusual place that isn't like a business.

Councilmember Isom motions for a positive recommendation for the name change and addition; Jett seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

Vicinity Plan- PUD
(Recommendation)

53 Aime Avenue
Aime Avenue PUD

Fausett/ Platt & Platt

Mike Platt: We are at the point where we need negative approval or approve with conditions. I am not coming back. We are going to City Council. We will get the attorney involved. We can pack units in there, but we aren't planning on it. There are some things that we need to get worked out before the City Council.

Don: There are still concerns. We sent comments, and we got new plans this morning. We are still reviewing whether this is ADUs and if it will work for the parking. Staff have not had time to review. There are quite a few issues. If wasn't for ADU issue, we would probably be moving forward. We still haven't determined whether this is twin homes or town homes. I have not had time to review these in detail. We responded to last set, and received response back today.

Jonathan: Don, Randall and I have talked. The response addressed the responses we had. We haven't had time to make sure it meets ordinance.

Mike: Before it goes to City Council I will make sure responses are adequate.

Randall: For example, you are generally required to have a wall. They are trying to not have a wall. It has gone to Board of Adjustments. What was presented and what was passed where different. We could not approve as it is.

Tom: Can we approve as it is now?

Randall: If you approve it now, it would violate the ordinance. I would hope you would say yes, contingent on a lot of things changing or if you give a thumbs down, he can still take to City Council. If we had time to address the other multiple comments, number 9 was an easy one. There is still a disputed area. Other issues are access, ADU, driveways.

Carter: Have they defined if they are townhomes or twin homes?

Randall: It is nowhere on the plans. Last meeting Twin homes was said, which had never been said previously. You can't grant a variance.

Mike: The property is an easement. It was not purchased. Given as a use easement.

Randall: A private easement cannot override a city ordinance. It can go back to board of adjustments. But they will ask, is it Self-imposed? By law its probably self-imposed. The slope, they didn't create. Easy for the board to grant that variance 5 years ago.

Open public hearing

Jonathan Pyne: I agree it will go to City Council. There are a multitude of issues going on. The developer

had the opportunity to build their 8 units and they squandered that. There have been yes men throughout the whole time. It needs to stop. When this was R-3-M I lobbied and got a negative recommendation from City Council. None of the residents were looking at the agenda weekly to attend. Yes, they can build apartments. Obviously they aren't, or they would have.

Closed public hearing

Councilmember Isom motions for negative recommendation the Vicinity Plan; Carter seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 4. PUBLIC HEARING
General Plan Amendment
Low Density Residential
to Central Commercial
(Recommendation) | 3200 N Canyon Ranch Drive
Cedar Bluff Subdivision | Esplin Land Holdings/
Alliance Consulting Eng. |
| 5. PUBLIC HEARING
General Plan Amendment
Low Density Residential
to High Density Residential
(Recommendation) | 3200 N Canyon Ranch Drive
Cedar Bluff Subdivision | Esplin Land Holdings/
Alliance Consulting Eng. |
| 6. PUBLIC HEARING
Zone Change from
Annexed Transition to
Central Commercial
(Recommendation) | 3200 N Canyon Ranch Drive
Cedar Bluff Subdivision | Esplin Land Holdings/
Alliance Consulting Eng. |
| 7. PUBLIC HEARING
Zone Change from
Annexed Transition
to R-3-M
(Recommendation) | 3200 N Canyon Ranch Drive
Cedar Bluff Subdivision | Esplin Land Holdings/
Alliance Consulting Eng. |
| 8. PUBLIC HEARING
Development Agreement
(Recommendation) | 3200 N Canyon Ranch Drive
Cedar Bluff Subdivision | Esplin Land Holdings/
Alliance Consulting Eng. |

Jonathan: The developer is not here. They are still working to gather infrastructure information and traffic monitoring. We have asked them to gather information because it is such a big project. Sewer and water infrastructure, Traffic study. Recommendation to table until next meeting. They are amenable to doing a Development Agreement. It would be based on the density they have here on these plans.

Carter: For me, there has to be some low density. It is master planned for low density.

Councilmember Carter motions to table item numbers 4-8 until November 28th. Jennifer Davis

seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

9. PUBLIC HEARING

Annexation
(Recommendation)

3900 W 1225 N
41.70 Acres

Ashdown/ L.R. Nelson
Consulting Engineers, LLC

Clayton Nielson: I am tied to this family they reached out to annex the property into the city. We are finally able to bring it forward to get it annexed. To the east is city residential. To the south is in the city, that has been annexed.

Jonathan: Magnola Fields to the south.

Clayton: We went to county and got their approval.

Don: Zoned Low density, and there's some medium density. It has gone through all the checkboxes.

Carter: Do you know what the plan is, is it to follow the master plan?

Clayton: I believe so. I do have to say, there was a letter received. They were concerned we were going to block the flow. The property owners have no issues with that being part of the conditions to annex.

Jonathan: There is an irrigation ditch that needs to remain open. I did talk to the person who had the letter written. He was under the impression it was a different property. I did let him know through the city review process blocking the flow would not be allowed.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Councilmember Isom motions for a positive recommendation to approve the annexation at 3900 W 1225 N; Carter seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

I. CITY ITEMS

1. Disposal of City Property
(Recommendation)

2100 N. Bulldog Rd
approx. 30 acres at old WWTP

Paul Bittmenn

Paul Bittmenn: This is a new presentation. Old Wastewater Treatment Plant. There are two additional pieces of information I would like to present to you. There are mining rights on the property. The property is in three sections. Fence on the south end. There is a piece leased out to DeMille. The front piece Cedar City still owns, unencumbered. The request is to dispose of mining rights on back piece. There are two proposals that will come before the council. That leads us into putting the mining rights up for bid. I have discussed this with Commissioner Cozzens and Mr. Monroe. They would like to see if there is a possibility to get existing pit from Parsons, it is a 10 year lease. And then use the pit for water recharging. This will be in a presentation to City Council about RCS, they have large pocketbook. They do flood mitigation for cities, counties, and towns. Sometime after the flooding a few years ago at the Flying L subdivision, the county started working with RCS to lower Coal Creek and get it out of the flood plain. It is split into upper and lower. Upper down to I-15. Lots of work has been done in the past 10-15 years. It holds more water. Then there is lower Coal Creek which is I-15 to WWTP. Basically, their idea is they know the carrying capacity of lower Coal Creek, take the water and debris that is over the carrying capacity and dump it into the gravel pit. Holding capacity exceeds the amount of carrying capacity. This pit alone could last 75-100 years for this purpose. We don't get the floods every year at Coal Creek, but they do reoccur. It is my

recommendation of disposing mining rights on the piece of property. We know Staker, Sunroc, DeMille, and Parsons would be interested in them. If they are put out to bid, flood control recharge could be part of the bid.

Jennifer: We would lease the land, dispose of the mineral rights.

Isom:

Paul: Our friends with Sunroc have pits we could use for 100 years. DeMille approached City and said he is getting pretty deep and getting pretty wet. We would open it up to everyone, flood control and water retention is part of the deal.

Carter: I think there are two issues, one day us using it for recharge. Also storm water department store trucks and dump stuff there.

Paul: There is a building we use for storage. There is another one the Police Department fixed up. Two new connexes, also belong to Police, long term evidence storage.

Jennifer: Last time they weren't talking about leasing mineral rights, they were talking about disposing of the property. We can all use it. If we dispose of Mining rights, can we still retain the parts we are using?

Paul: The piece where the buildings are, is 6 acres, where it fronts bulldog, is 4 acres. We can split it.

Tom: Is that enough?

Paul: We won't know until we put it out for bid. If we want to get rid of real property, we go to the Planning Commission, then the City Council. Do you even want to entertain getting rid of mining rights? If counsel is interested in proposals, then we go from there.

Garth Green: We talked about doing injection wells. That one is really expensive. I support leasing the mining rights, but not getting rid of the property. The holes are valuable to us. You have seen the size of Staker Parsons pit. It is valuable and works for both the City and County. I hope personally that Sunroc or Staker Parsons take more gravel out of the pit. We use their pit; we are presently putting water into it. If we are using part, we decide, how is the best way to do it and weight in, and negotiating. I support the idea. The pits are valuable. Where we have Coal Creek run out to Rush and Quichapa. Selling the gravel is a good idea. Move water from the freeway to Lake on the Hill. We can use Coal Creek to do that. There are opportunities to do that. South of us, wastewater is mixed with sewer water. It is AG water; I don't know why we aren't mixing water with Coal Creek rights and making AG water. There is an opportunity for the City and County to both benefit. I don't think it will hurt the city to put it out there,

Carter: Both proposals pertain to Staker Parsons moving, how long is left on their lease?

Mayor: 9 ½ years left on lease. We just renewed. Maybe they will be done in 5 years. They are clearly a player.

Paul Cozzens: I am the liaison to the water board. I served 2012-2019. In 2016 I took the assignment to contact those with pit leases. I called Staker Parsons, Etc. I asked if we could recharge. They weren't interested. We found pipe, ran from Coal Creek to pit. Jeff Hunter helped. Dug trench. Where it dropped off the bank, it collapsed. We brought in 100 loads of basalt. It is working really good. There is a dam between the two pits. The challenge is, we knew we would need every place we could put water. We asked Staker Parsons if they could pull out of the pit and start mining in the other pit. The dam started leaking. Pull out of the city pit and put a spillway to fill equally. They were amiable to that. I didn't know Sunroc approached about the trade. The one thing I would like to bring up is the awesome partnership we have with Western Rock. They own the old Schmidt pit. We can't base the RFP on past, we have to move forward. They have been an awesome partner. The pit near airport road, I asked if we could put water in, they said no, then two weeks later came back and said yes. We recharged about 1.7 billion gallons of water. A lot of that is because of what Sunroc has let us do with the property. The RFPs should be rated to how the companies could help us. We had meeting with NRCS, talked about putting water in the pits. Water is 50% mud, not conducive to recharge. But we don't have any other options. We could have a very controlled gate

to take off in case of another flood someday. It percolates in about a month. Water District is in support.

Carter: In your opinion, is the parcel all or nothing, or can we both use part?

Paul: I think so. To recharge you have to have a big hole in the ground. It has taken 5 years to dig to what it is now. It will take them a long time, maybe 10 years.

Carer: Not an immediate evacuation.

Tom Jett: Is that enough space?

Paul: I am not an expert. It would depend on growth and how much they need. The value to the county and city, when you consider the cost of water, it outweighs some buildings and storage.

Carter: Would it be the biggest recharge pit?

Paul: Sunroc would still be bigger. They still have a lot to mine. You can run semi dirty water in, and clean overflows. Anything we can do to promote water recharge

Darrin Adams: I acknowledge the values of the recommendation. There are two connexes. We picked this location because we didn't have another option. We have locking connexes, then enclosed fence. We have two vehicles that need to be kept 50 years to life. On the south we have taken over the old administration building. The guys have done a great job with it on their own time and energy. We train there. I have before and after photos. It has been huge for training and moral. I realize it could take years. Space is an issue. Having space that is already ours is huge. We are on the south end.

Carter: How long until you anticipate until you need more connexes?

Adams: I think the two are sufficient. Hopefully not another one for a long time.

Randy Clove: I am with Cedar City Wastewater Collections. We utilize this property daily. We use the drying beds. In the building we have a water truck, back up vac truck. Parks and Rec use the building for storage. We have used them for 20 years. At this location, sewer is out of sight out of mind. We are running out of room at Public Works. This would be a perfect spot for a new shop. I have four guys in one small room. It would be close for emergency calls. We have looked at this property for a long time for a new shop. This location helps alleviate odor complaints. We would have to build another drying bed, and who knows how much that would cost. Then driving out there and all that charge. This is centrally located. We would love to build a shop down there in the future.

Carter: This is the drying beds you pull that out of the vac truck?

Randy: When it dried out, we hydro excavate. We mix and put in pond bed. It is really easy for us, take from drying beds and put right there. It would be very detrimental to us if we lost these grounds. I understand we have water issues; this is very valuable real estate to the water treatment plant.

Tom: If we took some revenue from the mining rights, to put in drying beds, but it is further awa.

Randy: It would also be time. We take care of the county too. I would have to hire another guy and another truck.

Carter: In your opinion, if there room for both?

Randy: You have cell towers and slopes. I don't think there is a lot of room for mining.

Hahn:

Carter: My thought is this is the first step in many. It isn't a done deal. There are a lot of possibilities. I say, let's put our thinking caps on and see if we can make it work for everyone.

Councilmember Carter motions for a recommendation to approve disposal of city property, the Mineral Rights Lease at 2100 N Bulldog Rd; Jett seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

2. PUBLIC HEARING

Ordinance Text Amendment Section 26-VI-2
Landscaping for
Water Conservation
(Recommendation)

Don Boudreau

Don: You voted on this back in May. The ordinance change is for water conservation and how much turf is put in commercial and residential. The State (Department of Natural Resources) sent down how they want it changed. It boils down to width of turf. This has to do with the rebate. The only other change is that public agencies can now participate in program. But not parks or golf courses.

Carter: Is this mandated?

Don: No

Carter: But if we don't then we can't participate?

Don: This is for new developments and new homes. If it is a new development the rule applies to you, if you're an old one, the carrot hangs for you to tear out your lawn.

Carter: We require how much landscaping?

Don: 10 feet. The minimum is 5 along the front, as long as you can see it from the street. You couldn't put turf in that area anymore, since May.

Carter: In R-3 zone there is a 6-foot side setback. You can never put grass in the setback.

Don: When you put a 6-foot wall and a building, then you would have a waterlogged wall.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Councilmember Isom motions for positive recommendation for the ordinance text amendment of Section 26-VI-2; Hahn seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

Comprehensive Update to City-wide
Water Master Plan
(Recommendation)

Jonathan Stathis/Hansen,
Allen & Luce

Jonathan: We have Steve Jones, and Ridley Briggs here. City contracted about a year ago. They have been working and now ready to bring forward to Planning Commission. It is a comprehensive update to the City Water Plan.

Steve: We used future planning. We used the governor's office growth projection.

Jonathan: This is why the general plan is so important. It is the base map we use to put in infrastructure. The master plan is based on the general plan.

Don: Did we use the inconsistencies?

Steve: For the most part we used the governor's, we placed using your land use plan. It may happen faster, slower, have variances, etc. We can't be right or wrong, because it is in the future. IRC is units. For irrigation, we use irrigable area. How much are people are irrigating. 13950 ERC 11190 irrigated acres that are using water.

Carter: Include parks and golf course?

Steve: No this is drinking water. We look at source, storage, transmission, distribution to get to homes. You have three springs, 8 wells, 8 or so storage tanks. Distribution System, how much each person gets. Indoor

and outdoor use. These are responsible numbers. Cedar City isn't wasting a lot of water. 3-acre feet. Key issues: Limited source. Capacity is about 2 years remaining. Job number one is to get more source. Projecting on how fast homes are being built, two years capacity of infrastructure. Capacity of water in the ground and also the pumps pumping. Limited source redundancy. If a well goes down, it makes it hard. No options for new source. We have high pressures in lower areas. Dangerous for city crew. It makes it harder when we are trying to bring water in. Also, when the city is building out this way the pressure is a concern. 3600 available ground water. We are limited by peak day. It ramps up in the summer. There is a volume concern and getting it into the ground. There is a concern with system wide source for the future. That is a lot of water. We have to figure out where it is coming from. You have enough storage to last for 10 years. We discussed a tank being built to slow PSI. A pump station may be a better option. In the future on storage, you have about 15 million gallons That's not the problem, it is the source. More water in to the system, job number one. The cost is depressing. But you live in a desert, and growth is coming. Expansion is expensive. When you convert outdoor water use, to indoor, the money is probably better spent using drinking. There is the northern storage tank. We aren't recommending that. Only benefits at 7psi. It makes more sense to take turns, schedule usage. Optimize turn schedule or automate it. The state is giving many years, but the reality is, the 20/80 cuts are the numbers that are actually available.,

Tom: The council helped acquire 2400 acres of water.

Steve: That is why they are doing that. They are looking to other places.

Jonathan: The city made two purchases basin 71 and a recent one in this valley 1000 acre feet.

Steve: That is a smart thing to do. Without action the main source will be gone in two years. Paper water that is not attached to real water is not the solution. Planning is our recommendation, keep promoting water conservation. If you allow for higher density, it increases the water requirement.

Tom: Is the recharge a good option?

Steve: Recharge is complex. Sometimes clay blocks. Poo plants are becoming more viable. Getting more financially feasible. Use this plan when you are thinking about developments. Update the plan as change takes place. Direct injection has to be drinking water or better. It is more expensive.

Hahn: Question about water use on density. We have had people tell us High Density doesn't necessarily mean less water.

Steve: You would have to have 20 story buildings before the indoor use is more than irrigation. Generally, even apartments have the same level of usage. If you look at the data, multi family is 20% less or 80% of a single family. In general it is less in higher density. The level of service isn't really different. The city will use up more water than higher density. I can't think of a city that is worse off on source.

Open Public Hearing

Ann Clark: The answer is we either all live in High Density apartments, or we slow the growth. Nowhere in the equation does it say slow the growth. What we are doing is irresponsible. We pass more and more developments. When Developers come, do they bring enough water to service the people they are bringing? What good does money do if there isn't water to buy. I know the Mayor is working hard to get water. The building is irresponsible.

L. Henderson: I second wholehearted. We can't afford more water. People still need to be able to make a living.

Tom: Our water is extremely cheap here.

Public Hearing Closed

Councilmember Isom motions for positive recommendation for the Comprehensive Update to the Water Master Plan; Jett seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

Ordinance Text Amendment Chapter 32
Subdivision Ordinance
(Recommendation)

Randall McUne

Randall: Biggest changes 1. Removing parts (Council, Planning Commission) at basic subdivision level. 4 cycle process, all documents up front, appeals, public improvement avoidance. We clarified a few things on lot line adjustments. Planning Commission would still be needed for General Plan amendments, zone changes, changes to engineering standards, ordinance changes. Sketch meeting people haven't been happy with. It depended on what they brought. A developer got a variance because we didn't catch it at sketch meeting, we don't want that. City will have 15 business days to submit all comments. Developers have as long as they want. If they take more than 20 days, we get additional time. We have one chance in each cycle. If we miss something that isn't life safety, then we can't go back and readdress it. We have to catch little changes as they come through. At the end of the cycle, we approve or deny. Then change to two step for final approval. The process with subdivisions and PUDs will be very similar now. No more detailed minor lot, just subdivisions. Any comments or corrections, we say here are the problems, and cite the ordinance. Anything we miss other than life safety, or federal and state rule goes forward. They will need to be frontloading. Fees may change to average out instead of keeping track of how much time has gone into it. Fees will be paid upfront because we have to be able to do in 15 business days. If they say they don't need something, but they do, that is a cycle. Staff will reject if the proper upload was not made. If you say it's there, and it's not, it is rejected. More formal than what we have now. Be prepared to be rejected. We hope the developers can key into this. If they can frontload, it will make their jobs easier. Some will like it and some will struggle. Appeals: I did not give the three-engineer board any more than I had to. It is very expensive. Only if staff doesn't respond or ask for more than 32 feet of pavement on residential pavement.

Jonathan: Our standard is 30

Randall: We don't have to change anything besides appeals. It is very expensive. We have to pay the engineers. Applicant pays 50 % plus appeal fee. Timeline is quick. Limited to when statute requires. All other appeals can be to city manager or designee. Another appeal would go to the 5th district court. We changed this part. The previous draft was too short, we put this in going after developers. If I create a flag lot, which part to improve, and which ones do I not have to? The goal is to get public improvements in. What we don't want happening is people putting future phases along public improvements. We wanted to have it so they have to put it in, and where. This is the one thing that is not mandatory. This is solving a problem we have been running into. Not mandated by the state. If you don't pass it, it won't go into ordinance. The council has the authority to approve all but a certain subsection. They can tweak. That can be your recommendation as well. We don't want Developers to design phases purely to wait to make improvements.

Tom: Sometimes a developer has to do this or is not feasible. 60 feet is plenty to build a building. On the 14 acres we developed, if that was the rule, we couldn't have done it.

Hahn: When will that improvement be put in?

Tom: In our situation the road will be put in never.

Randall: The surest way to enforce a needed change is to change ordinance. If it doesn't work financially, then they would not do it. The city should decide if the city should keep the rule. Some developers

creatively make the phases to not have to make improvements. Maybe the developers wouldn't have if that is what they had to do. If it doesn't make sense to put it in for 10 acres, then it won't make sense for 1 acre. It can get complicated like if it is not rectangular, We are trying to get the quickest path, but at least same width or greater. Avoiding gaps. This would require them to fill that in. We have to deal with fire and police, it makes it easier for the city to attend to that. We have PUDs that the last phase was supposed to be the amenities, and the amenities never went in. If their overall subdivision reaches 75% that is when all improvements have to be in. Basically, when it is big enough the city has to provide services. These are the biggest changes. There are others on how we measure things. We are happy to hear suggestions. We think in the end, we are preventing developers from kicking it down the road to never be put in, or the city pays. Don: It does get complicated. Presented drawings of examples of phases and where improvements would be required. Flag shape development gets more complicated. The idea is to not encourage avoiding putting in improvements. This ordinance would require expand full width of phase 1. If they aren't developing a phase, but we need that access, if over 80 units, then it would go in. We are hoping for no gaps. We know we will run into a situation where it isn't feasible to close the gap, so we have a stop gap built in. In the past we have seen minor lot, that are left that is not part of the development. Improvements don't happen. Previous timeframe is 5 years.

Open Public Hearing
Closed Public Hearing

Councilmember Isom motions for positive recommendation the ordinance text amendment of the Subdivision Ordinance in chapter 32; Gardner seconds; Tom Jett opposes.

- | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|
| 5. Engineering Standards | Sections 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 | Jonathan Stathis |
| Revision | | |
| (Recommendation) | | |

Jonathan: Revisions go along with ordinance change we just talked about. Mostly with the state mandated requirements. When the city receives drawings for review, we require a complete packet. All of the items need to be submitted to be considered a complete submittal. We will tie it to all projects, not just subdivisions. Hopefully will speed up the review time. File naming convention for files that are submitted. A few clarifications on construction drawings and as-builts Traffic continues to be a concern. Require a traffic study where the general plan is changed. If something is being proposed to change general plan, then it would trigger a traffic study. Maybe needed other times. Guidance when it would be relevant is if it generates 200 or more peak trips per hour. Modeling would be done by the city's approved consultants. Results submitted to the city. Adding language for storm drainage. Study required and modeling done by approved consultants. We are going this direction because of the compressed timeframes. The modeling needs to be done first. So the developer and engineers know what needs to go in. Sanitary sewer, same thing, study and modeling, results and recommendations provided. Culinary water, similar to other items, requires water systems study and modeling. Proposing to modify to comply with state rules that have changed recently. Ensuring there is minimum flow for fire flow. On the new subdivision preliminary and final land use application. Complete application will include all items. We are working on an internal checklist that will go with Subdivisions, PUDs or land use application. Checklist ww will use and will have standard to refer to. Then we have the proposed fees. You will not be acting on this tonight. The upfront fee

would need to be paid. This will go to City Council for approval.

Councilmember Ray motions for positive recommendation to approve Engineering Standards revision of sections 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5; Jett seconds; all in favor for unanimous vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Amber Ray

Amber Ray, Executive Assistant