Development Review Committee
1020 East Pioneer Road
Draper, UT 84020
July 20, 2022

To: Draper City Planning Commission Business Date: July 28, 2022

From: Development Review Committee

Prepared By:Jennifer Jastremsky, AICP, Planning Manager/Zoning Administrator
Planning Division
Community Development Department
801-576-6328, jennifer.jastremsky@draperutah.gov

## Re: Trailside Townhomes - Site Plan and Plat Amendment Request

Application No.: SPR-58-2022 and SUBD-111-2022
Applicant: John Wheatley, representing IKON Development
Project Location: 2142 East Brookings Dr.
Current Zoning: RR-22 (Rural Residential), RR-43 (Rural Residential), and RM (Multifamily) Zone
Acreage: $\quad$ 19.37 Acres (Approximately 843,757 $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ )
Request: $\quad$ Request for approval of a Site Plan and Plat Amendment in the RR-22 and RR-43 zones in order to develop the vacant property with 152 townhomes.

## BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY

This application is a request for approval of a Site Plan and Plat Amendment for approximately 19.37 acres located on corner of Brookings Dr. and Suncrest Dr., at 2142 East Brookings Dr. (Exhibit B \& C). The property is currently zoned RR-22, RR-43, and RM. The applicant is requesting that a Site Plan be approved to allow the property to be developed with 152 townhomes and a Plat Amendment to consolidate the six lots that encompass the property into one single lot.

The property was originally part of the Suncrest development area and was recorded as Lots 1301-1306 of the Maple Hollow Phases 10, 11, and 13 at Suncrest plat. The Suncrest Master Plan for these properties was for them to be developed with commercial uses. The Suncrest development is vested under the 1999 Draper City Municipal Code (1999 DCMC) and properties in this area still contain zoning designations from the 1999 DCMC, like The

RR-22, RR-43, and RM zones.

In 2015 the then property owner and Draper City entered into a Development Agreement that removed the property from the Suncrest Development Agreement Area and allowed the property to be developed with up to 160 townhomes. While the property was not rezoned to modern Draper City Municipal Code (DCMC) zoning designations, it is now vested to the current zoning code regulations.

## ANALYSIS

## General Plan and Zoning.

| Table 1 | General Plan and Zoning Designations | Exhibit |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Existing Land Use | Residential Medium Density | Exhibit D |
| Current Zoning | RM, RR-22, and RR-43 | Exhibit E |
| Proposed Use | Multi-family Dwellings |  |
| Adjacent Zoning |  |  |
| East | RR-22 |  |
| West | RM |  |
| South | RM, RR-22 | A5 (Agricultural) |

The Residential Medium Density designation is characterized as follows:

Residential Medium Density
LAND USE DESCRIPTION

| CHARACTERISTICS | - Preservation of large tracts of open space, rather than open space contained primarily in individual subdivision lots <br> - Variations and mixing of lot sizes, setbacks, and residential development forms <br> - Minimal fronting of homes on major streets <br> - Provision for trails that allow interconnectivity to other existing or proposed trails <br> - Discourage "piecemeal" infrastructure installation <br> - Trees and abundant landscaping, encouraging low water use and native plants |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LAND USE MIX | Primary <br> - Single-family detached homes | Secondary <br> - Parks <br> - Churches <br> - Schools <br> - Open Space |
| DENSITY | - Density range: 2-4 dwelling units per acre |  |
| COMPATIBLE ZONING | - Residential Agricultural (RA2) <br> - Single-family Residential (R3) <br> - Single-family Residential (R4) <br> - Master Planned Community (MPC) |  |
| OTHER CRITERIA | - Preservation of environmental features usually requires a master-planned or cluster development. Increased densities within these areas would be allowed only with compliance to specified performance standards and impact mitigation measures |  |

According to 1999 DCMC Section 9-4-020 the purpose of the RR-22 and RR-43 zones was to "promote and preserve, in appropriate areas, conditions favorable to large-lot family life, the keeping of limited numbers of animals and fowl. These districts are intended to be primarily residential in character and protected from encroachment by commercial and industrial uses."

According to 1999 DCMC Section 9-4-030 the purpose of the RM zone was to "provide areas for low-to-medium residential density' with the opportunity for varied housing styles and character, providing for a maximum density of up to twelve (12) units per acre for medium to high density residential unit projects subject to conditional-use permit procedures and conditions for this type of use and based on minimum development guidelines adopted by the City."

Site Plan Layout. The property will be developed with 32 townhome buildings equaling 152 dwelling units (Exhibit F). The site will be accessed from Brookings Dr. and Suncrest Dr. There will three ingress and egress points in total.

Table 2 Site Plan Design Requirements
Standard DCMC Requirements Proposal Notes

| Boundary Line <br> Setback- |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Front | Min 5-feet to Max 20- <br> feet | 10-feet |  |
| Front | Min 5-feet to Max 20- <br> feet | 17-feet |  |
| Rear | 10 -feet Min | 61 -feet |  |
| Rear | 10 -feet Min | 178 -feet |  |
| Driveway Depth | 20 -feet Min | 19 -feet | Changes <br> required |

Subdivision Layout. The plat will combine six lots into one (Exhibit J). The development will be a rental product and the single lot will allow the development to be under one ownership. The lot will be referred to as Lot 1307.

| Subdivision Design Requirements |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Standard | DCMC Requirements | Proposal | Notes |
| Lot/Parcel Size | 20,000 sq ft and 40,000 sq ft Min | 843,757.20 sq ft |  |
| Lot Width | 90-feet to 100-feet Min | 580-feet |  |
| Lot Depth | 4:1 (depth to width) Max | 1,730-feet |  |
| Street Frontage | 50-feet Min | 2,565-feet |  |
| Easements- |  |  |  |
| PUE Front | 7-feet Min | 10-feet |  |
| PUE Rear | 7-feet Min | None | Changes required |
| PUE Side | 7-feet Min | None | Changes required |
| Other | NA | Sewer, Storm drainage, |  |

Circulation. The applicant is proposing private roads (Exhibit J). Dwelling units will be a mix of alley loaded and front loaded structures depending on their location in relation to areas with large ground slopes. The center of the development will have a grid system with alley loaded units and a center walkway running between the front of the units. A western single road spur will serve front loaded units on either side of the street. Two eastern spurs will serve units on one side of the road. These units will be alley loaded.

| Table 4 | Subdivision Circulation Design Requirements |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Standard | DCMC Requirements | Proposal | Notes |
| Block Size | NA | 160-feet to 420-feet |  |


| Stub Street Connections | Required to connect to all stub streets | The property will have direct connection to the Brookings Dr. stub | There is not a requirement to continue the public roadway through the property. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of Cul-de-sacs | NA | 1 |  |
| Street Width | 26-feet Min | 26-feet to 28-feet |  |
| Street Ownership | Private |  |  |
| Sidewalks | Sidewalks required on both sides of the street | Sidewalks on one side of the street | Deviation requested |

The applicant has requested a deviation to having sidewalk on both sides of the street. Per DCMC Section 9-32-030(D)(4) the Planning Commission can approve a deviation to allow sidewalk on one side of the street based on making the following findings:

DCMC 9-32-030(D)(4)
4. Multiple-family projects shall install sidewalks on both sides of all private streets. Sidewalks shall be a width of no less than five feet ( $5^{\prime}$ ).
a. The planning commission may permit a deviation from the requirement for sidewalks on both sides of a private street by eliminating the sidewalk or a portion of the sidewalk on one side of the street upon finding all of the following:
(1) The second sidewalk or portion of the sidewalk does not provide pedestrian connectivity to any units or amenities;
(2) Ample pedestrian circulation has been provided;
(3) The purpose and intent of the development standards set forth in this chapter are met; and
(4) The second sidewalk or portion thereof is unnecessary and/or undesirable.

The applicant has submitted a request outlining how they believe they have complied with the deviation standards (Exhibit K). The applicant states that the development will have a mountain ambiance and use reduced hardscapes and narrower rights-of-way similar to what is seen in the nearby Suncrest development. The applicant also discussed the restriction on usable space for the development based on the grading and slopes on the property. Staff has reviewed the sidewalk design. There are two buildings that won't have a sidewalk running in front of them. They will have access to pedestrian trails at the ends of the roadway. All other units have ample pedestrian access.

Landscaping and Lot Coverage. The landscape plan includes substantial natural open space, about $2 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ of the property will be in natural open space (Exhibit G). The other $1 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ will be made up of amenity space and landscaped areas adjacent to buildings. Amenities provided include a clubhouse, pool, hot tub, tot lot, picnic areas, and view decks.

| Table 5 | Landscaping Design Requirements |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Standard | DCMC Requirements | Proposal | Notes |
| Lot Coverage | 40\% Max | $29.8 \%$ |  |
| Overall Landscaping <br> Coverage | $30 \%$ Min | $34 \%$ |  |
| Buffer Landscaping | NA | NA |  |
| Water Wise <br> Landscaping | NA | The majority of the <br> property is in native <br> grasses. |  |
| Street Trees | From approved tree <br> list | Not all listed trees <br> are from approved <br> list | Changes <br> required |
| Amenities | 5 required | 7 provided |  |

Parking. The applicant is providing two car garages for each unit, along with a two car driveway (Exhibit F). Guest parking is provided around the club house area and on the west side of the development.

| Table 6 | Parking Lot Design Requirements |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Standard | DCMC Requirements | Proposal | Notes |
| Parking Required |  |  |  |
| Dwelling Units | $304(2 \mathrm{sp} / 1$ unit $)$ | 304 |  |
| Guest Parking | $38(1 \mathrm{sp} / 4$ units $)$ | 39 |  |
| Guest Parking <br> Dimensions | 9-feet $\times 18$-feet | 9-feet $\times 18$-feet |  |

Architecture. The applicant is proposing 2-3 story townhomes (Exhibit H). The architectural style can be described as modern-mountain. There are 32 buildings total. Due to the grade changes on the property, each building will be slightly different, from two or three stories tall, alley loaded, or front loaded, and the building material percentages will be different for each building.

Table 7 Architectural Design Requirements

| Standard | DCMC Requirements | Proposal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Building Height | 35-feet Max | 35-feet | Each unit <br> complies with <br> the 35-foot <br> requirement. |
|  |  |  | The grade <br> change on the |
| property results |  |  |  |
| in the overall |  |  |  |


|  |  |  | buildings <br> stepping up or <br> down with the <br> grade. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Materials | Brick or Stone | Stone <br> Shake, Shingle, Lap <br> Siding, Metal |  |
| Secondary | NA |  |  |
| Percentage of <br> Materials | 50\% Primary Min | $11 \%$ to $33 \%$ | Deviation <br> Front |
| Rear | $50 \%$ Primary Min | $0 \%$ to $33 \%$ | Deviation <br> Requested |
| Side | $50 \%$ Primary Min | $13 \%$ to $25 \%$ | Deviation <br> Requested |
| Side | $50 \%$ Primary Min | $12 \%$ to $24 \%$ | Deviation <br> Requested |

The applicant is requesting a deviation to the building material percentages. DCMC Section $9-32-030(B)(3)$ requires at least $50 \%$ of each façade face to contain brick, stone, or synthetic stone. The Planning Commission can approve a deviation to this standard based on the below findings:

DCMC Section 9-32-030(B)(3)
3. Building materials for multiple-family structures shall consist of at least fifty percent (50\%) brick, stone, or synthetic stone on all sides of the structure.
c. The planning commission may also grant a deviation from this clause if a predominant building material exists in the project vicinity and the use of the material will uphold the existing character and style of the given neighborhood. The project developer may present the proposed building material (and color) to the planning commission to substantiate the quality and durability of the proposed dominant material.

The applicant has provided a deviation request letter in Exhibit K. The applicant has stated that high quality materials have been provided on the building, including stone and fiber cement siding. The buildings contain four-sided architecture where all four sides of the buildings contain the same amount of detail and similar materials. The applicant also states that the design continues the mountain-style design aesthetic of residential developments in and around Suncrest.

Lighting. The applicant is providing light for the development via street light poles, and a few smaller scale pedestrian lights at the club house (Exhibit I).

| Table 8 | Lighting Design Requirements |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Standard | DCMC Requirements | Proposal | Notes |
| Property Lines Foot <br> Candles | 0.2 Max | 2.8 | Changes <br> required |
| Light Pole Height | 20 -feet Max | 14-feet |  |
| Foot Candles <br> Maximum <br> Illumination | 8.0 | 4.9 |  |
| Maximum <br> Average <br> Illumination <br> Maximum <br> Illumination Ratio <br> (Max:Ave) | 4.0 | 2.0 |  |

## Criteria For Approval.

## Site Plan

The criteria for review and potential approval of a Site Plan request is found in Sections 9-5090(E) of the DCMC. This section depicts the standard of review for such requests as:
E. Standards For Approval: The following standards shall apply to the approval of a site plan:

1. The entire site shall be developed at one time unless a phased development plan is approved.
2. A site plan shall conform to applicable standards set forth in this title, including but not limited to, building heights, setbacks, access points, parking, landscaping, and building materials.
3. The proposed development plans meet the intent, goals, and objectives of the general plan and the purpose of the zone district in which the site is located.
4. The public facilities and services in the area are adequate to support the subject development, as required by engineering standards and specifications.
5. The proposed development plans comply with the engineering standards found in Titles 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, and 18 of this code, including traffic, storm water drainage, and utilities concerns.

## Subdivision Plat Amendment

The grounds for review and potential approval of a subdivision plat amendment request is found in Section 17-9-040 of the DCMC. This section depicts the standard of review for such requests as:

The Planning Commission may approve the vacation or amendment of a plat by signing an amended plat showing the vacation or amendment if the Land Use Authority finds that there is good cause for the vacation or amendment; and no public street, right-ofway, or easement has been vacated or amended.

## REVIEWS

Planning Division Review. The Draper City Planning Division has completed their review of the Site Plan and Plat Amendment submission. Comments from this division, if any, can be found in Exhibit A.

Engineering and Public Works Divisions Review. The Draper City Engineering and Public Works Divisions have completed their reviews of the Site Plan and Plat Amendment submission. Comments from these divisions, if any, can be found in Exhibit A.

Building Division Review. The Draper City Building Division has completed their review of the Site Plan and Plat Amendment submission. Comments from this division, if any, can be found in Exhibit A.

Geotechnical and Geologic Hazards Review. Taylor Geo-Engineering, LLC and Simon Associates LLC., in working with the Draper City Building and Engineering Divisions, have completed their reviews of the geotechnical and geologic hazards report submitted as a part of the Site Plan and Plat Amendment. Comments from Taylor Geo-Engineering, LLC and Simon Associates LLC, if any, can be found in Exhibit A.

Fire Division Review. The Draper City Fire Marshal has completed his review of the Site Plan and Plat Amendment submission. Comments from this division, if any, can be found in Exhibit A.

Parks \& Trails Committee Review. The Draper City Parks and Trails Committee has completed their review of the Site Plan and Plat Amendment submission. Comments from this division, if any, can be found in Exhibit A.

Noticing. Notice has been properly issued in the manner outlined in the City and State Codes.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff finds that the application complies with the DCMC and recommends that the Planning Commission review the request, receive public comment, and approve the application
based on the findings listed below and the criteria for approval, as listed within the staff report.

If the Planning Commission decides to approve the request, staff recommends they include the following conditions of approval:

1. That all requirements of the Draper City Engineering, Public Works, Building, Planning, and Fire Divisions are satisfied throughout the development of the site and the construction of all buildings on the site, including permitting.
2. That all requirements of the geotechnical report are satisfied throughout the development of the site and the construction of all buildings on the site.
a) Prior to obtaining a Land Disturbance Permit addressing the following: TG recommendation No. 2, in the December 13, 2021, TG Geotechnical Engineering Review No. 2 (TG, 2021), is implemented by the City: "Before commencement of mass grading, the City requires a project meeting to review grading and earthwork requirements."
b) Prior to obtaining a Building Permit: Summary of CMT Earthwork Recommendations and Summary of CMT Geotechnical Recommendations for Plan Review in the December 13, 2021, TG Geotechnical Engineering Review No. 2, (TG, 2021), are implemented during Plan Review by the City.
c) Prior to obtaining a Land Disturbance Permit address the following: On page 2 of the June 27, 2022, CMT document, CMT states:
"We also understand that a storm brick system will be constructed at the site to collect and convey stormwater. The storm brick system will discharge water to a couple locations at the fill slope face and water will not be allowed to drain into the ground below the system."

Based on a review of Sheet C3.0, Grading and Drainage Plan, and Sheet C7.3, Construction Details, Trailside Townhomes, prepared by Kimley Horn, dated June 6, 2022, it appears the proposed "stormbrick" system will allow water to drain into the ground below the stormwater system.

If the "stormbrick" system is used as part of the development storm drainage plan, before final permit approval by the City, TG recommends the City REQUIRE CMT to update their global stability analyses of the affected slopes to include seepage pressure derived from the drainage water infiltrating the slope.
d) Prior to obtaining a Building Permit address the following: Under review comment (2) in the July 11, 2022, TG review letter, TG stated:
"Should CMT rely on the Geopier/stone column specialty contractor for the design analysis of the Geopiers/stone columns, TG recommends the City request the specialty contractor provide the design analysis for review."

In response to the comment, the July 12, 2022, CMT response letter stated:
"We understand that a specialty contractor will provide settlement analysis for Geopiers/stone columns."

Before final building plan permit approval, TG recommends the City REQUIRE CMT to provide the settlement and bearing design analysis for the Geopiers/stone columns for review.
3. Prior to Land Disturbance Permit issuance, address the outstanding Planning Division redlines listed in Exhibit A of this report.
4. All hydrants and a form of acceptable temporary Fire Department Access to the site shall be installed and APPROVED by the Fire Department prior to the issuance of any Building Permits. If at any time during the building phase any of the hydrants or temporary Fire Department Access becomes noncompliant any and all permits could be revoked.
5. No combustible construction shall be allowed prior to hydrant installation and testing by water purveyor. All hydrants must be operational prior to any combustible elements being received or delivered on building site.
6. Fire sprinklers are required or an approved alternative shall be approved by the Fire Marshal prior to building permit issuance.
7. Address the outstanding Engineering Division redlines listed in Exhibit A prior to issuance of a Land Disturbance permit, unless designated otherwise.

The findings for approval as are follows:

1. The entire site is being developed at one time.
2. The site plan conforms to applicable standards set forth in Title 9, including but not limited to, building heights, setbacks, access points, parking, landscaping, and building materials, as amended by the approved deviations.
3. The proposed development plans meet the intent, goals, and objectives of the general plan and the purpose of the zone district in which the site is located.
4. The public facilities and services in the area are adequate to support the subject development, as required by engineering standards and specifications.
5. The proposed development plans comply with the engineering standards found in Titles $7,8,11,12,16$, and 18 of this code, including traffic, storm water drainage, and utilities concerns.
6. There is good cause for the vacation or amendment; and no public street, right-of-way, or easement has been vacated or amended.
7. The second sidewalk or portion of the sidewalk does not provide pedestrian connectivity to any units or amenities.
8. Ample pedestrian circulation has been provided.
9. The purpose and intent of the development standards set forth in DCMC Chapter 9-32 are met.
10. The second sidewalk or portion thereof is unnecessary and/or undesirable.
11. A predominant building material exists in the project vicinity and the use of the material will uphold the existing character and style of the given neighborhood.

The findings for denial as are follows:

1. The site plans do not conform to applicable standards set forth in Title 9, including but not limited to, building heights, setbacks, access points, parking, landscaping, and building materials.
2. The proposed development plans do not meet the intent, goals, and objectives of the general plan and the purpose of the zone district in which the site is located.
3. The public facilities and services in the area are not adequate to support the subject development, as required by engineering standards and specifications.
4. The proposed development plans do not comply with the engineering standards found in Titles $7,8,11,12,16$, and 18 of this code, including traffic, storm water drainage, and utilities concerns.
5. There is not good cause for the vacation or amendment.
6. The second sidewalk or portion of the sidewalk does provide pedestrian connectivity to any units or amenities.
7. Ample pedestrian circulation is not being provided.
8. The purpose and intent of the development standards set forth in DCMC Chapter 9-32 are not being met.
9. The second sidewalk or portion thereof is necessary and/or desirable.
10. A predominant building material does not exist in the project vicinity and the use of the material will not uphold the existing character and style of the given neighborhood.

## MODEL MOTIONS

## Deviation: Building Design Standards

Sample Motion for Approval - I move that we approve the Building Design Standards Deviation, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SPR-58-2022, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022.

Sample Motion for Modified Approval- I move that we approve the Building Design Standards Deviation, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SPR-58-2022, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022 and as modified by the findings and conditions below:

## 1. List any additional findings and conditions...

Sample Motion for Denial - I move that we deny the Building Design Standards Deviation, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SPR-58-2022, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022.

## Deviation: Sidewalks

Sample Motion for Approval - I move that we approve the Sidewalk Deviation, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SPR-58-2022, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022.

Sample Motion for Modified Approval- I move that we approve the Sidewalk Deviation, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SPR-58-2022, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022 and as modified by the findings and conditions below:

1. List any additional findings and conditions...

Sample Motion for Denial - I move that we deny the Sidewalk Deviation, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SPR-58-2022, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022.

## Site Plan

Sample Motion for Approval - I move that we approve the Site Plan, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SPR-582022, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022.

Sample Motion for Modified Approval- I move that we approve the Site Plan, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SPR-58-2022, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022 and as modified by the findings and conditions below:

1. List any additional findings and conditions...

Sample Motion for Denial - I move that we deny the Site Plan, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SPR-582022, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022.

## Plat Amendment

Sample Motion for Approval - I move that we approve the Plat Amendment, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SUBD-111-2022, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022.

Sample Motion for Modified Approval- I move that we approve the Plat Amendment, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SUBD-111-2022, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022 and as modified by the findings and conditions below:

1. List any additional findings and conditions...

Sample Motion for Denial - I move that we deny the Plat Amendment, as requested by John Wheatley, representing IKON Development for Trailside Townhomes, application SUBD-111-2022, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report dated July 20, 2022.

## DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We, the undersigned, as duly appointed members of the Draper City Development Review Committee, do acknowledge that the application which provides the subject for this staff report has been reviewed by the Committee and has been found to be appropriate for review by the Draper City Planning Commission and/or City Council.



Draper City Fire Department

Keith Collieratizewaim
Date: 2022.07.21 13:56:42-06'00'
Draper City Building Division



## EXHIBIT A DEPARTMENT REVIEWS

## REVIEWS ARE NOT MEANT TO BE AN ALL INCLUSIVE LIST OF POSSIBLE COMMENTS OR CONDITIONS.

## Planning Division Review.

1. Prior to Land Disturbance Permit issuance, amend the lighting plan to address all outstanding comments:
A. Per DCMC Section 9-20-080, the maximum reading at any property line cannot exceed 0.2. Please adjust for all property lines.
B. No light source can be located within 20 feet of a shared property line. Please show compliance.
2. Prior to Land Disturbance Permit issuance, amend the landscape plan to address all outstanding comments:
A. Update the tree plat list so that all trees located on a street are from the approved Draper Street Tree list.
3. Prior to Land Disturbance Permit issuance, amend civil plans to address all outstanding comments:
A. Show driveway dimensions for all buildings.
B. All driveway shall be at least 20 -feet deep, not including the sidewalk.
4. Prior to Land Disturbance Permit issuance, amend the architectural plans to address all outstanding comments:
A. Clarify the garage door styles to be used on the different buildings.
5. Prior to plat recordation, amend the mylar to include a 7 -foot rear and at least one 7-foot side public utility easement.

## Engineering and Public Works Divisions Review.

1. Update property lines shown on site plans to reflect the public right-of-way dedication on Suncrest Drive. Update the setbacks accordingly. There is one setback that would be reduced to eight feet.
2. Stormwater Maintenance Plan and Agreement are now required for every private storm drainage system, per DCMC 16-2-170. Submission of the maintenance plan is now required prior to site approval. The maintenance agreement is a condition of approval; it is required to be recorded and returned to the city prior to issuance of the Land Disturbance Permit for construction of the site.
3. Retaining walls are to comply with DCMC 9-27-085. Retaining walls are not reviewed or approved with the site plan / subdivision review and approval process. A separate building permit is required after site plan or subdivision approval is received.

Retaining walls shown on the grading plan do not comply with city code. Address prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
4. For sites over five (5) acres, certified SWPPP is required. Contact Lucas Fowler, 801-576-6331, to verify compliance.
5. Provide service letter from South Valley Sewer District (SVSD) DCMC 9-5090(D)(1)(d)(3)(E). Review letter received from SVSD. Final approval required prior to LDP.
6. Once site plan has been approved, a Land Disturbance Permit is required prior to construction activities onsite. Permit is obtained through the Engineering Division and is required prior to Building Permit issuance.
7. Any work in the public right-of-way will require an Encroachment Permit obtained through the Engineering Division.
8. Update public right-of-way dedication for the access from Suncrest Drive. Dedicate the full alignment of the public sidewalk.
9. Provide a Draper City Water Easement from the public right-of-way to the master meter vault location.
10. Update the existing SD easement to center, 20 -foot wide, easement on the proposed updated city SD alignment.
11. Update PUE to PU\&DE on plat and label where dimensioned.
12. Add slope protection easements per DCMC 18-3-120 where necessary. Verify no slope easements are required to protect infrastructure. Comment response indicated easement slopes may be added.
13. Update signatures blocks - remove Qwest. Qwest and Century Link are the same entity - which is also Lumen.
14. On page 26 of the geohazard/geotech report, in the fill placement and compaction section, it indicates that fills of more than 10 feet are not anticipated. However, on the site grading plan, in many areas, fill areas exceed 10 feet. Verify placement of fills greater than 10 feet are addressed. (Placing fill on the existing slope to steepen it to $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ is also required to be addressed. Typically, this will require benching, toeing in at the base of the fill, and other fill placement requirements.) Updated letter from CMT, dated June 27, 2022, received after third submittal and is under review. Any comments will be forwarded.
15. On page 28 of the geohazard/geotech report, in the slope stability section, it indicates that no groundwater is expected onsite, except water infiltration from landscape irrigation and snowmelt. Detention basin infiltration is in excess of this statement. Verify placement of detention basins do not impact slope stability. Updated letter from CMT, dated June 27, 2022, received after third submittal and is under review. Any comments will be forwarded.
16. In CMT's addendum it states, "The storm brick system will discharge water to a couple of locations at the fill slope face and water will not be allowed to drain into the ground below the system." Reviewing the Stormbrixx installation details on sheet C7.3, it requires a non-woven geotextile fabric under and around the system. However, it is my understanding that the non-woven geotextile fabric is not water tight and
accommodates infiltration. Add a liner that will contain the water to prevent infiltration of any water to comply with CMT's assumptions or provide me with documentation that the non-woven geotextile fabric prevents erosion.
17. Provide the HGL in the realignment of the city's SD pipeline - add to the profile. The city has had issues with velocity and energy in SD bends of 90 degrees especially where the slope is significant, as in this case.
18. Several retaining walls do not comply DCMC 9-27-085(F)(3) \& (4). Verify retaining wall concept and update grading plan accordingly.
19. In the drainage report, it indicates the site is 19 acres but only 12 acres are being analyzed (developed). Indicate the remaining area will continue to meet predevelopment discharges and is not being modified due to development. Add offsite areas to the calculation tables where the comparison between pre- and postdevelopment flows are shown. Comment not addressed in third submittal.
20. Several pipelines shown in the pipeline capacity calculation table show surcharging (full flow is exceeded by calculated flow). For example, CO-4 to StartNullStruct0 \& Pipe-194 to SDCB 12... Resolution of this comment was not verified with the third review. Disregard comment if capacity calculations have been updated.
21. Update SDCB calculations to show which inlets were analyzed as sags (should be shown as a double inlet such as SBCB 1) and which inlets were calculated along a street with the potential of bypass flow (SDCB 2). Spread shown indicated bypass flow is expected with SDCB 2. Resolution of this comment was not verified with the third review. Disregard comment if capacity calculations have been updated.
22. On sheet 33 of 57 of the drainage report, the table shows the unit hydrograph, but is labeled "Cumulative Precip." It appears that this column is multiplied by the precipitation depth at the top of the page. The next three columns appear to show a cumulative depth of flow, not a flow rate as labeled. There is only one peak intensity identified, but three different storms shown in the calculations. Verify labels and columns. Resolution of this comment was not verified with the third review. Disregard comment if capacity calculations have been updated.
23. The site drawings show detention basin IV, V, and II in series, but the drainage report indicates IV to VI are in series while II is isolated as its own system. Resolve this conflict. Comment not addressed in third submittal.
24. Grading plan modifies existing fill slope to steepen the slope to the maximum of 2H:1V permitted by code. See cut and fill requirements in DCMC 18-3-060. Keying in the fill, benching, and other mass grading requirements are required. Update note 9 on the grading plans to include the final version of the CMT addendum.
25. Detention basins discharge nearly at the top of the $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ fill slope. Design does not show any energy dissipation, channel design, armoring, or permanent slope protection BMPs. Channel construction to the bottom of the fill slope is required. The discharge point shall be an existing channel or at the bottom of the ravine. Hatching modified on plans, but no details or construction information provided in third submittal.
26. There is the potential to have significant runoff from the site, units, and use areas to cause erosion issues on the fill slopes. Provide permanent erosion control to prevent
erosion, such as swales, etc., along the top each slope. Respond to this comment via email or memo outlining the permanent BMPs used to protect the fill slope.
27. Provide the design, standard section, and armoring of cut-off swales, behind lot swales, cross-lot swales, and cut/fill slope protection swales. Include in the design any discharge point or collection point. Armoring not included in provided detail in third submittal.
28. Four-foot trail shown on Sheet C3.1 along the southern area, at the top of the extensive fill slope, has a retaining wall adjacent to the trail with no buffer area at the edge of the trail. On city projects, we have a two-foot buffer at a maximum of $3 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$. Two foot buffer not provided along trail, but grading modified in some areas to provide broader area before $2 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ slope in second submittal. This comment is a recommendation and therefore is subject to the decision of the applicant.
29. All roof drains shall discharge onto site and into private SD system. Response letter indicates roof drains will discharge on the surface and flow to collection areas. The rear of the perimeter units on the south and west discharge to an open area without any drainage collection systems. No additional information provided in third submittal.
30. All improvements within the public right-of-way are required to meet Draper City standards and details. Informational comment - no additional action required.
31. Update property line in showing the set back from the property line along Ikon Drive ( 16125 S ) and Suncrest Drive where approximately eight feet of public right-of-way is being dedicated for the public sidewalk.
32. Park strip maintenance is responsibility of fronting parcel per DCMC 7-3-030. Park strip on Brookings Drive is part of site and site maintenance. Resolution of this comment was not verified with the third review. Disregard comment if landscaping plans include park strip on Brookings Drive.
33. Existing stubs are be required to be abandoned at the corp stop. Add note to utility page(s). Note not included on third submittal.
34. Add fire flow requirement to utility plan per DCMC 9-5-090(D)(1)(d)(3)(C). This is the fire flow required for the proposed building based on the structure material type and occupancy. This is the fire flow required by the structure, not the fire flow for internal sprinklers. Sprinklers could reduce the required fire flow - see fire code. Flow rate not found on utility sheets.
35. Plans identify master meter diameter of eight-inches. Specify diameter of bypass meter and pipeline. Two inch bypass meter specified in third submittal.
36. Private street connection to Suncrest Drive (arterial) requires right and left turn lanes per DCMC 11-2-050. Updated TIS provides analysis of lanes to satisfy the code requirement. Comment under review with third submittal. No additional action required.
37. Dimension utility cuts per Draper City Standard Detail ST-19 and ST-21. Informational comment. No additional response required at this time.

## Geotechnical Review.

Based on our review of the July 12, 2022, CMT letter, TG recommends the City
consider the June 27, 2022, CMT addendum letter combined with the July 11, 2022, response letter complete from a geotechnical engineering perspective with the following Conditions.

1. TG recommendation No. 2, in the December 13, 2021, TG Geotechnical Engineering Review No. 2 (TG, 2021), is implemented by the City: "Before commencement of mass grading, the City requires a project meeting to review grading and earthwork requirements."
2. Summary of CMT Earthwork Recommendations and Summary of CMT Geotechnical Recommendations for Plan Review in the December 13, 2021, TG Geotechnical Engineering Review No. 2, (TG, 2021), are implemented during Plan Review by the City.
3. On page 2 of the June 27, 2022, CMT document, CMT states:
"We also understand that a storm brick system will be constructed at the site to collect and convey stormwater. The storm brick system will discharge water to a couple locations at the fill slope face and water will not be allowed to drain into the ground below the system."

Based on a review of Sheet C3.0, Grading and Drainage Plan, and Sheet C7.3, Construction Details, Trailside Townhomes, prepared by Kimley Horn, dated June 6, 2022, it appears the proposed "stormbrick" system will allow water to drain into the ground below the stormwater system.

If the "stormbrick" system is used as part of the development storm drainage plan, before final permit approval by the City, TG recommends the City REQUIRE CMT to update their global stability analyses of the affected slopes to include seepage pressure derived from the drainage water infiltrating the slope.
4. Under review comment (2) in the July 11, 2022, TG review letter, TG stated:
"Should CMT rely on the Geopier/stone column specialty contractor for the design analysis of the Geopiers/stone columns, TG recommends the City request the specialty contractor provide the design analysis for review."

In response to the comment, the July 12, 2022, CMT response letter stated:
"We understand that a specialty contractor will provide settlement analysis for Geopiers/stone columns."

Before final building plan permit approval, TG recommends the City REQUIRE CMT to
provide the settlement and bearing design analysis for the Geopiers/stone columns for review.

## Geologic Hazards Review.

1. Based substantially in and on the reliance of the technical documentation and assurances provided by CMT, including their findings and conclusions, it is SA's opinion the August 26, 2021, CMT report sufficiently characterizes geologic conditions at the 19.36-acre parcel to satisfactorily:
a) Fulfill the requirements of the Draper City Geologic Hazard Ordinance and;
b) Evaluate slope stability at the site in accordance with Appendix C of the Draper City Geologic Hazards Ordinance.
2. Based on the requirements of the Draper City Geologic Hazards Ordinance and the technical documentation provided by CMT, SA recommends Draper City consider the August 26, 2021, CMT Geologic Hazards Study and Geotechnical Engineering Report for Lots 1301 through 1306, Maple Hollow 10, 11, \& 13 at Suncrest complete from a geologic perspective.

## Fire Division Review.

1. Fire Department Access is required. An unobstructed minimum road width of twenty-six (26) feet exclusive of the shoulders and a minimum height of thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches shall be required. The road must be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of emergency apparatus. The surface shall be able to provide all weather driving capabilities. The road shall have an inside turning radius of twenty - eight (28) feet. There shall be a maximum grade of $10 \%$. Grades may be checked prior to building permits being issued. This project appears to meet this requirement, field verification will be required.

D103.6.1 Roads 20 to 26 feet in width. Fire lane signs as specified in Section D103.6 shall be posted on both sides of fire apparatus access roads that are 20 to 26 feet wide (6096to 7925 mm ).

- This section requires that parking be prohibited on both sides of narrower fire apparatus access roads. Twenty feet ( 6096 mm ) is the appropriate width needed for two average-size fire trucks to pass one another. If that width is reduced by parking even on one side, it will be potentially difficult for a fire department to undertake emergency operations in that area.

D103.6.2 Roads more than 26 feet in width. Fire lane signs as specified in Section D103.6 shall be posted on one side of fire apparatus access roads more than 26 feet wide ( 7925 mm ) and less than 32 feet wide ( 9754 mm ).

- Because this width is more than sufficient for maneuvering at least two fire department vehicles by one another, parking would be allowed on one side.

2. D103.6 Signs. Where required by the fire code official, fire apparatus access roads shall be marked with permanent NO PARKING—FIRE LANE signs complying with Figure D103.6. Signs shall have a minimum dimension of 12 inches ( 305 mm ) wide by 18 inches ( 457 mm ) high and have red letters on a white reflective background. Signs shall be, posted on one or both sides of the fire apparatus road as required by Section D103.6.1 or D103.6.2. NO PARKING FIRE LANE signs shall be placed every 250 feet. Please show on plans. This project appears to meet this requirement

3. Fire Hydrants are required. Hydrants are required to be spaced at 450 ft as the hose lays not as the crow flies for this project. Fire Flow of 2,000 GPM @ 20 p.s.i. residual pressure.
4. Hydrants and Site Access. All hydrants and a form of acceptable temporary Fire Department Access to the site shall be installed and APPROVED by the Fire Department prior to the issuance of any Building Permits. If at any time during the building phase any of the hydrants or temporary Fire Department Access becomes non-compliant any and all permits could be revoked.
5. No combustible construction shall be allowed prior to hydrant installation and testing by water purveyor. All hydrants must be operational prior to any combustible elements being received or delivered on building site.
6. IFC SECTION 3310 ACCESS FOR FIRE FIGHTING DURING CONSTRUCTION
3310.1.1 Required access. Approved vehicle access for firefighting shall be, provided to all construction or demolition sites. Vehicle access shall be provided to within 100 feet ( 30480 mm ) of temporary or permanent fire department connections. Either temporary or permanent roads, capable of supporting vehicle loading under all weather conditions, shall provide vehicle access. Vehicle access shall be, maintained until permanent fire apparatus access roads are available.

- Until permanent fire apparatus access roads are constructed, fire-fighting vehicle access is the means by which fire fighters gain access to the construction or demolition site and building for fire suppression and rescue operations. Such access is an integral component of the fire prevention program. The site superintendent or other person responsible for construction and demolition
operations is responsible for maintaining and policing fire-fighter access routes, as pro-vided in Section 3308. Fire apparatus must be able to get within 100 feet ( 30480 mm ) of any installed fire department connection supplying water to temporary or permanent fire protection systems. Access roads must support the weight of the heaviest vehicle that might respond. The weight requirements are avail-able from the local fire department. All-weather sur-faces are required because the responding fire department should not waste time moving snow or trying to get out of mud.

7. IFC CHAPTER 33 FIRE SAFETY DURING CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION. This section of fire will be enforced. Please make sure the project is maintaining all aspects of this chapter during construction.
8. Fire Sprinklers Required. A deferred submittal for a NFPA 13-D fire sprinkler shop drawings are to be sent via email to: Don Buckley at fire.permits@draperutah.gov. A complete set of plans, with manufacturer cut sheets, and hydraulic calculations. Plans must be stamped by a NICET level III or better in Auto Sprinkler Layout. ALL FIRE PROTECTION PLANS REQUIRE 3rd PARTY REVIEW PRIOR TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE DRAPER FIRE DEPARTMENT.
9. Per Chapter 10 of the IFC roll up garage door's do not count for egress or access for the fire department. The following buildings do not comply with this requirement. Buildings 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. Also buildings 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31.
10. Visible Addressing Required. New and existing buildings shall have approved address numbers plainly legible and visible from the street fronting the property. These numbers shall contrast with their background. All addresses for the above listed buildings will all need to be on the garage side as well as the front side.

## Parks and Recreation Division Review.

1. Note that a potential alignment of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail is planned along the south side of the planned development. Final alignments to be studied and coordinated with property owner at a future date. Accommodations for future trail connections from Development may be considered by Developer.

## GIS Division Review.

1. The street coordinate for Rush Road contains a typo. Please correct the coordinate to be: Rush Road (16180 S) Private Road. Please make this correction on any applicable document.
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