



Project Management Meeting Minutes

Harrisville City Office

Thursday, September 12, 2024 – 9:00 a.m.

Present: Jennie Knight, City Administrator, Michelle Tait, Mayor, Jack Fogal, City Recorder, Cynthia Benson, Deputy City Recorder, Justin Shinsel, Public Works Director, Brandon Green, City Planner, Ryan Barker, Northview Fire, Doug Jeppesen, Pineview, Tyler Seaman, Building Official, Nathan Averill, Planning Commission Chair.

Excused: Matt Fox, Bona Vista and Brady Hansen, Bona Vista

Visitors: Trek Loveridge, Phil Holland, Hunter Murray, Eleanor Jenson, Mary Beus, Steve LeFevre, Cade Palmer.

Jennie Knight, City Administrator, opened the meeting by introducing the Project Management Committee present.

1. Discussion on proposed mixed-use concept for Parcels #1170660102 and #170660009 located at approximately 2500 N and Highway 89 – Trek Loveridge, Phil Holland, Hunter Murray

Trek Loveridge, the applicant, explained he was with the Holland Group. Primarily they complete commercial and mixed-use developments throughout the Wasatch Front. They were looking in this area for possible development for some national commercial tenants. They reached out to the property owner of these parcels because they thought this a great corner piece with access to Highway 89 which is a great northern Utah arterial. They feel this is a great opportunity for mixed-use development with a variety of housing. Using their knowledge of mixed-use they are here today to present their idea and to receive feedback.

Ms. Knight asked for more details on the proposed mixed-use development site plan presented to the committee. Mr. Loveridge explained that everything on the left side of the proposal fronting Highway 89, including the existing buildings, will be commercial. This area includes a convenience store with flex retail/office spaces and a potential drive-through.

Matt Robertson asked if the existing buildings were going to stay. Mr. Loveridge replied we feel there are two commercial phases which are outlined in the proposal. The corner will be phase one (1). The existing buildings will be phase two (2) introducing more retail/flex spaces in the future. At this stage, they are uncertain of what will happen with the existing buildings. It is a larger building. They are uncertain if they should utilize the large building and give it a facelift or something else. This phase completion may occur over a decade. They are planning around it for now. They met with UDOT about access. The proposal was taken from those UDOT meetings. Skeen will keep ownership of phase 2 and parts of phase 1.

Ms. Knight began the discussion portion by diving into some of the immediate challenges the development creates. The first being the 51% commercial calculation. Discussion revealed they

are closer to 33% with this proposal without the full complement of the live here/work here residencies included. Ms. Knight continued by reviewing the Mixed-Use and In-Fill Development code, HCMC §11.11.030(2). The commercial uses in a mixed-use vary slightly from our regular commercial uses. Convenience stores are not allowed in mixed-use zones. However, there is some negotiation with a mixed-use development agreement. This may prove to be a challenge but is workable. The other issue to address during the development agreement is that of the existing buildings' future use. Construction, which is the current use for this building and is not allowed in the mixed-use code. The city would need to have a timeline in the development agreement for this area.

Justin Shinsel, Public Works Director, asked if the residential roads would be privatized and maintained under an HOA or turned over to the city. Mr. Loveridge answered this community would be self-maintained with multiple amenities and private streets.

Mr. Shinsel brought up the fire accesses will need to be addressed on these streets as well. Ryan Barker, Northview Fire, said the ends need to be 150 feet and the alley ways will need to be addressed as well. They might be all right with what is drawn. It will need to be looked at in future discussions.

Mr. Shinsel said in other developments similar to this one, Bona Vista required master meters for culinary water and will most likely do so with this development. Matt Robertson, City Engineer, confirmed they do not like to own the lines. They will want master meters.

Doug Jeppesen, Pineview, said they will require master meters for secondary water. He also mentioned only one (1) acre is within the district. They will need to annex this area into the district. For clarification, the parcels are within the districts zone. In order for the development to be serviced with secondary water, they would have to annex into the district. Mr. Loveridge asked which water shares were acceptable for Pineview. Mr. Jeppesen answered the water shares would need to be North Ogden Irrigation. If they call Pineview, the assessment clerk could help him calculate the number for water shares needed. Mr. Loveridge will look at what shares he has available. He may have what they need already but will verify with North Ogden Irrigation.

Ms. Knight looked at the density calculation next. Fifteen (15) units per acre is a high density. Mr. Loveridge said he realizes high density means something different within each community. Ms. Knight continued by saying the highest density we have in the city is currently eight (8) units per acre. Mr. Loveridge interjected he was told this development was already approved for 10-12 units per acre. Ms. Knight clarified that there has been no development proposal accepted or approved on these parcels. There have been discussions on proposed commercial developments but no mixed-use agreement for this area. Mr. Loveridge asked if there is any mixed-use within the city. Ms. Knight replied yes but the highest density approved is eight (8) units per acre.

Mr. Loveridge asked what commercial developments are being brought into the area from these mixed-use developments. Ms. Knight said it is by percentage only and has not been fully developed yet. The commercial spaces are not filled. Something to consider is the city is trying to accommodate state housing requests for affordability, deed restrictions, along with more single-family homes. The council's attention is grabbed when there are detached single-family homes more so than townhomes.

Commissioner Averill voiced his concerns with the long units. There are seven (7) in these units and the code allows for six (6). Ms. Knight said they did approve of a couple with the MDA amendment for Dixon Creek. She then asked if the units were two-stories. Mr. Loveridge replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Knight reviewed the process for mixed use applications. Once the application is received the city holds a public hearing to receive residential input on the project. Then the mayor will assign a city council member and planning commissioner to sit on a committee. After that, the city opens negotiations to make certain all the elements which are necessary are included in the development agreement before it is presented for approvals. This will be a zoning change as well. The mixed-use development agreement becomes the zoning requirements for the parcels. This process helps to ensure the development will proceed through the approval process without denial. This is why she is bringing up the density and other items now to keep the project moving forward.

Ms. Knight asked the committee if there were any utilities to work through. Discussion occurred on the storm drain connection attaching to either Highway 89 or 2550 North which would mean the developer would need approval from either UDOT or Pleasant View. As for sewer, there are several connections in the area along with a Central Weber connection along 2550 North.

Mr. Robertson paused the discussion to bring attention to the whole area and other development proposals received by the city. He expressed his concern on a possible hardship for the development to the south of this proposal. The developer there wished to use the fire access road for a second access. He wishes to make certain the development in this area is good for all. It was decided reaching out to the developer to the south to see if he was still interested in developing and what his plans hold.

Ms. Knight reviewed the items the developer would need to work through before returning to the project management meeting. These items included what type of development they wished to have, getting up to the 51% commercial requirement, the density, inclusion of an affordable housing element, along with screening requirements found in HCMC §11.24.080 between the residential and commercial area.

Mr. Robertson added the right-of-way on 750 West needs to be looked at for improvements such as curb, gutter, and sidewalk since this road will be widened to meet the requirement of it being designated a collector in the future. Mr. Shinsel chimed in that he would like to see the curb and gutter for now.

Ms. Knight added a thank you for the driveways. This helps with parking. The townhomes are front loading and two-story units. She requested more detail on the varying colors in the units. Mr. Loveridge said the company has about ten (10) different townhome types as shown in the coloring difference on the concept. He stressed this is conceptual. For this development they are trying to incorporate three (3) different types. The live/work units could be 3-story, with the bottom being a garage and a portion of the square footage being commercial. It is important to them to have two (2) car garages with two (2) more spaces to park. This is something they have learned from other developments. The inner units will be safe-friendly to seniors but not necessarily only for them. The others out on 2550 North are more dense. The orange units might be with a master on the main floor. The others are for multiple people, not just a one (1) or two (2) bedroom unit. When somebody comes into this community they can have multiple options. They try to avoid the option

a, b, or c, choice sea of townhomes. They like to have variety in appearance and options. They have not designated exactly what kind of units they will build yet.

Ms. Knight explained the city has seen successful negotiations for mixed-use developments which consider buffering along residential areas. The public feedback is more amenable to single-family residential next to existing residential units.

Mr. Robertson brought up the additional visitor parking for the live here/work here. Mr. Shinsel asked about possible visitor parking on 2550 north. Ms. Knight told the developer to make certain in their discussions with Pleasant View, to review on-street parking options on 2550 North along with their infrastructure requirements such as curb, gutter, and sidewalk. She then reviewed the various amenities included in the concept which were grassy areas, pickleball courts, a playground, and pavilions.

Mr. Loveridge asked how to overcome the density. He feels eight (8) units per acre is not how a mixed-use should flow based on their experience. This requirement may kill the project before it gets started. If they include the whole development, it could be more like ten (10) units per acre. Ms. Knight replied that some of the items the committee is willing to negotiate are affordability options, deed restrictions such as owner occupied, or giving something back to the community like a park. However, ten (10) units might be more negotiable than fifteen (15). She reviewed some of the options other mixed-use developments have succeeded in negotiating within their approval process.

Tyler Seaman, Building Official, interjected the egress in the commercial building area needs to be reviewed since this plan limits those buildings to one exit. Also, fire suppression will need to be taken into account with this concept.

Ms. Knight reviewed the next steps on how to proceed. She asked if they would be willing to have an open discussion with the neighboring developer. Mr. Loveridge said they would be willing. Once the concept is nailed down and a viable option for you, apply for a rezone which will trigger a public hearing. Then the development agreement will be negotiated. It was clarified utilities and access on 2550 North are through Pleasant View.

2. Discussion on proposed site plan amendment for Furever Friends located at approximately 1761 North 750 West – Eleanor Jenson, Mary Beus, Steve LeFevre

Steve LeFevre reviewed the revisions of the site plan updates since the last meeting. They added an addition (animal adoption and care center) to the main building. The water already is existing on property. They updated the interface for the sewer with the addition. The light blue is water. The green is the proposed sewer line. The sewer line will be pressurized. Since there is an elevation difference on the property, a grinder will be installed to keep flow. The water and sewer would remain private lines.

Mr. Robertson asked if there would be a manhole requirement. Mr. Shinsel explained he typically likes to see a plastic 4" line run across the street which would gravity into the property. From there it would connect down into a normal 1 ¼" or 2" line connection. The problem they run into with pressurized line stubs is the developers stub too far into the main restricting the camera process. Because of this we recommend a lateral connection into the line size for the development.

Mr. LeFevre said they have placed the grinder at the corner of the addition for access purposes. Mr. Seaman asked where gravity will begin on the property. The committee explained how the line will look and where gravity should begin. Mr. Seaman said it should work with clean-outs but as more detail comes, then they will take a closer look to ensure proper flow.

Mr. LeFevre asked if he needed a sewer permit. Mr. Shinsel replied he would need a road cut permit but that will not be issued until after the building permit is submitted and approved.

Ms. Knight stated since this is a new site plan then it will need to go through Planning Commission again for approval. Once this approval is obtained, then it will go through the building permit and encroachment permit process which Mr. Shinsel and Mr. Seaman will coordinate. The prior approved site plan expired which calls for this new site plan to go through the Planning Commission under the regulations of HCMC §11.22.030 Site Plan Approval. This is the pre-application meeting we are having now. The staff will review the plan to see if it meets all the requirements and recommended they do the same before submitting application. She expressed her concerns for the access road appearance and if there would be any fire concerns.

Brandon Green, City Planner, interjected he had the same concern and would like to know what parking was going to be like for the new addition. Mr. LeFevre said there is a new concrete pad poured near the building for parking with concrete pathways. Mr. Green asked if the sidewalks were part of the old nursery structures. Mr. LeFevre answered yes. Mr. Barker added since this has always been a dirt road, there are no changes at this time. The committee reviewed the access requirements to make certain that they are met.

Mr. Shinsel asked if there are other uses for the property with the other greenhouses. Mary Beus, owner, replied there is a commercial grower in the front two (2) greenhouses. The grower is seasonal and does not sale the product on the property. They take it to another location to sale. The remaining greenhouses are not in use. Mr. Green asked for clarification on whether or not the other greenhouses are being utilized for housing of the animals since it was his understanding they were. Ms. Beus said no. They keep all the animals in the building to the north where they are planning to place the addition. He expressed his concerns for the leasing of the greenhouses. If this goes further then what is already being done, the leasing of the greenhouses could cause future zoning issues.

Ms. Knight asked for clarification on the use of the property. She reviewed the building uses starting with the main building housing the animals and the business Furever Friends. The two front buildings are leased to a commercial grower and all other buildings are abandoned. She made the owners aware if the grower expanded then the site plan would need to be brought back to the committee for an amendment. Ms. Knight expressed the committee's concern with future leasing or renting of the other greenhouses, they would need to come back into project management so this new use could be addressed. At that time the impact on access, traffic, and parking on the property will be reviewed.

Ms. Knight reviewed the site plan requirements for application submittal. She pointed out HCMC §11.22.030 Site Plan Approval and encouraged the applicants to make certain there are not outstanding items before submitting. She stated preliminary and final site plan approvals can be

granted at the same time if there is a clean engineer's memo. Application would need to be submitted by September 25, 2024 for the October 9, 2024 Planning Commission.

The committee reviewed the next steps. First, they need to submit an application to obtain site plan approval. They can submit the building permit while waiting for site plan approval. However, they cannot start the project until site plan approval is obtained and building permit is approved and paid for. Once all of this is complete then they can apply for the encroachment to install the sewer line.

3. Discussion for a site plan amendment within the Harrisville Retail Subdivision for a temporary business located at approximately 455 North Washington Blvd – Caden Palmer

Cade Palmer, applicant, described his seasonal business operating out of a trailer in the Walmart parking near the Subway. He would need to access utilities on 325 E. If this did not work, they would go to the north in front of Entertainmart. He had a contractor come look for which utilities he could hook up too. The contractor wanted to know if he could attach a hydrant meter. Mr. Shinsel stated he was unclear of what the answer would be because accessing the utilities, sewer, water, etc, will impact the party responsible for paying for those services. This will be discussed with the property matter. Also, he would need to receive permission from Bona Vista for placement of a hydrant meter. The other matter to look at is if you do install a hydrant meter, will it restrict flow for any emergency services. Mr. Palmer said his contractor told him it would not restrict. Mr. Barker replied, it depends on the meter installed.

Mr. Shinsel asked if the requested sewer connection is due to a restroom attachment to the trailer. Mr. Palmer said there is no restroom. The health department sees them as a brick and mortar because they are connected to utilities the whole time they are onsite. This is how we would like it to be since they set up tables and tents.

Mr. Shinsel said with the utilities the city has old conceptual plans for what was placed on the property. This whole area is completely privatized. The committee reviewed possibility for connections into area utilities based off the old plans and current projects in this area. Mr. Seaman said the utilities for the building along Washington run to Washington. The building closer to 700 North run to 700 North. They also reviewed connections, such as oil grease separators as connection points in the nearby businesses. Mr. Seaman asked what kind of trailer will be connected. Mr. Palmer said the only dumping will be grey water with no cooking. The business is custard ice cream. They obtain a restroom agreement with a nearby business for their employees.

Ms. Knight said with one utility connection this will not trigger a site plan amendment. Mr. Palmer would need to obtain Bona Vista approval, property management approval, health department approval, and locate the closest utility connections to utilize water, sewer, and power. After those are obtained, come back to Project Management for the committee to see what impact the business and connections will have on the surrounding area. Mr. Palmer said his contractor would like to have a copy of the as-buils. Staff will look through the files to see if any drawings can be located for this area. Otherwise, Mr. Palmer will return to the October 10, 2024 meeting with his findings.

4. Discussion on amended petition to amend Clustered Development Ordinance – Jennie Knight

Ms, Knight reviewed a petition to amend the cluster development ordinance received by the city in July of this year. During that discussion the committee decided not to move the petition forward to the Planning Commission. They felt the city was better served by developing an affordable housing ordinance or to repeal and replace the cluster ordinance with applicability to the city's open spaces. The committee felt the petition was not conducive to the ten (10) acres or more requirement since the city does not have many parcels remaining which would meet this. The applicant at first wanted to move it forward. However, he decided to amend the petition to go along with the city's recommendation which is repealing and replacing the cluster ordinance. The petition will not move forward at this time. Ms. Knight would like to wait and see what new legislation mandates will come out of the 2025 Legislative Session so the city will not need to redo anything regarding this matter. The committee agreed this is a good course of action. The petition will be looked at again in March of 2025.

Adjourn: 10:26 am

DRAFT