



Project Management Meeting Minutes
Harrisville City Office
Thursday, February 13, 2025 – 9:00 AM

Present: Jennie Knight, City Administrator, Justin Shinsel, Public Works Director, Matt Robertson, City Engineer, Brandon Green, City Planner, Jack Fogal, City Recorder, Cynthia Benson, Deputy City Recorder, Dan Johnson, Pineview, Ryan Barker, North View Fire, Tyler Seaman, Building Official, Michelle Tait, Mayor, Angie Francom, Planning Commission Chair, Nathan Averill, Planning Commission Vice-Chair.

Excused: Brady Hansen, Bona Vista Water, Kenny Hefflefinger, Bona Vista Water.

Visitors: Brad Lasater, Dave Murdock, George White, Rick Martinez, Glade McCombs, Lane Monson, Andy Hubbard.

Jennie Knight, the City Administrator, called the meeting to order, and introductions of the Project Management Committee were made.

1. Discussion on commercial site plan amendment located at 1096 Highway 89. –
George White, Richard Martinez

George White, the builder, began the discussion by stating the owner plans on building a 30 x 40 storage shop on the parcel with garage doors and power, no plumbing. It will be for storage of his specialty cars. The storage shop will not be related to the business. Ms. Knight said any change to a commercial property triggers an update to the site plan which includes bringing the property up to the current city code. City staff noticed Mr. White applied for a building permit. Ms. Knight informed him the building permit is the last part of the approval process. The first part of the process is to apply for a site plan amendment. The site plan requires an engineered site plan with location of new and existing buildings, the setbacks of those buildings, and access points to the property. The site plan approval would be through the Planning Commission. Before your application is presented to the commission, the committee prefer to have a review at this meeting to make certain everything is ready for approval. HCMC §11.22.110 will govern what to include in the site plan amendment application.

Ms. Knight reviewed HCMC §11.12.020 – Commercial and Manufacturing Land Use to verify the use was permitted in the current zone of the property. The code stated storage, not associated as the main use of the lot, is not permitted. However, it does state if the storage of these vehicles were part of the business, the conditional use would govern it. The current conditional use for auto car sales needs to be amended to include the new storage shed. This would need to go through Planning Commission approval as well. Potentially, the site plan amendment approval and the conditional use permit amendment could happen at the same meeting. The storage would need to be related to the business since under the current application it is not permitted.

Rick Martinez, property owner, asked if he were to transport his cars to the location, store them in the shop, and have Reyna's Auto sell them for him, would that work. Ms. Knight replied potentially, but before we get to that point an amended site plan approval process would need to be completed. She explained there is a plan review and a planning review for the building permit

process. During the planning review, the permit was flagged for a site plan amendment before the building permit could be granted. The committee explained what would need to be included in the amended site plan, such as drainage, grading, landscaping, and the probability for storm water retention.

Tyler Seaman, building inspector, stated if the building has any need for occupancy, such as the public reviewing the specialized cars, the building would be required to meet public use standards. This would include fire sprinklers and possibly restroom facilities. He asked them to make certain they have a plan in place of the intended use before proceeding since this would affect the requirements for the building permit.

Rick Martinez, property owner, said he would pull the cars out for them to be seen by the public. The main purpose of the building would be for storage of his classic cars, hot rods, etc.

Ms. Knight asked if there was any secondary water on the property. Dan Johnson, Pineview, said there are currently no secondary lines to the property. However, there are options to meet this requirement.

Mr. White asked if this storage shed would be allowed. He has already paid a great deal to get the building engineered. With a site plan engineering and other required items, it would cost him a great deal more. He wanted to know if this storage shed would even be permitted before moving forward. Ms. Knight said currently there is not enough information presented to complete an assessment and give an answer. After some discussion, it was agreed that the conditional use permit amendment presentation to the Planning Commission would give some clarity on whether the shed would be permitted. The application for the conditional use permit amendment would need to be submitted by Reyna's Auto. The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on March 12, 2025.

2. Discussion on preliminary commercial site plan for The Copperwoods at Harrisville development located at approximately 1956 North Highway 89. – Brad Laster, Dave Murdock

Dave Murdock and Brad Lasater, developers for the project, presented two (2) different site plans for the commercial element at Copperwoods development. They are working with the Thompsons to move forward on the commercial element in order to obtain the final 15% of residential occupancy. The preference is option two (2) with two (2) buildings. This site plan would create an aesthetically more appealing option for potential buyers by creating four (4) endcaps instead of two (2). Also, it fits the site well. While creating these options, they discovered there was a limitation to the number of parking spaces. They would like to add more parking spaces for the businesses and for the residents.

The committee reviewed HCMC §11.13.030 – Required Parking. The parking requirements are governed by what type of business is built. She gave examples of various types of businesses permitted in this zone and their parking requirements. The committee agreed more parking would be preferred and the Master Development Agreement (MDA) language needs to be reviewed during the application process to see if there was a limitation placed on parking.

Mr. Murdock mentioned they thought of adding another building due to the limited parking.

However, they would prefer to stay with only two buildings with the addition of parking stalls. The approved Copperwoods site plan was presented to clarify whether the commercial area is part of the whole subdivision. It was determined the commercial area is part of the whole subdivision as Lot 66. Mr. Murdock then asked what he needed to do to create individual lots for the commercial buildings. He needs the buildings separated for his lenders to secure funding. Brandon Green, City Planner, expressing concern with separating out the buildings. If the businesses were to separate the parking area from the common area, it could violate the original agreement in the MDA that designates the parking area as shared access.

Mr. Murdock clarified that, in the agreement with potential buyers, they would ensure parking remains in the common area. Essentially, the buyers would be partners with the residents in this regard. Mr. Robertson clarified the details on the commercial parking and appearance of the common area. The committee agreed that the common area should remain a shared space and decided they would need to amend the subdivision plat to split the lots.

Discussion moved to permitted uses for the commercial element referencing HCMC §11.11.030 (2) – Mixed-use Commercial (MU-C) Sub-zone. Ms. Knight reviewed the review process through the Planning Commission with a submittal deadline of February 25, 2025, to be placed on March 12, 2025, Planning Commission agenda. Mr. Murdock asked for the process after obtaining approvals since time is of the essence. Tyler Seaman, building official, said since the buildings will be shells, the review process will not take long. He would need to have all the documentation from the sewer district, culinary water, and secondary water. Since there have been no impact fees paid for the commercial element, these will be assessed at the building permit review. Mr. Murdock asked for an approximation of the permit fees. It had been his experience in other cities where the type of business causes a higher impact fee than a regular commercial business. Mr. Seaman said he would get back to him on this.

Mr. Murdock said he had discussed the options with the owners and found they preferred the second option with two buildings. The committee agreed they would like to see successful commercial businesses in this area and additional parking for the residents.

Mr. Seaman asked if there would be any drive-thru businesses at this location since the site creates limitations. Mr. Murdock asked if a drive-thru was allowed. Mr. Murdock clarified that there is currently no intention of placing a drive-thru in this area. Ms. Knight replied if this is something your team does consider the city code governs this type of business along with stacking, building location, and future purposes.

Mr. Murdock then asked if they had a green light to continue forward with obtaining the approvals and what all would be required. Ms. Knight said they do have the go ahead to send in the application for review. There will be a small fee associated with this application. The committee discussed what would need to be included in the site plan and subdivision amendments. This request would be two discussion items on the Planning Commissioner agenda: a subdivision amendment and a new site plan. Final approval would be through the Administrative Land Use Authority.

Discussion continued with the adjustments to the detention basin for more parking spaces closer to the commercial buildings. Mr. Murdock said he would include this in the new site plan. The committee also touched on the access point along 2150 North and where the best location would

be for this access point. They also discussed this access' potential for a right-in or right-out. Other concerns with access were how close the access is to the corner, stacking on the roadway, how this access will affect the nearby residents, and parking near this access.

Dan Johnson, Pineview, reviewed secondary water connections since they were already servicing Copperwoods. Mr. Johnson recommended making certain there were enough shares to include the subdividing and to submit the new site plan for review when it is ready. Businesses would need to have their own service line. Mr. Murdock asked if xeriscaping is allowed. The committee told him it was. However, he would still need to verify water shares since the assessment is completed the same. Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Murdock to send the site plan, once approved, to begin the secondary water review.

3. Continuing Projects

Lane Monson and Glade McCombs reviewed their projects with the committee including updates and questions. The discussion flowed between the projects. The projects and related comments are broken out under project name for clarity purposes. Andy Hubbard, their engineer, was also present.

Summit View Phase 3 Review

The discussion began with Mr. Hubbard distributing the latest site plan for Summit Views Phase 3. They reviewed a few of the changes which included Summit View Drive being stubbed with green space into the future commercial area, a small park was added against Berkley, concrete wall along south boundary, and the expansion of the existing city pond on Marshall Way. They also pointed out the placement of utilities for future development on the Butters property, review of the sewer connection, and the adjustments to the pond area configuration. They are hoping to have all adjustments ready for review at the beginning of next week.

Mr. Green asked if the retention basin would be the same length as the current basin which led to the committee discussing the basin's design. Mr. Robertson asked if they were aware of the commercial element needs. Mr. Hubbard said they were not. They would start with an easement and then expand as the commercial elements are developed. Mr. Robertson also mentioned verifying the elevation for the basin to alleviate any future concerns.

Mr. McCombs mentioned a few things they were thinking about regarding road widths and public rights-of-way. This led to a discussion on the street design for Summit View Drive and Berkley Drive. Clarification was given on what roads would be public and which would be private within this phase. Mr. Shinsel suggested they may want to designate which roads would be private and public with signage. Ms. Knight suggested putting something in their HOA monthly newsletter.

Mr. Shinsel recommended they look at any unit with a duel driveway. If discovered, try and eliminate them to alleviate future residential issues. Mr. Hubbard said there are still some configurations which need to be tweak before final is submitted. Further discussions touched on the amenities offered, possible additional parking stalls above lots 32, 33, & 34, and garage approach lengths. There was some discussion on the park strip transition, asphalt widths, and the buffering along the existing single-family homes.

Ms. Knight recommended they look at the amenities since the subdivision is quite dense and add this calculation on the site plan. She also reviewed the steps to receiving approval in this phase. The first step would be obtaining the subdivision review then the site plan. The subdivision application needs to be received by February 25, 2025.

Oak Hollow Review

Mr. McCombs said they are ready for the final on Oak Hollow. The committee reviewed the progress from engineering notes on the preliminary plat with Oak Hollow Subdivision. He stated there are some issues which need to be worked out such as the secondary water issues, pond capacity, and upsizing of the pump. Mr. Shinsel said the installation of the secondary water infrastructure can continue. However, the upsizing on the pump would be completed after the 2025 irrigation season. The committee also discussed secondary water, water shares, and will serve letters.

Final items discussed such as the city approval process, verification of pump data, lot addresses, and ditch user's notification of modifications. The Phase 1 Environmental Report was briefly reviewed to verify whether the wetlands at the bottom of a hill located at the northern end have been considered. Discussion on where the water was from with the result of placing a drain in the area to capture the surface water.

Ms. Knight said it might be possible to obtain final approval next month once the secondary water calculations are complete long with the water shares turned over to the city. The city will need to have the will-serve letters obtained as well and a clean engineer memo before final is granted.

Mr. McCombs said they will be subdividing the former Love property and not including this in the final plat to record for the subdivision. Discussion occurred throughout the committee on best practice. All decided to side with the county on how they would prefer to see the Love property governed.

Summit View Phase 2 Review

Mr. McCombs reviewed his understanding of the project's progress. The city is waiting for the property acquisition and preliminary plat approval. Ms. Knight informed Mr. McCombs that the project has been held up until the property acquisition is finalized. Mr. Robertson said he still needs to do a final review before the preliminary application can be submitted. The preliminary plat is tentatively scheduled for March 12, 2025, Planning Commission agenda. The builder is ready to move dirt on this phase.

Summit View Phase 1 Review

Mr. McCombs handed over the mylar for Summit Views Phase 1 with addresses. He would need to obtain the county surveyor signature before leaving with the city. He asked if they were ready to proceed with this phase. The committee replied that since the preconstruction meeting has been completed, they are free to begin moving dirt.

Meeting adjourned at 10:31 AM.