1	ELK RIDGE
2	PLANNING COMMISSION
3	SEPTEMBER 5, 2024
4	
5	TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING
6 7	A public hearing and the regular meeting of the Elk Ridge Planning Commission was held on Thursday September 5, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. at 80 E. Park Dr. Elk Ridge Utah.
8	ROLL CALL
9	Commissioners: Maureen Bushman, Ron Gailey, Ron Hill, Greg Shelton, Lisa Graham
10	Others: Royce Swensen, City Recorder, Laura Oliver, Deputy Recorder
11	Public: Dian Schultz, Larry lee, Robin Clark, Nate Brusik, Jared Peterson
12	7:00 pm OPENING ITEMS
12	Opening Remarks was given by Ron Hill
14	Pledge of Allegiance led by Ron Gailey
15	
16	GREG SHELTON MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA WITH CHANGE CORRECTION
17	OF THE DAY RON GAILEY SECONDED
18	
19	VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) APPROVED
20 21	PUBLIC HEARING
21	<u>I UDLIC IIEAKINU</u>
22	LIGHTHOUSE HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT
23	
24 25	MAUREEN BUSHMAN OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING
25 26	PUBLIC COMMENT
20	Dian Schultz stated she would like to wait and comment after some explanation of what the subdivision
28	amendment
29	End of Public Comment
30	
31	Matt Laurendeau of Jones and Demill brought up overlays for the Lighthouse Heights Subdivision. Jones and
32	DeMille was asked to look at differences in the original plan and the requested change to the grading, the
33 34	retaining pond, and swale. The city code allows up to 7 feet of cut. The developer received an exception for $13\frac{1}{2}$ - 14 feet on lots 7 through 11. The amendment is for a change in the grading on these lots. The contour lines are
34 35	farther and more evenly spaced making the area along the back of the lots steeper, reducing the steepness of the
36	front, driveway areas and building areas. The lots meet the slope requirements of 2 to 1. The city code cut
37	restrictions are for the roadway. Most of the change is for lot 11. It is the opinion of the engineers that the
38	change meets all the code requirements. They do recommend that when the homes are built, no more cuts are
39	allowed. Nate Brusik Developer clarified that the change was on lots 7-11 in order to create better building lots
40	reducing the steepness during the development stage instead of having to make changes to the grading during the
41	building of the individual lots. <u>Jared Peterson</u> stated when the Developer came to him with the changes on the
42	grading, because there was an exception made during the approval process the developer had to submit an
43 44	amendment to the city with the changes to the grading. He personally likes the changes. If there hadn't been an exception, they wouldn't even be discussing the changes. <u>Greg Shelton</u> asked about the swale. <u>Nate Brusik</u>
44 45	stated in between lots 11 and 12 the swale is to maintain the natural drainage from the hillside. <u>Matt Laurendeau</u>
46	stated in optimized in the state is to internate in this area to protect the swale in the future. <u>Nate Brusik</u> would
47	like to try and have the swale split between the property lines so most of it would be in the PUE where it's
48	prohibited to build. There is a gas pipeline that also runs through the lot and would rather not have further
49	restrictions on it with an easement but label the swale as a recommendation. Greg Shelton stated if the swale is
50	on the plans the plat needs show an easement, if the city can't guarantee that the drainage is going to be
51	protected then it should be removed from the plans. <u>Royce Swensen</u> stated grading is dealt with during the
52 53	building process. Typically, what happens though is homeowners want flat yards and they will change the grading. <u>Greg Shelton</u> asked what the repercussions are there to homeowners are changing the grade. <u>Royce</u>
53	grading. Oreg Shelton asked what the repercussions are there to nonicowners are changing the grade. <u>Royce</u>

<u>Swensen</u> stated it usually ends up with runoff flooding neighbors which is a civil matter. <u>Lisa Graham</u> stated the engineers recommended the swale be protected by an easement. <u>Jared Peterson</u> stated the building permit process involves the grading and protection of an easement. Discussion ensued on whether the swale should be removed from plans, keeping it as "recommended" or making it a protected easement. <u>Maureen Bushman</u> stated another item that needs attention is the pond and the recommendations from the engineer. <u>Matt</u> Laurendeau recommends a letter of certification verifying the volume of the retention pond.

<u>Diane Shultz</u> is concerned about runoff flooding neighboring lots.

 MAUREEN BUSHMAN MOTIONED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING GREG SHELTON SECONDED VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0)

## 1. LIGHTHOUSE HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT

<u>Lisa Graham</u> stated she would like to table the motion until the recommendations have been addressed. <u>Jared</u> <u>Peterson</u> stated any recommendations need to be put in the motion.

GREG SHELTON MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT THE ENGINEERS NEED TO DECIDE IF THE SWALE SHOULD STAY ON THE PLANS AND IF IT NEEDS AN EASEMENT AND HAVE THE POND CERTIFIED FOR VOLUME

Maureen Bushman recommends adding landowners cannot do any further cuts and fill

GREG SHELTON ADDED LANDOWNERS CANNOT DO ANY FURTHER CUTS AND FILL LISA GRAHAM SECONDED. Ron Gailey is not convinced that the easement requirement is needed.

VOTE AYE (4) NAY (1) APPROVED

## 2. <u>APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR August 1, 2024</u> Fix spelling in lines 40 through 59

VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) APPROVED

## RON GAILEY MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FOR JULY 16, 2024, WITH STATED CHANGE RON HILL SECONDED

VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) APPROVED

## RON HILL MOTIONED TO ADJOURN LISA GRAHAM SECONDED

VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) APPROVED

Planning Commission Coordinator