FEBRUARY 27, 2020
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING 6:00 P.M.

City Council Chambers
217 East Center Street
Moab, Utah 84532

1. 6:00 P.M.  Call To Order

2. Citizens To Be Heard

3. Approval Of Minutes

3.1. Minutes: January 23, 2020

   Documents:

   PC-MIN-2020-01-23 FINAL DRAFT.PDF

4. Action Item

4.1. Discussion And Potential Action - Planning Resolution #02-2020 - Kane Creek
     Condominiums Located At 443 Kane Creek Boulevard, Moab UT

   Documents:

   PC KANE CREEK CONDOMINIUM SITE PLAN AGENDA SUMMARY
   022720.PDF
   EXHIBIT A PLANNING RESOLUTION 02-2020 KANE CREEK
   CONDOMINIUM.PDF
   EXHIBIT B KANE CREEK CONDO APPLICATION.PDF
   EXHIBIT C KANE CREEK CONDO PROJECT NARRATIVE.PDF
   EXHIBIT D KANE CREEK CONDO PLAT.PDF
   EXHIBIT E KANE CREEK CONDO SITE PLAN.PDF

5. Discussion Item

5.1. Discussion Of Energy Requirements For Overnight Accommodations

6. Future Agenda Items

7. Adjournment
The Moab Planning Commission held a workshop and a regular meeting on the above date in the Council Chambers at the Moab City Center, located at 217 East Center Street. An audio recording of the evening meeting is archived at: https://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html and a video recording is archived at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x_6ooLznWAE.

Planning Commission Chair Pro Tem Kya Marienfeld called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Commission members Kya Marienfeld, Marianne Becnel, Brian Ballard, Luke Wojciechowski and Jessica O’Leary were present. Commission member Becky Wells was absent. Staff in attendance were City Planning Director Nora Shepard, Assistant Planner Cory Shurtleff and Deputy Recorder Joey Allred. Four members of the public and media were present.

**Election of Chair and Vice Chair:**
**Discussion:** There was no discussion.
**Motion and vote:** Commission member Ballard moved to approve Kya Marienfeld as Planning Commission Chair for 2020. Commission member O’Leary seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with commission members Becnel, Ballard, Wojciechowski, Marienfeld and O’Leary voting aye.
Commission member Ballard moved to approve Marianne Becnel as Planning Commission Vice-Chair. Commission member O’Leary seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with Commission members Becnel, Ballard, Wojciechowski, Marienfeld and O’Leary voting aye.

**February Planning Commission Meeting Dates:**

City Planning Director Shepard explained that she had wanted to adjust the meeting dates for February, but that due to various conflicts, the meeting dates would remain on February 13th and 27th of 2020.

Shepard announced that there would be a Utah Chapter of the American Planning Association Conference at the Hoodoo in Moab on February 26-28, 2019 if any of them would like to attend. She explained what such an event entailed.

The Commission made introductions around the table.

**Approval Of the June 27, 2019, July 3, 2019, August 22, 2019, September 12, 2019, September 26, 2019, October 10, 2019, November 7, 2019, November 21, 2019 and December 12, 2019 meeting minutes:**
**Discussion:** There was no discussion.
**Motion and vote:** Commission member Becnel moved to approve the minutes from June 27, 2019, July 3, 2019, August 22, 2019, September 12, 2019, September 26, 2019, October 10, 2019, November 21, 2019 and December 12, 2019. Commission member Ballard seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with Commission members Becnel, Ballard, Wojciechowski, Marienfeld and O’Leary voting aye.

Commission member Ballard moved to approve the minutes from November 7, 2019. Commission member O’Leary seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with Commission members Becnel, Ballard, Wojciechowski, Marienfeld and O’Leary voting aye.

**Citizens To Be Heard:**
There were no citizens to be heard.
Public Hearing:
Shepard explained to the Commission and the public that as the last meeting had been cancelled due to the lack of a quorum, the public hearing would need to be re-noticed and a new public hearing scheduled. However, the Commission would still hear from the members of the public that were present.

Public Hearing And Possible Recommendation To The City Council-An Ordinance Amending The City Of Moab Municipal Code Section 17.69.050(E) To Modify The Minimum Square Footage For Construction of Workforce Housing Units From 1,000 Square Feet To A Minimum Of 400 Square Feet:

Discussion: Shepard said, “I’m gonna ask you to open the public hearing, listen to the presentation and take public input and then I’m gonna ask you to continue the public hearing because by the time we cancelled the last meeting due to lack of a quorum, it was too late to notice this meeting, because of when she would have needed to get the notices to the newspaper. So, it has been officially re-noticed for the next meeting. She said, “So, we will, we’ll ask you to continue the public hearing and then take action at that time. And I apologized to the applicant for that. It’s just one of those timing issues that we run into.”

Shepard then gave a brief history of the Assured Workforce Housing Ordinance that required not less than 1,000 square feet per unit and the fee in lieu option. The Henry Shaw Hotel wants to build smaller Assured Workforce Housing units on site. Commission Chair Marienfeld asked where Council was on this issue because the increase was made at that level and Shepard told her that the subject was brought up at a Council meeting and they would be willing to entertain it.

Commission Chair Marienfeld opened the unofficial public hearing at 6:17 PM. On the Ordinance Amending The City Of Moab Municipal Code Section 17.69.050(E) To Modify The Minimum Square Footage For Construction of Workforce Housing Units From 1,000 Square Feet To A Minimum Of 400 Square Feet.

It was noted that one letter had been sent in on this issue.

Elizabeth Boone- Provided a presentation and said, “I’m Elizabeth Boone the architect of the Reynolds Ash and Associates and I’m the architect that’s working on the Henry Shaw Hotel and we’ve been working on the Henry Shaw Hotel since 2015. So, this has been a project in our office for a while and during this process we encountered the Workforce Housing Ordinance which passed, and we’ve been working to adopt it in a way that still pencils for the project. So, my critique of the 1,000 square foot units and the reason why it hasn’t been executed to date, and everyone’s paying the fee in lieu of, is because it doesn’t pencil. So, the cost of building these units, it’s cheaper for the developers to just pay the fee in lieu and move on than to actually provide you guys with the units. And so, one critique is that, you know, now all the units are concentrated into one location that the City controls versus sort of a variety of units throughout town on the same site as say, people that are working and could be living there to their benefit. So with that being said, I also wanted to share with you some typical apartment size samples from some projects that we’ve been involved with over the last few years and I would also like to note that there has been a downward trend in apartment sizes in the last ten years and we’re seeing a decrease of up to 12% in some cities and so people are accommodating smaller lifestyles with the benefit of being, you know, in a more walkable area, or having proximity to other amenities. So, this is actually a project that I’m working on in Gilbert and I wanted to point out the studio unit at 423 net square feet on the left side of that drawing. You go to the next one. This is a project that was just completed in Durango. This building is 100% sold. Very high demand for these types of units in Durango. This was not an affordable project by any means and sort of just market rate sales and the studio unit there is 392 net square feet. This one’s actually under construction in Durango right now and this is a series of studio units only and
these are each at 442 net square feet. We had such success with the previous project that really saw a position in the market for these 400 net square feet units and that was sort of the driver on this project. And then I wanted to also show the proposed design for the units at the Henry Shaw Hotel. So, these are 394 net square feet, 437 gross square feet, so that includes all the perimeter walls and there’s a couple little 3-D’s of, you know a little kitchenette, as dining area, a bed. This could potentially be a murphy bed and then a closet with a full bath. So, very livable. And then, if you go to the final slide, this is actually the apartment that I lived in for five years in Manhattan and it’s 278 square feet, and I think one of the critiques that we saw in this letter was that, how do people entertain and have enough space in these small unites and, certainly after living in this unit, I didn’t and my neighbors didn’t have any issues entertaining and still living a full life in 278 square feet. And so, while we’re not in a major city like New York who is setting small unit trends. They recently built a micro apartment for similar type of workforce housing and veteran’s housing and their apartment ranges were 150 to 400 square feet. So, we’re not quite that extreme, but we do want to be reasonable about what is the baseline? And 1,000 feet feels very generous and I think that there’s room to reduce that to make it work for the development. I’ll take any questions.” Commission Chair Marienenfeld said, “all right, thank you. Does anyone have any questions?” Commission Member Ballard said, “I have a question. And so, your purpose of being here is to share all of this because you’re proposing?” Shepard answered, “they’re proposing to do that.” Boone asked, “can we go back three slides, I believe? This is what we’re proposing. I think what I wanted to do was show a palette of successful apartments in the 400 square foot range. Also share our 400 square foot workforce housing proposal. The cost of building this to us is about the same as the fee in lieu of.” Commission Member Ballard said, “that’s good.” Boone said, “we prefer to build campus availability on our site, but unless we have this reduction, we can’t do that.” Commission Member Ballard said, “so, that’s where we’re at here. So, you’re in favor of all this?” Shepard said, “Yes.” Commission member Ballard said, “That’s great.” Commission Chair Marienenfeld said, “thank you, Elizabeth.”

Commission Chair Marienenfeld asked, “Okay, do we have anyone else for the public hearing tonight on this issue tonight, and it will be continued.” Shepard said, “Yeah.” Commission Chair Marienenfeld said, “To our February 13th meeting.” Shepard said, “Absolutely. And certainly, you can discuss it, but people will have the opportunity and did receive a public comment which is forwarded to you. Commission Chair Marienenfeld said, “Thank you. Okay, so I will continue the public hearing if anyone would like to discuss things now just to kind of get a general temperature before we do more public comment potentially in three weeks. If that works on our schedule tonight? Maybe take just a few minutes.”

Commission Member Becnel said, “sure, let’s just crunch some numbers. How many square feet is the Henry Shaw Hotel?” Boone answered, “we’re at 113,000.” Commission Member Becnel asked, “15.57 per square foot is your fee in lieu, is that right?” Shepard answered, “Yeah.” Commission Chair Becnel asked, “so, you’re at $1,759,410.00?” Boone answered, “Yep.” Commission Member Becnel asked, “what’s the cost per square footage for you build affordable housing?” Boone answered, “$250.00 per square foot.” Commission Member Becnel said, “Bull shit.” Commission Chair Marienenfeld said, “Whoa.” Commission Member Becnel said, “pardon my French, but that’s not true.” Commission Member Ballard said, “now wait a second, say that again? Commission Member Marienenfeld said, “alright, pause. I think we need to. Everybody just, like take a minute because we, we don’t need cursing to the public on the record.” Commission Member Ballard said, “no, no, no, you might be right if you’re talking about land use, all that kind of stuff. Okay, so she’s probably right, okay? So, I think the question was asking is per square foot for building that size and we’re thinking what, you’ve got 30 units in there or something, I don’t know.” Boone answered, “11.” Commission Member Ballard said, “okay, 11. So that square footage is going to go down, right? Do you have, does she have to build on the site to do this, or can she build them anywhere?” Shepard answered, “They can build them anywhere, but they have chosen to go this route.” Commission Member Ballard said, “Yeah, okay. That’s good, I’m just, just curious about that. So, I have another
leading question on that, as well. For us. Okay, and that is that since this proposal is in front of us at 400 square feet, can I, if I owned a motel, could I build that unit anywhere in town?" Shepard and Commission Chair Marienfeld answered, “Yes.” Commission Member Ballard said, “okay, on a 1,000 square foot piece of ground?” Shepard answered, “Yes, you would have to build it, and this is another thing we have to fix in the code, and probably deed it the City or a public entity.” Commission Member Ballard said, “well, that’s kind of where I’m going. So, that needs to be addressed. Although, I like the idea of 400 square feet though, because that makes total sense. You know what I mean? To have that, the small square footage, because if they’re required to provide housing, they don’t have to be required to build something huge to have a huge family. They’re meeting that requirement, but if they want to build two of them, do they have to have 2,000 square feet if they’re connected?" Shepard said, “I hadn’t thought about that. They could make them 2,000 square feet if they wish.” Commission member Ballard asked, “but, could they do it on less?” Shepard answered, “yes.” Commission Member Ballard asked, “okay, so she’s putting 11 units in there, does she have to have 11,000 square feet to put that in or can she do it on their much smaller base?” Shepard said, “the way this is proposed, they could be smaller units.” Commission Member Ballard said, “Smaller units, smaller property and that’s kind of where she was heading.” Shepard said, “yes. And you’re absolutely right, Maryanne, it’s sort of, it’s kind of cutting them a bread, but it’s also getting them built on site. So, I think from our point of view, if somebody wants to come in and do a motel and they want to put him on site, then cool. And we’re trying to encourage.” Commission Member Marienfeld said, “and we were. I remember the discussion when we were writing and tweaking and passing this ordinance along to City Council last year, was, you know, obviously the, the easy way out is gonna be fee in lieu. It’s simple, it doesn’t require any future involvement on the part of the developer once everything’s done and how are we gonna incentivize some of the things that are gonna get us housing faster? Right now, we do have Walnut Lane, so we actually do have a place that the fee is in lieu is going directly, but we might not have that in a few years. We might not have a project that’s actively happening and if someone owns land already, or if you have a spot to be able to provide that. I mean, this is something we were talking about when we wrote the ordinance in the first place.” Commission Chair Becnel said, “so, pardon my shock factor, but...” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “We don’t have to go with 400, we don’t have to make that our recommendation. We can tie it to something as Nora was saying.” Commission Member Becnel said, “I’m still talking. Pardon my shock factor with this, but our whole purpose here to be helping our community. How does this project, 200 plus units actually help our community and how many jobs is that creating? According to our housing research, that’s gonna create maybe, like 100 more jobs like housekeepers and maintenance people. Is that really worth 11 units of housing? We’re already behind 1,000 units. So, what I’m saying here is, like let’s look at the bigger picture. We spent three years on affordable workforce housing for a reason and now we finally came to an agreement and we’re talking about this again? And, they can pay the fee in lieu. Fine, they’re not asking for a 60% reduction in a fee in lieu, they’re asking for a price cut on the project where they’re gonna save $500,000.00 + per square footage. I mean. Just do what we asked for. Pay the fee in lieu, but don’t change something that we’ve been working on for three years that we’ve put thousands of hours of eyes and lawyers into. That’s my stance.”

Commission Chair Marienfeld asked, “anyone else have any questions or things to weigh in on? We’ll have a continuation of the public hearing in three weeks and maybe we could get more information by then, too.” Shepard said, “if you need specific information, we’d be happy to generate that for you. Just let me know. Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “I think I would like, maybe for other Commissions to, to think about if there’s a way we could. My inclination at least right now is 1,000 is too big to require. My house, my entire house is 1,000 square feet and I have a three-bedroom, two-bathroom house, so it’s. That’s big. And I think the way things are going, we do want to incentivize actually providing housing as a mix. We’re always gonna want a mix, we’re always gonna get the fee in lieu in some way probably continuing with most developments, but if you know you do have a sizable project that’s willing to
provide something on site, in particular, I think that’s good. 400 square feet does seem small. I’ll be honest, looking at the mock-up of what’s proposed, it seems small as well. So, if there’s some sort of happy medium we could come to where it would still be more of an incentive to provide that immediate housing to the community, but not quite that little if we’re not requiring more units. That, again being a caveat. Potentially we could require more units for a reduction in size too, and this might be something for the architect in the immediate stance to maybe have a sort of frank open conversation with the Planning staff about, say, you know realizing we’re not gonna, you know, hold you to that necessarily, but any input we have because you’re going through this right would be really useful, about what would be feasible? What would tip you back over to fee in lieu? How big would be too big? How many units at how many 450 square foot units would be too many units that would tip you back into fee in lieu. I think because we have a real situation in front of us for the first time with this was really good information, we should take advantage of.” Commission Member O’Leary said, “well, I think it’s also important to recognize some of the big differences between Moab and a city. People are coming to Moab. You know, I first moved here to climb and to ride my bike and you’re gonna have all this gear. People that are coming to live here are gonna have bikes and boats and this and that. So, is there an additional area they have access to to store all their stuff? I mean, we do have a bike theft problem in this town, and we don’t want it to increase.” Shepard said, “Right. So, there are lots of different kinds of people looking for housing in the community and I think most people that, that will working the hotels and motels probably won’t have bikes. They probably won’t have cars. Some of them may have bikes as their only means of transportation. So, if we’re trying to hit very low income, which we’re trying to do, and nobody else is really proposing that, then they probably aren’t here to climb and they’re not here to ride their bikes. They’re here to work and make money. So, this kink of unit is oriented toward that kind of person and not the kind of person like you and me, who, yeah, we have lots of stuff.” Commission Member O’Leary said, “well I lived in my car when I first came here too, so.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “Nora, there, there is a bit more of an overlap that I think you’re maybe recognizing. I do. I do think that, because when we’re looking at like our, all of our other affordable housing ordinances or things we’ve discussed have had on site storage for things like that, and I think if that’s something that can be provided, it would certainly kick that up, because on site secure bike storage would be a huge boon having some sort of dedicated 4x4 storage unit for each housing unit, as well. It doesn’t even. It could be on the other side of the building, but as long as it’s there. Like, there’s actually a storage unit shortage in Moab as much as there is housing.” Commission Member Becnel said, “but I think there’s a big difference between where a person will live and where they deserve to live, and this town is all about setting the bar high. Just because you’re a Mexican immigrant family and you’re forced to live in 300-400 square feet doesn’t mean that’s the right thing for us to make these people do.” Shepard said, “Certainly.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “Alright, if anybody else has any initial thoughts you will have this discussion again in a few weeks.

Commission Member Ballard said, “well, I have a lot of concerns about it, but rather than discuss it now, should we wait for that?” Shepard said, “if you have crucial information that can provide or that you want us to provide to help you make a decision.” Commission Member Ballard said, “okay, well first of all, I think the 400 square feet is not unreasonable. Okay, we were talking about this PAD system that we were had going and we were going much less than that, okay? So, 400 feet, 400 square feet is, is quite a bit more than that and I think she pointed out that there is some nice places for people. I don’t think they’re required to give them the Taj Mahal, you know. I mean, they’re, their employers. They’re almost getting their rent, I don’t know it’s free, but at least it’s getting provided. My concern is that if they’re gonna put in, say 11 units behind their motel. Yeah, that’s good, because they can walk to work and they’re there. I didn’t. Never liked the idea that the employer is also the owner of there where they live. I’ve, I’ve kind of been against that, but I do like the other side of it where they were living right on site there. It’s easy for them to get to and from, but if they happen to build more. Let’s say they hire “x” amount of people, say
they have 30 employees, but 10 don’t live, don’t want to live there because they live in town, right? That’s gonna happen that’s all. I think that’s obviously gonna happen. Then what do they do with the other half of them? Can they rent them out?” Shepard said, “Yes.” Commission Member Ballard said, “Okay, so they can take them, and they don’t have to have them for employee housing.” Shepard said, “they have to have them for workforce housing and they have to be restricted as to the amount of rent they can charge based upon the income levels that they’re trying to hit and one of the advantages of the smaller units is that it’s a much lower rent. So, people who are really very low income can actually afford something. Commission member Ballard said, “okay, so maybe there’s not something about that, because, because I think what’s gonna take place here is if they build those buildings on their site and they only have half of them rented to employees that they provided, the other half are empty.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “Well no, you could rent them.” Commission member Ballard clarified, “so, you can rent them, and you’re stipulate what that rent is?” Shepard said, “Yeah, they all have to be deed restricted and they have to, there’s a really strict formula s to the amount of rent you can charge and how much that can appreciate per year, so they are subject to 50 year deed restrictions.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “on those units and if they are not filled by employees they will be offered to other qualifying low income renters.” Shepard said, “Yeah.” Commission member O’Leary asked, “and if their employment changes but they’re still living in town?” Shepard said, “well that’s, I mean it would be the tenant’s choice. I don’t know. I mean I don’t know; we haven’t gotten to the details. They haven’t even come to the Planning Commission for site plan approval yet, because they don’t know exactly what they’re designing because they’re actually talking about incorporating the units into the main structure okay, and having separate entrances and things, but. So, they wouldn’t be a separate building out back like the Hoodoo. It would actually be incorporated into the primary structure is what they’re proposing, but it would allow that.” Commission member Ballard said, “I would think that would be an issue, but I noticed down here that you’ve to the 17.69.050 the area of affordable housing they’re discussion affordable housing here for 1,000 square feet, are, they’re just gonna reduce that, are they suggesting to reduce that affordable housing as well as this, the workforce housing, I mean?” Shepard said, “same thing.” Commission member Ballard asked, “Is it really the same thing?” Shepard answered, “Well, I’m probably using the terms interchangeably, but they are subject to the assured workforce housing.” Commission member Ballard asked, “Okay, okay, so they just kind of fall into that group?” Shepard answered, “Yes. They have to build or do something per that ordinance.” Commission member Ballard asked, “So, is affordable housing right now, down to. Have we got that down to 400 square feet?” Shepard said, “Well, you can build in the P&O, you can build 275 square feet. You can also build a 500 square foot unit in the R-3, so it’s, you know, and it probably goes back to, should it have been a thousand square feet to begin with when we’re not seeing the units getting built? So, maybe we’re considering whether the original requirement should be adjusted. That’s exactly what we’re doing and if you think some numbers change, like if they make them smaller, they have to do more of them, that’s an option. I don’t know whether we’ll actually get them built? So, maybe we’re considering whether the original requirement should be adjusted. That’s exactly what we’re doing. And if you think some numbers change, like if they make them smaller they have to do more of them, that’s an option. I don’t know whether they will actually get them built. I mean we’re trying to kind of, trying to deal with reality. I mean we’re trying to, kind of trying to deal with reality.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “Yeah, that’s why I just, I want to make sure we’re use, whether or not we end up, I don’t mean this as a cut. Whether or not we end up recommending this to City Council or what we recommend. I want to. We have a real-world situation in front of us, which we haven’t had yet and a chance to really use this to get something that is actually feasible.” Shepard said, “Right. Which is what happens when you adopt an ordinance and people are trying to figure out how to make it work, right? And there is, well, and we, we have to enter into with the, the developer or whoever, we will enter into what’s called ALURA, so it’s Land Use Regulation Agreement. It’s a deed restriction. It’s very restrictive. We were looking at another one. We were actually negotiating like a first right of refusal if somebody defaults, I mean there’s all kinds of. It’s very complicated from a legal standpoint but
that we haven’t even begun some of those negotiation. However, the very low or extremely low-income price point is defined by the County. HUD defines it, and so if you’re trying to hit the very low, then it’s a lot, lot lower rents than a moderate or just 100% of AMI. So, your, you know you’re talking about hitting those lower income brackets.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “And another thing we could think about would be having variation in unit sizes. Say you can have a minimum of just 400, but all a certain percentage of whatever units you’re providing could be that small, if that would be something feasible to, so you don’t end up with all 400 square foot units, you end up with a mix, which was kind of what we did with the PAD where it intending a mix. Like you need to have some very low, but they don’t all have to be very low and I think it does make sense if you’re asking for very low-income housing to have it be less than 1,000 square feet. I mean, just thinking about it.” Shepard said, “It would be very difficult to provide a $300 per month rent for a 1,000 square foot unit.” Commission member Ballard asked, “So, is there a fee that’s being set there then, for if somebody has a mote, they’re providing this workforce housing, can they say this is what we’re charging our employee for rent? Shepard answered, “they have to agree to maximum rents.” Commission member Ballard asked, “What, and that maximum rent is set by?” Shepard answered, “It’s based on. There are formulas that are based on the level of median income in the County.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “Yeah, it’s the USDA formula. It’s same one they use for the Rural Development Loans.” Commission member Ballard asked, “Okay, but, but I’m wondering if an employer in lieu of that rent is gonna be able to say that a minimum wage that we’re paying you or, or you know. Let’s say they’re getting $12 per hour for cleaning rooms or something. Are they gonna be able to put that down at nine?” Councilmember Marienfeld said, “They always could as long as it’s the legal minimum wage.” Shepard said, “We would try to work something into an agreement so that wouldn’t necessarily happen, and again they could rent these to anybody that works in Moab.” Commission member Ballard said, “Well, I’m just saying that it gets into a big bag of worms.” Shepard said, “This whole thing gets into a big bag of worms. This is extremely complicated code that was adopted and it’s, it’s almost, with this exception, it’s almost impossible for people to actually build the units because of the land costs associated with it, and you know, and so we want to try to get something. We don’t want to give people a free ride. We understand that there’s a huge impact. On the other hand, what’s gonna get units built? Commission member Ballard said, “Because if they can’t afford it, how can the City?” Shepard said, “Well, that’s the problem we’re having.” Commission member Ballard said, “I mean, if you’re gonna pay in lieu, in lieu of and then if its not enough for them to be able to afford it, the City’s gonna be in the red, and I’m not sure they can afford that.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “Yeah, the idea, I think being with providing housing. Pretend. I think as far as code writing we should pretend that these units are anywhere that they’re providing. We have to. You know if an employer is gonna pay poorly, I don’t agree with this, but the argument would be that the free market will make it so they can’t hire employees. I don’t think that’s true, but you that’s the, you know, if, if you’re, if you have, you know if you get first-come first-serve on housing units at your employer and then they’re opened up to other members of the community you can take them. You know, if I don’t how. I don’t know that we can talk about wages all?” Shepard answered, “It’s not, no. It’s crossing too many.” Commission member Ballard said, “It is, but, I would just like to make one more comment and that is I think the 400 square feet is not unreasonable.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “Yeah, I agree.” Shepard said, “I have lived in a lot.” Commission member Marienfeld said, “Yes. Size. I don’t think it’s unreasonable as a living space whether or not we want to allow it as the minimum in all instances is a different story.” Shepard said, “Yeah, I agree with that. So, maybe I’ll try to set up, sort of alternatives to talk about.” Commission Chair Marienfeld said, “And if, you’re available to continue discussions with the planning staff, it’d be really great to kind of get those outward parameters, because you’re sort of mired in it right now, just understanding if you give us, here’s your high-end square footage number, we’re not gonna be like, okay we’re gonna do that. So, be forthright as you can, I think with staff.” Shepard said, “Okay, great.”

At 6:46 PM Commission Chair Marienfeld continued the public hearing.
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January 23, 2019
**Review And Possible Recommendation To City Council On Resolution 01 -2020 The Two-Mac Minor Subdivision Located At 1053 Mill Creek Dr. Moab, UT 84532 Deed restriction:**

**Discussion:** Shurtleff provided a brief presentation explaining that this item involves subdividing the 1.49-acre parcel located at 1053 Mill Creek Drive into three lots. With lot one becoming .62 acres, lot two becoming .36 acres and lot 3 becoming 2.22 acres. The property is vacant and situated immediately west of the Gravel Pit Lanes Bowling Alley and has street frontage access to Mill Creek Drive. This property and the bowling alley are zoned C-4 general commercial zone. Directly across from this property are the Cinema Court Apartments and a section of County property zoned small lot residential and general business access. The property has a cliff, or hill, on the northern boundary. No removal or contouring is being requested during the processing of this application. The reason for requesting that this parcel be divided into smaller lots was, hopefully, for local developers to build small commercial projects to serve the local community. Landowners Doug and Jeremy McElhaney were present to answer any questions the Commission had. Doug McElhaney explained that lot 1 is larger, but much of it is unusable because of the cliff located there. Commission member Ballard clarified their intent is to build commercial buildings. Doug McElhaney explained that that was not what they were proposing. They were proposing that as the property stands it cannot be developed by a small developer. The issues caused by the terrain are insurmountable as one parcel. Therefore, they were proposing to split it into three manageable sized lots so that a small commercial development could be built on it without a 30-space parking lot. Hopefully, a local developer or person would want to buy one and build a small building on it. Shepard noted that there would be no change in zoning. The C-4 zones allows buildings to be built right next to each other just like Main Street. There was discussion regarding easements and the City right of way and the potential uses that could be put there.

**Motion and vote:** Commission Chair Marienfeld moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the approval of the Two-Mac Minor Subdivision Resolution 01-2020. Commission member Ballard seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0 with Commission members Becnel, Ballard, Wojciechowski, Marienfeld and O’Leary voting aye.

**Review And Possible Recommendation To The City Council On Ordinance 2019-30, An Ordinance Amending The City Of Moab Municipal Code, Section 17.31 RC Resort Commercial Zone To Allow Hotels And Motels, Subject To Revised Development Standards:**

**Discussion:** Shepard explained that she would go over the additional information that she had created based upon the City Council’s request. There wasn’t very clear direction given by Council. Shepard proposed stepping back and possibly having some joint work sessions with the Planning Commission and City Council to try to get to the core of what it is they’re trying to achieve and how they want to achieve it. There are two Councilmembers that feel very strongly about some kind of restriction on the numbers until everyone is caught up. There have been a lot of numbers floating around about numbers of units and how many existing rooms there are and how many proposed and somehow the community ended up with a unit calculation that the number of overnight accommodations units that are in the queue are 38% of what the City currently has. She didn’t know where that number came from. Just for the City, it’s 20% that are in the queue at this time that are moving forward. Shepard wanted the give people real numbers to work with. The only hotel in the queue that has not been approved by the Planning Commission is the Henry Shaw. Most of them have their building approval. She displayed the parcels that are left in the RC zone and discussed what may be placed on those parcels. There had been some discussion with one of the landowners regard the standards being proposed. They thought that requiring a certain amount of commercial space and incentivizing that was a good idea and their vision was a small boutique hotel with a separate retail business that could serve either the people staying out there or the Moab residents. Commission Chair Marienfeld asked if there was anything that Council wanted from the Commission at
this point. All of the Council had very individual comments and she would really like for at least three of them to give staff some directions so that they aren’t spinning their wheels. Commission Chair Marienfeld felt that the best thing to do would be to get the joint meeting scheduled. Commission member Ballard felt that they needed to have more meetings to accomplish anything. The recommendation was to continue to look at the emails that Shepard had been sending and try schedule a joint meeting as soon as possible.

**Motion and vote:**

**Future Agenda Items:** Possibly Four Corners Behavioral Health

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 7:11 PM.
Moab Planning Commission Agenda Item
Meeting Date: February 27, 2020

Title: Review and Potential Action to Adopt Moab Planning Resolution #02-2020, Conditionally Approving a Level II Site Plan for The Kane Creek Condominiums on Property Located at 443 Kane Creek Boulevard Moab, Utah 84532

Date Submitted: September 12, 2019
Staff Presenter: Cory P. Shurtleff, Assistant Planner
Property Owner: Kane Devco, LLC
Applicant: Architectural Squared, Courtney Kizer
Location: 443 Kane Creek Boulevard, Moab, Utah 84532
Zoning: R-3, Multi-Household Residential Zone

Attachment(s):
Exhibit A: Draft Planning Resolution #02-2020
Exhibit B: Application
Exhibit C: Project Narrative
Exhibit D: Plat
Exhibit E: Site Plan

Options:
1. Approve Moab Planning Resolution #02-2020, with or without modifications; or
2. Continue or table action to a later meeting with specific direction to City Staff and Applicant as to additional information needed to make a decision; or
3. Deny the Site Plan Application, giving specific findings for decision.

Motion for Approval: I move to adopt Moab Planning Resolution #02-2020 approving The Level II Site Plan for the Kane Creek Condominiums, with the following condition:
1. All outstanding engineering comments shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer as conditions of approval for Planning Resolution #02-2020, and satisfied prior to the issuance of a building permit. Comments included:
   a. Fire and service lines are using a single line from the water main (C-300). There should be accomplished with two connections on the water main line. One for 8" fire service line, the other one for 3" service line. Meter should be located on the City ROW but not on the sidewalk. Please contact the Water Superintendent Levi Jones, if you have any question regarding water line.
   b. We need a deed for the dedication of the road right-of-way before approving the plan.
   c. Please correct the project name on the cover sheet.
   d. Please make sure the final plan set is signed and sealed.
   e. Please put City Engineer approve signature line on final civil plan set.
Background:
The Site Plan Application was initially submitted September 12, 2019 and was reviewed by the Development Review Team (DRT). The DRT comments were sent to the applicant October 4, 2019. The applicant resubmitted revised plans on December 12, 2019. The DRT comments on the revised plans were sent to the applicant January 21, 2020. The applicant replied with revised plans addressing outstanding comments on February 6, 2020. The remaining comments that the City Engineer has outlined must be met as conditions of approval prior to issuance of a building permit. At this time the Site Plan Application is being submitted for review to the Moab City Planning Commission, on February 27, 2020.

Project Description:
Location: 443 Kane Creek Boulevard, Moab UT 84532
Property Owner: Kane Devco, LLC
Applicant: Architectural Squared, Courtney Kizer
Parcel Size: 2.16 acres
Zoning: R-3, Multi-Household Residential Zone
Proposed Use: Condominium Plat, Multi-Household Residential
Project Size: 37,355 sf; (28,205 sf) finished living space
Number of Units: (47) units
Parking: (71) spaces; Including (2) ADA, (1) ADA Van
1st Floor Area requirements: Units at least 500 sf

Narrative Summary:
The subject lot is currently zoned R-3 which includes multifamily residential as a use by right at a density of 2000 sf of site area per unit. No change in zoning is being requested. The lot is currently unimproved.

The proposed development will include (47) individual units on a 94,090 sf (2.16 Acre) lot resulting in a density of 21.75 units/ acre, maximum number of units is (47.05). Units vary from 500 sf to 735 sf.

The proposed scheme has (2) buildings with a total footprint area of 16,560 sf which correlates to a site coverage of 17.6%. 460 sf of open space is provided for each unit between open landscaped areas and roof top gathering spaces.

(1.5) exterior off-street parking spaces are provided for each residential unit for a total of (71) off-street parking spaces. The vehicular access points are proposed; one from Kane Creek Blvd and a second from Mountain View Drive.

General Plan Compliance:
The General Plan as expressed through the current Zoning Map designates this area as a R-3, Multi-Household Residential Zone. The proposed use is permitted within this zone.
CITY OF MOAB PLANNING RESOLUTION NO. 02-2020

A RESOLUTION CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A LEVEL II SITE PLAN FOR THE KANE CREEK CONDOMINIUMS, ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 443 KANE CREEK BOULEVARD, MOAB, UTAH 84532

WHEREAS, the following describes the intent and purpose of this resolution:

a. Kane Devco, LLC, as the Owner of record and of property located at 443 Kane Creek Boulevard, Moab, Utah 84532, has applied through their agent, Architectural Squared, Courtney Kizer, 150 E Center Street #205, Moab, Utah, for a Level II Site Plan Approval; and

b. Applicant has furnished a site plan and description of the property located at 443 Kane Creek Boulevard, Moab Utah, 84532; Parcel 01-0001-0207; Tax ID 26-21-1-180.12 & 180; Entry 533286; and

c. The City adopted Site Plan Review regulations in order to promote the health, safety and the general public welfare of the residents of the City by establishing standards for development in zones including the R3, Multi-Household Residential Zone; and

d. The Moab Planning Commission reviewed the application for Level II Site Plan for a condominium development on property located at 443 Kane Creek Boulevard, Moab, Utah in a regularly scheduled meeting held on February 27, 2020; and

e. Following the consideration of the technical aspects of the pertinent code sections, the Moab Planning Commission, pursuant to Moab Resolution #02-2020, hereby finds, that all applicable provisions of the Moab Municipal Code have or can be met.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MOAB PLANNING COMMISSION, the application for The Kane Creek Condominiums is hereby APPROVED, with the following conditions:

1. All outstanding engineering comments shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer as conditions of approval for Planning Resolution #02-2020, and satisfied prior to the issuance of a building permit. Comments included:
   a. Fire and service lines are using a single line from the water main (C-300). There should be accomplished with two connections on the water main line. One for 8” fire service line, the other one for 3" service line. Meter should be located on the City ROW but not on the sidewalk. Please contact the Water Superintendent Levi Jones, if you have any question regarding water line.
   b. We need a deed for the dedication of the road right-of-way before approving the plan.
   c. Please correct the project name on the cover sheet.
   d. Please make sure the final plan set is signed and sealed.
   e. Please put City Engineer approve signature line on final civil plan set.

PASSED AND APPROVED in an open meeting of the Planning Commission by a majority vote of the Governing Body of Moab Planning Commission on February 27, 2020.

SIGNED: ________________________________
        Kya Marienfeld, Chair
APPLICATION INFORMATION

DATE: 2019.09.03 PROJECT NAME: Kane Creek Condominiums

A. GENERAL INFORMATION
1. Name(s) of property owner(s): Kane Devco, LLC

Address: 285 S 400 E STE 216, Moab, UT 84532
Phone: 435.260.0366 Cell: Fax:

E-mail: productionsmoab@yahoo.com & tyeshumway@gmail.com

Attach additional owner information if necessary.

Where two or more persons own the subject property, one owner shall be designated as a contact if section 2 below is not completed. If the owner(s) of record as shown by the county assessor’s office is (are) not the agent, the owner’s (owners’) signed and notarized authorization(s) must accompany this application.

2. Applicant or contact person: Architectural Squared, Courtney Kizer

Address: 150 E Center Street #205, Moab, UT 84532
Phone: 512.656.1745 Cell: Fax:

E-mail: courtneykizer@gmail.com

3. Name of land surveyor: Red Desert Land Surveying, Lucas Blake

Address: 30 S 100 E #2, Moab, UT 84532
Phone: 435-280-0104 Cell: Fax:

E-mail: lucas@reddesertsurvey.com

4. Does the property/site contain hillside slopes over 15%? □ yes □ no □ unknown

5. Is any portion of the property located in the FC-1 flood zone? □ yes □ no □ unknown

6. Are any restrictive covenants existing or proposed? (If yes, please attach.) □ yes □ no

7. Are there underlying/overlying agreements on the property? □ yes □ no □ unknown

If yes, check as appropriate and provide a copy of the decision document:

□ Conditional Use Permit
□ Zoning Variance
□ Planned Unit Development
□ Other:

Under which jurisdiction was original site plan approval given?

□ City of Moab □ Grand County Approval date: __________________________
I hereby certify that I have read this application and know the same to be true and correct.

Tye Shumway

*Signature of owner or authorized agent

9/11/2019
Date

Kane Devco, LLC - Mathew Niesen & Tye Shumway

Please Print Name

*Signature of owner or authorized agent

Date

Architectural Squared - Courtney Kizer

Please Print Name

*If signatory is not the owner of record, the attached "Owner/Agent Agreement" must be signed and notarized

SITE PLAN APPROVAL APPLICATION
Supplementary Materials
August 2017
Owner/Agent Agreement

The undersigned is (are) the owner(s) of record of the property identified by the Grand County Assessor’s account number 01-0001-0207, located at 443 KANE CREEK BLVD, MOAB, UT 84532, City of Moab, Utah. The undersigned hereby gives (give) consent and approval to Architectural Squared, PLLC (Courtney Kizer) to act on his/her (their) behalf as his/her (their) agent to proceed with an application for (please check all items that apply): ☑ subdivision/land use application  
☐ other planning permits  
☐ construction permits (i.e. building, water/sewer availability, right-of-way, etc) on the property referenced herein. This agreement authorizes the agent to act on the owner’s behalf for the above checked applications through (date or specific phase) Site Plan Application Approval.

OWNER OF RECORD  DATE  OWNER OF RECORD  DATE
Kane Devco, LLC - Mathew Niesen  9-12-19  Kane Devco, LLC - Tye Shumway

STATE OF UTAH  )  ss.
COUNTY OF GRAND  )

On this 12 day of Sept., 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of Utah, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared:

Mathew Niesen  Tye Shumway

to me known as the individual(s) described in and who executed the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she/they signed and sealed the said instrument, as his/her/their free and voluntary act and deed for the uses and purposes therein mentioned, and on oath stated that he/she/they was (were) authorized to execute said instrument.

WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL, hereto affixed the day and year in this certificate above written.

Karen Ballantyne
Notary Public in and for the State of Utah
Residing at Moab, UT
My appointment expires: 29 Sept. 2020
APPLICATION FORM FOR STAMPED SITE PLAN APPLICATIONS & SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

City of Moab – Planning and Zoning Department
217 East Center Street
Moab, Utah 84532
Phone: (435) 259-5129
Fax: (435) 259-0600

USE THIS APPLICATION IF: you are planning a commercial development, a multi-family residential use requiring a site plan (whether new, amended, or a change in use), or if you intend to construct, enlarge, structurally alter, or move on a building or structure within the city of Moab. All applications are subject to review by city staff for completeness. Staff will notify the applicant of deficiencies or completeness within twenty-one business days.

Please note: Failure to comply with the requirements of a complete application will result in delay of processing your application.

Project Name: Kane Creek Condominiums

APPLICATION NUMBER:

CITY USE RECEIVED DATE STAMP

APPLICATION FEE:

- NEW OR AMENDMENT SITE PLAN - $50.00 per each 1,000 square feet of floor area
- Minimum Fee $50.00

TREASURER’S RECEIPT NUMBER:

Application for Site Plan Approval under Section 17.67 of the Moab Municipal Code (MMC), as amended.

USING THE APPLICATION FORM

This application form is to be used for the following development:
- Construction of a new commercial structure of 2,000 square feet or more; or
- Construction of a new multi-family residential structure of six or more units; or
- Remodeling of an existing commercial building involving an addition of 2,000 square feet or more; or
- Use change of an existing structure involving an addition of 2,000 square feet or more; or
- Establishing a commercial parking lot

Please check with the Planning and Zoning Department to determine whether a Site Plan Application is required and whether the proposed development meets current zoning regulations before submitting the application for processing. The applicant has the responsibility to advise the City of Moab of any changes in ownership, agents, their names, addresses and telephone numbers etc.

COMPLETENESS OF THIS APPLICATION

The information requested by this application must be provided by the applicant, and will be used to process the Site Plan under MMC Section 17.09.660. If the information, including copies of the required plans and the applicable fees are not provided, the City may return the application or refuse to consider the application further until receipt of all the required information and fees have been provided.

A Pre-application Conference is required prior to submitting a Site Plan Application. This application form is available online at www.moabcity.org or from the Planning Office on the second floor of the City
Center, 217 East Center Street, Moab, Utah 84532. A published schedule of meeting dates is also available at www.moabcity.org.

Please note that this application contains three sections which must be reviewed/completed by the applicant.

X Section One – Fees and Application Procedure
  o Please complete the fee calculation to ensure you have submitted the appropriate fee

X Section Two – Application Form
  o Please complete in full and sign as appropriate
  o Please complete the Owner’s Acknowledgement on page 4.

X Section Three – Site Plan Application Submittal Checklist

SITE PLAN APPLICATION PROCEDURE
An application for Site Plan Approval generally requires about 6 to 8 weeks to achieve final approval, depending on the complexity of the project. This process generally encompasses the following steps:

1. The application is received and reviewed by Planning Staff to ensure all required information is provided on the application form, that the appropriate fee is submitted, and that drawings are submitted in accordance with the City’s requirements.

2. Prior to the final consideration of an application, Planning Staff will schedule a Design Review Team (DRT) meeting for review of the proposal by the rest of the city departments as well as the Building Department, Fire Department, and utility providers.

3. At the DRT meeting staff and agencies will comment on the proposal and will outline where the site plan application does not satisfy the code or the required submittals for application.

4. Following the DRT meeting, Planning and Zoning Staff will forward all agency comments to the owner/applicant or the designated representative for a response, additional information or drawings. Upon receipt of agency and staff comments from the DRT meeting, the owner/applicant is required to forward an updated Site Plan, studies or any changes necessary to address comments or concerns arising from the DRT meeting. The revised plan must be in paper form and digital format. The applicant must submit the requested documents and a revised site plan for final review and comment by city staff. The city shall determine if the site plan application is sufficient to satisfy the definition of a “Complete Application” as established in MMC Chapter 17.06.020, Definitions, and if the application may be placed on the Planning and Zoning Commission agenda.

5. Following final review of the revised Site Plan, the applicant will be formally advised in writing, as to the final disposition of the proposed development. There are two levels of review. Level I applications shall be reviewed by the Development Review Team (DRT). Level II applications shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Subsequent to the DRT meeting or Commission meeting, a follow-up letter describing the action of the Land Use Authority, and any conditions, shall be forwarded to the applicant with a copy of the signed resolution.

HELP
Questions in respect to the application and process or requests for pre-consultation with staff may be made in person at: Planning and Zoning Department, 217 East Center Street 2nd Floor, Moab, Utah, or by telephone (435) 259-5129.

*********************************************************************************************************
Moab City Corporation
217 East Center Street
Moab, Ut 84532
435.259.5123

Receipt No: 262719
Receipt Date: 09/12/2019
Timestamp: 09/12/2019 11:42 AM
Payor: KANE CREEK CONDOMINIUMS

SITE PLAN APPLICATION #19-0128
1032215 PLANNING & ZONING ALL OTHER FEES

1,410.25

$1,410.25

Check 5876

Tendered Amount: $1,410.25
Cash Back: $0.00
Total Applied: $1,410.25
City of Moab Planning & Zoning
Attn: Nora Shepard, City Planner
217 E. Center Street
Moab, UT 84532

REF: Site Plan Application, Kane Creek Condominiums, 443 Kane Creek Boulevard, Moab, UT

Mrs. Shepard -

Please find attached a Site Plan Application for a multifamily residence at 443 Kane Creek Blvd, Moab, UT. Our goal is to provide much needed housing on an underutilized site in close proximity to the City core.

- **Land Use:** The subject lot is currently zoned R-3 which includes multifamily residential as a use by right at a density of 2000 SF of site area per unit. No change in zoning is being requested. The lot is currently unimproved.
- **Lot Area:** The proposed development will include (47) individual units on a 94,090 SF (2.16 Acre) lot resulting in a density of 21.75 units / acre.
- **Building Footprint:** The proposed scheme has (2) buildings with a total footprint area of 16,560 SF which correlates to a site coverage of 17.6%.
- **Open Space:** 460 SF of open space is provided for each unit between open landscaped areas and roof top gathering spaces, well in excess of the 200 SF required.
- **Off Street Parking:** (1.5) exterior spaces are provided for each residential unit for a total of (71) off street parking spaces.
- **Access:** Two vehicular access points are proposed; one from Kane Creek Blvd and a second from Mountain View Drive

We sincerely appreciate your consideration of our request. Please do not hesitate to let us know if further information is required in order to process this application.

Much appreciated,

[Signature]

Courtney Kizer
Principal, Architectural^2
EXTERIOR LIGHTING, CIRCULATION STAIRWELL LAYOUT

DARK SKY SCONCE, TYP.
Surface Mounted LED Fixture, TYP.

PARKING LIGHTING, TYP.

NOTE: FOR BUILDINGS WITH 2 FLOORS, USE BOTTOM AND MIDDLE FLOOR LIGHTING LAYOUT FOR A TOTAL OF (7) DARK SKY SCONCES AND (10) SURFACE MOUNTED LED FIXTURES.

EXTERIOR LIGHTING PLAN

EXTERIOR SCONCE LAYOUT, TYPICAL

EXTERIOR LIGHTING FIXTURES
UNIT TYPE A - EFFICIENCY

UNIT TYPE B - ONE BEDROOM, END

UNIT TYPE C - ONE BEDROOM, CENTER

UNIT TYPE B2 - ONE BEDROOM, TYPE A

1% OF UNITS IN PROJECT REQUIRED TO BE TYPE A COMPLIANT; 1 UNIT PROVIDED
UNIT TYPE D - TWO BEDROOM, END

UNIT TYPE E - ONE+ BEDROOM, CENTER

ARCHITECT STRONGLY RECOMMENDS CONSIDERING AN UNDERCOUNTER MOUNTED TANKLESS WATER HEATER SOLUTION.
CORRUGATED METAL ROOF
COLOR: RUST
MFR: TBD

WINDOWS AND DOORS
COLOR: DARK BRONZE
MFR: LOEWEN OR SIM

EXTERIOR SCONCES, DARK SKY
COLOR: BLACK
MFR: HUBBARDTON FORGE
MODEL: AIRIS, LARGE

STUCCO:
COLOR: 237 ROCK GREEN
MFR: OMEGA COLORTEK (OR APPROVED EQUAL)

STUCCO:
COLOR: 404 BARN SWALLOW
MFR: OMEGA COLORTEK (OR APPROVED EQUAL)
4039  

4040  

4040  

4040  

4041  

4042  

4042  

4043  

4045  

2.0%  

7.0%  

7.0%  

1.0%  

2.0%  

1.5%  

2.5%  

1893x1451  

3 :1  

3 :1  

2'  

2'  

1'  

1'  

6"  

6"  

1"  

1"  

4 :1  

4 :1  

NOTE: 

1. ADJACENT STOCKPILES OF RIVER ROCK AND SOIL SHALL BE CREATED AND MIXED BEFORE PLACING AT THE SPECIFIED LOCATION. MIX AT THE LOCATION WHERE SOIL PROTECTION IS TO BE PLACED. 

2. MIX TOPSOIL WITH 65% STOCKPILED RIVER ROCK BY VOLUME, USING ADDITIONAL MOISTURE AND CONTROL PROCEDURES THAT ENSURE A HOMOGENEOUS MIXTURE WHERE THE SOIL FILLS THE INHERENT VOIDS IN THE RIVER ROCK WITHOUT DISPLACING RIVER ROCK. 

3. THE MIXTURE SHALL BE CONSOLIDATED BY LARGE VIBRATORY EQUIPMENT OR BACKHOE BUCKET TO CREATE A TIGHT, DENSE INTERLOCKING MASS. 

4. THE SOIL SHALL BE FURTHER WETTED TO ENCOURAGE VOID FILLING WITH SOIL. 

5. WHEN VOIDS ARE FILLED AND THE SURFACE ACCEPTED BY ENGINEER, PLACE A NOMINAL SIX (6) INCHES DEPTH OF TOPSOIL OVER THE AREA SO THAT NO ROCKS ARE PROTRUDING. 

6. THE FINAL SURFACE SHALL BE THOROUGHLY WETTED FOR GOOD COMPACTION, SMOOTHED AND COMPACTED OF TOPSOIL OVER THE AREA SO THAT NO ROCKS ARE PROTRUDING. 

7. THE SURFACE shall THEN BE HAND RAKED TO RECEIVE PLANTING OR SEEDING. 

8. PEAK PONDING DEPTH WHEN ENTIRE POND BASIN RUNOFF IS ROUTED THROUGH THE 3" WATER QUALITY ORIFICE AT POND BOTTOM 

9. PEAK PONDING DEPTH WHEN POND BASIN IS ROUTED THROUGH THE 6" WATER QUALITY ORIFICE AT POND BOTTOM 

10. THE SURFACE shall THEN BE HAND RAKED TO RECEIVE PLANTING OR SEEDING.

NOTES:

ON GRADING PLAN (SHEET C-300)  

* - UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE

DEPTH = 1' MINIMUM

(A)

(B)

(C)

(SEE NOTES)

D50=6"; THICKNESS=1'

SOIL RIPRAP SPILLWAY

SECTION A-A

N.T.S.

NOTE: 

- UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE ON GRADING PLAN (SHEET C-300)