

Special Meeting of Glen Alps Community Council at request of Hultquist Homes RE: Canyon View Estates Platting Proposal. 3/4/2020 6-8 pm Bear Valley Elementary Library

Amy, Rob, Greg Present

Quorum established

Brian – Hultquist Homes

Lots of chatter and at RCCC found information that wasn't true. One key component of project that hasn't been communicated correctly. @RCCC – waited to submit plat application until after road was built – not true --- was brought project by Realtor. Didn't get until late summer. Then began looking at projects. No strategy on waiting until road was improved. Abnormal number of variance requests – not true – gave example of lot 7 for width. Trail construction – Trail on west side would be trail to nowhere. Public Use Easement – before GA could secure “quasi-right of way”. The current is an 100' easement, but the 60 foot is “standard”. Waited to do test holes until driest summer on record. Not true – did when we could. Looked at precipitation records, but for precip in past 32 years, it was close to average. “Test holes have failed”. Not true, appearance-wise it looks bad, but what happened is when you dig a test hole, you dig down to groundwater, bedrock, looking for a separation. Then next to that, you perform a perc test. Next to that, you dig for a perc test. We had a storm blowing in and the holes didn't get backfilled. Then surface water entered the hole. We are going to retest in the Spring and possibly dig new holes. We have two hats in the game. We need to know if lots are good enough to build on. We need to know if it's a good project. We are convinced it is.

Concern from GARSA about 27 driveways onto Canyon. We've addressed with Traffic Dept. Will have a turnaround in driveways. With each one of homes, will require right of way permit, which will want width, slope, culvert sizing info. We welcome input from Road Board. We don't want to jack it up. WE have 27 chance to get it right and city will make sure it's right. Road board is concerned with drainage, we will have city doing supervision. There are ways to mitigate – intercept swales, trench mounds, drains. Maybe blast out sub-base from driveway or road. Back to pathways & trails. Because Canyon is neighborhood collector, design states require a pathway – we are seeking a variance because, 1) Cost, but city doesn't take into account. City didn't see it as high enough priority to construct a path. Would be two ended path. Widest, best section of road is through our development. City requested we construct two trails from our property to Rabbit Creek. Would be clear & grub and mulch-type. Trails should be on south and is no way across creek. So Hultquist decided that there is a really nice trail from Echo Hills Park. Trail connects Echo Hills Park to Section 36. So we are proposing to donate land to Muni. What it would be is up to the Muni. Handled after the fact. In our discussions with muni, got two answers – one from Robyn Ward and one from muni. Planning thinks needs Assembly approval and Robyn thinks is easy. Still need to build trails, so would survey trail, dedicate as public utility easement and then other processes could be done.

Amy – concerned about pedestrian safety. People drive too fast. There will be children, where do they play? Kids on bikes. Where will school bus let off kids? Right now kids get driven or walk. Most kids will be walking and riding bikes.

Was bus stop negotiated with Lewis & Clark? Yes

Hultquist homes – Are you able to walk along the gas line? A: yes

Q: Do you know where gas line parallels Canyon Rd. now? Is that a utility easement? No, it is in the road easement. Maybe the utility company will want one.

Q: Will you have to move gas line? A: No data on it right now.

Where will center line be for the road? A: It might be skewed a little bit.

Q: At previous meetings, S4 said it was not a collector road, and members of the road board disagreed. In the Planning Documents it says no one objected.

S4 said it was an exception – because of the way it was built .

Q: When it was presented, we were told that we did not need exception to the road, but now you are saying it is needed.

Q: Grant was specifically approved to get Park access – we have not completed – GARSA will have to clear all the culverts and address all the drainages, the gas lines are for 33 houses. The project is not completed because the park access. How can the city give up the right of way. You cannot abandon the right of way because the project is not completed. It's not right.

A: What some people miss is that more houses will be contributing to the tax base. We will be addressing the culvert from thawing out.

Q: Multiple revisions accommodated the deep ditching to the north of the road. There is flowing water at 12 feet. The culver would have to be dropped that far down so your culverts would not solve this problem. The water is supposed to flow parallel. The cutbacks have failed, water is flowing, major groundwater defects. When you put all these driveways on, the expense gets transferred to the road board in the hundreds of thousands and 27 houses will not cover it. That's why the muni has regulations. You should engineer the driveway, but there are no regs for engineering a driveway.

Q: Many of us have had to deal with the shutdown of the road. We might not have money for other project. Can you explain what will be done with the water drainage?

A: We will have cross culverts.

Q: 9 culverts but only one carries water. Unless you trench deeper, there will be an issue.

A: we aren't saying that's out of the question

Q: As soon as we have to start tearing up culverts, we will be into private property. The 100 foot easement will allow this without tearing up septic systems.

Q: There is a stormwater utility. Is there another way to avoid 27 roads

A: Interior roads go against R10 regulations because they tear up even more land. Without getting too deep. We come across the rock, geotec, then culvert. Then the water flows right under the culvert. You provide thaw wires.

Q: Why hasn't the muni come to the Road Board or the CC. Why don't they come talk to us before it goes to the board. The process is not right.

A: They provide a phone number on the notice.

Q: The groundwater, the gas line, the maintenance of the road are public uses.

Q: The idea that driveways onto the main road is better than interior streets is not true. Look at Potter Heights. We've learned otherwise.

Q: Interior roads could happen with 200 foot cul-de-sacs. With less than 1/8 mile of road you could access all the land.

Q: You are vacating the 40 foot of the easement so you can make bigger lots?

A: This is standard

Q: Why aren't you asking to buy the easement back? You are taking it for free?

A: The city treats it as it's own. There are plat notes that say the slopes that expand beyond the right of way are maintained by the LRSA

Q: Why should we give up the land we already have.

A: You are not. The muni will create a right-of-way

Q: What's in it for us? We paid for it?

A: We are doing what is proper. This is standard.

Q: If Platting turn it down, can you still do it?

A: Yes

Q: Do you meet minimum lot sizes if you lose the 40 foot frontage?

A: We have to look at that.

Q: Why don't you just do it without the 40 foot frontage?

A: I'm doing a job

Q: Where are the test pits on the map and where are the reserve test pits? Especially on the steep lots.

A: This is a concept

Q: You did engineer the driveway slopes?

A: We haven't done that. We know generally that it will work. The test pits that we did are to prove that the onsite systems work. We are required to have one hole before the platting. The subdivision regs ar to show that you have the appropriate area and you can do it with one hole or five

Q: Test hole is good for 30 feet

A: 15.65 and now 300 since they wrote it.

Q: Are you saying that you can come to the city with one hole and then decide it will not?

A: No, we have proven it. We have shown each one of these have percable ground. We go in for each individual home after the platting and find the home.

Q: I've looked at subdivisions Ted has done.

Q: We've heard that some test holes have failed?

A: There were 3 that did. We went in & designed an engineered system for a primary, 2ndary, & Tertiary test holes. We found that close to road soils were bad but away from road found silty, sandy soil. In NW we found bad lots.

Q: How long do you guarantee your work? If you are saying you're doing it right, you should guarantee it longer than one year.

A: City requires one year.

Q: For land transfer, Hultquist will not have to construct any more trails or improve Canyon Rd.

Q: Considering the fact there is tremendous benefit for the land transfer, the quid pro quo is Hultquist no longer culpable for any issue. And you will see that Hultquist is no longer culpable.

A: If a homeowner gets attacked by a bear.

Q: One thing I want to bring up is the Watercourse Mapping Survey. Says mapping request has not been verified.

A: WMS has to come out and look at it. If preliminary plat is approved, there are conditions on it and one will be that WMS.

Q: Once it's approved, then we have no more public input for the WMS or Septic

A: Yes

Q: What about the trail along the road? There is a trail along there now, what is your proposed solution?

A: There will be a gas line, but it's not buildable. The gas easement is dedicated for the utility.

Q: The cut for the driveway will have to be 16' deep. The trail will become non-functional.

A: There are ways that if there is too steep of a cutbank, we can dedicate a cross access from one lot to another. The plat does not involve the driveway, the building.

Q: Can you explain the undue hardships for the width of the lots?

A: There are a million ways to do it. The lots would be cut off so much that the lot lines would be different. I don't know if it's an undue hardship persay. The concern is with frontage. We are limited in our grades. We are trying to eliminate as much cut and fill.

Q: Are you all going to fill the few spots for people to pull out on ?

Motion to Adjourn: Approved

