SANDY CITY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



JAMES SORENSEN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

> KURT BRADBURN **MAYOR**

MATTHEW HUISH CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

MEMORANDUM

March 18, 2021

To: **Planning Commission**

Community Development Department From:

Thackeray Towns Site Plan (Preliminary Site Plan **Subject:**

SPR-06-20-5868 Review) 4.0 Acres 10760 S. 700 E. PUD(10)

[Community #11 – Crescent]

HEARING NOTICE: This item has been noticed to property owners within **500** feet of the subject area. A sign was also posted on the property.

PROPERTY CASE HISTORY		
Case Number	Case Summary	
SPR #77-15	Reams Market – Site Plan Approval	
SPR #78-31	Reams Addition – Site Plan Approval	
CUP #92-10	Reams Conditional Use Approval	
SPR #92-20	Ream's Grocery Store – Site Plan Approval	
ZONE-5-19-5655	Villas at Southtowne Rezone from CN to PUD(10) approved in October 2019	
SUB-08-19-5699	Lot Line Adjustment Approved August 29, 2019	

REQUEST

The applicant, The Thackeray Company, is requesting preliminary site plan review for a proposed 40-unit development consisting of 12 single-family homes and 28 townhomes. The subject property is zoned PUD (10).

BACKGROUND

The subject property is 4.0 acres in size and currently consists of one (1) parcel. The property is currently vacant, and is south of the former Reams grocery store.

The subject property is zoned PUD (10). To the north is the site of the future Challenger School in the CN zone (Planned Center – Neighborhood District). To the west are single-family homes in the R-1-10 zone. To the south are single-family homes in the SD(R-1-8) PUD zone. To the east is 700 E. Across the street are multi-family units located in the RM (12) zone, and also homes in a PUD (8) zone.

NOTICE

Notices were mailed to property owners within a 500-foot radius of the subject parcel to notify them of the Planning Commission meeting. A sign was also posted on the property. The applicant held a neighborhood meeting on July 7, 2020. Notices (106) were sent for the neighborhood meeting, and there were 16 attendees. Several questions and concerns were raised during the meeting. A full summary from the meeting is attached to this report.

ANALYSIS

Site Design:

The PUD Zone gives the Planning Commission the ability to set the lot size, density, and configuration of a proposed development. There are site design principles that must be followed such as a requirement to provide at least 40% open space and homes that front on a public street.

The applicant is proposing a total of 40 units, which consist of 12 single-family homes and 28 townhome units. The proposed layout of the units conform to the standards of the PUD (10) zone. The proposal centers on orienting the two buildings on the east toward 700 E. These will have rear loaded two-car garages with full 20-foot driveways. All of the townhome units in the center of the development (20 units) would have rear loaded 2-car garages with no driveway. These would be accessed via a 24-foot wide alley. All the single-family units would have two-car front loaded garages with room for a 2-car driveway for guest parking.

This results in a density of 10 units per acre. The proposed front setback of these east buildings would be 20 feet from the front property line along 700 E. The rear setback of the southern units are at least 20 feet from the south property line. However, most of the units are being proposed with an optional covered rear patio which would then make the setback 13.8 feet. (See concern #4)

Along the west property line, the rear setbacks are more than 20 feet, although one unit has an optional covered rear patio which, if the buyer chose, would make the setback 13.8 feet from the west property line. The side setbacks are five (5) feet, resulting in 10 feet between each single-family home.

Access:

The access comes from a 52-foot public street on the north, that is accessed from 700 E. The street will also serve the future Challenger School to the north. There is only one primary point of ingress/egress from 700 E.

Architecture:

The Planning Commission is required to review and approve the building elevations for all projects utilizing the PUD zone. Sandy City ordinance reads as follows: "Building Materials: Building materials, roofing materials, and building design shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. High-quality exterior materials shall be used, including brick, stone, synthetic stucco, prefinished panel, composite materials, or other materials of similar quality, durability, and low maintenance."

The applicant has proposed units that make use of board and batten vertical siding, however there is a lot of stucco used as well (see elevation sheets accompanying this staff report). The single-family home designs make good use of dormers, and of changing the look of the homes enough to differentiate them and add variety to the development. Regarding the townhomes, there is only one plan shown to be used for the four 5-plexes at the center of the development. There is a lack of architectural variety. The Planning Commission, should it choose to do so, can add an extra condition of approval regarding the architectural design of the townhome units..

Parking:

All units will have two-car garages. All units on the outer perimeter of the project will have two-car driveways which will accommodate guest parking. The 20 units in the middle of the development will not have driveways to accommodate guest parking. Sandy City Code section 21-24-8(b) states the following calculation is to be used for guest parking:

Land Use Category	Space Requirements
Guest parking	2-car off street parking in the dwelling's
	driveway is required. Alternatively, 0.25
	spaced per unit after a base of 1 per unit for
	the first 5 units if provided in an off-street
	parking lot.

Using this calculation, five (5) spaces are needed for the first five (5) of the 20 units. After that .25 spaces per unit are required for each of the 15 remaining townhomes, which comes to 3.75 spaces. This calculates to a total of 8.75 guest spaces required, and the site plan shows nine guest parking spaces. The proposed site plan meets the parking requirement as laid out in the ordinance.

Landscaping:

The plan proposes 40.4 percent (1.62 acres) of total open space. Sandy City's PUD ordinance requires at least 40 percent of the gross development size. This open space proposal meets that requirement. The developer would install all site landscaping, including turf, bushes, and trees. The amenities offered within the open space include a picnic table and a tot lot with slides and swings. Staff would recommend a pergola that covers the picnic table and/or bbq pits or other usable amenities as well.

CONCERNS

Staff has the following concerns regarding this proposal as submitted by the applicant:

- 1. Drainage. The applicant's proposal contains 12 single-family lots. In their initial proposal they were not proposing to plat each individual unit. For that reason, the originally proposed open space around these single-family homes could be used for storm water management. Now the applicant is proposing to plat each individual lot and there is no common open space adjacent to the single-family homes. For this reason, each single-family lot will need to handle its own drainage, or else a new grading and drainage plan will need to be created to account for the individual lots and to ensure that the retention does not interfere with fencing locations.
- 2. Formation of HOA. The applicant needs to ensure that there is an HOA, or similar organization, in place to govern the common area of the development. A reserve study will need to be provided and a reserve fund will need to be established. The applicant has informed staff that an HOA will be created.
- 3. The preliminary plat shows the alley serving the townhome building at the southeast as being only 22 feet wide. This needs to be increased to 24 feet. Also, the plat shows the alley as extending all the way to the south property line, although all other plans show it terminating in line with the southern end of the townhome units fronting 700 E. This alley does not need to extend to the south property line.
- 4. There is a 20-foot irrigation easement that runs along the south property lines. The townhome building to the southeast falls slightly into that easement. Additionally, the optional rear covered patios fall partially within that easement as well. The applicant will need to work with Water Pro regarding what the restrictions are regarding this irrigation line. Water Pro will need to be a required signature block on the final plat.
- 5. Staff believes that there are not enough high-quality materials being used on the architectural plans for the homes, and especially the townhomes, both of which rely on very liberal use of stucco. The architectural elevations are attached to this staff report. Staff would recommend that the applicant work with staff regarding the building materials in order to provide more high-quality building materials. If a consensus cannot be reached, the materials will come back before the Planning Commission for final approval.
- 6. The building elevations provided do not appear to be to scale, and it is unclear whether every townhome building meets the 35-foot height requirement. If the Planning Commission determines that preliminary review is complete, scaled and labeled drawings need to be provided to ensure no building stands above 35 feet tall as part of final review. Failure to provide this will result in the applicant being unable to obtain a building permit for these buildings.
- 7. Approved road names (by Salt Lake County) will need to be provided by the applicant and labeled on the plat and site plan before final approval can be granted.
- 8. The masonry wall being constructed by Challenger School along their west property line extends part way across the rear yard of the neighbor who borders this project on the northwest corner. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider extending that wall all the way along the west property line of this project to maintain aesthetic continuity, or alternatively at least across the northwest neighbor's rear yard to avoid having two fence/wall types converge in the middle of their rear yard. Also, the applicant has not indicated what their plans for walls or fencing are for this site. They will need to provide clarification on that

to ensure it is appropriate for this PUD. Staff would recommend that the applicant work with the adjacent property owners to the south regarding the installation of a new solid vinyl fence to replace the wooden fences along the south property line.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff Recommends that the Planning Commission determine that preliminary site plan review is complete for the **Thackeray Towns Site Plan**, located at 10760 S. 700 E., based on the following findings and subject to the following conditions:

Findings:

- 1. The subdivision configuration, as proposed, meets the standards required by the PUD (10) zone, save for the three special exceptions being requested.
- 2. The density being proposed meets the maximum allowable density of 10 units per acre.

Conditions:

- 1. That the applicant complies with each department's comments and redlines throughout the final review process and that all issues be resolved before the subdivision can be recorded.
- 2. That all City provisions, codes and ordinances are adhered to during the review, construction, and operations process of this project.
- 3. That all lots comply with all requirements of the PUD (10) zone or as modified or approved by the Planning Commission.
- 4. That the maximum density of the development be limited to 40 (10 units per acre) units on this site.
- 5. That the applicant work with staff regarding the building materials in order to provide more high quality building materials. If a consensus cannot be reached, the elevations and materials will need to come back before the Planning Commission for final approval.
- 6. That a private homeowners association be established to ensure common area maintenance for the development. That a note be included on the plat to provide public notice of said HOA and maintenance requirements. The developer shall provide a capital reserve study and establish a reserve fund for the HOA.
- 7. That the driveway on the southeast portion of the development be modified from 22 feet wide to 24 feet wide. This alley shall terminate in line with the southern end of the townhome units fronting 700 E.

- 8. A revised grading and drainage plan be submitted to ensure that water is maintained on each individual single-family lot meeting all City standards.
- 9. No building shall exceed 35 feet measured to the peak of the roof according to Sandy City Code.
- 10. Approved road names (by Salt Lake County) to be provided by the applicant and labeled on the plat and site plan as part of final review.
- 11. The approved setbacks shall be: front: 20-feet, side: 10-feet between single-family dwellings and rear setbacks of 20-feet on the west (with an option of a covered patio to come as close as 13.5') and south boundaries with no structures (temporary or permanent) over the 20-foot irrigation easement on the south property line. Townhome setbacks shall be a minimum of 20-feet from 700 E. and 20-feet from other front property lines.
- 12. That the applicant work with Water Pro relative to possible relocation of their pressurized irrigation line. Water Pro shall be a required signature block on the final subdivision plat.
- 13. The Planning Commission consider extending the masonry wall along the west property line of this project to maintain aesthetic continuity, or alternatively at least across the northwest neighbor's rear yard to avoid having two fence/wall types converge in the middle of their rear yard.
- 14. That the applicant work with the adjacent property owners to the south regarding the installation of a new solid vinyl fence to replace the wooden fences along the south property line. If this is not an option, the applicant will need to provide fencing details for final review with the Planning Commission.
- 15. That this project come back for final review, unless otherwise determined by the Planning Commission.

Reviewed by:

Craig P. Evans	Brian McCuistion
Planner	Planning Director

Planner: