



# Staff Report

PLANNING DIVISION

**To:** Salt Lake City Planning Commission  
**From:** Eric Daems, Senior Planner  
[eric.daems@slcgov.com](mailto:eric.daems@slcgov.com), 801-535-7236  
**Date:** June 12, 2024  
**Re:** PLNPCM2023-00890- Carrigan View Phase 2- Planned Development  
PLNSUB2024-00219- Carrigan View Phase 2- Preliminary Subdivision

## Planned Development & Preliminary Subdivision

**PROPERTY ADDRESSES:** 1820 and 1822 S. Lakeline Drive  
1937 and 1939 S. Scenic Drive  
**PARCEL ID's:** 16-14-376-041, 16-14-376-052, 16-14-376-053, 16-14-353-012, 16-14-353-013  
**MASTER PLAN:** East Bench  
**ZONING DISTRICTS:** FR-2 (Foothills Residential) and OS (Open Space)

### REQUEST:

Adam Turville, property owner, is requesting Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision approval for a 3-lot residential subdivision and the dedication of open space land for conservation, trail preservation, and future trailhead development.

The subject property is in the FR-2 (Foothills Residential) and OS (Open Space) zoning districts at approximately 1820 S. Lakeline Drive. The property is just over 32 acres with approximately 4 acres to be used for the residential lots, 12 acres as dedicated Open Space for trail preservation and future trailhead development, and 16 acres as remainder parcels (Open Space).

The development requires Planned Development approval for the following:

1. Three residential lots do not front on a public street- rather, a private street is proposed.
2. Lot 3 is 50' wide at the front yard setback where 100' would be required.
3. The private road (Carrigan Rim Court) would include construction across manmade slopes that exceed 30%.
4. The residential lots include portions of their buildable area which include slopes that exceed 30%.

### RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of request #'s 1, 2, and 3 and denial of request #4 of both the Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision with the following conditions:

1. A 20' wide public access easement be dedicated from the property line at Lakeline Drive towards the H-Rock, generally located in alignment with the public utility easement for the waterline.

2. Minimum 6’ wide trail surface to be provided within the 20’ public access easement and to be acceptably engineered so as to not be impacted by water run-off.
3. Fence to be installed on north side of Carrigan Rim Court adjacent to trail. Fence is to be wood or metal with a design that is wildlife friendly, deters graffiti, and does not obscure public views to the south.
4. Retaining walls and necessary grading related to roadway and trail construction be allowed provided they meet engineering standards for slopeside stability and waterway protection.
5. Any areas disturbed during construction be revegetated with native plants.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. [ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity Map](#)
- B. [ATTACHMENT B: Plan Sets](#)
- C. [ATTACHMENT C: Property & Vicinity Photos](#)
- D. [ATTACHMENT D: FR-2 Zoning Standards](#)
- E. [ATTACHMENT E: OS Zoning Standards](#)
- F. [ATTACHMENT F: Planned Development Standards](#)
- G. [ATTACHMENT G: Subdivision Standards](#)
- H. [ATTACHMENT H: Public Process & Comments](#)
- I. [ATTACHMENT I: Department Review Comments](#)

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This request is for the Carrigan View Phase 2 Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision. The property is largely west of the north end of Lakeline Drive. The proposal is for a 3-lot residential subdivision in the FR-2 zone and the dedication of open space within the OS zone.

The residential lots range from 51,255 to 67,843 square feet. Lots that exceed 32,760 square feet in the FR-2 zone can be permitted so long as they are created through the subdivision process and are found to be compatible in configuration and orientation with those on the block face. Open space including, and north of the current Bonneville Shoreline Trail would be designated as public open space.


Specific housing plans or development of a trailhead parking area has not yet been proposed. Future homes will need to acquire building permits and meet the standards of the FR-2 zone. A future trailhead parking area will need to go through a public review process prior to development.

The development is to be accessed from a private road (Carrigan Rim Court), which would extend from the end of Lakeline Drive. The first half of the road would include a public access easement and could be used to access future trailhead parking. A gate would then extend across the road to give private access to the three residential lots.

<i>Quick Facts</i>
<b>Total Acres:</b> 32
<b>Public Open Space Acres:</b> 12
<b>Total Open Space Acres:</b> 28
<b>Residential Lots:</b> 3
<b>Proposed Development:</b> None
<b>Future Envisioned Development:</b> 3 Residential units, trailhead parking lot.
<b>Review Process &amp; Standards:</b> Planned Development, Subdivision, FR-2, OS,

The property has a 33' wide public utility easement for a waterline. The waterline runs beneath a dirt road across the property that also serves as the trail surface for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The construction process to level the surface for the dirt road left manmade slopes across the property that exceed 30% slope. To accommodate the new paved private road, construction will need to take place within those areas that exceed 30% slope. Engineered drawings will need to be provided to show how slope stability and water run-off will be mitigated during the construction and with the built roadway.


There is a proposal to sell the land immediately to the north of Carrigan Rim Court to Salt Lake Public Lands, which is intended to be designated as public open space. It would also contain a 20' corridor adjacent to the road that would include the slightly re-aligned Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Staff is recommending that the 20' wide corridor be dedicated as a public access easement. The Bonneville Shoreline Trail would continue to connect Lakeline Drive to the H-Rock.



**Public Open Space (Red), Residential Lots (Yellow), Open Space (Blue), Bonneville Shoreline Trail (Green)**

**Updates since the Planning Commission meeting held May 22, 2024**

Since the Planning Commission meeting held May 22, 2024, Staff has been working with the applicant on several changes to the proposal and additional information has been provided. The subdivision boundaries are now drawn to show Lot 4, which is located adjacent to Lakeline Drive. The lot was previously intended to be part of the proposal but was not shown in the plans. Lot 4 is zoned FR-2 but is projected to be included in the sale to Public Lands and would then be dedicated as public open space.




The inclusion of Lot 4 within the subdivision boundaries would also eliminate a 2' protection strip that is currently in place between the property and Lakeline Drive. The protection strip was put in place to ensure development along Lakeline Drive would not impede future access to portions of the property that did not front the public street.

On recommendation of Staff, the buildable areas of each of the residential lots have been extended to the front and side yard setbacks for the properties. The buildable areas were not previously shown in the top portions of the lot as it is anticipated that those areas will be needed for driveways to access the lots from Carrigan Rim Court. The modifications now maximize the developable area of the less sloped portions of each lot and provide additional flexibility for the future. If a different driveway design is contemplated, the upper portion of the lots will still be buildable without need for a timely plat amendment.


<b>Buildable Area Comparisons</b>		
	<b>Previous Buildable Area</b>	<b>Current Buildable Area</b>
<b>Lot 1</b>	13,678 sq. ft.	17,014 sq. ft.
<b>Lot 2</b>	15,438 sq. ft.	23,633 sq. ft.
<b>Lot 3</b>	20,685 sq. ft.	26,114 sq. ft.

At the previous Planning Commission meeting, Staff requested additional information about the proposed buildable areas within slopes that exceed 30%. The applicant has provided revised drawings to show the amount of land within each steep slope area and lot slope profiles showing a cross section of each proposed lot. A breakdown of proposed buildable areas within the steep slope areas and the lot slope profiles are shown below.


<b>Steep Slope Comparisons</b>		
	<b>Buildable Area over 30% Slope</b>	<b>Maximum Slope</b>
<b>Lot 1</b>	390 sq. ft.	30.5%
<b>Lot 2</b>	3,720 sq. ft.	36%
<b>Lot 3</b>	3,910 sq. ft.	44%




**Buildable areas encroaching into slopes that exceed 30% (circled in blue)**



**Lot 1 Slope Cross Section- with maximum slope just over 30%**



Lot 2 Slope Cross Section- with maximum slope just over 36%



Lot 3 Slope Cross Section- with maximum slope just over 44%


Since the previous Planning Commission meeting, Staff was made aware of an annexation agreement for the Carrigan View Phase 1 subdivision. That agreement includes a condition that a 20' wide public access easement be included from Lakeline Drive towards the H-Rock, generally following the public utility easement for the waterline.

The proposed trail placement with this development would align with that agreement and Staff is recommending a public access easement be recorded with the plat. The trail alignment described in the annexation agreement is shown below.



**20' Public Access Easement Alignment**

Finally, the applicant has provided a new trail cross section with a design that is more appropriate to handle water runoff. The cross section will still need to be reviewed and given final approval by various City departments.



**Proposed Trail Cross Section**

## APPROVAL PROCESS AND COMMISSION AUTHORITY

Per section 21A.55.030 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission may approve a Planned Development as proposed or may impose conditions necessary or appropriate for the project to comply with the standards. The Planning Commission may deny the Planned Development if it finds that the proposal does not meet the intent of the base zoning districts, the purpose of a Planned Development, or is not consistent with the standards in 21A.55.050.

Section 20.04.040 of the Subdivision Ordinance grants approval authority to the Planning Commission for preliminary subdivisions associated with a Planned Development. The commission may approve the request as proposed or with mitigating conditions or may deny the subdivision if it is found not to meet applicable standards.

If approved, both the Planned Development and Subdivision Plat will still be subject to department review comments and all other applicable standards for which no specific relief has been granted.

## KEY CONSIDERATIONS

The key considerations listed below were identified through the analysis of the project:


1. Preservation of Open Space and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail
2. How the Proposal Helps Implement City Goals & Policies Identified in Adopted Plans
3. Buildable Areas that Exceed 30% Slope
4. Additional Environmental Controls of Slopeside Development

### Consideration 1: Preservation of Open Space and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail

The section of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail that runs from H-Rock to Lakeline Drive is on private property and does not have a recorded public easement. Through this proposal, the land for, and above, the trail is anticipated to be sold to Salt Lake Public Lands as perpetual public open space. Independently of the sale of the approximately 12 acres to Salt Lake Public Lands, Staff is recommending a 20' wide public access easement be recorded to accommodate the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. This would ensure public access be provided from Lakeline Drive toward the H-Rock and is consistent with the 1990 annexation agreement for Carrigan View Phase 1 subdivision.



If the sale of the land takes place, it is anticipated that portions of the land will be used for a future trailhead parking area and basic trailhead amenities. Without the allowances given through the planned development, this would likely not be possible.



**Land to be Designated as Public Open Space**

The proposals will create a few changes to the alignment and design of the Shoreline Trail. To accommodate the private street that will access the three residential lots, the trail will need to be shifted several feet north of its current alignment. A 20' wide corridor will be designated for the trail, and it is recommended that an easement be recorded to establish it for public access.

Updated cross sections show a 7' trail surface adjacent to a 5' drainage channel intended to capture water runoff from the hill above. The design will still need to be reviewed and approved by various City departments.

**Consideration 2: How the Proposal Helps Implement City Goals & Policies Identified in Adopted Plans**

**Plan Salt Lake**

**Growth**

- Preserve open space and critical environmental areas.
- Provide access to opportunities for a healthy lifestyle.

**Natural Environment**

- Preserve natural open space and sensitive areas to sustain biodiversity and ecosystem functions.

**Parks & Recreation**

- Enhance trail and open space connectivity through improved visual and physical connections.
- Protect and enhance existing parks, recreation facilities, and trails allowing for modifications to enhance usability and promote activity.

**Discussion:** This development will lead to the preservation of approximately 28 acres of open space with nearly 12 acres designated as public open space. Staff is recommending a specific 20' corridor be dedicated for public access for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The open space will also provide access to connecting trails in the area and opportunities for hiking and other outdoor activities. Portions of the public land will be used for a future trailhead parking area with basic trailhead amenities.

### **East Bench Master Plan**

#### **Initiative PR-2.2- Preserve and Expand Foothill Trails and Trailheads**

##### **Initiative PR-3.1- Preserve the Foothill Open Space**

- Development should be limited to single-family land uses or other low intensity uses that serve the neighborhood and should minimize impacts to the natural environment and views of the foothills. The development should be clustered in a manner that preserves the maximum amount of open space.
- Private land that is undevelopable should be designated as open space and conveyed to a land trust or similar public or private entity for perpetual preservation.
- Cuts and fills in grade should be kept to a minimum. Natural vegetation should be preserved, and structures should be tucked into the hillsides rather than perched on knolls and other prominent, visible areas. Location and height of foothill development should be such that development blends into natural features to the extent possible.

**Discussion:** This proposal includes three single-family lots on property zoned FR-2. The proposed layout clusters the homes below the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and designates the rest as open space. The property north of Carrigan Rim Court would all be sold to Salt Lake Public Lands as public open space and would include the corridor for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Staff is recommending that any areas disturbed throughout the construction process be replanted with native vegetation.

Due to the large buildable areas of the lots and potential impacts created, Staff does not recommend portions of the buildable areas to exceed 30% slope. If the Planning Commission votes to approve the buildable areas within the steep slope area, Staff is recommending that a geotechnical evaluation be conducted and the recommendations therein be implemented.

### **Open Space Plan**

- Negotiate property acquisition or easements with private property owners along the eastern City boundary to complete the trail in the foothill open space area.
- Establish the Shoreline Trails as the edge of the built area and discourage development beyond this edge.

**Discussion:** The applicant has been working with Salt Lake Public Lands to facilitate the sale of the property north of Carrigan Rim Court for dedication as public open space. The preliminary plat would establish new property lines for that to take place. Staff is also recommending the dedication of a specific 20' public access easement for the trail corridor be recorded with the plat.

All proposed development will be below the Shoreline Trail. Without the proposed plans, at least one home could be built above the trail at 1820 S. Lakeline Drive.

### **Consideration 3: Buildable Areas that Exceed 30% Slope**

The applicant has requested an Planned Development approval to allow portions of the buildable areas of the lots to include slopes greater than 30%. According to the applicant this would allow the properties to be more marketable and to be more flexible in their layout. However, in order to protect the foothills from overdevelopment, particularly on steep slopes where building integrity in our seismically active region is most at risk, such areas have long been classified as undevelopable. Moreover, the Applicant has provided no analysis to support why the already sizeable lots created by the subdivision are inadequate without building on these steep slope areas.

After weighing these considerations, Staff is recommending denial of the buildable areas exceeding a 30% slope. The properties still have large buildable areas to accommodate development in harmony with the neighborhood. Lot 1 would have a buildable area of approximately 16,000 sq. ft, Lot 2 would have close 17,000 sq. ft., and Lot 3 would have near 18,000 sq. ft.. The Planning Division concludes that it is important to retain the 30% undevelopable slope prohibition and that the applicant has not provided any information to warrant setting a precedent of allowing development within a steep slope area.

If the Planning Commission votes in favor of the request to allow for the buildable areas to include slopes over 30%, then additional conditions of approval should be considered. To ensure slopeside stability, a geotechnical report from a qualified professional should be required. Any recommendations within the report will then need to be implemented for construction permits to be issued.


## Consideration 4: Additional Environmental Controls of Slopeside Development

The purpose of the FR-2 zone is to promote environmentally sensitive development along the foothills. Consideration is given to help minimize flooding, erosion, and other environmental impacts that could occur with development. This proposal has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of the FR-2 zone, a planned development, and the subdivision standards for a preliminary plat.

Additional reviews will take place with the final subdivision plat, construction improvement plans, and with building permits. Each review includes specific standards that will need to be met to ensure slopeside protection, water management, and more.

The planned private road for the development will require construction across manmade slopes that exceed 30%. Those slopes were created during the construction of the service road for the waterline that traverses the property. Engineered drawings will need to be approved for the construction of any elements that are built within steep slopes. The department review comments identify additional items that need to be addressed as reviews continue. These include the handling of cut and fill needed for construction, the design of retaining walls, and properly mitigating ephemeral streams that cross the property.

Staff is recommending additional environmental controls as a condition of the planned development approval. Retaining walls and necessary grading related to roadway and trail construction should be allowed, provided they meet engineering standards for slopeside stability and waterway protection. Areas disturbed during construction should be revegetated with native plants. These, and other standards, will help minimize potential impacts to natural environment and neighboring properties.



Ephemeral Stream (shown in blue)

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

With the exception of allowing the buildable areas to cross into slopes that exceed 30%, the Planned Development proposal meets the intent of the FR-2 and OS zones. It helps achieve City goals by implementing objectives from the East Bench master plan, Plan Salt Lake, and the Open Space master plan. It creates a public benefit by facilitating low impact development on a downslope area while facilitating upland open space and creates a better project than could be provided if it were to follow the strict application of the zoning and subdivision standards.

The Staff recommendations are in consideration of public benefit and ensure mitigation of any potential impacts to surrounding properties. Staff recommends approval of request #'s 1, 2, and 3, and denial of request #4 of both the Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision.

If the Commission votes to approve for the buildable areas to encroach into portions of the lot that exceed a 30% slope, an alternate motion should be considered related to slopeside protection and mitigation. Staff recommends that the Commission at minimum (1) require a geotechnical

evaluation be performed prior to the issuance of any construction permits and for development to follow any recommendations contained therein; and (2) to prohibit buildable areas from being in areas greater than 40% slope.

## **NEXT STEPS**

### **Approval of the Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision Requests**


If the petitions are approved by the Planning Commission, the applicant will need to comply with the conditions of approval, including any of the conditions required by City departments and the Planning Commission. The applicant will also need to submit an application for Final Plat, although that application will be reviewed administratively. Unless specified in the zoning ordinance as a minor modification, any changes to the development plans must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

### **Denial of the Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision Requests**

If the petitions are denied, the applicant would still be able to develop the residential portion of the property but would need to comply with the underlying standards of the FR-2 zone and subdivision code without modification. In accordance with the annexation agreement of 1990, a 20' public access easement will need to be recorded in approximate alignment with the public utility easement for the waterline. Additional open space land would not need to be dedicated as public open space. Beyond the public access easement, the area where the Bonneville Shoreline Trail crosses the property would remain private land. It would be unlikely that a future trailhead or public amenities could be developed in the area in the future. Development reviews for any future permits would be handled administratively and would not involve a public process nor be subjective to the objectives or standards for a Planned Development.

# ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity Map

## Carrigan View Phase II



# **ATTACHMENT B: Plan Sets**

---



# CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.

## PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL

1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

**FOR REVIEW  
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

**DATE PRINTED  
June 5, 2024**

### INDEX OF DRAWINGS

1 OF 1	SUBDIVISION PLAT
1 OF 1	BOUNDARY LINE AGREEMENT RECORD OF SURVEY
C-001	GENERAL NOTES
C-200	GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
C-201	SLOPE MAP
C-300	UTILITY PLAN
PP-1	PLAN AND PROFILE CARRIGAN RIM COURT
PP-2	PLAN AND PROFILE CARRIGAN RIM COURT

**ENSIGN**  
THE STANDARD IN ENGINEERING

**SANDY**  
45 W 10000 S, Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529

**LAYTON**  
Phone: 801.547.1100

**TOOELE**  
Phone: 435.843.3590

**CEDAR CITY**  
Phone: 435.865.1453

**RICHFIELD**  
Phone: 435.896.2983

[WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM](http://WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM)

FOR:  
TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

CONTACT:  
ADAM TURVILLE  
PHONE: 801.403.9276

**CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.  
PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL**

1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

#### NOTICE TO CONTRACTOR

ALL CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS PERFORMING WORK SHOWN ON OR RELATED TO THESE PLANS SHALL CONDUCT THEIR OPERATIONS SO THAT ALL EMPLOYEES ARE PROVIDED A SAFE PLACE TO WORK AND THE PUBLIC IS PROTECTED. ALL CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS SHALL COMPLY WITH THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REGULATIONS OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND THE STATE OF UTAH DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CONSTRUCTION SAFETY ORDERS. THE CIVIL ENGINEER SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE IN ANY WAY FOR THE CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS COMPLIANCE WITH SAID REGULATIONS AND ORDERS.


CONTRACTOR FURTHER AGREES TO ASSUME SOLE AND COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY FOR JOB-SITE CONDITIONS DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION OF THIS PROJECT, INCLUDING SAFETY OF ALL PERSONS AND PROPERTY. THAT THIS REQUIREMENT SHALL APPLY CONTINUOUSLY AND NOT BE LIMITED TO NORMAL WORKING HOURS, AND THAT THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DEFEND, INDEMNIFY AND HOLD THE OWNER AND THE CIVIL ENGINEER HARMLESS FROM ANY AND ALL LIABILITY, REAL OR ALLEGED IN CONNECTION WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF WORK ON THIS PROJECT, EXCEPTING FOR LIABILITY ARISING FROM THE SOLE NEGLIGENCE OF THE OWNER OR ENGINEER.

#### NOTICE TO DEVELOPER/ CONTRACTOR

UNAPPROVED DRAWINGS REPRESENT WORK IN PROGRESS, ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE, AND DO NOT CONSTITUTE A FINISHED ENGINEERING PRODUCT. ANY WORK UNDERTAKEN BY DEVELOPER OR CONTRACTOR BEFORE PLANS ARE APPROVED IS UNDERTAKEN AT THE SOLE RISK OF THE DEVELOPER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO BIDS, ESTIMATION, FINANCING, BONDING, SITE CLEARING, GRADING, INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRUCTION, ETC.

#### UTILITY DISCLAIMER

THE CONTRACTOR IS SPECIFICALLY CAUTIONED THAT THE LOCATION AND / OR ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING UTILITIES AS SHOWN ON THESE PLANS IS BASED ON RECORDS OF THE VARIOUS UTILITY COMPANIES AND WHERE POSSIBLE MEASUREMENTS TAKEN IN THE FIELD. THE INFORMATION IS NOT TO BE RELIED ON AS BEING EXACT OR COMPLETE. THE CONTRACTOR MUST CALL THE LOCAL UTILITY LOCATION CENTER AT LEAST 48 HOURS BEFORE ANY EXCAVATION TO REQUEST EXACT FIELD LOCATIONS OF UTILITIES. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO RELOCATE ALL EXISTING UTILITIES WHICH CONFLICT WITH THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS SHOWN ON THE PLANS.



### GENERAL NOTES

- ALL WORK SHALL CONFORM TO SALT LAKE CITY STANDARDS & SPECIFICATIONS.
- CALL BLUE STAKES AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES.
- BENCHMARK ELEVATION = SOUTHWEST CORNER SECTION 14, T1N, R1E SALT LAKE BASE & MERIDIAN ELEV. = 4783.86.

**OWNER**  
ADAM TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84108  
PHONE: 801.403.9276  
ADAMTURVILLE@GMAIL.COM



**ENGINEER**  
ENSIGN ENGINEERING INC.  
45 WEST 10000 SOUTH, SUITE 500  
SANDY, UTAH 84070  
ROBERT Q. ELDER, P.E.  
PHONE: 801.254.7529  
RELDER@ENSIGNUTAH.COM

PROJECT NUMBER: 9806  
PRINT DATE: 2024-06-05  
PROJECT MANAGER: RQE  
DESIGNED BY: KFW



# CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 14,  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE & MERIDIAN  
SALT LAKE CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH  
PRELIMINARY PLAT - FOR REFERENCE ONLY



**LEGEND**

- EXISTING STREET MONUMENT
- PROPOSED STREET MONUMENT
- SECTION CORNER
- BOUNDARY LINE
- SECTION LINE
- MONUMENT LINE
- EASEMENT LINE
- ADJACENT BOUNDARY LINE
- ZONE FR2 OVERLAY

THIS PLAT CONFORMS TO ALL A CLASS B SURVEY STANDARDS WITH THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE ERROR OF 1:15,000.


- NOTES:**
- PUBLIC ACCESS ACROSS PARCEL B IS PERMITTED ON DESIGNATED PUBLIC TRAILS ONLY.
  - ALL PARTIES OF LOTS 1, 2, AND 3 SHALL SHARE EQUALLY IN THE COST FOR MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND REPLACEMENT AS NEEDED FOR THE CONTINUOUS OPERATION AND SERVICE OF THE SEWER LATERAL THAT IS LOCATED IN THE 20' PRIVATE SANITARY SEWER LATERAL EASEMENT SERVICING THOSE LOTS AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT.
  - THE PRIVATE STREET, 30' ACCESS EASEMENT, UTILITY, AND WATER LINE EASEMENTS ARE ALSO IN FAVOR OF SLOPU AS WATER MAIN, FIRE HYDRANT, WATER METER, AND SERVICE LATERAL EASEMENTS.

**CURVE TABLE**

CURVE	RADIUS	LENGTH	DELTA	BEARING	CHORD
C1	174.50'	174.41'	57°15'55"	S86°40'02"W	167.24'
C2	98.00'	40.02'	23°24'02"	N69°44'09"E	39.75'
C3	50.00'	140.82'	161°22'14"	N75°47'44"E	98.68'
C4	50.00'	56.01'	64°10'52"	S55°36'35"E	53.13'
C5	50.00'	84.81'	97°11'22"	N43°42'19"E	75.01'
C6	10.00'	16.91'	96°52'33"	S32°59'50"W	14.98'
C7	488.34'	208.38'	24°26'57"	N74°31'05"W	206.81'
C8	50.00'	69.41'	79°32'09"	S41°40'02"W	63.97'
C9	50.00'	22.18'	25°25'06"	S10°48'36"E	22.00'
C10	477.42'	13.14'	1°34'35"	N63°00'47"W	13.14'

**LINE TABLE**

LINE	BEARING	LENGTH
L1	S58°02'05"W	20.95'
L2	S8°33'54"E	36.50'
L3	N66°57'23"W	80.67'
L4	S8°33'54"E	41.38'
L5	N50°02'53"E	21.14'



**SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE**  
I, PATRICK M. HARRIS, with Ensign, do hereby certify that I am a Licensed Professional Land Surveyor in the State of Utah and that I hold Certificate No. 286882 in accordance with Title 58, Chapter 22, of the Professional Engineers and Land Surveyor's Act. I further certify that by authority of the Owners, I have completed a survey of the property described on this subdivision plat in accordance with Section 17-23-17 and have verified all measurements; that the reference monuments shown on this plat are located as indicated and are sufficient to accurately establish the lateral boundaries of the herein described tract of real property, and has been drawn correctly to the designated scale and is a true and correct representation of the herein described lands included in said subdivision, based upon data compiled from records of the Salt Lake County Records Office. I further certify that all lots meet frontage width and area requirements of the applicable zoning ordinances.

**BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION**  
Beginning South 89°41'10" East 1,110.30 feet and North 18°24'07" West 447.60 feet from the Southwest Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running  
thence North 18°24'07" West 635.93 feet;  
thence North 89°41'10" West 128.42 feet;  
thence North 17°42'04" West 124.72 feet;  
thence North 09°40'00" West 187.06 feet;  
thence South 89°51'06" East 1,931.47 feet;  
thence South 30°32'00" West 165.47 feet;  
thence Southwesterly 88.53 feet along the arc of a 50.00 foot radius curve to the left (center bears South 06°45'01" West and the chord bears South 46°01'30" West 77.41 feet with a central angle of 101°12'02");  
thence North 64°42'00" West 21.10 feet;  
thence Westerly 45.94 feet along the arc of a 220.88 foot radius curve to the left (center bears South 25°18'00" West and the chord bears North 70°39'28" West 45.85 feet with a central angle of 11°54'55");  
thence South 24°30'00" West 142.00 feet;  
thence Northwesterly 330.57 feet along the arc of a 478.34 foot radius curve to the left (center bears South 27°46'25" West and the chord bears North 82°01'28" West 324.04 feet with a central angle of 39°35'47");  
thence South 79°23'38" West 24.00 feet;  
thence South 11°30'30" East 131.46 feet;  
thence South 47°54'00" East 353.41 feet;  
thence North 44°51'11" East 137.16 feet;  
thence South 69°30'00" East 7.75 feet;  
thence South 00°03'14" East 410.56 feet;  
thence South 13°10'08" West 150.04 feet;  
thence South 66°39'56" West 230.69 feet;  
thence North 00°28'37" East 64.77 feet;  
thence North 89°21'20" West 340.00 feet;  
thence South 00°18'50" West 54.11 feet;  
thence North 89°41'10" West 5.85 feet;  
thence North 00°18'50" East 265.00 feet;  
thence North 89°41'10" West 727.78 feet to the point of beginning.

Contains 1,425,578 Square Feet or 32.727 Acres, 4 Lots and 2 Parcels  
Tax Parcel No. 16-14-353-012, 16-14-353-013, 16-14-376-041, 16-14-376-042, 16-14-376-052, and 16-14-376-053



DATE \_\_\_\_\_ PATRICK M. HARRIS  
P.L.S. 286882

**UTILITY DEDICATION**  
By execution of this plat, the Owner(s) shown below does hereby grant and convey to the Salt Lake City and other public utility companies, a permanent easement and right of way in and to those areas reflected on the map and defined as "PRIVATE STREET", and for construction and maintenance of approved public utilities and appurtenances therewith with right of access thereto.

**OWNER'S DEDICATION AND CONSENT TO RECORD**  
\_\_\_\_\_, the owners of the described tract of land to be hereafter known as

## CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.

hereby consents and give approval to the recording of this plat for all purposes shown herein. There are no streets, easements or other property reflected on this plat to be dedicated to the public.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ A.D. 20\_\_\_\_

(COMPANY NAME)  
By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_

### NOTARY ACKNOWLEDGMENT

STATE OF UTAH, County of SALT LAKE, J.S.S.  
On this day of \_\_\_\_\_, in the year 20\_\_\_\_, before me \_\_\_\_\_, a notary public, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_, the \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_, who proved on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to in the foregoing Owner's Dedication and Consent regarding the CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D., and was signed by him/her on behalf of said \_\_\_\_\_ and acknowledged that he/she/they executed the same.

Commission Number \_\_\_\_\_  
My Commission Expires \_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
A Notary Public Commissioned in Utah

## CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 14,  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE & MERIDIAN  
SALT LAKE CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH  
PRELIMINARY PLAT

**SHEET 1 OF 1**  
PROJECT NUMBER: 9808  
MANAGER: ROE  
DRAWN BY: KFW  
CHECKED BY: PMH  
DATE: 6/5/24

**RECORD SURVEY DATA**  
ROS NO.: \$\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

PREPARED BY:  
**ENSIGN**  
SALT LAKE CITY  
45 W. 10000 S., Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529  
Fax: 801.255.4449  
WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM

LAYTON Phone: 801.541.1100  
TOOELE Phone: 435.843.3990  
CEDAR CITY Phone: 435.861.1643  
RICHFIELD Phone: 435.899.2963

**BOARD OF HEALTH APPROVAL**  
APPROVED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ BY THE BOARD OF HEALTH.  
SALT LAKE COUNTY HEALTH DEPT.

**CITY PLANNING DIRECTOR**  
APPROVED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ BY THE SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION.  
SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING DIRECTOR DATE

**CITY ENGINEER DIVISION**  
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE HAD THIS PLAT EXAMINED BY THIS OFFICE AND IT IS CORRECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH INFORMATION ON FILE.  
CITY ENGINEER DATE

**CITY PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPARTMENT**  
APPROVED AS TO SANITARY SEWER AND WATER UTILITY DETAIL THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.  
SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC UTILITIES DIRECTOR

**CITY ATTORNEY**  
APPROVED AS TO FORM THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ BY THE SALT LAKE CITY ATTORNEY.  
SALT LAKE CITY ATTORNEY

**CITY APPROVAL**  
PRESENTED TO SALT LAKE CITY THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ AND IS HEREBY APPROVED.  
SALT LAKE CITY MAYOR ATTEST: CITY RECORDER

**ZONING ADMINISTRATOR**  
APPROVED AS TO FORM THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ BY THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR.  
ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

**SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER**  
RECORDED # \_\_\_\_\_  
STATE OF UTAH, COUNTY OF SALT LAKE, RECORDED AND FILED AT THE REQUEST OF: \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME: \_\_\_\_\_ BOOK: \_\_\_\_\_ PAGE: \_\_\_\_\_  
FEES \_\_\_\_\_ SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER

NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_  
ACCOUNT \_\_\_\_\_  
SHEET 1  
OF 1 SHEETS

**SALT LAKE CITY**  
45 W. 10000 S., Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529

**LAYTON**  
Phone: 801.547.1100

**TOOELE**  
Phone: 435.843.3590

**CEDAR CITY**  
Phone: 435.865.1453

**RICHFIELD**  
Phone: 435.896.2983

WWW.ENSGNENG.COM

FOR:  
SCOTT R TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH  
CONTACT:  
SCOTT R TURVILLE  
PHONE:

**SCOTT R TURVILLE PROPERTY  
BOUNDARY LINE AGREEMENT**  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS, UTAH



**BOUNDARY LINE  
AGREEMENT  
RECORD OF SURVEY**

PROJECT NUMBER: 8008  
PRINT DATE: 6/5/24  
DRAWN BY: KFW  
CHECKED BY: PMH  
PROJECT MANAGER: RQE

1 OF 1

**SURVEYOR'S NARRATIVE**

I, Patrick M. Harris, do hereby state that I am a Professional Land Surveyor and that I hold Certificate No. 266882 as prescribed by the laws of the State of Utah and represent that I have made a survey of the following described property. The Purpose of this survey is to provide a boundary survey and resulting boundary line agreement with the request of Scott R. Turville. The boundary lines shown of the surveyed parcels are per the record deeds as researched in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder unless noted otherwise. Boundary corners along the new common boundary line shall be set with an iron and cap marked "Ensign". The Basis of Bearing is the line between the Southwest Corner and the South Quarter Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian measuring South 89°41'10" East 2927.03 feet.

**EXISTING PARCEL DESCRIPTIONS**

**Tax Parcel No. 16-14-363-012 and 16-14-363-013**  
Beginning North 0°17'39" West 1320 feet and South 89°41'10" East 576.8 feet from the Southwest Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North 02°45'32" West 291.35 feet; thence South 89°39'52" West 220.11 feet; thence North 89°41'10" West 696.29 feet; thence North 17°42'04" West 124.72 feet; thence North 09°40' West 190 feet to the point of beginning.

**Tax Parcel No. 16-14-376-048**  
Beginning North 0°18'50" East 50 feet from the Northwest Corner of Lot 8, Arcadia Heights Plat A, Amended Subdivision, said subdivision being located in Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence South 89°41'10" East 340 feet; thence South 00°18'50" West 64.77 feet; thence North 66°30' East 230.77 feet, more or less; thence North 13° East 155.12 feet; thence North 00°17'39" West 411.34 feet; more or less; thence North 69°30' West 9.31 feet; thence South 42°06' West 153 feet, more or less; thence North 47°54' West 360 feet; thence South 35°06' West 353.9 feet, more or less; thence South 00°18'50" West 434.12 feet to the point of beginning.

**Tax Parcel No. 16-14-376-052**  
Beginning South 89°41'10" East 1110.30 feet and North 18°24'07" West 447.604 feet from the Southwest Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North 18°24'07" West 627.838 feet; thence South 89°41'10" East 563.88 feet; thence North 86°30' East 220.11 feet; thence North 02°45'32" East 291.35 feet; thence South 89°41'10" East 135.79 feet; thence South 00°08'54" West 235.776 feet; thence East along a 45.107 foot radius curve to the right 13.472 feet; thence East along a 30 foot radius curve to the left 22.426 feet; thence North 79°35'14" East 202.01 feet; thence East along a 511.386 foot radius curve to the left 22.363 feet; thence North 00°08'54" East 167.859 feet; thence South 89°41'10" East 337.03 feet; thence South 00°17'39" East 193.98 feet, more or less; thence South 24°30' West 130.17 feet; thence Northwesterly along a curve to the left 354.88 feet; thence South 11°30'30" East 131.45 feet; thence South 47°54' East 360 feet; thence North 42°08' West 160 feet; thence North 89°41'10" West 0.0 feet; thence North 00°08'54" West 265.0 feet; thence North 89°41'10" West 727.782 feet, more or less to the point of beginning.

**Tax Parcel No. 16-14-376-053**  
Beginning at a point which is North 00°07'45" West 1335.05 feet and North 89°51'06" West 667.03 feet from the South Quarter Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North 89°51'06" West 260.540 feet; thence South 00°08'54" West 235.776 feet to the point of beginning of a 45.107 foot radius curve to the right (Bearing to center is South 14°17'59" West); thence along the arc of said curve 13.472 feet (Delta = 17°06'40") to the point of beginning of a 30.00 foot radius curve to the left (Bearing to center is North 31°25'14" East); thence along the arc of said curve 22.428 feet (Delta = 42°50'00"); thence North 78°35'14" East 208.010 feet to the point of beginning of a 511.386 foot radius curve to the left (Bearing to center is North 11°24'46" West); thence along the arc of said curve 22.363 feet (Delta = 02°30'20"); thence North 00°08'54" East 197.859 feet to the point of beginning.

**NEW PARCEL BOUNDARIES DESCRIPTIONS**



**Tax Parcel No. 16-14-363-012**  
Beginning South 89°41'10" East 1,110.30 feet and North 18°24'07" West 1,083.53 feet from the Southwest Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North 89°41'10" West 128.42 feet; thence North 17°42'04" West 124.72 feet; thence North 09°40' West 187.86 feet; thence South 89°51'06" East 1,728.47 feet; thence South 00°17'39" West 172.60 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 6 of Carrigan View Subdivision, recorded in Book 1990P at Page 79 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder; thence North 00°07'45" West 1335.05 feet and North 89°51'06" West 667.03 feet from the South Quarter Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North 89°51'06" West 260.540 feet; thence South 00°08'54" West 235.776 feet to the point of beginning of a 45.107 foot radius curve to the right (Bearing to center is South 14°17'59" West); thence along the arc of said curve 13.472 feet (Delta = 17°06'40") to the point of beginning of a 30.00 foot radius curve to the left (Bearing to center is North 31°25'14" East); thence along the arc of said curve 22.428 feet (Delta = 42°50'00"); thence North 78°35'14" East 208.010 feet to the point of beginning of a 511.386 foot radius curve to the left (Bearing to center is North 11°24'46" West); thence along the arc of said curve 22.363 feet (Delta = 02°30'20"); thence North 00°08'54" East 197.859 feet to the point of beginning.

**Tax Parcel No. 16-14-363-013**  
Beginning South 89°41'10" East 1,631.24 feet and North 712.59 feet from the Southwest Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North 83°54'41" West 169.43 feet; thence North 04°21'38" West 293.95 feet; thence North 78°53'39" East 323.62 feet; thence Northwesterly 69.41 feet along the arc of a 50.00 foot radius curve to the right (center bears South 88°06'02" East and the chord bears North 41°40'02" East 63.97 feet with a central angle of 79°32'09"); thence North 81°26'06" West 163.99 feet; thence North 08°33'54" East 10.38 feet; thence South 81°26'06" West 163.99 feet; thence Southwesterly 69.41 feet along the arc of a 50.00 foot radius curve to the left (center bears South 08°33'54" East and the chord bears South 41°40'02" West 63.97 feet with a central angle of 79°32'09"); thence South 78°53'39" West 323.62 feet; thence South 85°33'41" West 109.09 feet; thence North 65°59'09" West 119.39 feet; thence North 89°41'10" West 454.31 feet to the point of beginning. Contains 489,962 Square Feet or 11.248 Acres.

**Tax Parcel No. 16-14-376-048**  
Beginning at the southwest corner of Lot 2 of Scenic Circle Amended Subdivision, recorded in Book 2002P at Page 162 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder, said point being South 89°41'10" East 1,110.30 feet and North 18°24'07" West 447.60 feet from the Southwest Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North 18°24'07" East 626.53 feet; thence South 89°41'10" East 454.31 feet; thence South 65°59'09" East 119.39 feet; thence North 65°53'14" East 109.09 feet; thence South 04°21'38" East 293.95 feet; thence North 83°54'41" East 658.34 feet; thence South 47°54'00" East 310.02 feet; thence North 44°51'11" East 137.16 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 1 of Carrigan View Subdivision, recorded in Book 1990P at Page 79 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder; thence South 69°30'00" East 7.75 feet along the southerly boundary line of said Lot 1 to the extension of the westerly boundary line of Lot 5 of the Valley Vista Subdivision, recorded in Book 95 at Page 69 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder; thence South 00°03'14" East 410.56 feet along the extension and the westerly boundary line of said Lot 5 to an interior corner of said Lot 5; thence South 13°10'08" West 156.04 feet along said westerly boundary line of Lot 5 and the westerly boundary line of Lot 403 of Arcadia Heights Subdivision Plat D, recorded in Book S at Page 99 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder; thence South 66°39'56" West 230.69 feet along the northerly boundary line of said Arcadia Heights Subdivision Plat D to an interior corner on the easterly boundary line of Lot 2 of Alder Robinson Subdivision, recorded in Book 2012P at Page 129 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder; thence North 00°28'27" East 64.77 feet to the northeast corner of said Lot 2; thence North 89°21'20" West 340.00 feet along the northerly boundary of said Alder Robinson Subdivision to the northwest corner of Lot 1 of said Alder Robinson Subdivision; thence South 00°18'50" West 54.11 feet thence along the westerly boundary line of said Lot 1 to the northeast corner of Lot 7 of Arcadia Heights Subdivision Plat A, recorded in Book P at Page 98 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder; thence North 89°41'10" West 6.88 feet along the northerly boundary line of said Lot 7 to the southeast corner of Lot 4 of Scenic Circle Subdivision, recorded in Book 1993P at Page 254 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder; thence North 00°18'50" East 265.00 feet along the easterly boundary line of said Lot 4 to the northeast corner of Lot 4 of Scenic Circle Amended Subdivision to the point of beginning. Contains 729,418 Square Feet or 16.745 Acres.

**Tax Parcel No. 16-14-376-052**  
Beginning South 89°41'10" East 1,631.24 feet and North 712.59 feet from the Southwest Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North 06°05'19" West 285.83 feet; thence North 78°53'39" East 164.26 feet; thence Southeasterly 56.01 feet along the arc of a 50.00 foot radius curve to the left (center bears North 66°28'51" East and the chord bears South 55°36'35" East 53.13 feet with a central angle of 64°10'32"); thence South 09°50'08" West 271.71 feet; thence South 83°54'41" West 147.20 feet to the point of beginning. Contains 51,552 Square Feet or 1.183 Acres.

**Tax Parcel No. 16-14-376-053**  
Beginning South 89°41'10" East 1,777.61 feet and North 729.00 feet from the Southwest Corner of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North 65°59'09" East 271.71 feet; thence Northwesterly 84.81 feet along the arc of a 50.00 foot radius curve to the left (center bears North 02°18'00" East and the chord bears North 43°42'19" East 75.01 feet with a central angle of 97°12'22"); thence North 50°02'53" East 21.14 feet; thence Northwesterly 16.91 feet along the arc of a 10.00 foot radius curve to the right (center bears North 74°33'33" East and the chord bears North 32°59'50" East 14.36 feet with a central angle of 56°52'33"); thence North 81°26'06" East 163.99 feet; thence South 08°33'54" East 10.38 feet; thence Southeasterly 208.38 feet along the arc of a 488.34 foot radius curve to the right (center bears South 03°15'26" West and the chord bears South 74°13'19" East 208.81 feet with a central angle of 24°29'37"); to the westerly boundary line of Lot 1 of Carrigan View Subdivision, recorded in Book 1990P at Page 79 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder; thence South 24°30'00" West 10.02 feet along said westerly boundary line of Lot 1 to the southwest corner of said Lot 1 and a point on the northerly boundary line of Knotts PUD, recorded in Book 2001P at Page 272 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder; thence along the northerly, easterly, and southerly boundary line of said Lot 1 the following four (4) courses: (1) Northwesterly 330.57 feet along the arc of a 478.34 foot radius curve to the left (center bears South 27°46'25" West and the chord bears North 62°01'28" West 324.04 feet with a central angle of 39°39'47"); (2) South 79°23'38" West 24.00 feet; (3) South 11°30'30" East 131.46 feet; (4) South 47°54'00" East 262.38 feet; thence South 83°54'41" West 341.71 feet to the point of beginning. Contains 60,838 Square Feet or 1.397 Acres.



**LINE TABLE**


LINE	BEARING	LENGTH
L1	S8°33'54"E	31.00'
L2	N50°02'53"E	21.14'

**CURVE TABLE**

CURVE	RADIUS	LENGTH	DELTA	BEARING	CHORD
C1	478.34'	330.57'	39°35'47"	N82°01'28"W	324.04'
C2	488.34'	208.38'	24°26'57"	N74°31'05"W	206.81'
C3	50.00'	69.41'	79°32'09"	S41°40'02"W	63.97'
C4	50.00'	84.81'	97°12'22"	N43°42'19"E	75.01'
C5	10.00'	16.91'	96°52'33"	S32°59'50"W	14.96'
C6	50.00'	140.82'	161°22'14"	N75°47'44"E	98.68'

**LEGEND**

- SECTION CORNER
- BOUNDARY CORNER NOT SET
- SET ENSIGN REBAR AND CAP
- SECTION LINE
- PROPERTY LINE
- ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE
- DEED LINE
- EXISTING FENCE LINE
- RECORD BEARING AND/OR DISTANCE (XXX.XX)



LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 14  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,  
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN  
SALT LAKE CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH

**SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC UTILITIES GENERAL NOTES**

**1. COMPLIANCE:**  
ALL CONSTRUCTION AND MATERIALS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THESE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS AND THE MOST RECENT EDITIONS OF THE FOLLOWING: THE INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING CODE, UTAH DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS, APWA MANUAL OF STANDARD PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS, AND SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES MODIFICATIONS TO APWA STANDARD PLANS AND APPROVED MATERIALS AND SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES APWA SPECIFICATIONS MODIFICATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR IS REQUIRED TO ADHERE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE-MENTIONED DOCUMENTS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED AND APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE SALT LAKE CITY DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC UTILITIES.

**2. COORDINATION:**  
THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO NOTIFY ALL APPROPRIATE GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENTITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT. THE FOLLOWING MUST BE CONTACTED 48-HOURS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION AS APPLICABLE TO THE PROJECT:

PUBLIC UTILITIES:  
BACKFLOW PREVENTION - 483-6795  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ENGINEERING - 483-6781  
INSPECTIONS, PERMITS, CONTRACTS & AGREEMENTS - 483-6727  
PRETREATMENT - 799-4002  
STORM WATER - 483-6751

SLC DEPARTMENTS:  
ENGINEERING - PUBLIC WAY PERMITS AND ISSUES - 535-6248  
ENGINEERING - SUBDIVISIONS - 535-6159  
FIRE DEPARTMENT - 535-6636  
PERMITS AND LICENSING (BLDG SERVICES) - 535-7752  
PLANNING AND ZONING - 535-7700  
TRANSPORTATION - 535-6630

- ALL OTHER POTENTIALLY IMPACTED GOVERNING AGENCIES OR ENTITIES  
- ALL WATER USERS INVOLVED IN WATER MAIN SHUTDOWNS  
- APPLICABLE SEWER, WATER AND DRAINAGE DISTRICTS  
- BLUESTAKES LOCATING SERVICES - 532-5000  
- COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT - 743-7231  
- COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL - 468-2779  
- COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT - 385-468-3913  
- COUNTY PUBLIC WAY PERMITS - 468-2241  
- HOLLADAY CITY - 272-9450  
- SALT LAKE COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT - 468-3705 OR 468-2156  
- THE UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY FOR RE-ROUTING SERVICE - 262-5628  
- UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO., SUPERINTENDENTS OFFICE - 593-3405  
- UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, REGION #2 - 975-4800  
- UTAH STATE ENGINEER - 538-7240

**3. SCHEDULE**  
PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROVIDE, AND WILL UPDATE AS CHANGES OCCUR, A CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SPECIFICATIONS AND SALT LAKE CITY ENGINEERING OR SALT LAKE COUNTY REGULATIONS AS APPLICABLE FOR WORKING WITHIN THE PUBLIC WAY.

**4. PERMITS, FEES AND AGREEMENTS**  
CONTRACTOR MUST OBTAIN ALL THE NECESSARY PERMITS AND AGREEMENTS AND PAY ALL APPLICABLE FEES PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. CONTACT SALT LAKE CITY ENGINEERING (535-6248) FOR PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS REQUIRED FOR ANY WORK CONDUCTED WITHIN SALT LAKE CITY'S PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY. APPLICABLE UTILITY PERMITS MAY INCLUDE MAINLINE EXTENSION AGREEMENTS AND SERVICE CONNECTION PERMITS. ALL UTILITY WORK MUST BE BONDED. ALL CONTRACTORS MUST BE LICENSED TO WORK ON CITY UTILITY MAINS.

CONSTRUCTION SITES MUST BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE UTAH POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (UPDES) STORM WATER PERMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES (538-6396). A COPY OF THE PERMITS STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN MUST BE SUBMITTED TO PUBLIC UTILITIES FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL. ADDITIONAL WATER QUALITY AND EROSION CONTROL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED. THE CONTRACTOR MUST ALSO COMPLY WITH SALT LAKE CITY'S CLEAN WHEEL ORDINANCE.

**5. ASPHALT AND SOIL TESTING**  
THE CONTRACTOR IS TO PROVIDE MARSHALL AND PROCTOR TEST DATA 24-HOURS PRIOR TO USE. CONTRACTOR IS TO PROVIDE COMPACTION AND DENSITY TESTING AS REQUIRED BY SALT LAKE CITY ENGINEERING, UDOT, SALT LAKE COUNTY OR OTHER GOVERNING ENTITY. TRENCH BACKFILL MATERIAL AND COMPACTION TESTS ARE TO BE TAKEN PER APWA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS, SECTION 330302. BACKFILLING OF TRENCHES, OR AS REQUIRED BY THE SLC PROJECT ENGINEER IF NATIVE MATERIALS ARE USED. **NO NATIVE MATERIALS ARE ALLOWED WITHIN THE PIPE ZONE.** THE MAXIMUM LIFTS FOR BACKFILLING EXCAVATIONS IS 8-INCHES. ALL MATERIALS AND COMPACTION TESTING IS TO BE PERFORMED BY A LAB RECOGNIZED AND ACCEPTED BY SALT LAKE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS AND/OR SALT LAKE CITY ENGINEERING.

**6. TRAFFIC CONTROL AND HAUL ROUTES**  
TRAFFIC CONTROL MUST CONFORM TO THE MOST CURRENT EDITION OF SALT LAKE CITY TRAFFIC CONTROL MANUAL - PART 6 OF "MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES" FOR SALT LAKE COUNTY AND STATE OF UTAH. TRANSPORTATION MUST APPROVE ALL PROJECT HAUL ROUTES (535-7129). THE CONTRACTOR MUST ALSO CONFORM TO UDOT, SALT LAKE COUNTY OR OTHER APPLICABLE GOVERNING ENTITIES REQUIREMENTS FOR TRAFFIC CONTROL.

**7. SURVEY CONTROL**  
CONTRACTOR MUST PROVIDE A REGISTERED LAND SURVEYOR OR PERSONS UNDER SUPERVISION OF A REGISTERED LAND SURVEYOR TO SET STAKES FOR ALIGNMENT AND GRADE OF EACH MAIN AND/OR FACILITY AS APPROVED. THE STAKES SHALL BE MARKED WITH THE HORIZONTAL LOCATION (STATION) AND VERTICAL LOCATION (GRADE) WITH CUTS AND/OR FILLS TO THE GRADE OF THE MAIN AND/OR FACILITY AS APPROVED. IN ADDITION, THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR SURVEYOR SHALL PROVIDE TO SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC UTILITIES CUT SHEETS FILLED OUT COMPLETELY AND CLEARLY SHOWING THE PERTINENT GRADES, ELEVATIONS AND CUT/FILLS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FIELD STAKING OF THE MAIN AND/OR FACILITY. THE CUT SHEET FORM IS AVAILABLE AT THE CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS OFFICE AT PUBLIC UTILITIES. ALL MAINS AND LATERALS NOT MEETING MINIMUM GRADE REQUIREMENTS AS SPECIFIED BY ORDINANCE OR TRANSPORTATION MUST BE RECONSTRUCTED TO MEET DESIGN GRADE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROTECT ALL STAKES AND MARKERS UNTIL PUBLIC UTILITY SURVEYORS COMPLETE FINAL MEASUREMENTS. THE CONTRACTOR WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR FURNISHING, MAINTAINING, OR RESTORING ALL MONUMENTS AND REFERENCE MARKS WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE. CONTACT THE COUNTY SURVEYOR (469-2028) FOR MONUMENT LOCATIONS AND CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS. ALL ELEVATIONS SHALL BE REFERENCED TO SALT LAKE CITY DATUM UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE ON THE PLANS.

**8. ASPHALT GUARANTEE**  
THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE, DISPOSE OF, FURNISH AND PLACE PERMANENT ASPHALT PER SALT LAKE CITY ENGINEERING, UDOT, COUNTY, OR OTHER GOVERNMENT STANDARDS AS APPLICABLE TO THE PROJECT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL GUARANTEE THE ASPHALT RESTORATION FOR A PERIOD AS REQUIRED BY THE GOVERNING ENTITY.

**9. TEMPORARY ASPHALT**  
IF THE CONTRACTOR CHOOSES TO WORK WITHIN THE PUBLIC WAY WHEN HOT MIX ASPHALT IS NOT AVAILABLE, THE CONTRACTOR MUST OBTAIN APPROVAL FROM THE APPROPRIATE GOVERNING ENTITY PRIOR TO INSTALLING TEMPORARY ASPHALT SURFACING MATERIAL. WITHIN SALT LAKE CITY, WHEN PERMANENT ASPHALT BECOMES AVAILABLE, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE THE TEMPORARY ASPHALT, FURNISH AND INSTALL THE PERMANENT ASPHALT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL GUARANTEE THE ASPHALT RESTORATION FOR A PERIOD AS REQUIRED BY THE GOVERNING ENTITY FROM THE DATE OF COMPLETION.

**10. SAFETY**  
THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL ASPECTS OF SAFETY OF THE PROJECT AND SHALL MEET ALL OSHA, STATE, COUNTY AND OTHER GOVERNING ENTITY REQUIREMENTS.

THE CONTRACTOR IS SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR CONFORMING TO LOCAL AND FEDERAL CODES GOVERNING SHORING AND BRACING OF EXCAVATIONS AND TRENCHES, AND FOR THE PROTECTION OF WORKERS.

**11. DUST CONTROL**  
THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DUST CONTROL ACCORDING TO THE GOVERNING ENTITY STANDARDS. USE OF HYDRANT WATER OR PUMPING FROM CITY-OWNED CANALS OR STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES IS NOT ALLOWED FOR DUST CONTROL ACTIVITIES WITHOUT WRITTEN APPROVAL OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES DIRECTOR.

**12. DEWATERING**  
ALL ON-SITE DEWATERING ACTIVITIES MUST BE APPROVED IN WRITING BY PUBLIC UTILITIES. PROPOSED OUTFALL LOCATIONS AND ESTIMATED FLOW VOLUME CALCULATIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED TO PUBLIC UTILITIES FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL. ADEQUATE MEASURES MUST BE TAKEN TO REMOVE ALL SEDIMENT PRIOR TO DISCHARGE. PUBLIC UTILITIES MAY REQUIRE ADDITIONAL MEASURES FOR SEDIMENT CONTROL AND REMOVAL.

**13. PROJECT LIMITS**  
THE CONTRACTOR IS REQUIRED TO KEEP ALL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE APPROVED PROJECT LIMITS. THIS INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT STAGING, MATERIAL STORAGE AND LIMITS OF TRENCH EXCAVATION. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO OBTAIN PERMISSION AND/OR EASEMENTS FROM THE APPROPRIATE GOVERNING ENTITY AND/OR INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY OWNER(S) FOR WORK OR STAGING OUTSIDE OF THE PROJECT LIMITS.

**14. WATER, FIRE, SANITARY SEWER AND STORM DRAINAGE UTILITIES**  
**A. INSPECTIONS**  
IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SCHEDULE ANY WATER, SEWER, BACKFLOW AND DRAINAGE INSPECTION 48-HOURS IN ADVANCE TO WHEN NEEDED. CONTACT 483-6727 TO SCHEDULE INSPECTIONS.

**B. DAMAGE TO EXISTING UTILITIES -**  
THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR REPAIRING ANY DAMAGE, CAUSED BY ANY CONDITION INCLUDING SETTLEMENT, TO EXISTING UTILITIES FROM WORK PERFORMED AT OR NEAR EXISTING UTILITIES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE ALL MEASURES NECESSARY TO PROTECT ALL EXISTING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ROADWAY AND UTILITY FACILITIES. DAMAGE TO EXISTING FACILITIES CAUSED BY THE CONTRACTOR, MUST BE REPAIRED BY THE CONTRACTOR AT HIS/HER EXPENSE, TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE OWNER OF SAID FACILITIES.

**C. UTILITY LOCATIONS -**  
CONTRACTOR WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCATING AND AVOIDING ALL UTILITIES AND SERVICE LATERALS, AND FOR REPAIRING ALL DAMAGE THAT OCCURS TO THE UTILITIES DUE TO THE CONTRACTOR'S ACTIVITIES. CONTRACTOR IS TO VERIFY LOCATION, DEPTH, SIZE, MATERIAL AND OUTSIDE DIAMETERS OF UTILITIES IN THE FIELD BY POT-HOLING A MINIMUM OF 300-FEET AHEAD OF SCHEDULED CONSTRUCTION IN ORDER TO IDENTIFY POTENTIAL CONFLICTS AND PROBLEMS WITH FUTURE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. EXISTING UTILITY INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES' MAPS MUST BE ASSUMED AS APPROXIMATE AND REQUIRING FIELD VERIFICATION. CONTACT BLUE STAKES OR APPROPRIATE OWNER FOR COMMUNICATION LINE LOCATIONS.

**D. UTILITY RELOCATIONS -**  
FOR UTILITY CONFLICTS REQUIRING MAINLINE RELOCATIONS, THE CONTRACTOR MUST NOTIFY THE APPLICABLE UTILITY COMPANY OR USER A MINIMUM OF 2-WEEKS IN ADVANCE. A ONE-WEEK MINIMUM NOTIFICATION IS REQUIRED FOR CONFLICTS REQUIRING THE RELOCATION OF SERVICE LATERALS. ALL RELOCATIONS ARE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL FROM THE APPLICABLE UTILITY COMPANY AND/OR USER.

**E. FIELD CHANGES -**  
NO ROADWAY, UTILITY ALIGNMENT OR GRADE CHANGES ARE ALLOWED FROM THE APPROVED CONSTRUCTION PLANS/DOCUMENTS WITHOUT WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM THE SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES DIRECTOR. CHANGES TO HYDRANT AND/OR FIRE LINES MUST BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE SALT LAKE CITY OR SALT LAKE COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT (AS APPLICABLE TO THE PROJECT) AND PUBLIC UTILITIES.

**F. PUBLIC NOTICE TO PROJECTS IN THE PUBLIC WAY -**  
FOR APPROVED PROJECTS THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO PROVIDE AND DISTRIBUTE WRITTEN NOTICE TO ALL RESIDENTS LOCATED WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA AT LEAST 72-HOURS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. WORK TO BE CONDUCTED WITHIN COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL AREAS MAY REQUIRE A LONGER NOTIFICATION PERIOD AND ADDITIONAL CONTRACTOR COORDINATION WITH PROPERTY OWNERS. THE WRITTEN NOTICE IS TO BE APPROVED BY THE SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES PROJECT ENGINEER.

**G. PUBLIC NOTICE FOR WATER MAIN SHUT DOWNS -**  
THROUGH THE SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES INSPECTOR AND WITH THE PUBLIC UTILITIES PROJECT ENGINEER APPROVAL, SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES MUST BE CONTACTED AND APPROVE ALL WATER MAIN SHUTDOWNS. ONCE APPROVED THE CONTRACTOR MUST NOTIFY ALL EFFECTED USERS BY WRITTEN NOTICE A MINIMUM OF 48-HOURS (RESIDENTIAL) AND 72-HOURS (COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL) PRIOR TO THE WATER MAIN SHUT DOWN. PUBLIC UTILITIES MAY REQUIRE LONGER NOTICE PERIODS.

**H. WATER AND SEWER SEPARATION -**  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH UTAH'S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH REGULATIONS, A MINIMUM TEN-FOOT HORIZONTAL AND 1.5-FOOT VERTICAL (WITH WATER ON TOP) SEPARATION IS REQUIRED. IF THESE CONDITIONS CANNOT BE MET, STATE AND SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES APPROVAL IS REQUIRED. ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION MEASURES WILL BE REQUIRED FOR THESE CONDITIONS.

**I. SALVAGE -**  
ALL METERS MUST BE RETURNED TO PUBLIC UTILITIES, AND AT PUBLIC UTILITIES REQUEST ALL SALVAGED PIPE AND/OR FITTINGS MUST BE RETURNED TO SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES (483-6727) LOCATED AT 1530 SOUTH WEST TEMPLE.

**J. SEWER MAIN AND LATERAL CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS -**  
SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES MUST APPROVE ALL SEWER CONNECTIONS. ALL SEWER LATERALS 6-INCHES AND SMALLER MUST MEET THE SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES REQUIREMENTS. ALL 6-INCH AND LARGER SEWER CONNECTIONS MUST BE PETITIONED FOR AT PUBLIC UTILITIES (483-6762) AND CONNECTED AT A MANHOLE. **INSIDE DROPS IN MANHOLES ARE NOT ALLOWED.** A MINIMUM 4-FOOT BURY DEPTH IS REQUIRED ON ALL SEWER MAINS AND LATERALS. CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL INVERT COVERS IN ALL SEWER MANHOLES WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA.

CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE AIR PRESSURE TESTING OF SEWER MAINS IN ACCORDANCE WITH PIPE MANUFACTURERS RECOMMENDATIONS AND SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC UTILITIES REQUIREMENTS. ALL PVC SEWER MAIN AND LATERAL TESTING SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH UN-BELL UN-B-6-98 RECOMMENDED PRACTICE FOR LOW PRESSURE AIR TESTING OF INSTALLED SEWER PIPE. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE SEWER LATERAL WATER TESTING AS REQUIRED BY THE SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC UTILITIES PROJECT ENGINEER OR INSPECTOR. A MINIMUM OF 9-FEET OF HEAD PRESSURE IS REQUIRED AS MEASURED VERTICALLY FROM THE HIGH POINT OF THE PIPELINE AND AT OTHER LOCATIONS ALONG THE PIPELINE AS DETERMINED BY THE SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES PROJECT ENGINEER OR INSPECTOR. TESTING TIME WILL BE NO LESS THAN AS SPECIFIED FOR THE AIR TEST DURATION IN TABLE I ON PAGE 12 OF UN-B-6-98. ALL PIPES SUBJECT TO WATER TESTING SHALL BE FULLY VISIBLE TO THE INSPECTOR DURING TESTING. TESTING MUST BE PERFORMED IN THE PRESENCE OF A SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES REPRESENTATIVE. ALL VISIBLE LEAKAGE MUST BE REPAIRED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES ENGINEER OR INSPECTOR.

**K. WATER AND FIRE MAIN AND SERVICE CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS -**  
SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES MUST APPROVE ALL FIRE AND WATER SERVICE CONNECTIONS. A MINIMUM 3-FOOT SEPARATION IS REQUIRED BETWEEN ALL WATER AND FIRE SERVICE TAPS INTO THE MAIN. ALL CONNECTIONS MUST BE MADE MEETING SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES REQUIREMENTS. A 5-FOOT MINIMUM BURY DEPTH (FINAL GRADE TO TOP OF PIPE) IS REQUIRED ON ALL WATER/FIRE LINES UNLESS OTHERWISE APPROVED BY PUBLIC UTILITIES. WATER LINE THRUST BLOCK AND RESTRAINTS ARE AS PER SLC APPROVED DETAIL DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS. ALL EXPOSED NUTS AND BOLTS WILL BE COATED WITH CHEVRON FM1 GREASE PLUS MINIMUM 8 MIL THICKNESS PLASTIC. PROVIDE STAINLESS STEEL NUTS, BOLTS AND WASHERS FOR HIGH GROUNDWATER/SATURATED CONDITIONS AT FLANGE FITTINGS, ETC.

ALL WATER LINES INSTALLATIONS AND TESTING TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AWWA SECTIONS C600, C691, C651, C286, C260, C900, C303 APWA MANUAL M11 AND ALL OTHER APPLICABLE AWWA, UPWS, ASTM AND ANSI SPECIFICATIONS RELEVANT TO THE INSTALLATION AND COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT. AMENDMENT TO SECTION C600 SECTION 4.1.1; DOCUMENT TO READ MINIMUM TEST PRESSURE SHALL NOT BE LESS THAN 200 P.S.I. GAUGED TO A HIGH POINT OF THE PIPELINE BEING TESTED. ALL MATERIALS USED FOR WATERWORKS PROJECTS TO BE RATED FOR 150 P.S.I. MINIMUM OPERATING PRESSURE.

CONTRACTOR IS TO INSTALL WATER SERVICE LINES, METER YOKES AND/OR ASSEMBLIES AND METER BOXES WITH LIDS LOCATED AS APPROVED ON THE PLANS PER APPLICABLE PUBLIC UTILITIES DETAIL DRAWINGS. METER BOXES ARE TO BE PLACED IN THE PARK STRIPS PERPENDICULAR TO THE WATERMAIN SERVICE TAP CONNECTION. ALL WATER METERS, CATCH BASINS, CLEANOUT BOXES, MANHOLES, DOUBLE CHECK VALVE DETECTOR ASSEMBLIES, REDUCED PRESSURE DETECTOR ASSEMBLIES AND BACKFLOW PREVENTION DEVICES MUST BE LOCATED OUTSIDE OF ALL APPROACHES, DRIVEWAYS, PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS AND OTHER TRAVELED WAYS UNLESS OTHERWISE APPROVED ON PLANS.

BACKFLOW PREVENTORS ARE REQUIRED ON ALL IRRIGATION AND FIRE SPRINKLING TAPS PER PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SLC FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS. CONTRACTORS SHALL INSTALL BACKFLOW PREVENTION DEVICES ON FIRE SPRINKLER CONNECTIONS. DOUBLE CHECK VALVE ASSEMBLIES SHALL BE INSTALLED ON CLASS 1, 2 AND 3 SYSTEMS. REDUCED PRESSURE PRINCIPLE VALVES SHALL BE INSTALLED ON CLASS 4 SYSTEMS. ALL FIRE SPRINKLING BACKFLOW ASSEMBLIES SHALL CONFORM TO ASSE STANDARD 1048, 1013, 1047 AND 1015. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE TO PERFORM BACKFLOW PREVENTION TESTS PER SALT LAKE CITY STANDARDS AND SUBMIT RESULTS TO PUBLIC UTILITIES. ALL TESTS MUST BE PERFORMED AND SUBMITTED TO PUBLIC UTILITIES WITHIN 10 DAYS OF INSTALLATION OR WATER TURN-ON. BACKFLOW TEST FORMS ARE AVAILABLE AT PUBLIC UTILITIES' CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS OFFICE.

**L. GENERAL WATER, SEWER AND STORM DRAIN REQUIREMENTS -**  
ALL WATER, FIRE AND SEWER SERVICES STUBBED TO A PROPERTY MUST BE USED OR WATER AND FIRE SERVICES MUST BE KILLED AT THE MAIN AND SEWER LATERALS CAPPED AT PROPERTY LINE PER PUBLIC UTILITIES REQUIREMENTS. ALLOWABLE SERVICES TO BE KEPT WILL BE AS DETERMINED BY THE PUBLIC UTILITIES PROJECT ENGINEER. ALL WATER AND FIRE SERVICE KILLS AND SEWER LATERAL CAPS ARE TO BE KILLED AND CAPPED AS DETERMINED AND VISUALLY VERIFIED BY THE ON-SITE PUBLIC UTILITIES INSPECTOR.

ALL MANHOLES, HYDRANTS, VALVES, CLEAN-OUT BOXES, CATCH BASINS, METERS, ETC. MUST BE RAISED OR LOWERED TO FINAL GRADE PER PUBLIC UTILITIES STANDARDS AND INSPECTOR REQUIREMENTS. CONCRETE COLLARS MUST BE CONSTRUCTED ON ALL MANHOLES, CLEANOUT BOXES, CATCH BASINS AND VALVES PER PUBLIC UTILITIES STANDARDS. ALL MANHOLE, CATCH BASIN, OR CLEANOUT BOX CONNECTIONS MUST BE MADE WITH THE PIPE CUT FLUSH WITH THE INSIDE OF THE BOX AND GROUTED OR SEALED AS REQUIRED BY THE PUBLIC UTILITIES INSPECTOR. ALL MANHOLE, CLEANOUT BOX OR CATCH BASIN DISCONNECTIONS MUST BE REPAIRED AND GROUTED AS REQUIRED BY THE ON-SITE PUBLIC UTILITIES INSPECTOR.

CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT ALLOW ANY GROUNDWATER OR DEBRIS TO ENTER THE NEW OR EXISTING PIPE DURING CONSTRUCTION. UTILITY TRENCHING, BACKFILL, AND PIPE ZONE AS PER SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES, 'UTILITY INSTALLATION DETAIL.'

**ABBREVIATIONS**

APWA	AMERICAN PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION
AR	ACCESSIBLE ROUTE
ASTM	AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS
AWWA	AMERICAN WATER WORKS ASSOCIATION
BOS	BOTTOM OF STEP
BVC	BEGIN VERTICAL CURVE
C	CURVE
CD	CATCH BASIN
CF	CURB FACE OR CUBIC FEET
CO	CLEAN OUT
COMM	COMMUNICATION
CONC	CONCRETE
CONT	CONTINUOUS
DIA	DIAMETER
DIP	DUCTILE IRON PIPE
ELEC	ELECTRICAL
ELEV	ELEVATION
EOA	EDGE OF ASPHALT
EVC	END OF VERTICAL CURVE
EW	EACH WAY
EXIST	EXISTING
FF	FINISH FLOOR
FG	FINISH GRADE
FL	FIRE HYDRANT
FH	FLOW LINE OR FLANGE
GB	GRADE BREAK
GF	GARAGE FLOOR
GV	GATE VALVE
HC	HANDICAP
HP	HIGH POINT
IRR	IRRIGATION
LC	RATE OF VERTICAL CURVATURE
LD	LAND DRAIN
LF	LINEAR FEET
LP	LOW POINT
MH	MANHOLE
MIN	MINIMUM
MJ	MECHANICAL JOINT
NG	NATURAL GROUND
NC	NOT IN CONTRACT
NUM	NUMBER
OC	ON CENTER
OCW	ON CENTER EACH WAY
OHF	OVERHEAD POWER
PC	POINT OF CURVATURE OR PRESSURE CLASS
PCC	POINT OF COMPOUND CURVATURE
PI	POINT OF INTERSECTION
PIP	PLASTIC IRRIGATION PIPE
PIV	POST INDICATOR VALVE
PL	PROPERTY LINE
PRC	POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE
PRO	PROPOSED
PT	POINT OF TANGENCY
PVC	POINT OF VERTICAL CURVATURE
PVI	POINT OF VERTICAL INTERSECTION
PVT	POINT OF VERTICAL TANGENCY
R	RADIUS
RD	ROOF DRAIN
ROW	RIGHT OF WAY
S	SLOPE
SAN SWR	SANITARY SEWER
SD	STORM DRAIN
SEC	SECONDARY
SS	SANITARY SEWER
STA	STATION
SW	SIDEWALK
SWL	SECONDARY WATER LINE
TBC	TOP BACK OF CURB
TOG	TOP OF GRATE
TOA	TOP OF ASPHALT
TOC	TOP OF CONCRETE
TOF	TOP OF FOUNDATION
TOW	TOP OF WALL
TOS	TOP OF STEP
TYP	TYPICAL
VC	VERTICAL CURVE
WI	WALL INDICATOR VALVE
WL	WATER LINE

NOTE: MAY CONTAIN ABBREVIATIONS THAT ARE NOT USED IN THIS PLAN SET.

**LEGEND**

	SECTION CORNER		EXISTING EDGE OF ASPHALT
	EXISTING MONUMENT		PROPOSED EDGE OF ASPHALT
	PROPOSED MONUMENT		EXISTING STRIPING
	EXISTING REBAR AND CAP		PROPOSED STRIPING
	SET ENSIGN REBAR AND CAP		EXISTING FENCE
	EXISTING WATER METER		PROPOSED FENCE
	PROPOSED WATER METER		EXISTING FLOW LINE
	EXISTING WATER MANHOLE		PROPOSED FLOW LINE
	PROPOSED WATER MANHOLE		GRADE BREAK
	EXISTING WATER BOX		EXISTING STORM DRAIN LINE
	EXISTING WATER VALVE		PROPOSED STORM DRAIN LINE
	PROPOSED WATER VALVE		ROOF DRAIN LINE
	EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT		CATCHMENTS
	PROPOSED FIRE HYDRANT		HIGH WATER LINE
	PROPOSED FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTION		EXISTING SANITARY SEWER
	EXISTING SECONDARY WATER VALVE		PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER LINE
	PROPOSED SECONDARY WATER VALVE		PROPOSED SAN. SWR. SERVICE LINE
	EXISTING IRRIGATION BOX		EXISTING LAND DRAIN LINE
	EXISTING IRRIGATION VALVE		PROPOSED LAND DRAIN LINE
	PROPOSED IRRIGATION VALVE		PROPOSED LAND DRAIN SERVICE LINE
	EXISTING SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE		EXISTING CULINARY WATER LINE
	PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE		PROPOSED CULINARY WATER LINE
	EXISTING SANITARY CLEAN OUT		EXISTING CULINARY WATER SERVICE LINE
	EXISTING STORM DRAIN CLEAN OUT BOX		PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER LINE
	PROPOSED STORM DRAIN CLEAN OUT BOX		EXISTING STORM DRAIN WATER LINE
	EXISTING STORM DRAIN INLET BOX		PROPOSED SECONDARY WATER LINE
	EXISTING STORM DRAIN CATCH BASIN		PROPOSED SEC. WATER SERVICE LINE
	PROPOSED STORM DRAIN CATCH BASIN		EXISTING IRRIGATION LINE
	EXISTING STORM DRAIN COMBO BOX		PROPOSED IRRIGATION LINE
	PROPOSED STORM DRAIN COMBO BOX		EXISTING OVERHEAD POWER LINE
	EXISTING STORM DRAIN CLEAN OUT		EXISTING ELECTRICAL LINE
	EXISTING STORM DRAIN CULVERT		EXISTING GAS LINE
	PROPOSED STORM DRAIN CULVERT		EXISTING TELEPHONE LINE
	TEMPORARY SAG INLET PROTECTION		ACCESSIBLE ROUTE
	TEMPORARY IN-LINE INLET PROTECTION		SAW CUT LINE
	ROOF DRAIN		STRAW WATTLE
	EXISTING ELECTRICAL MANHOLE		TEMPORARY BERM
	EXISTING ELECTRICAL BOX		TEMPORARY SILT FENCE
	EXISTING TRANSFORMER		LIMITS OF DISTURBANCE
	EXISTING UTILITY POLE		EXISTING WALL
	EXISTING LIGHT		PROPOSED WALL
	PROPOSED LIGHT		EXISTING CONTOURS
	EXISTING GAS METER		PROPOSED CONTOURS
	EXISTING GAS MANHOLE		BUILDABLE AREA WITHIN SETBACKS
	EXISTING GAS VALVE		PUBLIC DRAINAGE EASEMENT
	EXISTING TELEPHONE MANHOLE		EXISTING ASPHALT TO BE REMOVED
	EXISTING TELEPHONE BOX		PROPOSED ASPHALT
	EXISTING TRAFFIC SIGNAL BOX		EXISTING CURB AND GUTTER
	EXISTING CABLE BOX		PROPOSED CURB AND GUTTER
	EXISTING BOLLARD		PROPOSED REVERSE PAN CURB AND GUTTER
	PROPOSED BOLLARD		TRANSITION TO REVERSE PAN CURB
	EXISTING SIGN		CONCRETE TO BE REMOVED
	PROPOSED SIGN		EXISTING CONCRETE
	EXISTING SPOT ELEVATION		PROPOSED CONCRETE
	PROPOSED SPOT ELEVATION		BUILDING TO BE REMOVED
	EXISTING FLOW DIRECTION		EXISTING BUILDING
	EXISTING TREE		PROPOSED BUILDING
	DENSE VEGETATION		

NOTE: MAY CONTAIN SYMBOLS THAT ARE NOT USED IN THIS PLAN SET.



**SANDY**  
45 W 10000 S, Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529

**LAYTON**  
Phone: 801.547.1100

**TOOELE**  
Phone: 435.843.3590

**CEDAR CITY**  
Phone: 435.865.1453

**RICHFIELD**  
Phone: 435.896.2983

**WWW.ENSGNENG.COM**

FOR:  
TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

CONTACT:  
ADAM TURVILLE  
PHONE: 801.403.9276

**CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE IIP.U.D.  
PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH**

**GENERAL NOTES**

PROJECT NUMBER: 9806  
PRINT DATE: 2024-06-05  
PROJECT MANAGER: RQE  
DESIGNED BY: KFW

**C-001**

**811**  
Know what's below.  
Call before you dig.

CALL BLUESTAKES  
@ 811 AT LEAST 48 HOURS  
PRIOR TO THE  
COMMENCEMENT OF ANY  
CONSTRUCTION.

**BENCHMARK**  
SOUTHWEST CORNER SECTION 14  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST  
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN  
ELEV = 4783.86'

**ENSIGN**  
THE STANDARD IN ENGINEERING

**SANDY**  
45 W 10000 S, Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529

**LAYTON**  
Phone: 801.547.1100

**TOOELE**  
Phone: 435.843.3590

**CEDAR CITY**  
Phone: 435.865.1453


**RICHFIELD**  
Phone: 435.896.2983

**WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM**


FOR:  
TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

CONTACT:  
ADAM TURVILLE  
PHONE: 801.403.9276


**CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.  
PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL**  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH



- GENERAL NOTES**
- ALL WORK TO COMPLY WITH THE GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - ALL IMPROVEMENTS MUST COMPLY WITH ADA STANDARDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.
  - ALL WORK SHALL COMPLY WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER POSSIBLY INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, REMOVAL OF UNCONSOLIDATED FILL, ORGANICS, AND DEBRIS. PLACEMENT OF SUBSURFACE DRAIN LINES AND GEOTEXTILE, AND OVEREXCAVATION OF UNSUITABLE BEARING MATERIALS AND PLACEMENT OF ACCEPTABLE FILL MATERIAL.
  - THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THE EXISTING SOIL CONDITIONS.
  - LANDSCAPED AREAS REQUIRE SUBGRADE TO BE MAINTAINED AT A SPECIFIC ELEVATION BELOW FINISHED GRADE AND REQUIRE SUBGRADE TO BE PROPERLY PREPARED AND SCARIFIED. SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.
  - SLOPE ALL LANDSCAPED AREAS AWAY FROM BUILDING FOUNDATIONS TOWARD CURB AND GUTTER OR STORM DRAIN INLETS.
  - EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS ARE SHOWN IN THEIR APPROXIMATE LOCATIONS BASED UPON RECORD INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF PREPARATION OF THESE PLANS. LOCATIONS MAY NOT HAVE BEEN VERIFIED IN THE FIELD AND NO GUARANTEE IS MADE AS TO THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF THE INFORMATION SHOWN. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO DETERMINE THE EXISTENCE AND LOCATION OF THE UTILITIES SHOWN ON THESE PLANS OR INDICATED IN THE FIELD BY LOCATING SERVICES. ANY ADDITIONAL COSTS INCURRED AS A RESULT OF THE CONTRACTOR'S FAILURE TO VERIFY THE LOCATIONS OF EXISTING UTILITIES PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION IN THEIR VICINITY SHALL BE BORNE BY THE CONTRACTOR AND ASSUMED INCLUDED IN THE CONTRACT. THE CONTRACTOR IS TO VERIFY ALL CONNECTION POINTS WITH THE EXISTING UTILITIES. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGE CAUSED TO THE EXISTING UTILITIES AND UTILITY STRUCTURES THAT ARE TO REMAIN. IF CONFLICTS WITH EXISTING UTILITIES OCCUR, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ENGINEER PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION TO DETERMINE IF ANY FIELD ADJUSTMENTS SHOULD BE MADE.
  - ALL STORM DRAIN INFRASTRUCTURE TO BE INSTALLED PER GOVERNING AGENCY OR APWA STANDARD PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - ENSURE MINIMUM COVER OVER ALL STORM DRAIN PIPES PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS. NOTIFY ENGINEER IF MINIMUM COVER CANNOT BE ATTAINED.
  - ALL FACILITIES WITH DOWNSPOUTS/ROOF DRAINS SHALL BE CONNECTED TO THE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM. SEE PLUMBING PLANS FOR DOWNSPOUT/ROOF DRAIN LOCATIONS AND SIZES. ALL ROOF DRAINS TO HAVE MINIMUM 1% SLOPE.
  - THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ADJUST TO GRADE ALL EXISTING UTILITIES AS NEEDED PER LOCAL GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - NOTIFY ENGINEER OF ANY DISCREPANCIES IN DESIGN OR STAKING BEFORE PLACING CONCRETE, ASPHALT, OR STORM DRAIN STRUCTURES OR PIPES.
  - THE CONTRACTOR IS TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE ALL EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS, UTILITIES, AND SIGNS, ETC. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON THESE PLANS.



- SCOPE OF WORK:**  
PROVIDE, INSTALL AND/OR CONSTRUCT THE FOLLOWING PER THE SPECIFICATIONS GIVEN OR REFERENCED, THE DETAILS NOTED, AND/OR AS SHOWN ON THE CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS:
- A-2000 PVC STORM DRAIN LINE OR APPROVED EQUAL. INSTALLATION AND TRENCHING PER CITY STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS. LENGTH AND SLOPE PER PLAN.
  - CATCH BASIN PER CITY STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - COMBO BOX PER CITY STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - DOUBLE CATCH BASIN PER CITY STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.



**GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN**

PROJECT NUMBER: 9806  
PROJECT MANAGER: RQE  
DESIGNED BY: KFW

PRINT DATE: 2024-06-05

**C-200**

**811**  
Know what's below.  
Call before you dig.

**BENCHMARK**  
SOUTHWEST CORNER SECTION 14  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH RANGE 1 EAST  
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN  
ELEV = 4783.86'

**ENSIGN**  
THE STANDARD IN ENGINEERING

**SANDY**  
45 W 10000 S, Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529

**LAYTON**  
Phone: 801.547.1100

**TOOLE**  
Phone: 435.843.3590

**CEDAR CITY**  
Phone: 435.865.1453


**RICHFIELD**  
Phone: 435.896.2983

[WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM](http://WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM)

FOR:  
TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT


CONTACT:  
ADAM TURVILLE  
PHONE: 801.403.9276

**CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.  
PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL**  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH



**SLOPE TABLE**  
10' AVERAGING RULE

NUMBER	MINIMUM SLOPE	MAXIMUM SLOPE	COLOR
1	0.00%	9.99%	
2	10.00%	19.99%	Yellow
3	20.00%	29.99%	Orange
4	30.00%	100.00%	Red



**SLOPE MAP**

PROJECT NUMBER: 9808  
PRINT DATE: 2024-06-05  
PROJECT MANAGER: RQE  
DESIGNED BY: KFW

**C-201**

**811**  
Know what's below.  
Call before you dig.

CALL BLUESTAKES  
@ 811 AT LEAST 48 HOURS  
PRIOR TO THE  
COMMENCEMENT OF ANY  
CONSTRUCTION.

**BENCHMARK**  
SOUTHWEST CORNER SECTION 14  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST  
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN  
ELEV = 4783.86'

**ENSIGN**  
THE STANDARD IN ENGINEERING

**SANDY**  
45 W 10000 S, Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529

**LAYTON**  
Phone: 801.547.1100

**TOOELE**  
Phone: 435.843.3590

**CEDAR CITY**  
Phone: 435.865.1453



**RICHFIELD**  
Phone: 435.896.2983

**WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM**

FOR:  
TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

CONTACT:  
ADAM TURVILLE  
PHONE: 801.403.9276

**CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.  
PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL**  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH



- NOTES:**
- INCORPORATE A PUBLIC WATER MAIN EXTENSION REQUIRED FOR 8" LINE SERVICING LOTS 1, 2, AND 3 FROM THE EXISTING WATER LINE IN LAKELINE DRIVE TO THE WATER METERS AND FIRE HYDRANT AT THE END OF CARRIGAN RIM COURT.
  - THE PRIVATE STREET, 30' ACCESS EASEMENT, UTILITY, AND WATER LINE EASEMENTS ARE ALSO IN FAVOR OF SLCPU AS WATER MAIN, FIRE HYDRANT, WATER METER, AND SERVICE LATERAL EASEMENTS.

- SCOPE OF WORK:**  
PROVIDE, INSTALL AND/OR CONSTRUCT THE FOLLOWING PER THE SPECIFICATIONS GIVEN OR REFERENCED, THE DETAILS NOTED, AND/OR AS SHOWN ON THE CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS:
- 8" DUCTILE IRON CL250 POTABLE WATER LINE PER GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - FIRE HYDRANT ASSEMBLY COMPLETE PER APWA STANDARD PLAN NO. 511 AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - 1" CULINARY WATER METER AND CONCRETE VAULT PER APWA STANDARD PLAN NO. 521 AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - 4" SDR-35 PVC SANITARY SEWER LATERAL, INCLUDING CLEANOUTS AT MAXIMUM 100-FOOT SPACING, PER GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS. LENGTH AND SLOPE PER PLAN.
  - SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE PER GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - CONNECT TO EXISTING SEWER MAIN PER GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - 6" SDR-35 SANITARY SEWER LATERAL PER GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - 20' WIDE SHARED PRIVATE SANITARY SEWER LATERAL EASEMENT ALONG THE BACK OF LOTS 2 AND 3 AND ACROSS PARCEL 'B' OPEN SPACE AREA.
  - INSTALL 8" GATE VALVE
  - INSTALL 22.5" BEND WITHRUST BLOCK
  - INSTALL 45" BEND WITHRUST BLOCK
  - SANITARY SEWER CLEANOUT PER GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.

- GENERAL NOTES**
- ALL WORK TO COMPLY WITH THE GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS ARE SHOWN IN THEIR APPROXIMATE LOCATIONS BASED UPON RECORD INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF PREPARATION OF THESE PLANS. LOCATIONS MAY NOT HAVE BEEN VERIFIED IN THE FIELD AND NO GUARANTEE IS MADE AS TO THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF THE INFORMATION SHOWN. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO DETERMINE THE EXISTENCE AND LOCATION OF THE UTILITIES SHOWN ON THESE PLANS OR INDICATED IN THE FIELD BY LOCATING SERVICES. ANY ADDITIONAL COSTS INCURRED AS A RESULT OF THE CONTRACTOR'S FAILURE TO VERIFY THE LOCATIONS OF EXISTING UTILITIES PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION IN THEIR VICINITY SHALL BE BORNE BY THE CONTRACTOR AND ASSUMED INCLUDED IN THE CONTRACT. THE CONTRACTOR IS TO VERIFY ALL CONNECTION POINTS WITH THE EXISTING UTILITIES. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGE CAUSED TO THE EXISTING UTILITIES AND UTILITY STRUCTURES THAT ARE TO REMAIN. IF CONFLICTS WITH EXISTING UTILITIES OCCUR, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ENGINEER PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION TO DETERMINE IF ANY FIELD ADJUSTMENTS SHOULD BE MADE.
  - ALL SANITARY SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE TO BE INSTALLED PER GOVERNING AGENCY STANDARD PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - ALL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE TO BE INSTALLED PER GOVERNING AGENCY OR APWA STANDARD PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - DEFLECT OR LOOP ALL WATER LINES TO AVOID CONFLICTS WITH OTHER UTILITIES PER GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - PROJECT SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL UTAH DIVISION OF DRINKING WATER RULES AND REGULATIONS INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THOSE PERTAINING TO BACKFLOW PROTECTION AND CROSS CONNECTION PREVENTION.
  - THE CONTRACTOR IS TO COORDINATE ALL UTILITIES WITH MECHANICAL/PLUMBING PLANS.
  - NOTIFY ENGINEER OF ANY DISCREPANCIES IN DESIGN OR STAKING BEFORE PLACING UTILITY STRUCTURES OR PIPES.
  - THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ADJUST TO GRADE ALL EXISTING UTILITIES AS NEEDED PER LOCAL GOVERNING AGENCY'S STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
  - THE CONTRACTOR IS TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE ALL EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS, UTILITIES, AND SIGNS, ETC. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON THESE PLANS.

**UTILITY PLAN**



PROJECT NUMBER: 9806  
PRINT DATE: 2024-06-05  
PROJECT MANAGER: RGE  
DESIGNED BY: KFW

**C-300**



**811**  
Know what's below.  
Call before you dig.

CALL BLUESTAKES  
@ 811 AT LEAST 48 HOURS  
PRIOR TO THE  
COMMENCEMENT OF ANY  
CONSTRUCTION.

**BENCHMARK**  
SOUTHWEST CORNER SECTION 14  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH RANGE 1 EAST  
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN  
ELEV = 4783.86'



**CARRIGAN RIM COURT**  
(PRIVATE ROAD AND PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT)



**ENSIGN**  
THE STANDARD IN ENGINEERING

**SANDY**  
45 W 10000 S, Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529

**LAYTON**  
Phone: 801.547.1100

**TOOLE**  
Phone: 435.843.3590

**CEDAR CITY**  
Phone: 435.865.1453

**RICHFIELD**  
Phone: 435.896.2983

**WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM**

FOR:  
TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

CONTACT:  
ADAM TURVILLE  
PHONE: 801.403.9276

**CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.**  
**PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL**  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

**PLAN AND PROFILE**

PROJECT NUMBER: 9808  
PROJECT MANAGER: RQE

PRINT DATE: 2024-06-05  
DESIGNED BY: KFW



**PP-01**





CALL BLUESTAKES  
@ 811 AT LEAST 48 HOURS  
PRIOR TO THE  
COMMENCEMENT OF ANY  
CONSTRUCTION.

**BENCHMARK**


SOUTHWEST CORNER SECTION 14  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST  
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN  
ELEV = 4783.86'



1 ROAD CROSS SECTION  
CARRIGAN RIM COURT  
SCALE: NONE



**CARRIGAN RIM COURT**  
(PRIVATE ROAD AND PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT)



**CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.**  
**PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL**  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

**PLAN AND PROFILE**

PROJECT NUMBER: 9808  
PRINT DATE: 2024-06-05  
PROJECT MANAGER: RQE  
DESIGNED BY: KFW

**PP-02**

FOR:  
TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT  
CONTACT:  
ADAM TURVILLE  
PHONE: 801.403.9276

WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM

**RICHFIELD**  
Phone: 435.896.2983

**CEDAR CITY**  
Phone: 435.865.1453

**TOOELE**  
Phone: 435.843.3590

**LAYTON**  
Phone: 801.547.1100

**SANDY**  
45 W 10000 S, Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529

**ENSIGN**  
THE STANDARD IN ENGINEERING





**811**  
Know what's below.  
Call before you dig.

**BENCHMARK**  
SOUTHWEST CORNER SECTION 14  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH RANGE 1 EAST  
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN  
ELEV = 4783.86'

**ENSIGN**  
THE STANDARD IN ENGINEERING

**SANDY**  
45 W 10000 S, Suite 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Phone: 801.255.0529

**LAYTON**  
Phone: 801.547.1100

**TOOELE**  
Phone: 435.843.3590





**CEDAR CITY**  
Phone: 435.865.1453

**RICHFIELD**  
Phone: 435.896.2983


[WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM](http://WWW.ENSIGNENG.COM)

FOR:  
TURVILLE  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT


CONTACT:  
ADAM TURVILLE  
PHONE: 801.403.9276



LOT 3 SECTION



LOT 2 SECTION



LOT 1 SECTION

**CARRIGAN VIEW PHASE II P.U.D.**  
**PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL**  
1820 SOUTH LAKELINE DRIVE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

LOT SECTION EXHIBIT

PROJECT NUMBER: 9808  
PROJECT MANAGER: RQE  
PRINT DATE: 2024-05-23  
DESIGNED BY: KFW

**EX-1**

# Carrigan View Phase II Planned Development

*1820 South Lakeline Drive  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84108*

## *Table of Contents*

---

<b>RECORD OWNER</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PLAT PREPARATION</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED USE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PLANNED DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE ESTIMATES</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>SITE PLANS</b>	<b>17</b>

---

*Record Owner*

Scott and Annette Turville Family Trust  
3812 Honeycut Rd.  
Millcreek, UT 84106

*Applicant*

Adam Turville  
1808 E Oakridge Dr.  
Millcreek, UT 84106

*Plat Preparation*

Robert Q. Elder  
Ensign Engineering  
45 Segoe Lily Dr # 500  
Sandy, UT 84070  
+1(801) 255 - 0529

---

**AFFIDAVIT OF AUTHORIZATION FOR ENGINEERING**

Annette Turville  
Scott and Annette Turville Family Trust  
3812 Honeycut Rd.  
Salt Lake City, UT 84106

October 19, 2023

I, Annette Turville, hereby declare that I am the duly appointed trustee of the Scott and Annette Turville Family Trust and that I am authorized to act on behalf of the Trust in all matters related to the planned development of the property described below.

Authorization: I hereby authorize Ensign Engineering and Land Surveying including their employees, contractors, agents, and any other individuals or entities working under the direction or on behalf of Ensign Engineering and Land Surveying, to perform all work necessary to prepare all exhibits and plans related to the planned development proposed at 1820 S. Lakeline Dr., Salt Lake City, UT 84108 and all other contiguous parcels under the same ownership.



Annette Turville  
Trustee, Scott and Annette Turville Family Trust

### *Description of Proposed Use*

The proposed development is part of a larger contingency of parcels totaling more than 40 acres owned by the Scott and Annette Turville Family Trust.

The proposed development encompasses roughly seven acres upon which is proposed three single family residential lots and a private cul-de-sac. These seven acres are currently zoned FR-2 / Foothill Estates Residential.

The proposed single-family residential lots, as well as the private road and cul-de-sac will be maintained in perpetuity by a homeowner's association yet to be formed. Please see an attached exhibit for an infrastructure maintenance plan and estimates, including capital improvements estimates.

An adjoining area consisting of more than two acres zoned FR-2 and almost ten acres zoned OS are planned to be sold to Utah Open Lands in partnership with Salt Lake City Public Lands for conservation, trails preservation, and trailhead development.

A plan has not been finalized for the more than 20 additional acres owned by the Scott and Annette Turville Family Trust, which are contiguous to the proposed development and contiguous to the land to be sold to Utah Open Lands and Salt Lake City Public Lands.

## ***Planned Development Information***

*Demonstrate how your project meets the purpose and at least one objective of a planned development as stated in 21A.55.010 of the planned development ordinance.*

### ***Meets Purpose and Objectives of Planned Development***

This project has been conceived with the goal of both preserving substantial land for recreation, conservation, and trailhead development, as well as providing for a well-designed residential development. By clustering the residential development in its own area west of the main trailhead area and south of the current Bonneville Shoreline Trail the plan accomplished an efficient use of land and minimizes the residential impact on the foothill landscape and trail use.

Additionally, this project has been redesigned from past proposals to preserve substantial open space and natural lands, as well as to optimize access to those lands. This fulfills **Objective A** found in **21A.55.010** of the Planned Development Ordinance. This proposed development is configured in such a way that will preserve existing trail systems but disentangle them from adjacent residential use and ensure in perpetuity that those trails are accessible to the public while also being properly improved and maintained by public entities. This will also leave much of the natural beauty of this particular foothill area undisturbed for conservation and preservation purposes.

### ***Master Plan: Implements Adopted Master Plan***

Additionally, Objective F of 21A.55.010 of the Planned Development Ordinance calls for projects that, “*implement portions of an adopted Master Plan in instances where the Master Plan provides specific guidance on the character of the immediate vicinity of the proposal.*”

The East Bench Master Plan (2017, p. 108) calls for the city to “Negotiate property acquisition or easements with private property owners along the eastern City boundary to complete the trail in the foothill open space area.” This project is in perfect harmony with the completion and preservation of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail in perpetuity. Additionally, the same plan calls for “connections to trails that penetrate the eastern foothills.” This project and adjacent land accommodate and enable improved access to popular trails such as Jack’s Peak. Additionally, this ensures a vital connection to the newly constructed Bonneville Shoreline Trail connection to Parley’s Trail.

This proposal also accommodates and enables the implementation of the Arcadia Heights Plan (1998) calling for a foothill access point and a recommended park site adjacent to the proposed development.

Finally, the East Bench Master Plan Conditions Report (2014, p. 130) reiterates that the city should accommodate properties with development potential or acquire these properties for public open space. This proposed development meets and fulfills both

objectives by developing a portion into residential use where high development potential exists, while also conveying other properties to the city for use by the public as open space. The same report (p. 131) reiterates that this specific subject property should be prioritized as the first preference location for a foothill park. The current proposal enables planning for such a public use to move forward on public lands.

---

*Meets Purpose of Zoning*

The three proposed lots and the proposed road are all situated on land that is zoned FR-2 / Foothill Estates Residential. Each lot is roughly two acres in size, exceeding the minimum lot size requirement of 21,780 square feet.

The Salt Lake City Zoning Code states that the “purpose of the FR-2/21,780 Foothills Residential District is to promote environmentally sensitive and visually compatible development of lots not less than twenty one thousand seven hundred eighty (21,780) square feet in size, suitable for foothills locations as indicated in the applicable community Master Plan. The district is intended to minimize flooding, erosion, and other environmental hazards; to protect the natural scenic character of foothill areas by limiting development; to promote the safety and well being of present and future residents of foothill areas; to protect wildlife habitat; and to ensure the efficient expenditure of public funds.”

The lots in the proposed development are positioned south and lie downhill from the current Bonneville Shoreline Trail. This Trail will be relocated slightly to the north to accommodate construction of the proposed cul-de-sac. By positioning the lots on the downhill slope from the trail and from the proposed road, future homes built on these lots will mitigate any potential visual impacts to those recreating in surrounding lands.

Additionally, all the proposed lots avoid intrusion into sensitive and irreplaceable tree groves on the property. This layout fulfills the zoning purpose of FR-2 to “promote environmentally sensitive and visually compatible development.”

*Exhibits enclosed*

1820 S Lakeline Dr.  
Salt Lake City, UT

**TOTAL AREA UNDER OWNERSHIP**


Approx. 40 acres

**IMPACTED TRAILS**

Bonneville Shoreline Trail  
Jack's Peak  
Other connecting trails

**ZONING**

FR-2 / Foothill Residential  
and  
OS / Open Space



# SALT LAKE CITY ZONING

## **FR-2 / 21,780 FOOTHILLS RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT**

The purpose of the FR-2/21,780 Foothills Residential District is to promote environmentally sensitive and visually compatible development of lots not less than twenty one thousand seven hundred eighty (21,780) square feet in size, suitable for foothills locations as indicated in the applicable community Master Plan. The district is intended to minimize flooding, erosion, and other environmental hazards; to protect the natural scenic character of foothill areas by limiting development; to promote the safety and well being of present and future residents of foothill areas; to protect wildlife habitat; and to ensure the efficient expenditure of public funds.

## **OS / OPEN SPACE**

The purpose of the OS Open Space District is to preserve and enhance public and private open space, natural areas, and improved park and recreational areas. These areas serve to provide opportunities for active and passive outdoor recreation; provide contrasts to the built environment; preserve scenic qualities; protect sensitive or fragile environmental areas such as wetlands, steep slopes, ridge lines, meadows, and stream corridors; preserve the capacity and water quality of the stormwater drainage system; encourage sustainability, conservation and renewable energy and provide pedestrian and bicycle transportation connections. This district is appropriate in areas of the City where the applicable master plans support this type of land use.





# TRAILS

Newly constructed BST from Parley's Canyon to Lakeline Dr. stops at Lakeline Dr., adjacent to subject property

Existing BST runs through subject property for about 0.3 miles connecting to "H" Rock

Trails connecting to Jack's Peak trail and others also run through the property and adjacent to it



# ORIGINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN


Bonneville Shoreline Trail

Lot 1

Lot 2

Lot 3

- 3 Lots
- No plan for off-street trailhead parking
- Realignment of some trails
- Homes and pavement over existing Bonneville Shoreline Trail






# ORIGINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN

Bonneville Shoreline Trail

Lot 3

Lot 2


Lot 1




# REVISED PROPOSAL

Set aside blue parcel (10+ acres) for conservation and trailhead development to mitigate street parking congestion and provide off-street parking trailhead

Develop three smaller lots at the end of new cul-de-sac south of BST in new planned development






**REVISED**  
**PROPOSAL**

3 smaller lots at end of new  
cul-de-sac


Preserve 10+ acres for trailhead  
development and trail  
improvement



**CONSERVATION PARCEL**  
*(Blue Outlined Parcel)*

- Approx. 10+ acres
- Direct access to existing Lakeline Dr. cul-de-sac
- 4 acres of buildable acreage
- Provides acreage for trailhead development to mitigate current street parking congestion
- Minor realignment of Bonneville Shoreline Trail
- Access to Jack's Peak trails and other trails

# ADDITIONAL CONSERVATION PARCELS



Parcel #1 - 10.5 acres (FR-2 / OS)

Parcel #2 - 0.35 acre (FR-2)

Parcel #3 - 17.7 acres (OS)

Parcel #4 - 4.5 acres (OS)

Note: Additional Open Space parcels (red) to be appraised at open space values



## Infrastructure Maintenance Estimates

### Exhibit 1

#### INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE COST ESTIMATES

##### INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE ESTIMATES (Years 1-10)

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Item</b>										
Snow Removal	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,080.00	\$ 4,161.60	\$ 4,244.83	\$ 4,329.73	\$ 4,416.32	\$ 4,504.65	\$ 4,594.74	\$ 4,686.64	\$ 4,780.37
Asphalt Resurfacing										
Asphalt Sealing					\$ 20,094.27					\$ 22,185.70
Gate Maintenance	\$ 400.00	\$ 408.00	\$ 416.16	\$ 424.48	\$ 432.97	\$ 441.63	\$ 450.46	\$ 459.47	\$ 468.66	\$ 478.04
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,400.00</b>	<b>\$ 4,488.00</b>	<b>\$ 4,577.76</b>	<b>\$ 4,669.32</b>	<b>\$ 4,761.97</b>	<b>\$ 4,857.96</b>	<b>\$ 4,955.11</b>	<b>\$ 5,054.22</b>	<b>\$ 5,155.30</b>	<b>\$ 5,256.11</b>


##### INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE ESTIMATES (Years 15-60)

Year	20	30	40	50	60
<b>Item</b>					
Snow Removal	\$ 5,943.79	\$ 7,245.45	\$ 8,832.16	\$ 10,766.35	\$ 13,124.12
Asphalt Resurfacing	\$ 27,044.24		\$ 40,186.32		\$ 59,714.76
Asphalt Sealing		\$ 32,966.78		\$ 48,986.90	
Gate Maintenance	\$ 594.38	\$ 724.54	\$ 883.22	\$ 1,076.64	\$ 1,312.41
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 33,582.41</b>	<b>\$ 40,936.77</b>	<b>\$ 49,901.70</b>	<b>\$ 60,829.89</b>	<b>\$ 74,151.30</b>

\*Inflation Assumption                      2%

# ATTACHMENT C: Property & Vicinity Photos

---



*Future Residential Portion of Subject Property (Looking Southeast)*



*Potential Location for Future Trailhead Parking Lot*



***Subject Property from Lakeline Drive (Looking North)***



***Future Residential Portion of Subject Property (Looking East)***



***Current Trail and Access Road (Looking West)***



***Current Trail and Access Road (Looking East)***

# ATTACHMENT D: FR-2 Zoning Standards

## FR-2 (Foothills Residential District)

Purpose Statement: The purpose of the FR-2/21,780 Foothills Residential District is to promote environmentally sensitive and visually compatible development of lots not less than twenty-one thousand seven hundred eighty (21,780) square feet in size, suitable for foothills locations as indicated in the applicable community Master Plan. The district is intended to minimize flooding, erosion, and other environmental hazards; to protect the natural scenic character of foothill areas by limiting development; to promote the safety and wellbeing of present and future residents of foothill areas; to protect wildlife habitat; and to ensure the efficient expenditure of public funds.

Standard	Requirement	Proposed	Finding
<b>Uses</b>	Identified in 21A.33	Single-family residential	<b>Complies</b>
<b>Minimum Lot Area</b>	21,780 sf. For single-family use	60,838 sf- Lot 1 51,525 sf- Lot 2 67,843 sf- Lot 3	<b>Complies</b>
<b>Minimum Lot Width</b>	100'	Lot 1 and 2 exceed 100', Lot 3 is a flag lot that is 50' wide at its opening	<b>Does not comply- Planned Development approval required</b>
<b>Maximum Building Height</b>	28'	None proposed- future homes will need to comply through building review process	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Front/Corner/Side/Rear Yard Setbacks</b>	Front- 20' Corner-20' Side- 20' Rear- 40'	No buildings proposed- future homes will need to comply through building review process	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Maximum Building Coverage</b>	Not to exceed 25% of lot area	None proposed- future development will need to comply through the building plan review process	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Slope Restrictions</b>	No building allowed within portions of slope which exceed 30%	Minor portions of the buildable area for Lot 2 and 3 include a 30% slope	<b>Does not comply- Planned Development approval required</b>
<b>Maximum Lot Size</b>	32,760 sf unless created through a subdivision and the size, configuration, and relationship of width to depth is compatible	60,838 sf- Lot 1 51,525 sf- Lot 2 67,843 sf- Lot 3	<b>Complies through Subdivision process and compatibility</b>

	with those on the block face		with nearby properties
<b>Off Street Parking &amp; Loading</b>	2 stalls per single-family home	No homes proposed at this point	<b>Not applicable</b>

# ATTACHMENT E: OS Zoning Standards

## OS (Open Space District)

Purpose Statement: The purpose of the OS Open Space District is to preserve and enhance public and private open space, natural areas, and improved park and recreational areas. These areas serve to provide opportunities for active and passive outdoor recreation; provide contrasts to the built environment; preserve scenic qualities; protect sensitive or fragile environmental areas such as wetlands, steep slopes, ridge lines, meadows, and stream corridors; preserve the capacity and water quality of the stormwater drainage system; encourage sustainability, conservation and renewable energy and provide pedestrian and bicycle transportation connections.

Standard	Requirement	Proposed	Finding
<b>Use</b>	Identified in <a href="#">21A.33.070</a>	Open Space	<b>Complies</b>
<b>Minimum Lot Area and Lot Width</b>	None	OS lot is 11.24 acres and 300'+ wide and 1700'+ deep	<b>Complies</b>
<b>Maximum Building Height</b>	35' for lots less than 4 acres. 35', but up to 60' with Design Review for lots greater than 4 acres.	No buildings proposed	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Front/Corner/Side/Rear Yard Setbacks (lots less than 4 acres)</b>	Front: 10' Corner: 10' Interior Side: 10' Rear: 15'	No buildings proposed, OS lot is greater than 4 acres	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Front/Corner/Side/Rear Yard Setbacks (lots greater than 4 acres)</b>	Front: 10' Corner: 10' Interior Side: 15' Rear: 15'	No buildings proposed	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>Buffer Yard</b>	10' when abutting single or two-family zone	Property will not have buildings and includes natural hillside vegetation	<b>Complies</b>
<b>Lighting</b>	Lighting not to impact natural environment or glare onto adjacent properties	No lighting proposed	<b>Not applicable</b>

# ATTACHMENT F: Planned Development Standards

## Planned Development Standards

**21A.55.050: Standards for Planned Developments:** The planning commission may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a planned development based upon written findings of fact according to each of the following standards. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide written and graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the following standards.

The Finding for each standard is the recommendation of the Planning Division based on the facts associated with the proposal, the discussion that follows, and the input received during the engagement process. Input received after the staff report is published has not been considered in this report.

**A. Planned Development Objectives:** The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development (section 21A.55.010 of this chapter) and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development, and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of the land use regulations.

**Planned Development Purpose Statement:** A planned development is intended to encourage the efficient use of land and resources, promoting greater efficiency in public and utility services and encouraging innovation in the planning and building of all types of development. Further, a planned development implements the purpose statement of the zoning district in which the project is located, utilizing an alternative approach to the design of the property and related physical facilities. A planned development incorporates special development characteristics that help to achieve City goals identified in adopted Master Plans and that provide an overall benefit to the community as determined by the planned development objectives. A planned development will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations, while enabling the development to be compatible with adjacent and nearby land developments.

**Discussion:** With the exception of allowing the buildable areas to include slopes that exceed 30%, the proposal creates a more enhanced development than could be achieved if it were to follow the base zoning standards. Specifically, the project could include residential development on the north of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, and it would not need to dedicate land for public use. This could impact views and public access to auxiliary trails in the area. This proposal creates a community benefit by designating over 12 acres of land as public open space, which includes the corridor for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. It allows limited residential development to occur in a way that is compatible with the purpose of the FR-2 zone.

**Finding:**  Meets Purpose Statement  Does Not Meet Purpose Statement

- A. Open Space And Natural Lands: Preserving, protecting or creating open space and natural lands:
1. Inclusion of community gathering places or public recreational opportunities, such as new trails or trails that connect to existing or planned trail systems, playgrounds or other similar types of facilities.
  2. Preservation of critical lands, watershed areas, riparian corridors and/or the urban forest.
  3. Development of connected greenways and/or wildlife corridors.
  4. Daylighting of creeks/water bodies.
  5. Inclusion of local food production areas, such as community gardens.
  6. Clustering of development to preserve open spaces.

**Discussion:** The project clusters the three residential lots into the area that least impacts the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and maximizes the preservation of foothill open space. With exception to allowing the buildable areas to exceed a 30% slope, the requested modifications through the Planned Development help the project to be configured in the least impactful way. Additional analysis can be found in the Key Considerations section of this report.

**Finding:**  Objective Satisfied       Objective Not Satisfied

B. Historic Preservation:

1. Preservation, restoration, or adaptive reuse of buildings or structures that contribute to the character of the City either architecturally and/or historically, and that contribute to the general welfare of the residents of the City.
2. Preservation of, or enhancement to, historically significant landscapes that contribute to the character of the City and contribute to the general welfare of the City's residents.

**Discussion:** Proposal meets Objective A and F. Only one objective is required to be satisfied through a Planned Development.

**Finding:**  Objective Satisfied       Objective Not Satisfied

C. Housing: Providing affordable housing or types of housing that helps achieve the City's housing goals and policies:

1. At least twenty percent (20%) of the housing must be for those with incomes that are at or below eighty percent (80%) of the area median income.
2. The proposal includes housing types that are not commonly found in the existing neighborhood but are of a scale that is typical to the neighborhood.

**Discussion:** Proposal meets Objective A and F. Only one objective is required to be satisfied through a Planned Development.

**Finding:**  Objective Satisfied       Objective Not Satisfied



D. Mobility: Enhances accessibility and mobility:

1. Creating new interior block walkway connections that connect through a block or improve connectivity to transit or the bicycle network.
2. Improvements that encourage transportation options other than just the automobile.

**Discussion:** Proposal meets Objective A and F. Only one objective is required to be satisfied through a Planned Development.

**Finding:**  Objective Satisfied       Objective Not Satisfied

E. **Sustainability: Creation of a project that achieves exceptional performance with regards to resource consumption and impact on natural systems:**

1. **Energy Use And Generation: Design of the building, its systems, and/or site that allow for a significant reduction in energy usage as compared with other buildings of similar type and/or the generation of energy from an on-site renewable resource.**
2. **Reuse Of Priority Site: Locate on a brownfield where soil or groundwater contamination has been identified, and where the local, State, or national authority (whichever has jurisdiction) requires its remediation. Perform remediation to the satisfaction of that authority.**

**Discussion:** Proposal meets Objective A and F. Only one objective is required to be satisfied through a Planned Development.

**Finding:**  Objective Satisfied       Objective Not Satisfied

F. **Master Plan Implementation: A project that helps implement portions of an adopted Master Plan in instances where the Master Plan provides specific guidance on the character of the immediate vicinity of the proposal:**

1. **A project that is consistent with the guidance of the Master Plan related to building scale, building orientation, site layout, or other similar character-defining features. (Ord. 8-18, 2018)**

**Discussion:** This proposal helps achieve goals related to natural lands in the East Bench Master Plan. Additional discussion on compatibility with master plans is found in the Key Considerations section of this report.

**Finding:**  Objective Satisfied       Objective Not Satisfied

**B. Master Plan Compatibility: The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.**

**Finding: Complies**

**Discussion:** This proposal helps achieve goals of the East Bench Master Plan to implement the opens space plan, preserve foothill open space, and improve trail connections. Additional discussion on compatibility with master plans is found in the Key Considerations section of this report.

**Condition(s):**

**C. Design And Compatibility: The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:**

1. Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;

**Finding: Complies**

**Discussion:** The three residential lots are larger than some in the area, but due to limitations created by the slope, the buildable areas are more similar to those found on other lots in the area. The future homes will need to meet all zoning requirements including maximum height and yard setbacks.

**Condition(s):**

2. Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;

**Finding: Complies**

**Discussion:** Although no buildings are currently proposed, the buildable areas of the three residential lots are oriented parallel to the proposed road and are compatible with others in the neighborhood. Future homes will need to be in compliance will zoning regulations of the FR-2 zone.

**Condition(s):**

3. Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development:
- a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan.
  - b. Provide sufficient space for private amenities.
  - c. Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.
  - d. Provide adequate sight lines to streets, driveways and sidewalks.
  - e. Provide sufficient space for maintenance.

<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The buildable areas defined on the subdivision plat meet all required setbacks of the FR-2 zone.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
4. Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;
<b>Finding: Not Applicable</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> No structures have been proposed at this point.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
5. Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;
<b>Finding: Not Applicable</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> No lighting has been proposed at this point.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
6. Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened;
<b>Finding: Not Applicable</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> None proposed at this point.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
7. Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.
<b>Finding: Not Applicable</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> No parking areas proposed at this point. A future trailhead parking areas will be subject to these standards.
<b>Condition(s):</b>

<b>D. Landscaping: The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:</b>
1. Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained;
<b>Finding: Complies</b>

<b>Discussion:</b> There is a grove of Gambel Oak in the eastern portion of the property. The proposed road will require the removal of some of those trees but the impact will be lessened as the proposed road will be located where the current dirt road is.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
2. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved;
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The properties are not currently developed and only include native vegetation. There is no current proposal to alter the native landscape beyond conversion of a dirt road to paved.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
3. Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development;
<b>Finding: Complies With Conditions</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> Beyond the road, no proposed development or landscaping at this point. All native vegetation in the unbuildable areas will be left undisturbed.
<b>Condition(s):</b> Staff is recommending that any areas that are disturbed during construction be replanted with native vegetation.
4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.
<b>Finding: Not Applicable</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> No proposed development or landscaping at this point.
<b>Condition(s):</b>

<b>E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports Citywide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:</b>
1. Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street;
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The proposal will create a private street to serve three single-family homes and will connect to the end of Lakeline Drive. The street will not impact the safety, purpose, or character of Lakeline Drive.

<b>Condition(s):</b>
2. Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design;</li> <li>b. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and</li> <li>c. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes;</li> </ul>
<b>Finding: Complies With Conditions</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The proposal will create a private street and an extension of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.
<b>Condition(s):</b> Staff has recommended a fence be placed between the road and the trail to reduce conflict between users. The trail will also need to be at least 6' wide and engineered to not be impacted by water runoff.
3. Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities;
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The proposal includes land that is anticipated to be sold to Salt Lake Public Lands for preservation of open space and a section of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.
<b>Condition(s):</b> Staff is recommending a 20' public access easement be dedicated from Lakeline Drive towards the H- Rock to serve as the corridor for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.
4. Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access;
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The development complies with emergency vehicle access requirements. Additional requirements will be implemented through the building permit review.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
5. Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The residential lots will be accessed via a private road. Loading and service activities will be limited but will access the properties from the private road.
<b>Condition(s):</b>

**F. Existing Site Features: The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment.**

**Finding: Complies**

**Discussion:** Although the proposal includes three lots of residential development, it also preserves over 28 acres as open space. There is a small grove of Gambel Oak trees on the property which is close to Lakeline Drive. Construction of the private road will require the removal of some of these trees, although the impact is minimized as the road is proposed close to the southern property line and is in alignment with the existing dirt road. The majority of the land will see no development activity and the natural environment will generally be unaltered.

**Condition(s):**

**G. Utilities: Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area.**

**Finding: Complies**

**Discussion:** The site includes an easement for a public water main. That easement will continue to be in place with the proposal. Additional utilities will be added to serve the three residential lots. All utilities have been found to be adequate at this point. Additional reviews will take place through the final subdivision and building permit process and will ensure that the development is adequately serviced and that no detrimental impacts are created.

**Condition(s):**

# ATTACHMENT G: Subdivision Standards

## 20.16.050. B.1: STANDARDS OF APPROVAL FOR PRELIMINARY PLATS:

All preliminary plats for subdivisions and subdivision amendments shall meet the following standards.

*The Finding for each standard is the recommendation of the Planning Division based on the facts associated with the proposal, the discussion that follows, and the input received during the engagement process. Input received after the staff report is published has not been considered in this report.*

<b>Standards of Approval</b>
<b>a. The preliminary plat map and associated documents include all information and is properly formatted as required by this title;</b>
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> Additional formatting will be established through the final plat process.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
<b>b. The subdivision shall comply with all subdivision design standards or with approved modifications to the subdivision design standards in Chapter 20.26 of this title;</b>
<b>Finding: Complies With Conditions</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The proposal meets all subdivision design standards, but requires modification through the Planned Development process for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Three residential lots do not front on a public street- rather, a private street is proposed.</li> <li>2. Lot 3 is 50' wide at the front yard setback where 100' would be required.</li> <li>3. The private road (Carrigan Rim Court) would include construction across manmade slopes that exceed 30%.</li> <li>4. The residential lots include portions of their buildable area which include slopes that exceed 30%.</li> </ol>
<b>Condition(s):</b> Subject to Planned Development approval for items listed above. Staff is recommending approval for items 1, 2, and 3.
<b>c. Water supply and sewage disposal including all offsite utility improvements, required easements and infrastructure upgrades shall be satisfactory to the public utilities department director;</b>
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The subdivision has been reviewed for the ability to provide utility improvements. Improvements will be required with the final plat and during building permit review.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
<b>d. The location and design of all water supply and sanitary sewer facilities are appropriately sized, connect to adequately sized infrastructure and found to be compliant with the adopted standards;</b>

<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The subdivision has been reviewed for the ability to provide water and sewer connections. Improvements will be required with the final plat and during building permit review.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
<b>e. The location and design of drainage elements to handle stormwater, ensure compliance with floodplain regulations, prevent erosion, and minimize formation of dust has been found to be compliant with adopted city standards and if applicable, Salt Lake County Flood Control and the Utah Department of Environmental Quality;</b>
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The subdivision has been reviewed for compliance with drainage standards. Additional improvements will be required with the final plat, the construction improvement plans, and during building permit review.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
<b>f. The subdivision provides access and infrastructure necessary for firefighting equipment as required by the applicable fire code adopted by the city;</b>
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The subdivision has been reviewed for compliance with fire code. Additional requirements will need to be met during building permit review.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
<b>g. The subdivision provides adequate easements and locations for all necessary utilities that are not provided by the city;</b>
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The subdivision provides adequate easements for all utilities.
<b>Condition(s):</b>
<b>h. All required dedications of land for streets, midblock walkways, alleys, parks, trails, and open space are provided for on the preliminary plat as indicated in the 29 adopted general plan of the city or as agreed to as part of any land use approval or development agreement. Any exactions that are not agreed to as part of a land use approval or development agreement shall be roughly proportionate and directly related to the impact of the proposed subdivision;</b>
<b>Finding: Complies</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> One of the primary purposes of the subdivision and planned development proposals is to establish public land for open space and to establish public access for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The subdivision creates the delineations of land necessary for the



owner to sell approximately 12 acres to Salt Lake Public Lands for dedication as public open space. Whether or not that transaction takes place, Staff is recommending that a 20' public access easement be recorded on the plat for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. This would be in accordance with the annexation agreement for the Carrigan View Phase 1 subdivision recorded in 1990. The 20' wide easement would largely follow the existing public utility easement for the waterline and would extend from Lakeline Drive towards the H-Rock. Additional explanation of the annexation agreement is found in the Key Considerations portion of this report.

**Condition(s):**

- i. The subdivision includes recommendations in the subdivider's traffic impact study when the transportation director indicates the recommendations are required to mitigate adverse impacts; and**

**Finding: Not Applicable**

**Discussion:**

**Condition(s):**

- j. The proposed subdivision will not create any injury or harm to any other property or persons.**

**Finding: Complies**

**Discussion:** The subdivision has been reviewed by the various city departments for compliance with all applicable standards. Additional standards will need to be met through the final subdivision and building permit review processes.

If the Planning Commission votes to allow for the buildable areas to include slopes over 30%, additional conditions of approval should be considered. A geotechnical report should be required to investigate and make recommendations on slopeside stability and management of water runoff. The engineering recommendations of the geotechnical report should be incorporated into the design and construction within areas exceeding slopes of 30% to ensure that no harm will come to other property or persons.

**Condition(s):**

# ATTACHMENT H: Public Process & Comments

## Public Notice, Meetings, Comments

The following is a list of public meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to the proposed project since the applications were submitted:

- December 5, 2023- Notice of the planned development was posted on the property.
- March 12, 2024- Notice of the preliminary subdivision was posted on the property.
- December 5, 2023 - Property owners and residents within 300 feet of the development were provided early notification of the planned development.
- March 12, 2024 - Property owners and residents within 300 feet of the development were provided early notification of the preliminary subdivision.
- December 12, 2023- The planned development was posted to the Online Open House webpage.
- December 4, 2023 – The East Bench Community Council was sent the 45-day required notice for recognized community organizations. The council did not provide written comments.
- March 11, 2024- The East Bench Community Council was notified of the preliminary subdivision plans.
- April 17, 2024- The East Bench Community Council held a meeting to discuss the proposal.

Notice of the public hearing for the proposal included:

- May 9, 2024 and May 31, 2024
  - Public hearing notice sign posted on the property
- May 9, 2024 and May 31, 2024
  - Public hearing notice mailed
  - Public notice posted on City and State websites and Planning Division list serve

## Public Input:

The following comments were received from the public throughout the public engagement period:

### **Email from Bertram Koelsch- received 12/19/2023**

I saw the sign and read through the website for the Carrigan View Phase II – Planned Development.

What are the plans for the trailhead? For locals, this and the nearby BST from Parley's Canyon are popular trailheads with only street parking at this time. I worry those living on this street will eventually revolt and want to limit access to these trailheads. I won't be surprised if the future owners of the planned houses in the Carrigan View Phase II – Planned Development will also eventually be annoyed by all the trailhead traffic.

Thus, I think it would be prudent to be ahead of the issue and plan more specifics on the trailhead: for example, how many parking spots, where the access points will be, how will it be paid for, when would it be built? Maybe the SLC Public Lands Dept can help as a part of their "SLC Foothills Trail System Trailhead Infrastructure Improvement Project"?

I see that the same family also owns Parcel Record 16144000434001, which is right across the street from the BST from Parley's Canyon TH. Maybe there is an option to add a small TH here too, since I think this will become open space.

Just ideas to maintain access for the public to these trails.

Good luck with the planning

### **Email from Karl Sowa- received 12/22/2023**

I'm one of the homeowners on [REDACTED] whose property backs up right to the currently open space around the H-Rock trail. I am a little dismayed at the scale of this proposed Carrigan View Phase 2 project, although encouraged that it looks like there will continue to be guaranteed access for the many dozens if not hundreds of people who enjoy that trail every day.

Three questions:

1) I want to make sure that the proposed plans will not interfere with public access to that trail. Will people still be able to park at the end of Lakeline and walk along that path? I have used it literally almost every day for the last 7 years of living here, rain or snow or sun, and I see many other neighbors who also have been using it for decades. It is a beloved and VERY well used trail by citizens of this city and I want to make sure that new gated community is not going to prevent pedestrian access to the trails there.

2) There is also a trail that goes from the end of Scenic Circle up to the H-Rock trail that I and many other neighbors use regularly. It looks like it crosses through what is proposed to be the third lot of that development. Will the developer be required to rebuild that trail around the edge of that lot so SLC citizens can continue to reach the H-Rock trail on something close to the existing, long-established route from Scenic Circle?

3) This is my biggest concern: the primary view from the back of my property is right at where those three lots are proposed. Obviously it's always been open space before this proposal, and when I bought my house based on the signage at the end of Lakeline, I thought that already had an Open Space restriction on it. If three giant houses get built there, they will be looming over my

backyard and view. I guess if they have development rights there's probably not much I can do about it - but are there at least some visual design restrictions on what can be built there? That area is highly visible to the entire neighborhood, and if it ends up with three more houses as visually disruptive as the house at 1858 Lakeline Dr, it will be a sad day for the city. Are there some kind of zoning or other design restrictions on what can be built on these proposed lots so they have to visually blend into the hillside? I cringe every time I look down at that area from the amazing new Bonneville Shoreline trail that got built in 2021 and see how garish and unlike the rest of the neighborhood 1858 Lakeline is. I'd like to make sure that doesn't happen on the proposed lots as well, especially since that will become my new primary view from my yard.

**Email from Adam Payton- received 12/24/2023**

As a frequent user of the section of the Bonneville Shoreline trail and the trail to Jack's Mailbox near the proposed development, my primary concern is about maintaining public access to those trails and trail system. I have no issue at all with the proposed 3 lot development, I would love to see it happen in conjunction with maintaining access to the excellent public trails the City has in that area.

**Email from Ross Chambless- received 1/8/2024**

Dear Mr. Daems,

I am writing as a current resident in the East Bench neighborhood to express my interest and a few concerns about the proposed development.

The proposed development appears to be a positive compromise with the private property owner in which a significant amount of the developer's private, undeveloped land (about 20 acres), will be converted to open space for public and wildlife enjoyment, with the remaining 6 acres to be used for 3 residential subdivision lots.

However, one concern I have is that the proposed sizes of the residential lots (about 2 acres for each) are considerably larger than any other existing residential lot size in this neighborhood. Most residential parcels in this neighborhood are about a single acre or less. The proposed 2 acres per lot seems excessively large for three single family homes. Additionally, will there be limits to the sizes of the new homes to be built?

I am also concerned about the potential for further erosion to the mountainside that would be caused by this development on the steep grades. Erosion is a serious concern for current residents who live downslope. How would this proposed development plan to mitigate heavy rains, provide adequate drainage, and prevent erosion impacts that could undermine the integrity of the hillsides above our homes?

In addition, what will be the impact on the existing water supply and water pressure to the neighborhood if these three new homes with significantly large lot sizes are built?

Another concern is that the proposed expansion of the access road along the Shoreline Trail would seem to cut through a small grove of healthy Gambel Oak trees at the current trailhead at the end

of Lakeline Drive. This Gambel Oak patch is one of the few healthy groves remaining along the foothills and it provides valuable habitat and forage for wildlife. I would like to know how this proposed development plans to mitigate any degradation to this grove of oak trees.

Finally, I would like to point out that the gradual development and urbanization of the foothills in this area has resulted in a loss of habitat for native wildlife, including deer, elk, porcupine, skunks, red tail hawks, and other flora and fauna that were once much more ubiquitous in this area. Additionally, invasive Myrtle spurge, which provides no sustenance for local wildlife and is toxic to humans, has continued to spread throughout the area near this proposed development.

These problems of habitat and forage loss and invasive species are, of course, a worldwide problem and certainly not unique to Utah, although they have occurred more frequently with urbanization and encroachment into wildland-urban interfaces. Sadly, we are reducing habitat and forage options for wildlife during a time when they are needing it most.

Because we should strive to act with more awareness and responsibility to these larger problems, I hope that Salt Lake City will consider requiring additional restoration actions to be taken by the developer to mitigate the impacts. This could involve requiring a certain percentage of low water-use native plants; tree planting; revegetation of native plants; and/or financial support for efforts to purge the nearby hillside of the Myrtle spurge.

I would appreciate if you can let me know about any future public hearings related to this proposed development.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

## **Letter from Bruce Alder- received 1/9/2024**

Dear Mr. Daems and SLC Planning and Zoning Staff

I am writing to express my comments about the above noted Planned Development. As background, my wife and I live adjacent to this proposed development having built and lived in our house since 1992. For many years following our move to Lakeline, I was active with the past Arcadia Heights Community Council as a member and Chairman until we morphed it into the now East Bench Community Council. As a community council we worked with many development issues and property owners in our area of control and know the job is not easy and, in this case, admire the final outcome of a proposed development with a rough and controversial history.

During my time as chair of the Arcadia Heights CC, Mr. Scott Truville presented several proposals for the property included in this development that originally included up to 20 lots, and obliteration of the recognized public access/walkway around the H-Rock on what later became the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Due to many issues with those initial proposals that I won't detail here, we fought for a reduction in the number of lots, and the preservation of access to the trails and public ground above the property.

Today I would like to thank the Turville family for their new approach/proposed development and the city for their willingness to buy into and preserve access to the hillsides and open spaces that surround the proposed development. This proposal is definitely a win for the community and city in many ways. I am hopeful that the development as now proposed and with the Cities Public Lands and Utah Open Lands involvement will provide the Turville family with an adequate reward for their wiliness to work together with the planners and community to complete and finalize the development of this hillside. A resolution to this issue is long overdue. To restate, my wife and I and many of our neighbors are fully in agreement with this proposal.

That said, we do have some comments/suggestions we would like the city to consider associated with this proposal.

First, as we have discussed with Councilman Dugan, adjacent to this property the City has built a small "Trailhead Park" with access to Jack's Peak and the foothills above this property. Recently the City also built a newly constructed section of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail that runs from the top of Lakeline Drive to the Parley's Canyon Crossing. Together with the existing BSTrail around and below the H-Rock, our little cul-de-sac has become a magnet for many city residents who want to hike the trails, walk their dog or get a little exercise. The occasional result is that the cars of those visitors line both sides of the street, occasionally blocking access to some driveways, garbage cans and mailboxes and eliminating parking for any guest who may want to visit the current residents. On those days emergency access would be impossible. We therefore would encourage the addition of a small parking area that could be located immediately behind and to the north-west of the current gate on land that we understand the City or Utah Open Lands would purchase. This ground is relatively level and could, with little cost provide parking for 5-10 cars and help reduce the current crowding.

Secondly, the details of the proposed development show a gate midway on the access road to the new lots that would seem to limit or restrict foot traffic of those walkers headed around the H-Rock on the existing Bonneville Shoreline Trail. We understand the desire to limit car access, but no details are shown or labeled that clearly identify the BSTrail as it goes west from the current cul-de-sac and through the new development. My assumption is that the BSTrail right of way and H-Rock trail would share the new road to and through the new proposed cul-de-sac that accesses the 3 new lots. The proposed gate should not inhibit this foot traffic, and yet no information is provided regarding this access. This needs to be clarified and the BST right of way preserved.

Third, is the status/maintenance and future of the existing Arcadia (or Jack's Peak) Trailhead Park (located at the existing cul-de-sac at the top of Lakeline Drive and adjacent to the city's water tank access). When constructed, with joint input from the community and SLC Parks department, this small pocket park was to serve as a trailhead for access to the public ground above the neighborhood, and as a place to stop and regroup or relax. Trees and bushes were planted along with native grasses and initially the city took care of the area. After a few years, maintenance fell off someone radar and for the past 10 years, no one shows up to do anything including turning on or off the water fountain, several trees or parts of trees died, the grasses have not been cut or trimmed and the long dead grasses create a substantial fire hazard that could easily be eliminated by a quarterly pass with a weed wacker and a quick cleanup.

Finally, some better signage would be welcome to clarify allowed parking, dog regulations and use of the current and to be acquired open areas.

Again, I want to thank you and the Turville's for arriving at this current proposal. I am sure there will be those who will oppose any further development or construction in this area, but we all need to recognize the owners' right to develop it should appreciate the efforts they have made to accommodate the wishes of the community.

Sincerely,



## **Letter from Gary Reimer- received 1/10/2024**

Dear Mr. Daems,

Thanks for taking the time recently to discuss the planned development at the north end of Lakeline Drive. We are responding to your request for comments. Our house is at the end of Lakeline Drive, immediately adjacent to the current trailhead and the proposed new road and parking lot.

### **Summary**

In summary, we very much appreciate and support the currently contemplated development as it has been described in the plans on the SLC website, and as further explained to us by Dan Dugan (our City Council representative), the open space planner we met with, and you:

- An extension of Lakeline Drive beyond the current cul-de-sac to a gated community of three homes situated on the downhill (south) side of the new road, which ends in a new cul-de-sac; and
- An addition of a parking area for 8 to 12 cars situated in the north side of the new road, to service the needs of hikers and those visiting the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and East Bench Nature Preserve.

*This development, done right, offers an opportunity to complete the development of Lakeline Drive, preserve public access to the foothills in ways that consider the nearby homes, and rectify many of the negative impacts currently existing. We compliment and thank the developer, the planning staff and Mr. Dugan for recognizing the current problems and thoughtfully addressing them in the plans.*

### **Current Situation**

It is safe to say that no one is more impacted than us and our neighbors by the current trailhead situation and the proposed development. We have lived on the west side of the cul-de-sac at the north end of Lakeline Drive since we built our house in 1993, 30 years ago. We are the last house on Lakeline before the current undeveloped space. Our front yard is immediately adjacent to the Bonneville Shoreline / East Bench Preserve trailhead



formalized by the City several years ago, and is a few yards west of the park earlier installed at the Jack's Peak trailhead. Yet a third trailhead was installed a block or two down the street a couple of years ago.

The trailheads are a great asset to the community. We respect their value to the East Bench residents near and far, and we enjoy them ourselves. Yet, they have brought significant traffic and problems to our street. The main problems to date have been parking congestion at busy times (blocking our mailboxes and crowding out our visitors) and especially for the Reimers, dogs off leash. Meager signage citing leash requirements and other rules in fine print are generally ignored by visitors to the area.

For our house in particular, dogs off leash are a significant problem. The open space in the preserve and the undeveloped land beyond the cul-de-sac understandably offer an irresistible attraction to dog owners. A significant portion of these people completely ignore the City's leash laws, which is not really a problem in the open space but is a big problem on the street. Unfortunately, most of the current parking for the trailhead is on the street immediately in front of our house. People roar up in their cars, let their dogs out off leash, and often ignore them while they get ready for their walk or talk on their phones. We routinely clean up dog droppings on our front lawn and have even had to clean them up on our front porch! Dogs have lifted their leg on the planter by our front door. People treat our end of the street like a giant dog park.

This has to stop. We have appealed for enforcement and for clear street signs announcing the leash laws and the penalties for non-compliance. We hope we can get these installed.

### **Comments on New Development**

- **The street extension and the new homes**
  - We support this. When we built our house 30 years ago we expected more homes beyond the existing cul-de-sac, and we are aware of the small area master plan history and how the developer was eventually limited to three home lots despite plans for many more. It is only fair that the developer be allowed to complete this, despite any opposition that may be put forth by those unaware of this history.
  - **We very much appreciate that the homes are to be situated together on the downhill side of the new street, where they will be less noticeable to the users of the trails and to the existing homes.**
  - We are not opposed to the street gate as long as it is not too loud when operated. It won't be far from our bedrooms. We assume it will not impede pedestrian traffic.

- **Suggestions/requests:**
  - Post the lower speed limit (20 mph) starting at the current cul-de-sac, along with possibly speed bumps on the new street. This would be appropriate here given the street gate and the number of hikers, and it would help to cut down on noise for the two nearby homes (ours and our neighbors) bordering the new street.
- **The relocated trailheads and parking area to serve them**
  - Because the lot will be right across from our yard, we have some specific comments.
  - **First, the proposed off-street parking area is a critical and much needed aspect of the development.** It is very welcome and should relieve most of the parking problems in the present cul-de-sac.
  - It will also move most of the dog-walkers (who drive up with their dogs) out of the current cul-de-sac into the new parking area, away from front yards. It cannot be overstated what a nuisance this is to our homes at the end of the street.
  - **Suggestions/requests:**
    - We understand that the lot is to be located on the north side of the new street, and not immediately adjacent to us. We very much appreciate this.
    - To be fair to the new homes, we shouldn't just move the dog problem to them. If possible the parking area should be organized in a way that directs/funnels hikers and dog walkers out of the lot directly to the trails and keeps the dogs off the street and out of front yards. Perhaps the lot could be fenced, and / or there could be a fence leading from the lot between the trail and the new road until it gets past the last home. Fencing around the lot may not work as it may interfere with a snow plow. But anything to keep dogs off the street would be good.
    - The leash laws should remain in effect. We further request that a couple of street signs are posted on Lakeline from the new trailhead that was installed down the street to the new development, warning people that the leash laws are to be obeyed and indicating the penalties. Please see the attached sign that Sandy City uses at Dimple Dale Park.
      - Again, dogs off leash unofficially on the trails are not a bother. The concern is on the street and in neighborhood front yards.

- We assume the parking lot would be paved. Gravel would be loud due to tire noise and would create dust. Again, our home and our neighbor will be adjacent to this lot.
- The lot should be lit but not too brightly, and patrolled. We often get people parking late at night at the end of Lakeline and this lot, being more secluded, will be an attraction.
- It would be nice if some small trees could be planted shielding the parking area and street from the two affected homes.
- We understand that Parcel A, which is contiguous to our home and our neighbor, is to remain undeveloped, providing a buffer between us and the new street, parking lot and trails. We appreciate this. In any case there is a water line junction there which would make any change costly.
- Finally, we hope that this would be the end of any further development. Specifically, we would be opposed to any additional “park” infrastructure other than the parking lot. In our view the development should be minimalistic in nature. Providing off-street access and parking is all that is needed. (Frankly, the current park at the end of Lakeline is not well maintained, if at all. Installing more park infrastructure and then not maintaining it looks worse than just letting the natural landscape be).

Thank you for your consideration of neighborhood concerns and for your good planning. Again, we appreciate the thought that has gone into these plans. We hope that this is the final development to take place on Lakeline and that it brings resolution to the existing problems in the best possible way for everyone. All of the neighbors at the end of our street share these concerns.

We would be happy to discuss further the above, and we look forward to the completion of the development.

#### **Email from Julie Drake- received 1/13/2024**

As a long time resident in the neighborhood of the planned development of our beautiful hillside, I wanted to express my adamant disapproval of this project.

I have lived in the neighborhood for over 40 years and have enjoyed walking, running and hiking the hillside trails on a regular basis. To add more houses to the hillside would destroy the beauty of the mountain and surrounding area.

Let the land stay as open space and prohibit the development of more houses on the hillside. We already lost the nearby hillside to the Parley’s Pointe development. Don’t let us lose another hillside to houses.

## **Phone call from Sharon and John Burton- received 1/15/2024**

Sharon and John Burton on Lakeline Drive are in full support of the proposal.

## **Email from Winston Dines- received 1/16/2024**

Dear Sir:

This letter comes as part of public comment period for the Phase II Carrigan View Planned Development at 1820 South Lakeline Drive. My name is Winston Dines and I live on Scenic Drive, directly below the proposed three-lot residential subdivision. While I understand the desirability of extending housing in the foothills of the Wasatch, there are also many concerns for area residents. Below are four issues that must be addressed as part of the planning process.

### 1) Slope and Landscaping.

Existing area residents are very aware of the issues of slope and landscaping in the Foothill area. Many of us have voluntarily reduced lawn size or eliminated it altogether as part of conserving water and addressing slope on our properties. Many have had to shore up back and front yards with rock, terracing, and careful plantings to stave off slippage and run-off in times of heavy rain. Still others have invested in xeriscaping and native vegetation so as to stabilize soils and scale back water use.

- New development in the foothills with slopes as steep as the Carrigan View Phase II need to include requirements for wise and careful landscaping that does not contribute to run-off or downslope impacts. With greater variability of weather related events, including sporadic, occasionally very heavy rainstorms; less snowfall; and increasing summer and fall heat, climate issues need to be considered in landscape design of the proposed homes. Below are some suggestions.
  - New homes should be required to have plantings that are compatible with existing native vegetation (sage, rabbit brush, and native grasses for example.) New homes should be required to demonstrate soil and slope stabilization, as well as maintain viewsapes so valued by those using the area for recreation and residence.
  - Any new development should mandate exterior design that does not introduce non-native or invasive plants (such as spurge) that are easily spread by wind or disturbed soils.
  - Each of the proposed lots should incorporate plans to maximize long-term slope stabilization and minimize erosion potential. With steep slopes above and below the lots, careful construction and design is important to the development process. Attention should be paid not just to the present but to future impacts as well.
  - Such stipulations should apply equally to the construction process.

### 2) Parking and Recreational Use of the Area

Another consideration for Carrigan View II should include the daily and seasonal use of the Jack's Peak and Bonneville Shoreline Trails. While local residents use walk-in access to the area above the proposed development, many others come to this area in cars. Currently, parked cars at the turn-around at the end of Scenic Drive – and Lakeline Drive - can fill up the allotted space and extend down the street. On Scenic Drive, large vehicles such as trash trucks and delivery vehicles do not have room to turn around and must back out the way they came in, creating potential danger for drivers. When planning for Carrigan View II, incorporating a large enough turn-around for current and future recreational use would be a wise choice for both safety and convenience of users and residents.

### 3) Water Use.

Water use in a time of climate change is an important issue to all Utah residents. The Carrigan View II development should have built-in water reducing features in both home and garden. With many low-flow water plumbing fixtures now available, including low flow toilets and low flow aerators on taps, the new homes should be required to incorporate these features such as these. Reducing water loss in the landscaping should also be required in new home development plans, including automated sprinkler timers and drip irrigation systems.

In the current proposed development plan, no discussion of impacts of increased demand for water by new residents is given. Are existing water reserves on the hillside adequate to incorporate the additional draw on systems for residential, irrigation, and sewer needs? Will this new demand potentially impact existing users downslope?

Further, are existing water systems large enough and able to handle potential fire suppression?

### 4) Underground Utilities

All of us near the mouth of Parley's Canyon have experienced high velocity winds that come from the east during storms and seasonal change. Our area has had power outages due to these winds, including the need to replace lines and power poles. In planning for the new development at Carrigan View II, placing power lines below ground would be a wise choice, not to mention cheaper at the time of construction than in the future. Such a choice would also benefit area residents as part of fire mitigation.

While a new development such as Carrigan View II has many potential benefits to those who may come to live there, planning for the needs of existing residents and recreational users is vitally important. In your planning process, please include - and pay careful attention to - the issues of slope, landscaping, water use, underground utilities, and recreational / parking needs in the design of the new neighborhood.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

### **Email from Stephen Carson- received 1/17/2024**

Dear Mr. Daems:

I am a long-time resident of the Arcadia Heights neighborhood. I would like to encourage the Planning Commission to reject the proposed development titled “Carrigan View Phase 2” located at 1820 S. Lakeline Drive. My reasons are as follows:

1. My understanding is that most or all of the land involved in the proposal is currently zoned as Open Space. This zoning reflects the inaccessibility of the land, its slope, and other factors that have made it unsuitable for development in the past. None of these factors have changed, thus I see no compelling reason to alter the Open Space zoning.
2. My impression from occasional glances at Zillow is that this land or a portion thereof was recently sold (or offered for sale) at a very low valuation reflecting the Open Space zoning. The sale description clearly mentioned that there was only a single, small developable parcel directly on Lakeline Drive. Hence, the owner knew or should have known the zoning limitations when purchasing the land.
3. The land abuts one of the few open segments of the Bonneville-Shoreline trail, which is heavily used by residents of the area. This is a significant natural resource on the East Bench which has already been destroyed over much of its course. Building a “trailhead” does not make up for altering the flow of the trail through open spaces.
4. Much of the land serves as hiking trails for local residents and especially dog owners in the area. These activities take place over a significant area—not just a single trail.
5. Development of the land would effectively nullify the value of the H-Rock open space purchased at considerable expense by the city to protect the open space in this area. The H-Rock space lies just above the proposed housing lots, and would be effectively cut off from the city by the development.
6. Needless to say, the addition of three luxury lots does not in any way help with the shortage of affordable housing in the area.

I have talked to many of my neighbors who feel similarly about the project. I would urge the Planning Commission to maintain all current zoning as it stands (this is after all the purpose of zoning) and reject the proposed development.

### **Email from Sue Alder- received 1/17/2024**

I have been very interested in the development of this Turville property for quite some time for the following reasons. First, I spend a lot of time walking and enjoying the trails here with my dogs. Secondly, my brother lives at the top of Lakeline Drive and because of that I hear about the frustration and challenges that they are facing regularly with this property and the trail use. The third reason for my interest in this property is because my property on 21st borders the Turville property in question.

Because of these three items, I have been interested in this property for quite some time. I have spoken with Dan Dugan on several occasions concerning the property and how best to go forward

in the best interest of the property owner, the property owners adjacent to the Turville property and those interested in using the wonderful trails in the area.

From talking to my brother Bruce Alder, and his neighbor Gary and Nicki Reimer, as well as Rick Schmitz, it sounds like a lot of the interests of the area are being and have been considered and addressed in formulating a plan. I was excited to hear that the city & or Utah Open Lands was planning to buy at least two of the five lots on the property for trail head parking and a possible small park, that would be amazing! If they can buy more lots, that would be even More Amazing!! It would serve a large network of people who love Utah, love the trails and want to keep as much open lands as possible.

This area has been loved for decades, I remember coming here almost daily while I was in high school, over forty years ago, and I continue to come almost daily even now. The new trail that was built a couple years ago is delightful and is being used by bikers, walker and runners, almost to an extreme. More of the developed city trails would be better for our mountain erosion and are more enjoyable for the user. I would love to see more trails like it to spread out the people out who are using them, but in doing so, the issue of parking has got to be addressed and dealt with for the adjacent homeowners who are impacted by the trail use on a daily basis.

I was excited to hear of Rick Schmitz proposal to help restore the trails access point to protect the erosion that is occurring around the H Rock. Although as a Highland High School alumni, I would love to continue to see the H on the H rock remain. I realize that it is difficult with maintaining it with other schools. Maybe this is something, the Highland High Alumni could help fund?

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss these items with you. I look forward to any public meeting to hear from the development group and to hear other public opinions.

### **Comments Received Since First Public Hearing:**

#### **Email from Tom Nelson- received 5/23/2024**

My name is Tom Nelson, I am a resident of the Arcadia Heights neighborhood in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Born and raised here, and now raising my family here, I was sincerely shocked and dismayed when I saw a private landowner blocking off the trail system up by the H rock on my evening walk with my dogs.

Without any overstatement, this is a beloved trail network utilized by numerable members of the community. I happen to know people that actually commute to this area to access the trail. This is a vital and vibrant part of our city.

The landowner was actually quite approachable, and took about a half hour to speak with me. The way he painted the picture, he's tried on numerous occasions to sell the property at market value to the city, and has been shot down on each occasion. Considering how high the taxes are, he said he was left with no recourse, but to exercise his right as a landowner and sell the land.

Undoubtedly there are always numerous sides to every story, but if that's true, I can't begin to fathom how Salt Lake City would let this fall through its fingertips. Public land is, in my opinion, one of the most cherished commodities we have, and this is a true keystone of our community. The number of dismayed residence I've spoken to just tonight is overwhelming.

Can you please help me understand the decision to not purchase this land for all to enjoy, and what we can do to rectify the situation?

Sincerely,

Tom Nelson

**Email from Alice Betts- Received 6/6/2024**

Please please please do not allow more of our trail access to be blocked.

My neighbors and I from below foothill use these open spaces at least 3 times a week. Building more mansions further up the mountain is bad for our whole city. It ruins everyone's view and it's bad for the environment. The people who build them and buy them by definition do not care about the community.

The mess they have made further south with those construction sites over the old trails should be enough of an example of what greed does to an area.

The houses built in inappropriate terrain that are sliding down the hillside by point of the mountain show what happens when planning departments allow developers to bully them into breaking the rules for them.

I understand that exceptions to the 30% grade rule have been made before but just because one of my kids got away with breaking a rule one time doesn't mean I should just throw out the rules for everyone else.

Please protect our foothills.

-Alice Betts

2492 E 2100s



# ATTACHMENT I: Department Review Comments

This proposal was reviewed by the following departments. Any requirement identified by a City Department is required to be complied with.

Salt Lake City Planning 451 S State Street, Rm 406 Salt Lake City, UT 84114  
801-535-7700 [www.slc.gov/planning](http://www.slc.gov/planning)



PLNPCM2023-00890
Planned Development
1820 S. Lakeline Drive
January 2024

## Planned Development- 1<sup>st</sup> REVIEW COMMENTS

### PLANNING DIVISION COMMENTS

Comments by: Eric Daems

Email: [eric.daems@slcgov.com](mailto:eric.daems@slcgov.com)

Phone: 801-535-7236

Status: Make Corrections

1. Please provide your proposal (with all proposed property lines) overlaid with our zoning map
2. Provide a drawing of all buildable area envelopes for the 3 residential lots (showing current slopes and grading)
3. Per 21A.55.040.A.6- Please submit a preliminary subdivision application.
4. Please show any anticipated fencing or gates, including heights. Per 21A.40.040 if there is to be a gate in the road, it will need to be on a private section (which would need to follow property lines).
5. Per 21A.24.010.G.6- Lot 4' will need to be at least 24' wide for access.
6. Additional explanation is needed for the purpose and layout of Parcel F.
7. Delineation of private and public portions of Carrigan Rim Court needed (you may want to contact Public Utilities and Engineering to discuss)

### Suggestions for Consideration

1. Combine Parcels D & E
2. Combine Parcels B & C

### PUBLIC UTILITIES DIVISION COMMENTS

Comments by: Kristeen Beitel

Email: [Kristeen.beitel@slcgov.com](mailto:Kristeen.beitel@slcgov.com)

Phone: 801-483-6733

Status: Make Corrections

*The following comments are provided for information only and do not provide official project review or approval. Comments are provided to assist in design and development by providing guidance for project requirements.*

- There is an existing 16" water main that runs through these lots, protected by an existing 33-foot easement (Book 943, Page 545). This public water main and easement must remain in place and protected. No additional utilities are permitted within this easement.
- There are several public water mains in the vicinity of this development serving the existing tanks and pump station. Connection will not be allowed to any mains associated with the tanks and pump station. Specifically, no connection to the 8" overflow line will be allowed. Additionally, no service connections are allowed to any of the 16" water mains in the vicinity.
- Additional easements will be required for existing public water mains that impact the subject lots.
- To provide water to these properties, a public water main extension will be required in the new roadway from the 8" water main in Lakeline Drive. The water main shall be public in any public roadway. Termination of the public water main at the interface of the public/private roadways must be coordinated with SLCDPU. It is recommended to meet with SLCDPU with proposed design as soon as possible to receive specific feedback.
- One culinary water meter and one sewer lateral are required for each new lot. For lots greater than 0.5 acres in size, a separate irrigation water meter may also be allowed. Fire services may also be permitted for each property. Additional sewer laterals may be installed, but a minimum of one per building is required. Any proposed shared utility services (i.e. master water meter or shared sewer lateral) would require a variance approved by the SLCDPU Director. Approval is not guaranteed for any variance to SLC Ordinance, SLCDPU Policy, and/or SLCDPU Standard Practice.
- Public Utility permit, connection, survey, and inspection fees will apply.
- All utility design and construction must comply with APWA Standards and SLCPU Standard Practices.
- All utilities must meet horizontal and vertical clearance requirements. Water and sewer lines require 10 ft minimum horizontal separation and 18" minimum vertical separation. Sewer must maintain 5 ft minimum horizontal separation and 12" vertical separation from any non-water utilities. Water must maintain 3 ft minimum horizontal separation and 12" vertical separation from any non-sewer utilities.
- Public street light requirements are determined during building permit review.
- Utilities cannot cross property lines without appropriate easements and agreements between property owners.
- Site utility and grading plans will be required for building permit review. Site utility plans should include all existing and proposed utilities, including water, irrigation, fire, sewer, stormwater, street lighting, power, gas, and communications. Please refer to APWA, SLCDPU Standard Practices, and the SLC Design Process Guide for utility design requirements.
- Applicant must provide fire flow, culinary water, and sewer demand calculations to SLCDPU for review. The public sewer and water system will be modeled with these demands. If the demand is not adequately delivered or if one or more reaches of the sewer system reach capacity as a result of the development, a water/sewer main upsizing will be required at the property owner's expense.
- Site stormwater must be collected on site, treated with green infrastructure, and detained to 0.2 cfs/acre (with 80th percentile storm retained), and routed to the public storm drain system. Stormwater cannot discharge across property lines or public sidewalks.
- Technical Drainage Study and SWPPP will be required.

### **ENGINEERING DIVISION COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Scott Weiler**

**Email: [scott.weiler@slcgov.com](mailto:scott.weiler@slcgov.com)**

**Phone: 801-535-6159**

**Status: General Comments**

Engineering has no comments pertaining to the proposed Planned Development other than to say that the [25,320 sf](#) shown as Lot 1 includes the width of Carrigan Rim Court. That might create confusion regarding maintenance responsibilities for the road if SLC Corporation becomes the owner of Lot 1. The plans that accompanied this application indicate that Carrigan Rim Court is to be a private road all the way from Lakeline Drive to the cul-de-sac bulb. If SLC will need to maintain the portion of Carrigan Rim Court within Lot 1, then that creates a potential reason to have the subdivider execute an SICA prior to recordation of the final plat. The proposed road cross section and turnaround radius for Carrigan Rim Court will eventually need to be reviewed for fire protection purposes.

### **BUILDING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Jason Rogers**

**Email: [Jason.rogers@slcgov.com](mailto:Jason.rogers@slcgov.com)**

**Phone: 801-535-7642**

**Status: No Corrections**

Comments will be provided on Subdivision or Building [plans](#)

### **FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Douglas Bateman**

**Email: [douglas.bateman@slcgov.com](mailto:douglas.bateman@slcgov.com)**

**Phone: 801-535-6619**

**Status: General Comments**

\*Approved fire apparatus access roads shall be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into; and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility.

\*Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet for buildings 30-feet and less, exclusive of shoulders, except for approved security gates in accordance with Section 503.6, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches. Buildings greater than 30

feet shall have a road width of not less than 26 feet. Fire apparatus access roads with fire hydrants on them shall be 26-feet in width; at a minimum of 20-feet to each side of the hydrant in the direction or road travel.

\*Fire lane signs as specified in Section D103.6 shall be posted on both sides of fire apparatus access roads that are 20 to 26 feet wide (See Figure D103.6 for example).

\*Fire lane signs as specified in Section D103.6 shall be posted on one side of fire apparatus access roads more than 26 feet wide and less than 32 feet wide (See Figure D103.6 for example).

\*Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus (80,000 pounds) and shall be surfaced to provide all-weather driving capabilities.

\*The required turning radius of a fire apparatus access road shall be the following: Inside radius is 20 feet, outside is 45-feet

\*Dead-end fire apparatus access roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved area for turning around fire apparatus. Turn areas for hammerhead are increased to 80-feet (160-feet total) to accommodate SLC Fire Department apparatus. See appendix D for approved turnarounds. Cul de sac shall provide minimum diameter of 96-feet.

\*Buildings or portions of buildings constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction is more than 400 feet from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site fire hydrants and mains shall be provided where required by the fire code official.

\*Where a fire hydrant is located on a fire apparatus access road, the minimum road width shall be 26 feet, exclusive of shoulders.

\*Maximum grade of fire access roads shall not exceed 10%

#### **TRANSPORTATION DIVISION COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Jena Carver**

**Email: [jena.carver@slcgov.com](mailto:jena.carver@slcgov.com)**

**Phone: 801-535-6694**

**Status: Make Corrections**

The "Revised Proposal" shows the Bonneville shoreline trail relocated to the north side of the proposed private access road, but there is no trail shown on the plan and profile or grading and drainage plans. More information on the relocation of the trail and resulting street cross section is needed. Other than the matter of trail relocation I have no issues with the proposal.

#### **PUBLIC LANDS**

**Comments by: Tyler Murdock**

**Email: [tyler.murdock@slcgov.com](mailto:tyler.murdock@slcgov.com)**


**Phone: 801-972-7810**

**Status: General Comments and Corrections**

## Public Lands Comments for Turville Plat Development

### Preferred trail amenities and access

- Recommendations for trailhead
  - Utilize Lot 1, Parcel A, and eastern side of Parcel B (approximately to the development vehicular gate noted in red below) as a study area for a “East Bench Preserve Trailhead”.
- Recommendation for sidewalk:
  - In lieu of trail, a sidewalk (marked in gray) would be recommended from the current cul-de-sac at Lakeline Drive along the north side of “Carrigan View Road” to the HOA vehicular gate (marked in red) and continuing past to the gate to the Public Utility access gate at the northwest corner of the Carrigan View Road cul-de-sac (marked in red). See map below and similar precedent at Colomubs Court, north of the Capitol.



- Recommendations for a trail:
  - Assuming Public Utilities needs continued access to their easement, our recommendation would be to keep the 8' - 10' wide fire road trail along the north edge of Parcel 4 (marked in purple), and include a privacy fence to separate the trail from the parcel.

Preferred parcel configuration for acquisition

- Lot 1 and Parcel A and part of Parcel B be combined for a trailhead development
- Combine into one parcel for "East Bench Preserve" open space:
  - Parcel B, Parcel D, Parcel E
  - Turville Parcels: 16-14-400-043-4001, 16-14-353-013, 16-14-353-012
  - Existing SLC parcels
    - 16-14-353-022, 16-14-376-055, 16-14-326-016, 16-14-306-030, 16-14-306-002
- Parcel C is a trail and utility easement

-

PL Recommendation for street location/ownership

- See comment above. Do PL own road between Lot 1 and Parcel A, east of HOA vehicular gate

Potential Trail connection from Scenic Drive to Lakeline Drive

- 16-14-400-043-4001 for trail



PLNSUB2024-00219
Carrigan View Phase 2 Prelim Plat
1820 S Lakeline Drive
April 2024

## PRELIMINARY PLAT 1<sup>st</sup> REVIEW COMMENTS

### PLANNING DIVISION COMMENTS


Comments by: Eric Daems

Email: [eric.daems@slcgov.com](mailto:eric.daems@slcgov.com)

Phone: 801-535-7236


Status: Make Corrections

- Drawings and cross section to show fence on north side of road. Fence needs to be transparent such as wrought iron or chain link.
- Improvements for street will be required across parcel 16-14-376-041, the public easement will also need to be recorded across that section in accordance with the public benefit and access this proposal seeks to create. The boundaries of the subdivision could be revised to include all or a portion of that parcel so that the easement can be recorded and improvements established. Otherwise, language and deed to establish that easement outside of proposed subdivision boundaries will be required.
- Trail easement width and design will need to be satisfactory to Public Lands and Transportation in order for Planned Development requirement to be fulfilled.
- Parcel 16-14-376-041 needs to be included in the subdivision boundaries as it will be sold to SLC Public Lands and will include the trail access until a trailhead is developed



- Design and exact placement of fence on north side of Carrigan Rim Court needs to be provided. Fence should be metal or wood with consideration of design appropriate for wildlife, public views to the south, and to not attract graffiti.

- Trail cannot run through drainage channel as it would cause substantial rutting and other problems. With the private road removing the existing trail, this needs to be engineered in an acceptable manner for an at least 6' trail to function. The premise of the Planned Development is to create a public benefit, so this element is critical to solve. As drawn, it is more of a private benefit to handle the drainage for the private development. Trail surface needs to have a convex crown.



- The proposed 5' retaining wall will need to be engineered for building permit review
- Revised cut and fill plan should be sought (see notes from Jena)
- There are 2 ephemeral streams crossing the property (see attached). Plans should show how they are going to reroute these or otherwise handle them. One of the streams passes directly through their proposed cut for the road and trail. They both cross the trail and the buildable areas.
- Part of the property is in the Surface Fault Rupture Zone shown on the Utah Geologic Hazards map
- Slope retention/revegetation plans should be required for all cut slopes
- Access to the buildable area on each lot must be provided to show that the lots can be built on without exceeding current city requirements for driveway slope and retaining wall height. The current plans show the access to lots 2 and 3 stopping short of the potential building pad with the building pads located down slope from the end of the accesses. Grading plans and plan and profile drawings for each driveway should be required prior to subdivision approval.

## PUBLIC UTILITY COMMENTS

Comments by: Kristeen Beitel

Email: Kristeen.beitel@slcgov.com

Phone: 801-604-0056

Status: Make Corrections- additional comments may arise as result of potholing

*There is an existing 16" water main that runs through these lots, protected by an existing 33-foot easement (Book 943, Page 545). This public water main and easement must remain in place and protected. No additional utilities are permitted within this easement. This easement must be shown on the plat. It is understood that the applicant is performing potholing on 03/26/2024 to determine exact location. Please coordinate with SLCDPU when this information is obtained to determine any required changes to the existing easement.*

*There are several public water mains in the vicinity of this development serving the existing tanks and pump station. Additional easements will be required for existing public water mains that impact the subject lots and must be shown on the [plat](#).*

*To provide water to these properties, a public water main extension will be required in the new roadway from the 8" water main in Lakeline Drive. The water main shall be public in any public roadway. Any public water main outside of public right of way will require an easement. Please coordinate with SLCDPU to locate the easement based on the design of the water main.*

*It is understood that the three lots will discharge to a shared sewer lateral. Please verify that all appropriate easements are shown for the proposed shared sewer lateral on this [plat](#). Additionally, please include a note on the [plat](#) indicating that there is a shared, private sewer lateral and describe the ownership and maintenance responsibility for this specific utility. If there will be an HOA, then please include CC&R's that address this same ownership and maintenance responsibility from the public main to each individual unit for any shared utilities.*



**PUBLIC SERVICES COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Jorge Chamorro**

**Email: Jorge Chamorro@slcgov.com**

**Phone: 801-483-6733**

**Status: General Comment**

Only comment from Public Services Operations is related to the fact that Lakeline Dr is a cul de sac, which for snow removal purposes it is on the lower priority, meaning clear access after a snow storm will take some time.

**ENGINEERING REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Scott Weiler**

**Email: Scott.weiler@slcgov.com**

**Phone: 801-535-6159**

**Status: Make corrections for final plat**

See attachments

With Carrigan Rim Court being termed a private street, there is a segment of that street that is not within the plat boundary. Please indicate how you intend for that segment to be dedicated for public use and if you are intending to install the curb & gutter and pavement on that segment.

**ATTORNEY'S COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Jennifer Wordelman**

**Email: attyplats@slcgov.com**

**Phone: 801-535-7662**

**Status: Comments to be made on Final Plat**

**TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Jena Carver**

**Email: jena.carver@slcgov.com**

**Phone: 801-573-5058**

**Status: Make Corrections**

Though the city will own parcel A, the proposed road is placed where the existing trail is. This creates a situation where putting the trail on parcel A may be very difficult and expensive due to the drainage ditch and slope. The city would be required to pipe or relocate the drainage ditch or significantly reroute the trail up the slope creating a trail that is much steeper, less accessible, and that would scar the hillside. The trail should be maintained in its current alignment and a public easement provided on the plat. The trail easement could be located in the road or engineering plans could be provided to show a trail on the north side of the road could be constructed along with required drainage and any proposed fences and gates. There is a "drainage interceptor corridor" shown on page PP-01 (page 8) congruent with the possible trail. Details on this "drainage interceptor corridor" are needed before approving a trail there.

Access to the buildable area on each lot must be provided to show that the lots can be built on without exceeding current city requirements for driveway slope and retaining wall height. The current plans show the access to lots 2 and 3 stopping short of the potential building pad with the building pads located down slope from the end of the accesses. Grading plans and plan and profile drawings for each driveway should be required prior to subdivision approval.

. The proposed 6' cut increases the slope north of the private road from 40% (2.5:1) to 50% (2:1) with a 60 foot vertical cut. The vertical cut distance can be reduced to 8' if they construct two 3 to 4 foot high retaining walls, or to zero with one 6' retaining wall. I've included an example of tiered retaining walls from the SLCO FCOZ ordinance. A couple of other things I noticed:

- They are proposing a 5' "rock wall". I think this needs to be an engineered retaining wall and they should provide engineering plans for it, if they haven't already.
- There are 2 ephemeral streams crossing the property. A fairly large one and a small one. They should show how they are going to reroute these or otherwise handle them. One of the streams passes directly through their proposed cut for the road and trail. They both cross the trail and the buildable areas.
- Part of the property is in the Surface Fault Rupture Zone shown on the Utah Geologic Hazards map
- Slope retention/revegetation plans should be required for all cut slopes

From a transportation perspective I would ask that the ephemeral streams be addressed as they cross the trail and road, that revegetation be required to prevent erosion that could affect the road and trail, and that they either provide engineering plans for their proposed wall or provide an engineering assessment showing that the rock wall proposed is sufficient.

**FIRE REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Seth Hutchinson**

**Email: seth.hutchinson@slcgov.com**

**Phone: 801-535-7164**

**Status: Corrections for Final Plat and Building Permit**

Section 507 in the IFC requires that a fire hydrant, providing the required fire flows (as defined in Appendix B in the IFC) shall be located within 600-feet of all ground level exterior walls for any structures on the parcels. Measurements are in straight lines and right angles from the hydrant, following the drive route, and then around the structure. Approved fire apparatus access roads shall be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction. The fire apparatus access road shall comply with the requirements of IFC section 503 and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet, exclusive of shoulders, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches, and be capable of supporting 80,000 pounds per square inch (psi). Fire apparatus access roads shall not be obstructed in any manner, including the parking of vehicles, or medians. The approved method of measurement for the 150 foot requirement is from the curbing of the FD Access Road, then using right angles and straight lines, measure around the building. Dead-end fire apparatus access roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved area for turning around fire apparatus. FD turnarounds must meet SLC Fire Department requirements, and requirements in Appendix D Section D103.4 and Table D103.4 in the IFC. SLC Fire Department requires that hammer head turnarounds measure 160 feet (80-foot Y) with a minimum of 20 foot inside turn radius, and a 45 foot outside turn radius (this is the radius that the fire truck tires would follow while turning).

**BUILDING REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Timothy Burke**

**Email: timothy.burke@slcgov.com**

**Phone: 801-535-7746**

**Status: No Corrections**

We have no specific Building Code review comments for the proposed Carrigan View Phase 2 Preliminary Subdivision application as presented at this time.

Any proposed construction/remodeling will need to be submitted for formal review for Building, Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Permits as applicable.

Comments/corrections may arise when any proposed construction project is submitted for formal review for compliance with the applicable Codes.

All proposed construction within the corporate limits of Salt Lake City shall comply with all State of Utah adopted construction codes including any applicable state or local amendments to those codes.

RE: Title 15A State Construction and Fire Codes Act.

Existing structures on adjacent parcels or neighboring structures or spaces within the same parcel shall not be made less complying to the construction codes than they were prior to this proposed construction.

**Additional Comments from William Warlick**

*Building Services can review the plans to ensure that they designate “undevelopable areas” per 18.28.040(F)(3) [new text]:*

*F. Grading and Erosion Control Standards and Regulations: All site development work shall be accomplished in conformance to the following grading and erosion control design standards and regulations:*

*3. Undevelopable Slopes: Any (1) slope identified on a subdivision plat as undevelopable, (2) slope that has been altered without permits or prior approval to 30% or greater, or (3) natural slopes of 30% or greater (as measured pursuant to a “ten-foot averaging” method as defined in Section 20.50.020), shall be designated undevelopable area. In no event shall streets traverse such slopes.*

*Note that 18.28.040(F) only requires the designation of “undevelopable areas” in the context of site development work. It does not prohibit development based on this designation.*

*It is my understanding that the State Construction Code would prevail over any more restrictive provision in Chapter 18. The building code requirements in Chapter 18.28 are related to slope stability, drainage, erosion, and design of the structure. The State Construction Code also covers these subjects, so on those subjects it prevails over the City code per 15A-1-*

*204(8). The State-adopted building codes (IRC and IBC) allow an engineered solution where the prescriptive requirements cannot be met. So, as far as the building codes are concerned, there is no reason that a structure cannot be built on any slope, provided there is an approved engineered solution that meets the intent of the prescriptive requirements.*

**COUNTY RECORDER REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Steve Keisel**

**Email: skeisel@slco.org**

**Phone: 385-468-8145**

**Status: Comments to be made on final plat**

**SUSTAINABILITY REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Comments by: Peter Nelson**

**Email: peter.nelson@slcgov.com**

**Phone: 801-573-6477**

**Status: No Comments**

**POLICE REVIEW COMMENTS**

Comments by: Andrew Cluff

Email: Andrew.cluff@slcgov.com

Phone: 801-799-3805

Status: No Comments

**PUBLIC LANDS COMMENTS**

Comments by: Tyler Fonarow

Email: tyler.fonarow@slcgov.com

Phone: 801-972-7810

Status: Make Corrections

- The trail on the north side of Carrigan Rim Court needs to be wide enough to support a 6' wide paved trail (either asphalt path or sidewalk) and needs to have a convex crown to drain water to both sides or sloped to once side or the other to drain into a drainage ditch. The trail as shown doubling as a "drainage channel" is exactly what we are trying NOT to do in trail engineering. I am not familiar with the engineering requirements for storm water, but that needs to be addressed somehow. Water running down a trail creates significant erosion and is counterintuitive to modern trail construction standards. Additionally, all of the HOAs in SLC that have public access easements provide either a sidewalk or a paved path to circumnavigate their roadway so that should be the expectation here as well.