

OLYMPIA WORKING GROUP SUMMARY INFRASTRUCTURE

Date: August 5, 2021

Time: 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Attendees: Nathan Cherpeski, Tami Moody, Wendy Thomas, Chase Andrizzi, Alan Rae, Blake Thomas, Justun Edwards, Jonathan Bowers, Anthony Teuscher, Olympia Development Team

This meeting focused on two main topics: parking requirements and what capital infrastructure will be included in the development fee.

The parking conversation arose from a concern the developer had about requirements to provide parking for a townhome (2.75 stalls) versus a detached single-family home of identical size (4.25 stalls). The developer felt that in respect to parking, it feels like a penalty to provide single family homes instead of multifamily because of the additional parking requirement. The group acknowledged the dilemma as the City encourages as much detached single-family housing as possible within Olympia. It was also generally agreed that a fractional requirement (4.25) for a single-family home may not be the best option (as .25 parking stalls is impossible to construct in a single home's construction on a single lot), whereas multifamily housing makes more sense to have a fractional requirement as multifamily units are always built together.

The following was proposed as a discussion starting point:

Multifamily residential: maintain existing
MF 1 bedrooms: 1.75 stalls
MF 2 bedrooms: 2.25 stalls
MF 3+ bedrooms: 2.75 stalls

Single family residential:
Require at least a two-car garage in all cases.
SF 4 bedrooms or fewer: 3 stalls
SF 5+ bedrooms: 4 stalls

The group discussed the suggestion and various factors that affect parking. It was mentioned that front-load SF homes will always provide at least four stalls with the two-car garage requirement plus a driveway setback. For rear/alley-load homes with a 3' apron driveway, on-street parking may need to be provided and count toward the requirement. One concern brought up was that City ordinance prohibits on-street parking during snow events. A possible solution was to provide bulb-out road sections that are wide enough for on-street parking but decrease width at intersections; this would allow "protected" parking space along the side of the road with an understanding that snow plows will maintain only the travel lanes. It was also suggested to eliminate the minimum parking requirement altogether for SF front-load homes, which default to four spaces, and require a 2.75 minimum for rear-load homes. The group agreed to consider that until a future meeting, and wanted to wait to make a decision until a councilmember was present. It was also noted that

sometimes adequate parking is provided, but residents may fill garages with stuff rather than cars, which pushes cars into the driveway and street.

The development team also requested to review commercial parking requirements, as they felt the City's code for some uses requires excessive parking. For example, for restaurant uses, the City code currently requires 30 stalls per 1,000 square feet of restaurant space, and developer noted that 10 stalls is closer to the industry standard. Another example is office space—City code currently requires 1 stall/150 square feet, and the industry standard suggests 4/1000 square feet. It was noted that the City sometimes will decrease the parking requirement with a study-verified justification, especially in cases of shared parking for a complex. The group left this item for discussion at a later meeting, allowing time for the group to consider the requirements.

The group then discussed what infrastructure needs to be included in master plan updates and the contract fee paid to the City. Olympia will be responsible to pay for 100% of infrastructure needed to service its project within its boundaries. There are some cases—such as the water tank to be built in the first part of the development—that the City will ask for an upsize to help service other areas outside of Olympia. This may be true in the future for transportation or other water infrastructure as well. To address the matter, the master development agreement will include a standard clause that requires the City to pay for (via a reimbursement agreement) upgrades to the new infrastructure to service other needs than are identified in the initial master plan.

The group discussed the reverse situation as well, where Olympia will need to buy into equity to use existing infrastructure (such as the Zone 4 water tank). Those fees (Olympia buying into City systems) are calculated in impact fee evaluations.

It was discussed that the draft Olympia water plan serves as a baseline that outlines overall water infrastructure needs and obligations. If the City chooses to upsize infrastructure, the City would be responsible to pay for the upgrade cost (as noted previously). However, it was pointed out that the Division of Drinking Water requires each phase of development to support itself with water infrastructure when it is built. Because of that, as the project is constructed phase by phase, some water lines may need to be larger than the overall water plan shows, based on requirements from the DDW. Those upsized lines may not necessarily need to be that size at Olympia's completion, but because of needs in certain time periods during construction, they would be required to be upsized by the DDW. The City would not be obligated to pay for those particular upsize costs.

The group is working to identify how many units can be sustained by existing City water infrastructure in the project's first phase. That number will essentially dictate how many units can be bonded against in the first public infrastructure district (PID), if the developer chooses to use a PID. Once that number is identified, further discussions can materialize regarding the phasing of new water lines to service the project as it is constructed.

The group then discussed stormwater systems. Olympia is planned to construct the project in a way that stormwater is contained on-site, including utilizing low-impact development and an

underground drainage system for detention basins. Most stormwater will be retained on-site or will flow into Salt Lake County facilities such as Midas Creek or Butterfield Creek. Some stormwater on the eastern side of the project south of Creek Ridge may use existing City stormwater systems, which would require an impact fee to the City. Those impacts are being analyzed now and results will be ready in approximately a month—a similar timeline to transportation and water analyses.

The Olympia team is proposing to connect to a park on its southern border that will be constructed by Ivory in the Dansie property (about 6.59 acres). Olympia would approximately match the park size on its own property to combine into a larger regional park. It was discussed to include in the MDA that Olympia will match pro rata whatever funds Ivory puts into its portion of the park. The City would work with both developers to construct a park that suits the needs of the community in that area.

The group discussed not including parks in the contract fee paid to the City as Olympia will be responsible for constructing all parks within its area and Olympia's park level of service is equal to or greater than Herriman City's park LOS. It was suggested to include in the MDA an agreement for the City to accept maintenance of any park over x size (currently drafted at 2 acres, but the group will discuss the size later) and that the City and developer will work together to construct those parks.

The last item discussed briefly was regarding the right of way along 6400 West, south of Herriman Boulevard. There are approximately 133 feet of ROW for an 86-foot roadway. The remaining area will need to be addressed and could likely include improvements paid by park impact fee funds. This item will be discussed more at a later date.