B & A Engineers, Inc.
Consulting Engineers & Land Surveyors
5505 West Franklin Road. Boise, ID 83705
Telephone 208.343.3381 Facsimile 208.342.5792

To: **Garden City Planning**

Copy: **Jenah Thornborrow**
Chris Samples
Betty Gumm
Colin Schmidt
Kevin Wallis
Troy Vaughn
Chad Vaughn
Olesya Durfey

From: **Joe Canning, PE/PLS**
Telephone: 208.343.3381
E-Mail: jdcanning@baengineers.com

Date: 2 January 2020

Subject: **Mountain View Townhomes**
SUBFY2020-01
7.44 Acres
Parcel Numbers S0536141980 & S0631233880
Planning Review

Pages: 8

Media: Transmitted via E-mail

On behalf of Garden City, as the city engineer, we have completed our review of the application for the subject project. The application proposes construction of seventy-two unit land subdivision on approximately 7.74 acres of land. We note the property does **not** include a 0.7 acre parcel (#S0536141988) that is adjoining Glenwood Street. The site will be subdivided into seven-seven lots (seventy-two building lots, four common area lots and one lot to be deeded to the Settlers Irrigation District).

Comments within this review are specific to the information provided for the current submittal and for proposed infrastructure content. The review should not be considered all encompassing. Other reviews within the city and by other review agencies will occur.

Information provided applicable to our review is:

1. Design Review application form

2. Land Division application form
3. Applicant's design review letter dated 5 November 2019 by neUdesign Architecture
4. Letter dated 2 December 20019 by Hale Development requesting to terminate an existing development agreement dated October 2006
5. Submittal material waiver request letter dated 2 December 2019 by Hale Development
6. Site Geotechnical report prepared by Bob J. Arnold, PE of Site Consulting, LLC and dated 5 March 2014
7. Site Plan prepared by neUdesign and 25 June 2019
8. Landscape Overview plan by Stack Rock Group, Jessen Buster, LA and dated 4 November 2019
9. Preliminary Plat (2 sheets) prepared by ULC Management and dated 10 September 2019
10. Lighting Plan prepared by ULC Management and dated 5 December 2019

Any suggestions for design modifications are not made to replace the position of the professional of record. We are simply making an observation that may impact the project or its review by city staff. The design professional may not necessarily be obligated to use the suggestion unless conformance to city requirements is an issue.

We have the following comments regarding this project:

General

1. Was an Affidavit of Legal Interest executed by CS2, LLC submitted?

2. Comply with any requirements of the Ada County Highway District.

3. The project must be conditioned upon approval of the North Ada County Fire and Rescue District (NACFRD). Should required water fire flows to serve the project exceed the production capabilities of the city's water system in the area, the applicant may have to modify the project, upgrade the city water system in the area or not complete the project. It is recommended the applicant begin assessing the impacts of this comment as soon as possible.

4. Prior to beginning any site grading, the applicant must submit and have approved by the city an Erosion Control Plan and Narrative for the project.

5. The project must be approved with providing full storm drainage design information in accordance with city requirements. This includes providing an augmented site geotechnical report covering the necessary design parameters. Roof drainage must be accounted for and must remain on-site.

6. Please provide a subdivision name reservation from the Ada County Surveyor's office. We note the project name is titled "Mountain View Townhomes". We cannot find a reservation for this name that is valid for this project. Please advise.

7. The city will require easements to the city be provided for water mains, water meters, fire hydrants, sanitary sewer mains, sanitary sewer services and manholes over internal drives and adjoining lots.

8. We note an emergency access route near the northwest corner of the site to the private land to the north. An approval from that landowner is required for the access to occur. We suggest that perhaps a better location for that emergency access route would be via Glenwood to the west. Either route involves addressing notable elevation differentials. Either route will require approval by another landowner, but the access via Glenwood should contain less interference and hazards to possible slow moving traffic and pedestrians on the Fred Meyer site. Additionally, as was noted on the application for a prior property line adjustment (file number LLAFY2019-2), the applicant was cautioned that a development plan for the parcels proposed for this development may require multiple accesses to the primary parcel on this site for emergency access and that the city would not be responsible for loss of development options created by the applicant.

Comments from Project Conditional Will Serve Letter

9. The plat of Metropolitan Subdivision created a utility easement that is 10 feet wide along the boundary line common to the Fred Meyer building and the proposed site. From construction plans the city has on file, the water line in this area is shown as 30 feet north of the property line. The city would probably claim a prescriptive easement for the existing water line, but there is concern that the easement could be used to extend service to another parcel of land. This issue must be researched to determine if the city water system may be connected to for extension to the subject property and is an easement now exits. City records for BLD2015-00109 and PWU2014-00128 at the Fred Meyer site should be researched regarding granting of an easement to the city. The author of this letter does not have access to city recorded easement records. Should access be allowed, considering the possible easement concerns with the Metropolitan Subdivision, the city water system is capable of providing adequate fire protection capacity to serve a proposed facility if the NACFRD determines that the project does not require more fire protection water than what is available from the city system or extensions to the city system. Should the District require more fire protection water than the current system is capable of providing; the owner of the project may be required to modify and propose construction to comply with the District's flow requirements and/or upgrade the city's water system.

10. The NACFRD will require additional fire hydrants.

11. A water line is available in a portion of West 53rd Street. The applicant should review its location as the city will require connection to the line to assure a looped water distribution system.

12. The ground elevation at the point of need may impact the delivery volume and pressure. System modeling of a proposed water distribution system by the applicant for a project at this location will probably be necessary.

13. In 2014, the site was located in the West Boise Sewer District. We believe it was de-annexed from the District; but, since that project was not completed, we do not know if the de-annexation took place. If the property remains in the District, connection to the District's system must be coordinated with the District. If service is sought to be provided by Garden City, the land must be de-annexed from the West Boise Sewer District and service must be requested from the city. Said request to the city must be accompanied with an analysis of the feasibility of service from the city, including a proposed connection route and right to connect, connection point capacity and adequate elevation exists to successfully make the connection.

14. Any special uses on the site may require pretreatment of wastewater based upon review of use by Garden City Environmental.

15. Any new water and sanitary sewer mainline extensions or service connections must be coordinated, reviewed and approved by the city prior to installation. Design and installation is the responsibility of the applicant. Should the applicant desire the city to perform a QLPE review of the extensions, costs of said review would be borne by the applicant.

Applicant's Submittal Waiver Request Letter

16. We do **not** support a waiver of some of the items the applicant has requested by waived at the time of application. This site has some unique conditions that should be addressed prior to development approval. Some of the information needed could impact the site layout and its features. Those site conditions include some notable slopes, proximity of an elevated major canal and prior fill placed on the site. The letter notes the missing material will be provided prior to submittal of the final plat and after it is understood what specific conditions of approval will pertain to the project. Without some of the needed information, we do not know what conditions will be necessary.

17. Grading Plan – We request that some effort be made to indicate site grading. Based upon one of the sheets provided as a preliminary plat, we note some areas of notable existing slopes (although the contour intervals and if they are existing or proposed are not labeled). Information should be provided on the proposed height of the retaining walls noted on the site plan (keynote 16). We expect a structural engineering design will be required for this wall based upon probable heights, but it is not clear from the contents of the current application. Additionally the preliminary plat sheet with elevation contours on it, depict notable impact to proposed building lots along the south and southwest lines of the site. What is the proposal to deal with the grade differences? Will the area be leveled, will retaining walls be added, will buildings have stepped foundations, will earthwork in the area possibly disturb barriers to mitigate seepage from the canal?

18. Grading Plan – Projected sanitary sewer elevations from a connection point to the end of the proposed mainline extensions need to be provided with the application to assure the project may be served without a lift station. A water way crossing will be required. We suspect this is not an issue, but the effort to provide the information is not significant considering the possible impact to the project.

19. Grading Plan – The extension of West 53rd Street will require a road waterway crossing. Some preliminary effort should be provided on the type of crossing, who the controlling entity is for the waterway and if the crossing will be approved by the entity.

20. Grading Plan – It is not entirely clear where the public road (West 53rd Street) will end and the private road will begin. We presume the ACHD will require a turnaround at the public road terminus. Please advise on this.

21. Hydrology Report - We request that a site hydrology report be submitted. The site contains notable fills (ranging from 9.5 to 11.5 feet, according to the project soil report). This fill might impact how site drainage could be mitigated and not cause blow-out to down-gradient lands. Additionally, the hydraulic impact of the elevated Settlers Canal could be an issue that needs to be addressed to assure negligible impact to the development.

22. Natural Hazard and Resource Analysis – Based upon our comments in the two immediate prior comments, an analysis should be provided. We believe the site could contain hazards to proper development. Not enough information has been provided to know.

23. If the land occupied by the Settlers Canal is to be deeded to the Settlers Irrigation District as noted on the preliminary plat, the District must be willing to accept the deed.

24. The Project Covenant, Conditions and Restrictions, when prepared, must contain requirements for maintenance of all common facilities in a manner applicable to the subdivision. Membership by landowners, their benefits and their responsibilities must be defined.

25. Pressurized irrigation using Thurman Mill water is proposed for the project. We must presume that adequate volume and frequency of water is available. A review of the PI system could occur during construction plan submittal.

Site Geotechnical Report

26. We note the report references one of the two parcel numbers proposed to house the project and notes the parcel size at 5.5 acres. The report only references four borings over the site that contains fill. This seems to be sufficient for preliminary observations, but we would suggest that more borings might be necessary to cover the entire 7.74 acres and for specific design.

27. This site has been covered with a considerable amount of fill material. The report notes fill depths of up to 11.5 feet. Construction on filled material always requires care and particularly careful oversight. The geotechnical report suggests such oversight and development must be conditioned upon such oversight. Of particular concern are trench support for utilities, storm water disposal in fill areas, construction of the roadways/drives, construction of buildings, possible seepage from the canal impacting improvements, slope stability along the canal and the bench to the Fred Meyer site. Settlement of utilities after installation cannot occur. An extended warranty of the improvements may be required. More information is needed to assess these issues.

28. We note the site plan within the report does not match the proposed development plan. The geotechnical engineer should revise the report or issue an amendment letter to acknowledge the site plan change and be provided the opportunity to offer additional comments if necessary.

29. Due to the fill on the site, the report is making recommendations for many aspects of the site construction. The recommendations must be followed.

30. The report notes a history of fill being placed in the site from 2007 to perhaps 2012. Some historic reports are noted in the report. The city would request being provided with all prior reports.

31. The report notes a former drainage ditch that apparently has been filled. The city requests a history of this ditch and what its purpose was. Were any approvals obtained to fill the ditch or was it tiled? Was the ditch a seepage collection system for the up-gradient canal?

32. The report does not provide a depth to seasonal high groundwater. We note the borings were advanced in February of 2014. Piezometers were set in two borings. Was groundwater monitored and, if so, what were the results?

33. The report does not provide specific recommendations for storm water disposal. Suggested design infiltration rates, and at what depth, are required. Additionally, an assessment must be included on the injection of site storm water into fill materials and possible lateral movement of that water to daylight down-gradient.

34. We request that the location of the borings be placed on the preliminary plat with an elevation of the top of the piezometers or ground elevation at the boring location.

Preliminary Plat Sheets

35. The plat shows two connection points to the private land to the north. One is an emergency access previously noted in this review and one is for a pedestrian connection. Approval of these connections must be provided from the landowner to the north. Additionally, we expect the pedestrian access will need to be ADA accessible. The plat (keynote 4) includes a ramp, but it is not clear how the grading and its connection at the ends work. Depending on the elevation difference required, the ramp could be significant.

36. The plat indicates private access routes and noted as “common drives” and “private roads”. It is our understanding that addressing off of named private roads will be required by Ada County. Please provide road names that have been approved by the Ada County Street name committee.

37. The project professional engineer will be responsible for quality control testing and observation of the site construction including compaction testing of all trench areas, subgrades and building sites. Construction quality control reports and observation logs provided to the city will be required during construction.

38. Please note that when the final plat is prepared, specific water and sewer easements naming Garden City will be required. Garden City is not a “public utility”. Reference preliminary plat notes 1 and 10.

39. Preliminary plat note 2 creates side yard easements. Is this correct?

40. Preliminary plat note 6 references DEQ. DEQ does not review the site drainage, the city and the ACHD will do so.

41. Preliminary plat note 12 may be removed from the plat, if desired.

42. What is the intent of preliminary plat note 17? Who is the beneficiary of the easement?

43. We would recommend the throat of the southwest parking area be opened up some to accommodate vehicles turning around in that area, as turning in the emergency access area is not ideal. We note the delineation of the west side of the parking area with the access drive appears to be slightly different on the site plan compared to the preliminary plat. The configuration on the site plan is preferred. The turnaround should meet the maneuvering requirements of the NACFRD for non-emergency inspections that NACFRD may perform from time to time.

We have no other comments regarding this application at this time. We request that additional information, as noted in this review, be provided prior to preliminary approval. Needed additional information may require modifications to the project plan.