SOUTH WEBER CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: **20 October 2021** **TIME COMMENCED:** **6:00 p.m.**

LOCATION: **1600 E. South Weber Drive, South Weber, Utah**

PRESENT: **COMMISSIONERS:** **Gary Boatright**
Jeremy Davis
Wes Johnson
Julie Losee
Taylor Walton

COMMUNITY SERVICE DIRECTOR: **Trevor Cahoon**

DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR: **Kimberli Guill**

Transcriber: Minutes transcribed by Michelle Clark

ATTENDEES: Rod Westbroek, Paul Sturm, Blair Halverson, Michael Grant, Tammy Long, Joel Dills, Becky Dills, Preston Lasater, Lynn Wood, and Jake Jones.

Commissioner Boatright welcomed those in attendance and pointed out this is the first time this year all Planning Commissioners have been in attendance in person.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commissioner Walton

2. Public Comment: Anyone requesting to comment live via Zoom must pre-register at the following https://forms.gle/PMJFhYFJsD3KCi899 before 5 pm on the meeting date. Comments will also be accepted at publiccomment@southwebercity.com

a. Individuals may speak once for 3 minutes or less.
b. State your name and address.
c. Direct comments to the entire Commission
d. Note Planning Commission will not respond during the public comment period.

The city received public comment emails from the following:

- Todd Jenson, 1600 East 300 South, Fifth Floor Salt Lake City, UT
- Joel Dills, 7749 S. 2100 E., South Weber, UT
- Amy Mitchell, 1923 Deer Run Drive, South Weber, UT

ACTION ITEMS:

3. Approval of Consent Agenda

- **Planning Commission Minutes of 12 August 2021**

Commissioner Johnson moved to approve the consent agenda. Commissioner Losee seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Johnson, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.

Community Services Director Trevor Cahoon explained tonight's public hearing is for preliminary plat and improvements plans for Riverwood Subdivision (56 Lot Plat) R-LM Zoning (Current) Rezone .546 of an acre from A to R-LM, located at approximately 128 East South Weber Drive for applicant, Nilson Homes. The total acreage is 33.03 acres with a total open space of 1.82 acres. He expressed the density calculation is based off of gross total acreage. This calculation is consistent with other developments throughout the community. Per South Weber City code the only development type that the city can use a net calculation is in a Planned Unit Development (PUD). He identified phase 2 of the project lies mostly outside the Davis County line and will need to be annexed before final is obtained on phase 2. City staff does not see a reason a preliminary approval could not continue. Currently, the developer does not have enough water shares for the entire development. They will need to finalize this item prior to final approval.

Trevor read an email submitted by Todd Jenson, Assistant Attorney General, on 20 October 2021. Trevor spoke with Todd today and discussed preliminary approval prior to these items being resolved.

Trevor reviewed the maps for the preliminary approval.

Commissioner Johnson moved to open the public hearing for Preliminary Plat & Improvement Plans for Riverwood Subdivision (56 Lot Plat R-LM) by Applicant: Nilson Homes. Commissioner Walton seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Johnson, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.

*********** PUBLIC HEARING *********

4. Public Hearing & Action on Preliminary Plat & Improvement Plans for Riverwood Subdivision (56 Lot Plat R-LM) by Applicant: Nilson Homes

Tammy Long, 2178 East Deer Run Drive, asked about sewer connections and questioned if Central Weber Sewer District has been contacted and have there been any exemptions for this subdivision?

Joel Dills, 7749 S. 2100 E., questioned when the noise easement with Hill Air Force Base was set up was it based on F-16 or F-35's.

Lynn Wood, 2480 Wall Ave., voiced the HAFB noise easement was based on the F-16. He appreciated the Planning Commissions review of this as he is the executor of the estate and is willing to work with the city to make this a quality development.

Brandon Jones, City Engineer's review of 13 October 2021 is as follows:
Our office has completed a review of the Preliminary submittal dated October 4, 2021, for the Riverwood Subdivision.

STAFF ASSESSMENT
The property is zoned R-LM except for a small section of ground in the southeast corner that is zoned A. This ground is requested to be rezoned to R-LM for consistency purposes. The preliminary plans meet the requirements of the City Code and City Standards. Phase 2 is located in unincorporated Weber County and may receive preliminary approval but will not be able to receive final approval until it has been annexed into South Weber City.

The comments listed below are included for the purpose of providing additional information relative to final approval.

GENERAL

E1. Annexation. The northern portion of the development needs to be annexed into South Weber City (see item E6).

E2. Will Serve Letters.

A. The Utility Notification form for Comcast Cable, Dominion Energy, Rocky Mountain Power, and Century Link has been received.

B. A Will-Serve letter from the South Weber Irrigation Company was submitted but is conditional upon acquiring sufficient water shares. The additional shares required may be purchased after city subdivision approval, but before any plats will be recorded.

E3. Plan Review Approval Letters.

A. Due to the powerline traversing the property and questions about the width of the easement required a plan review letter is required from Rocky Mountain Power prior to final.

B. Prior to final, a plan review approval letter will be required from the South Weber Irrigation Company indicating that the proposed improvements meet their requirements.

C. Prior to final, the Riverdale Bench Canal Company will need to approve of the relocation and piping of their canal. Any additional easements for the relocation needed, must be acquired. The grade and location of the pipe on the east will need to be coordinated with South Weber City to ensure sufficient grade for piping across their property.

D. Prior to final, UDOT needs to approve the new access to and improvement in South Weber Drive (SR-60).

E. Prior to final, the Utah Division of Water Quality (Weber River Basin Watershed) will need to approve the storm drain discharge to the culvert under I-84.

E4. Cost Share Agreement.

A. Some of the waterlines and storm drain lines need to be up sized for future development and other drainage purposes. The city is responsible for these costs. Our office will provide an analysis of these costs.

E5. Geotechnical Report. The following comments are based on the study provided by CMT Engineering, dated June 15, 2021.

A. With a land drain system being added after the report was submitted, the geotechnical report needs to be updated (or addendum provided) addressing depths of the basement relative to each lateral to the lot. A reference table will need to be added to the plat giving the maximum depth of the lowest floor slab from the TBC elevation in front of the lot. Both the updated report and table on the plat will need to be part of the final submittal.
B. No infiltration rate was provided. Most LID BMP's require infiltration. As part of the storm water LID analysis an infiltration rate will be required based on actual field testing or the minimum from the UCEA.net saturated hydraulic conductivity table for typical saturated infiltration rates may be used.
C. The preliminary grading plan shows an average fill of about 2' across the entire site. If excess fill is required with the final design, the report should be updated (or an addendum provided) to address any issues related to the additional fill.
D. On site material can only be used for utility trench backfill if it meets a Type A-1a or A-1b AASHTO soil classification.

PLAT

E6. Phasing. It is our opinion that Phase 1 and Phase 2 can receive preliminary approval prior to the annexation portion being annexed into South Weber. However, Phase 2 cannot proceed to final until the property is annexed.
E7. The Final Plat will need a signature block for Rocky Mountain Power (RMP), Central Weber Sewer Improvement District (CWSID), and Weber Basin Water Conservancy District (WBWCD). E8. Prior to final, our office will provide addresses for the lots.

IMPROVEMENT PLANS

E9. Storm Drain.
A. Storm water Low Impact Development (LID) best management practices are required for this development. The preliminary plans show retention in the detention basin. Prior to final, the Storm Water Quality Report will need to be provided, and any additional BMP's shown in the drawings.
i. Follow State's Guidelines at https://deq.utah.gov/water-quality/low-impactdevelopment
ii. Follow State's "Guide to Low Impact Development within Utah Manual"
iii. Complete State's "Storm Water Quality Report Template"
E10. Trail. In accordance with the General Plan, and consistent with other developments, a 10' wide asphalt trail (3" HMA, 4" UTBC) is being provided. It is located between I-84 and the backyards of the homes on Harper Way.

Commissioner Losee moved to close the public hearing for Preliminary Plat & Improvement Plans for Riverwood Subdivision (56 Lot Plat R-LM) by Applicant: Nilson Homes. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Johnson, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.

******************* PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED **********************

Jake Jones, of Nilson Homes, explained this project is for 56 lots. He appreciated working with city staff concerning this project.

Commissioner Johnson asked if there is a setback requirement for the HAFB easement. Trevor replied there is not. Commissioner Johnson is concerned about drought issues and feels the city should take this into consideration. He pointed out the Public Works Building will be constructed next to this development. He asked if UDOT has signed off on the access point for the city building. Blair Halverson voiced UDOT has given approval. Jake Jones replied they have submitted an application to UDOT for access to South Weber Drive. Commissioner Johnson pointed out the trails and roads don't match the general plan. Trevor explained there is access through Harper Way. Commissioner Johnson asked about the storm drain and if it is capable to take the run off. Trevor replied it is capable. Commissioner Johnson stated there isn't anything that identifies trail head access. He also addressed lights from vehicles along the highway and requested looking at requiring a 20 ft. fence. Trevor expressed the city code requires 6 ft. fencing.

Commissioner Losee asked about the plan for the property in the HAFB noise zone. Jake explained it will be open space for private property owners. Commissioner Losee queried if fencing is required along South Weber Drive. Trevor replied the city code doesn't require a fence for South Weber Drive. Discussion took place regarding the access points for the subdivision. Jake explained there is access through Harper Way and South Weber Drive.

Commissioner Walton asked if the city has copies of all easements. Jake replied they have Rocky Mountain approval. Commissioner Walton queried concerning the State of Utah easements. He expressed not having those easements in front of the Planning Commission makes it difficult to review this project. He suggested in the future all easements be included in the packet. He questioned how secondary water is calculated. Blair Halverson replied the State of Utah has calculations that require 1 share per 1 acre. Jake reported they currently have 27 water shares.

Commissioner Walton questioned the sewer capacity. Trevor will confirm with City Engineer Brandon Jones. Commissioner Walton voiced based upon the easements adjacent to this property there may be requirements for construction materials for the building of the homes. He doesn't see a proposal for fencing material on the east boundary. Trevor replied city code requires a chain link fence between residential and agriculture. Jake stated they will be installing a fence but he doesn't know the type of fencing. Commissioner Losee requested no chain link fence. Trevor reported the city can ask for a different type of fencing but can't require it. Discussion took place regarding access from South Weber Drive. Jake reported they will be widening South Weber Drive for easier access to their subdivision.

Commissioner Walton discussed the existing ditch. It was stated the ditch will be piped under Harper Way. He asked how much vegetation will remain along the highway. Jake reported they will try to keep as much as they can.

Trevor reported he reached out to City Engineer Brandon Jones and he reported capacity exists for sewer. Commissioner Boatright asked about the status of the annexation. Jake replied the annexation will take place in phase 2. Blair stated both counties agree the property can only be serviced by South Weber City. Commissioner Boatright doesn't agree with using the

unbuildable land to be used in the density calculations. Commissioner Walton requested being able to review the cost share agreement between the developer and city.

Blair Halverson discussed the density should be calculated on the residential development and not by using the unbuildable area. As a member of the City Council he will vote no with this density.

Commissioner Johnson discussed tabling this item until the city receives information on the easements. Commissioner Walton needs more information to make a decision tonight. Commissioner Losee doesn't feel the Planning Commission is ready to make a decision. Jake welcomed a list of items for approval so they can move forward.

Commissioner Walton moved to approve the Preliminary Plat & Improvement Plans for Riverwood Subdivision (56 Lot Plat R-LM) by Applicant: Nilson Homes subject to the following conditions:

1. **Community Services Director, Trevor Cahoon, review of 20 October 2021**
2. **City Engineer, Brandon Jones, review of 13 October 2021**
3. **Planning Commission to receive copies of all existing easements on the parcel prior to final approval as well as any new easements**
4. **State of Utah approval regarding APZ zones**
5. **UDOT approval for access on South Weber Drive**
6. **Approval from Rocky Mountain Power in regards to bio swell for storm water retention.**
7. **Submit a landscaping plan**
8. **Identify type of fence material for east side fence.**
9. **Annexation letter from Davis and Weber County.**
10. **Preliminary approval letter for secondary water with appropriate shares.**

Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Johnson, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.

Commissioner Boatright moved to open the public hearing for Rezone .546 of an acre from A to R-LM, located at approx. 128 E South Weber Drive by Applicant: Nilson Homes. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Johnson, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.

******************* PUBLIC HEARING **********************

5. Public Hearing & Action on Rezone .546 of an acre from A to R-LM, located at approx. 128 E South Weber Drive by Applicant: Nilson Homes: Trevor reported this request is to rezone .546 from A to R-LM to keep consistent zoning for the subdivision.

Commissioner Boatright asked if there is any public comment.

Michael Grant, 2622 Deer Run Drive, isn't opposed to good development, but doesn't feel the Planning Commission should be in a rush to push this development through.

Commissioner Walton moved to close the public hearing for Rezone .546 of an acre from A to R-LM, located at approx. 128 E South Weber Drive by Applicant: Nilson Homes. Commissioner Losee seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Johnson, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.

******************* PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED **********************

Trevor reported city staff feels this request is consistent with the development. The general plan recommends commercial recreation. Commissioner Walton is concerned about approving a request that is different than the general plan.

Commissioner Losee apologized if it seems as though this is being rushed and discussed the Planning Commission making sure city code is followed for the safety and wellbeing for future residents of the city.

Commissioner Losee moved to recommend to the City Council the approval rezone of .546 acre from A to R-LM, located at approx. 128 E South Weber Drive by Applicant: Nilson Homes. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Johnson, and Losee and voted aye. Commissioner Walton voted nay. The motion carried 4 to 1.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

6. Discussion- Private Right of Way

Community Services Director Trevor Cahoon reported South Weber City code as it relates to private streets and rights-of-way (ROW) has some minor inconsistencies in the application of the code. As more requests have come for development or improvements, it has been difficult to instruct applicants on how to apply code effectively for the projects being proposed. References to private streets and ROW are found throughout Title 10 and Title 11 of City Code. References vary; however, some areas reference a variety of road widths and conditions in which to utilize a private street. The need has become apparent to fix the inconsistencies for better control and application of the city code.

Trevor pointed out private ROW are used in situations that a city standard street does not adequately fit the needs of a development, or in cases where the city does not want to be the primary party to be responsible for future maintenance, for example internal streets for a commercial development. There are instances that can be found that the creation of private ROW are more advantages for parties involved. These instances should not impede any future development or the placement of future public roads, nor should they impact any roads proposed on the City’s General Plan.

Staff has discussed various options for the standardization of private ROW within the ordinance and have proposed the following list:

Zone	Permission	Information
R-M	Not Allowed	
R-LM	Not Allowed	
R-7	Allowed	26 ft street, Asphalt/Concrete, No on street Parking, Curb and Gutter. Sidewalk or Pedestrian path must be made available, on the front of residence or fronting a public ROW and must connect to public ROW, Minimum ROW 32'
R-L	Not Allowed	
A	Allowed	20 ft street, Asphalt/Concrete, No Curb or Gutter, No sidewalk required, Turn around as required, Minimum ROW 22'
A-10	(Discontinued)	
C	Allowed/Required?	Same as R-7
C-H	Allowed/Required?	Same as R-7
T-1	Allowed/Required?	Same as R-7
N-R	Allowed	Same as R-7
P-O	Allowed	Same as R-7
L-I	Allowed	Same as R-7
C-R	Allowed	Same as R-7
C-O	Discontinued	
B-C	Allowed	Same as R-7
R-P	Allowed	32 ft street, Asphalt, Curb and gutter, 6' sidewalk required, No park strip required, Minimum ROW 50'

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

The following items need clarification and direction to proceed in crafting a sufficient code for general application:

- SIZE OF STREET: Currently code allows a width of 41 feet in a PUD, or 30 feet but it must only serve two dwellings. Does it make sense to have a one size must fit all, or do we allow variation based on zoning?
- ALLOWED ZONES: Which zones would we be comfortable allowing Private ROW?
- SETBACKS: What are adequate setbacks for private ROW?

Commissioner Davis asked why the requirement for concrete or asphalt. Trevor replied it is better for the overall maintenance and visual.

Commissioner Losee is concerned about allowing this (especially in R-7 Zone) and doesn't allow for enough parking or proper access. She doesn't feel the city needs this. Commissioner Johnson pointed out the city doesn't currently maintain private right-of-ways and feels this is against private property owners' rights. Commissioner Walton discussed the need to define city code. Commissioner Boatright pointed out this will not apply to any private right-of-way that currently exists in the city, but any new development. Trevor discussed in the past there being inconsistent applications. Commissioner Walton addressed the need for a standard. Commissioner Losee feels the standard should be a high standard.

Commissioner Walton feels a standard for a Private ROW sets the city up for success and suggested widening the requirement for the L-I Zone, C-H Zone, and T-1 Zone. Commissioner Davis suggested a sidewalk on at least one side of the road.

7. Discussion- Residential Parking

Community Services Director Trevor Cahoon reviewed the recommendations for residential parking and stated during the discussion on the Internal Accessory Dwelling Unit (IADU) and

recommendation to the City Council at the August Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission moved to recommend the IADU ordinance with the recommendation to look at the parking ordinance within Title 10. Parking for the IADU ordinance has been detailed in the new ordinance. This review is centered on how the city can address the parking needs for residential units and have a more consistent approach to what will be required when creating parking. This discussion will only focus on parking within Title 10 and will not be focused on parking enforcement in Title 6.

The current code does not reference what type of surfacing is required for off-street parking in residential zones. Nor does it specify what materials should be used for any accessory parking. We have addressed those two items within the draft ordinance for Chapter 10-8-2 Paragraph F:3 as follows:

> 3. Surfacing: Except as provided in subsection 3b of this section, all off street parking areas shall be surfaced with asphalt, concrete pavement, masonry pavers, or comparable material and shall be graded to dispose of all surface water. Surfacing may be installed in stages as approved by the planning commission. All parking and grading plans shall be reviewed and approved by the city engineer.
>
> > a. Residential Parking Areas: All new main residential driveways, approaches, and parking spaces required by this title shall be surfaced with concrete, asphalt or other hard surfaced pavement material.
> >
> > b. Gravel or crushed rock may be installed for accessory parking in a residential zone and must be a minimum of four inches (4") deep, compacted, placed atop a weed barrier, be maintained completely free of grass and weeds, and contained within durable borders.
>
> 4. Parking for public use shall have appropriate bumper guards where needed as determined by the zoning administrator and shall be so arranged and marked as to provide for orderly and safe loading or unloading and parking and storage of vehicles
>
> 5. Lighting: Lighting used to illuminate an off-street parking area shall be so arranged as to reflect the light away from adjoining premises.

In addition to this item, we have included IADUs in the Residential; all dwelling types matrix provided within the same section.

<u>QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER</u>

As we consider the entire ordinance of residential parking as it pertains to the land-use ordinance, are there any other items to consider?

Commissioner Walton questioned how to define a vehicle. Discussion took place regarding what constitutes off-street parking and what the standard should be for that space.

8. Utah APA Report by Commissioner Walton

Commissioner Walton reported he attended the Utah Chapter of American Planning Associations and learned more about land use issues facing the State of Utah. He thanked the city for allowing him to attend this meeting. He expressed the need to address water issues when adding more residents to the community. The recommendation was given to bring Weber Basin Water

Conservation into the general plan process. It is important to make decisions based on water. There are land use guides as well as individuals who are willing to attend meetings to discuss ideas and insight. He discussed opportunities to look at post construction fixtures for water use. He also attended a session concerning billboards and how they are utilized. He attended a session concerning the balance of development agreement and city code. He discussed the presentation by the Utah League of Cities and Towns concerning group decision making. Trevor discussed Planning Commission members being required 4 hours of training per year.

REPORTS:

Planning Commission Comments

Commissioner Boatright: reported the next Planning Commission Meeting will be held on 4 November 2021.

Commissioner Walton: suggested the Code Committee review how to determine developable acreage as it relates to hillsides.

Commissioner Losee: This Saturday the Youth Council will be holding a Trunk or Treat at Central Park 4:30 to 6:00 p.m. Meet the Candidate Debate at Highmark Charter School at 6:30 p.m. on 23 October 2021.

Commissioner Johnson: reported there has been a lot of discussion in the city concerning dust. He suggested the city look at obtaining a series of sensors for measuring decibels for the HAFB noise from the F-35's.

ADJOURNED: Commissioner Johnson moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:48 p.m. Commissioner Walton seconded the motion. Commissioners Boatright, Davis, Johnson, Losee, and Walton voted aye. The motion carried.

APPROVED:_____ Date
Chairperson: Gary Boatright

_____
Transcriber: Michelle Clark

_____
Attest: Development Coordinator, Kimberli Guill

Kim Guill

From: Todd Jenson <toddkjenson@agutah.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 4:57 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: comment on 10/20 Agenda Item 4(c) Preliminary Riverwood Subdivision

To the Chair and Commissioners of the South Weber City Planning Commission,
I represent the Governor's Office of Economic Development (Go Utah), pursuant to Utah Code 63M-6-201.
I write regarding an agenda item 4(c) on the 10/20/2021 agenda for the Planning Commission.
More than a decade ago, the State acted to condemn certain parcels of property around Hill Air Force Base (HAFB), located in and around the Accident Potential Zone (APZ), to create restrictions on development, easements, etc.
There is a review process in place with our office and HAFB to review proposed developments in that area around HAFB, to verify that the subject properties were not affected by a prior State condemnation action, judgments, other restrictions on development in that area, easements, or other land use restrictions. A title search should have identified those recorded restrictions, but sometimes, title reports miss things (that's why there is a title insurance industry).
Of course, hopefully, the parcels in this particular Riverwood project/subdivision are not burdened or negatively affected by the State's property interests and restrictions, but it is best to double check first before developers or other entities incur or spend thousands of dollars on a development that is prohibited by law.
I have also reached out to the agent of the developer involved in this project, Nilson Land Development, LLC, and asked them to submit the parcel numbers involved with this project to my office, so we can conduct a review together with HAFB.
I suggest that any approval of this development project by the South Weber City Planning Commission may be still be subject to some type of land use restriction created by the State's prior condemnation action or easements. It is too soon at this point in time to make a determination on that issue, but preliminary review of the location of the parcels, and names of prior owners compared with records in our office suggest the subject parcels may be affected. We would like to review this more in depth, with additional information provided by the developer.
Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,

Todd Karl Jenson, Assistant Attorney General
State Agency Counsel Division
Utah Attorney General's Office
160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor
P.O. Box 140857
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0857
Mobile: (385) 414-2654
toddkjenson@agutah.gov
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

Kim Guill

From: joel.dills@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 4:53 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Planning commission meeting, Oct 20, 2021

Joel Dills

7749 s 2100 e

Dear commissioners,

There was an article in the Salt Lake Tribune yesterday entitled "This street is falling apart and Salt Lake City leaders say it's not their problem". It's about a private road that has fallen into such disrepair, that the residents living on the road can no longer even drive on it. They can't afford to fix it themselves and so the city refuses to plow it, mail trucks cant deliver and even the garbage truck requires the trash cans to be drug out and onto another street to be picked up. The cost for road repair is outrageously expensive and far beyond the price range of the dozen or so homeowners stuck there.

While I agree our city code is an abysmal mess, I don't see anything in there that refers to a private street being only 26 ft wide with no parking – that's new.

1. Major streets: One hundred ten feet (110');
2. Collector streets: Seventy-eight feet (78'); and
3. Local streets: Seventy feet (70');
4. Public streets are a minimum of fifty (50')
5. PUD Private streets: minimum of forty-one feet (41') in width with the same construction standards as required for a public street, in the city subdivision standards, from the back of curb to back of curb.
6. Alley: A public thoroughfare less than twenty-six feet (26') wide.

Looking at the code of other cites, widths may vary, and I do think we could do a better job organizing our standards to be more easily understood, but other than that, I'm having a hard time understanding why this so-called attempt to clean up the code and "to fix the inconsistencies" is instead suggesting we cut the minimum requirement for roads in half!! In effect making them the size of an alley. On top of that, our City Staff has recommended this only be changed in our highest density (R7) zone.

So in the zone of side by side townhomes, usually squished together with the bare minimum of driveways, they suggest it will serve the citizens who buy those homes best to make their road smaller than the average driveway... AND because it's so small, ban all street parking.

Sorry but this is ONLY in the interest of the developer who isn't satisfied with our highest density residential zone but wants to minimize the roads down so he can squeeze even more homes in.

In my opinion, all of our city roads, public and private should be the same width. Why would it make sense for public roads to be 70' but private roads to only be 26'? Should we make all public roads 26'? What is the difference? Why would one residential road need to be 70' and a much higher density road, with a higher traffic density as well, only need to be 26'? Make them all uniform – it works in other cities.

Private roads in the other commercial and industrial zones need even more research before we make any decisions. The last thing we need to do is make our limited commercial zones cheap and congested.

The only reason for this change, being disguised as cleaning up "inconsistencies", is to make more money for a developer, and that is NOT the responsibility of the city. The responsibility of the city is to serve and protect the citizens – those who live here now and those who may move into a project YOU as Planning Commissioners make possible. Is this really what you want to recommend?

Thank you,

Joel

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

Kim Guill

From: Amy Mitchell <5rusticknots@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 4:10 PM
To: Jo Sjoblom; Wayne Winsor; Hayley Alberts; Angie Petty; Quin Soderquist; Blair Halverson; Public Comment; Gary Boatright Jr.; jlosse@southwebercity.com; Jeremy Davis; Wes Johnson; Taylor Walton
Subject: Planning Commission Mtg Public Comment

Amy Mitchell
1923 Deer Run Drive

Hi All-

I'm trying to wrap my brain around the packet. If I understand the 2 main topics of discussion... I see something about a private right of way? Make the developer put in a real road if they want to develop that area, not an exception. What happens if the private property owners change and decide they no longer want to offer that right of way, is that an option or a problem? It will be interesting to see the discussion tonight!

As for Residential Parking, I want to decide for myself what I want to do on my own property with-in reason. Not have the city tell me, let alone fine me for doing it the way I want. Maybe I just want it to be temporary and not the costly concrete or pavers. No need to add to the long list of what we already pay our city engineer to look at. We need to shorten that list, not add to it!! It should only be required to the homes that are adding in an ADU.

When looking at the rezones, please only rezone those areas to Low. We have enough moderate in that area.

Thank you for all you do!
Amy Mitchell