

Dear Planning Commission:

RE: River Crossing Continuance

Ken and I and one of my neighbors, Jinks Dabney from the Boulders had an opportunity to sit down with the developers of the property this morning to look at the modification of the Land Use Planning Map showing the south side of the property as Professional Office. We are in support of professional office designation on the south side of the property as shown on the land use map.

I also had an opportunity to speak with Ron Reber and Dan Kitchen who were unable to attend the meeting this morning but voiced concerns at the last meeting as well as Hal Hickman who also expressed to me that they could support professional office at this location if the height of the professional offices do not exceed two stories or possibly three if they are recessed into the ground correctly, and the road from the Boulder Villas extends through the property as shown so residents of the Boulder Villas can access River Road when traffic on 1450 South eventually precludes a left hand turn out of the Boulder Villas.

As a compromise position, we are in support of the general plan land use amendment as proposed.

- We believe the Professional Office designation will provide some buffer between residential use and higher intensity commercial uses such as drive through restaurants.
- Professional office designation should eliminate some of the border conflicts that regularly coincide when high intensity commercial uses backup to residential.
- The traffic count generated by professional offices is more in line with the traffic count of medium density and low density residential that is now shown in the plan and should help with the mix of more high intensity uses from other parts of the commercial area. High trip generation rates from higher intensity commercial use has been one of our main concerns throughout this process. This will help address this.
- The typically limited business daytime hours of professional office versus commercial should eliminate some concerns about the noise of commercial operations late into the evening or nighttime deliveries that can come with potential loading docks of retail uses of Commercial.
- Lighting from Professional Offices will likely be more subdued than that need for retail or other high intensity commercial uses.

The developers have expressed their desire to continue to work with the neighbors when they get to the PD Commercial stage on issues such as landscaping buffers for the Villas and softening the look of brick walls and perhaps roof color and other details that will be addressed later in the process.

We want to express our sincere appreciation to the planning commission for your patience in hearing our concerns and your willingness to offer a continuance so the neighbors could meet with the developers and re-submit a plan more favorable to the neighbors.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorri and Ken Puchlik



Proposed Zoning Change - Becco Creek Project

1 message

Dean Hughbanks [REDACTED]

Fri, Apr 22, 2022 at 9:42 AM

To: daniel.boles@sgcity.org

To St George Planning Commission

My name is Dean Hughbanks and my wife Vicki Pearl own our home at [REDACTED] in St George which will be directly impacted by the proposed zoning change to build 2 and 3 story townhomes adjacent to our home. We purchased our home in February of 2021 from Ence Homes. Our backyard has an unobstructed view of the red rocks and Pine Valley Mountains facing North. We paid a large lot premium to ensure we would have this beautiful view for the rest of our lives. The proposed 3 story town homes will block that view and negatively impact the neighborhood with traffic and parking issues associated with that many proposed town homes. My neighbors and I who also paid premiums for view lots will have our home values impacted by this zoning change. Please reject this proposed zoning change from the original plan for 10,000 sq foot minimum lot size as was originally envisioned. Thank you for hearing this testimony as we will be out of state and cannot attend the Commission meeting on April 26th.

Respectfully,

Vicki Pearl and Dean Hughbanks

Sent from my iPhone

Dear St. George City Planning Commission,

We are reaching out in regards to an item that is on your agenda for your April 26th meeting. Our understanding is that you have been asked to allow a conditional use permit for the installation of an 80' cell tower at 1842 W Sunset Blvd. As residents that live within 300' feet of this location, we would like to express that we are strongly opposed.

This location is near Color View Town Homes, which is a densely populated residential area. Cell phone towers are still relatively new, and the possible negative health effects of radio-frequency (RF) waves transmitted by cell towers are still being explored. Radio-frequency waves from cell phone towers have not been proven to be absolutely safe. Most expert organizations agree that more research is needed to help clarify this, especially for any possible long-term effects. According to the American Cancer Society, some studies have found possible increased rates of certain types of tumors in lab animals exposed to radio-frequency radiation. Researchers in Taiwan compared children with cancer to a group of similar children without cancer. They found a slightly higher overall risk of cancer in those who lived in towns that had an estimated radio-frequency radiation exposure from cell phone towers that was above the midpoint level in the study.

Large studies published in 2018 by the US National Toxicology Program (NTP) and by the Ramazzini Institute in Italy exposed groups of lab rats to radio-frequency waves starting before birth and continuing for most or all of their natural lives. Both studies found an increased risk of uncommon heart tumors. The results of these studies suggest that the radio-frequency waves of cell phone towers might somehow impact human health. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has classified radio-frequency radiation as “possibly carcinogenic to humans,” based on evidence of a possible increase in risk for brain tumors.

Because cell phone towers have not been proven to be safe for human health, we request that you do not approve the placement of a cell phone tower within 300' of the ColorView Town Homes residential area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Christopher and Marie Ehlers

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



Carol Davidson <carol.davidson@sgcity.org>

Case No. 2022-GPA-005

1 message

Adam Meyer [REDACTED]

Fri, Apr 22, 2022 at 2:37 PM

To: "carol.davidson@sgcity.org" <carol.davidson@sgcity.org>

Mrs. Davidson,

I am not able to attend the meeting related to Case No. 2022-GPA-005 due to my work travel schedule, so please accept my written comments for the public hearing on April 26, 2022.

This letter is regarding the request for a general plan amendment to change the land use from Commercial (COM) to High Density Residential (HDR) on the 10.13 acres located West of Dixie Drive and just South of Gap Canyon Parkway.

When I purchased my property in 2008, I knew the empty neighboring lots would eventually be developed, so my concern isn't having a neighbor, but amending this to a High Density Residential area seems like nothing but a selfish investment for the City and Developer without any regard for the natural resources to sustain this, or any residential building for that matter.

St. George only receives 10" of rainfall per year on average compared to the US average of 38". We only receive 2" of snowfall compared to the US average of 28". The average family uses, on average, 300 gallon of water per day! With a population nearing 200,000 back in mid-2021 (probably much higher now), means that we need 60,000,000 gallons of water per year to sustain a population of 200,000 not including agricultural, swimming pools etc. Considering we are, and have been in a Severe drought with no foreseeable end in sight, proposing to add ANY residential housing, much less **High Density** Residential areas is irresponsible and negligent for the City to consider much less approve!

Furthermore, Dixie Drive today isn't capable of handling the current volume much less the additional traffic associated with High Density Residential housing. There are times due to high traffic, excessive speed and island that prevent you from turning in to the center median, that it may take 10 minutes OR MORE to turn left from Gap Canyon Parkway on to Dixie Drive! It is difficult and dangerous! So, taxpayers will eventually be on the hook for the cost of road modifications as well if this change is approved.

And just like that, we're on the road to all the problems that population density leads to. Higher cost of living, depletion of natural resources, traffic congestion, car accident rates, higher property crime.....I could go on.

I feel its time to stop the greedy growth and start making decisions that are data driven! Can our natural resources sustain the growth we are seeing? I would propose that question to the division that handles our Natural Resources let that determine if you approve or disapprove this project.

People are fleeing out of communities to escape exactly what you are going to create by over crowding our City for the sake of money.

Thank you for your time.

Adam Meyer

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Disclaimer

This E-mail (including attachments) is confidential and the property of Berry Global, Inc. and its subsidiaries (collectively, \"Berry\"). If you are not the intended recipient, reading, copying, disclosure or any action or forbearance based on the E-mail is prohibited. Berry retains all copyright and other intellectual property rights and objects to misuse. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS E-MAIL IN ERROR, IMMEDIATELY CONTACT THE SENDER TO SO ADVISE OF THE ERROR AND PERMANENTLY DELETE THIS E-MAIL.