

	Company	Price		Price Score	Equip/Cert	Yard	Years	Ranking	Difference
1	Fort Union	345	30	30	9.33	30	15	84.33	19.49
2	Beehive	405	24.7826087	24.78	8	30	15	77.78	12.94
3	McNeils	510	15.65217391	15.65	18.67	30	8	72.32	7.48
4	Price	475	18.69565217	18.7	17.33	12	20	68.03	3.19
5	Advanced	465	19.56521739	19.57	14.67	12	20	66.24	1.4
6	One Stop	435	22.17391304	22.17	6.67	30	6	64.84	0
7	Hagen	380	26.95652174	26.96	14.67	6	15	62.63	-2.21

ADDENDUM

To

PRESENTATION BEFORE DRAPER COUNCIL

7 January 2013

William W. Wagner

The purpose of this addendum is to provide additional information for your consideration in support of our opposition to the request of B&B to rezone their property from RA-2 to RM-1 (high density, multiple family, residential, 8 units per acre).

The eight heirs/owners of the Crossgrove development due south of the B&B property appreciate the opportunity to continue dialogue to express our opposition to the rezoning of the property to RM-1 high Density and we appreciate the service of the Council members in behalf of Draper and its residents.

We support the action of the Council of directing that B&B prepare a Development Plan for review and approval by the Council before making a decision on the rezoning request. Because of the sensitive and precedent setting nature of the issue we are confident that the Council will now take the time necessary to adequately review the written and oral input from the public and the Commission member discussions at the meeting on December 5th, the written and oral comments of the public and the Council discussions on January 7th, as well as the Development Agreement to be submitted for the January 21st meeting,

Our opposition remains in three primary areas of concern:

1. The rezoning from RA2 to RM-1 high density 8 units to the acre is in direct conflict with the existing "Draper Master Land Use Plan", a guideline which we understand adopted the public recommendation that any future lot development east of 13th East be no less than one-half acre in size. The B&B property is presently surrounded by residencies on one, one-half, and one-third lots.

At the Planning Commission meeting on December 5th, eight (8) of the nine (9) public responders, who are residents on property in close proximity to B&B, were opposed to the rezoning. The single public responder who spoke in support of the rezoning was a developer. In their discussions, the Commission members acknowledged that "Draper is changing" and that high density was needed in support of TRAX, the "city center", etc. Our review of the recorded record of the

meeting also brings out Commission members expressions including being “ kind of torn on rezoning”, “does not like, does not fit”, “doesn’t feel right”, “ many other areas where high density fits”, etc. It surprised and disappointed us that the final vote of the Commission members was four (4) to one (1) in favor of forwarding a positive recommendation to the rezoning proposal. We appreciated the Commission members comment that “she hopes the developers have great integrity with keeping the area what it is regarding the aesthetically pleasing nature of the area”.

We recognize that Draper is not like it once was and is changing. My wife who was born and raised in Draper, as was her Father, knows that full well. We understand that commitments made to TRAX as well as support for the “city Center” must address high density zoning. We also believe that given the responsibilities of the Council to the citizens of Draper, that each Council member and the Mayor want to assure that, by adherence to established land development guidelines, the desirable attributes of a community are maintained. We are not resisting change nor is it our intent to prevent B&B from developing their property for it is their right; but, we are for moderate well controlled growth and we are opposed to rezoning that negatively impacts the aesthetics and integrity of an established neighborhood and community. High density rezoning of B&B lands in an area of surrounding One-acre, one-half and one-third acre properties and residences is not only out of place but sets an undesirable precedent and opens up the neighborhood to more high density development.

2. We are concerned that rezoning of the B&B property to RM-1 high density and the subsequent development would negatively impact the value and desirability of the surrounding properties and activities related to them whereas an RA-3 zoning would maintain the integrity of the surrounding properties, be compatible with the existing Master Land Use Plan (some properties east of 13th East were grandfathered in), and not have the degree of negative impact to property values that high density would have.

We recognize and appreciate the stated intentions of B&B to be “protective of the area”, and “to build high quality homes on their property”. We have no reason to doubt their sincerity and integrity and we fully support their stated desire to protect the aesthetics and value of the neighborhood. The fact remains that RM1 is what it is; high density, multiple family residential zoning allowing up to 8 units per acre. It is also our understanding that single family dwellings must be situated on lots no smaller than 10,000 square feet which would be the equivalent of an RA-4 which does not exist at the present time. By our rough calculations, the concept

design of B&B displays four lots on the east side of Mr. Hilton's property that range from 6229 square feet to 8973 square feet. On Mr. Pollards property which we assume totals 4.023 acres, the 18 lots shown on the concept design would average 9728 square feet. Allowing 20% for infrastructure reduces lot sizes down further to an average of 7783 square feet. All of these are less than the minimum 10,000 square feet requirement for a single family residence. We believe that their expressed development objectives would be accommodated by RA3 zoning. Rezoning to RA-3 would not however allow 8 lots on 2.1 acres or 18 lots on 4.02 acres but would fit into a neighborhood already zoned RA1, RA2, and RA3.

3. We remain concerned with the added traffic pressure, burden and congestion that a high density development would impose on the already heavily used and overburdened 13th East by north/south traffic and the present burden of east/west traffic on Pioneer Streets. This is true whether it be the 26 units as presently proposed in their concept design or something else allowed under RM-1 high density design. The report given to the Planning staff by the Engineering Department as reported at the Commission hearing was that the widening work being done to 13th east would adequately handle increased traffic from high density development as proposed by B&B. This is baffling to us because it our understanding that the widening of 13th East that is now occurring will only provide curb, gutter, sidewalk, and a median turning lane. It does provide relief for traffic wanting to turn onto 1300 East to proceed north or south. There is not an additional through-traffic lane provided and a turning lane cannot be legally used for through traffic. Additionally Pioneer Street is already a narrow street, heavily used and often congested. In our view, high density development in the area can only add to and negatively impact the already high traffic pressure and related congestion on those streets.

As an added note, the Wheadon Preserve development on 13800 So. and 3rd E. is often used as an example of the desirability of a high density development. It must be kept in mind that Wheadon development has immediate access to major traffic corridors such as I-15 to Bangeter highway and the Traverse Mountain road for easier traffic flow whereas the B&B property does not have this advantage. In addition, Wheadon Preserve has been developed in a neighborhood of homes situated on quarter acre lots with a large industrial building on its west border. In contrast, the B&B property sits in the middle of one, one-half, and one-third acre properties. We believe, therefore that the Wheadon development is a poor example to be used to support high density rezoning in the B&B neighborhood.

IN CONCLUSION

Having expressed our concerns about the rezoning of the B&B property and what we are against, I am reminded of an article that appeared in a past week's issue of the Deseret Newspaper by Joseph Walker entitled, "It's what you are for-not what you are against-that matters".

Respectfully therefore we are for:

1. First; moderate, well controlled growth that brings stability, pride and increasing value to the community of Draper. We recognize that Draper is changing as was stated several times at the Planning Commission hearings. It is not the quiet, semi-rural farming community it once was. Increasing population growth and related infrastructure for the City of Draper must be accommodated; but, we believe city planning must be carefully done and high density development locations carefully selected to maintain the beauty and desirability of Draper as a place to live.
2. Second, we are for planning that maintains or improves the integrity, quality and value of an established neighborhood and its respective properties through development of projects that respect and reinforce that integrity, value and quality of the B&B neighborhood by maintaining the RA1 (one acre), RA2 (one-half acre) and RA3 (one-third acre) zoning for the neighborhood.
3. And third, we are for development projects that fit smoothly into the infrastructure of an established neighborhood (roads, traffic, utility capacity, etc.) without adding significant, additional burdens on an existing neighborhood and its infrastructure. We do not believe rezoning the B&B property to high density would fit smoothly into the existing infrastructure of the subject area and would add significant additional burden and congestion to the vehicular traffic flow.

Respectfully Submitted

William W. Wagner