Sharon Allen

From: Chuck Gillette
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 9:03 AM
To: Sharon Allen; Tom Jorgensen
Cc: Rob Dalley; Bryan Pack
Subject: RE: TRC--Vista Estates Plat and related code for Planning Commission

Hi all,

I agree with the dislike of the way the development worked out as well. I think if we are going to revise codes, we might start with this one:

> **15.05.204: FLAG LOTS:**
> (1) Flag lots ~~may only be~~ are not allowed except under the following conditions:
> (a) Significant natural features exist on the property that are not created by the applicant, such that a flag lot would better utilize the irregularly shaped properties;
> (b) The flag lot facilitates infill development; or
> (c) The flag lot eliminates access to an arterial street.
> (2) Where flag lots are allowed, the following shall be required:
> (a) The access strip to a flag lot shall be a minimum of twenty feet (20'), shall be part of the lot and no access shall be permitted across another property;
> (b) The large portion of the flag lot shall meet all lot width and yard requirements for the zoning district in which it is located. The narrow portion of the lot, however, may be included in the calculation of the lot area;
> (c) The "leftover" lot resulting from the creation of a flag lot shall also meet all the width and yard requirements for the zoning district in which it is located; and
> (d) All flag lots shall have frontage upon a dedicated roadway or a publicly approved street. (Ord. 2016-02, 2016)

This subdivision is basically full of flag lots, although maybe not technically, but definitely in terms of the same end result. Especially since they basically lack any street frontage. Reading through this section of the code, I actually think we could have (maybe should have) rejected the Vista Estates layout based on this section of code as it is currently written. I think we could have argued that this subdivision did not meet any of the criteria that allows the flag lots.

I added the verbiage in red with strike outs, to make it sound less permissive, but it doesn't technically change it. Let's discuss at the TRC meeting.

I also think we should also consider revising this code:

> **15.05.302: STREET REQUIREMENTS:**
> Streets shall be designed and constructed according to the cross sections, policies, and design standards set forth in Ivins transportation master plan and city standard specifications.
> (1) The developer shall dedicate right of way and install improvements for proposed streets which are planned to adjoin or traverse the project or which are necessary for the development. The entire proposed right of way shall be dedicated to the city according to the design width specified by the Ivins transportation master plan. The city may participate in a percentage of the cost of improvements for arterial and major collector streets as proposed in the Ivins City capital facilities plan.

(2) Subdivisions and other developments shall be designed to provide future access to adjoining vacant parcels. Developments shall also be designed so that existing stub streets in existing developments will be connected to the proposed streets and accesses. Where a stub street is provided which accesses more than two (2) lots on each side, a temporary turnaround and public use easement at least eighty feet (80') in diameter, or equivalent hammerhead turnaround, shall be provided as approved by the fire marshal. The city may require improvements to be installed in temporary turnaround areas.

(3) Generally, fire apparatus access roads, including cul-de-sac and dead end streets, may not exceed seven hundred fifty feet (750') in length, as measured from the center of the intersection of a connecting through street to the center of the turnaround area, without special approval by the city council for circumstances where it would be impracticable to comply with the seven hundred fifty foot (750') maximum length. The maximum length of a cul-de-sac street may not be extended by additional turnarounds between the intersecting through street and the cul- de-sac. However, if the distance from the end of a proposed cul- de-sac to a connecting road is less than two hundred feet (200'), where conditions permit, connection to the connecting road shall be required if doing so does not violate requirements of the Ivins City transportation master plan, does not disturb or eliminate any unique geographical feature, including boundaries where the abutting property is tortoise habitat, state park, Indian reservation or owned by the bureau of land management (BLM) thereby making it impracticable to install a connecting road, and does not prevent full development of approved densities.

(4) Cul-de-sacs shall have a minimum pavement turnaround diameter of ninety six feet (96') with a minimum right of way line diameter of one hundred fifteen feet (115').

(5) Streets in subdivisions, excluding collector streets, exceeding eighty feet (80') in length are encouraged to be curvilinear or provide sufficient alignment variation to calm traffic and enhance aesthetic appeal in the subdivision.

(6) Subdivision streets shall be designed to approach an arterial or collector street in accordance with the standard specifications. (Ord. 2016-02, 2016)

We could add another paragraph regarding how we treat dead end streets that are shorter than 150'. Right now we don't require a turn around. I would support requiring a cul-de-sac at a minimum on all public streets, but not the full 96' diameter. Probably a minimum of 75' diameter. It could result in some subdivisions that have bulb outs like this one:



Anyway those are my initial thoughts on this request to reconsider this situation from the Planning Commission.

-Chuck