

Sharon Memmott | November 13, 2024

Northeast area Plan Notes - Sorry it appears long but I was trying to be clear

Attached are my thoughts on the Northeast Neighborhood Plan. I'm sorry if it appears long - I was trying to be clear. Also I know time at the meeting is limited for neighborhood input. I will try to attend the meeting if you would like me to try to clarify any of my comments.

Thank you all for all of your hard work on this.

Thanks again,

Sharon Memmott

Provo Neighborhood District 1

Please let me know if you cannot open either - they are the same just 2 different formats for convenience.:

Northeast Neighborhood Plan notes

p.11 Arterial Streets

The north end of Canyon Road as listed as an arterial street is incorrect as defined by 'generally 3-7 lanes wide'. Fully half of the area shown on the map is no more than 2 lanes wide. It is 3 lanes wide at 3700 N but actually narrows significantly about 4800 N – just past Canyon Crest Elementary. This street should be maintained as a Collector Road as it mainly passes through low density residential areas similarly to Timpview Drive and is in fact more narrow physically than Timpview Drive parallel to this area.

p.12

Figure 2.4 shows a section of Canyon Rd in yellow marked as 'Phase 2' but it actually is already wider and more improved than the area north of it on the map – can you explain what some of the possible improvements are that are being considered please?

p.13

Refencing Figure 2.5 – which should be a full page – there is too much being reference here for such a small illustration:

Where is the Bonneville Shoreline Trail on this map?

Why are private trails listed here? If they are inaccessible to the public then they shouldn't really be called out as an asset to the area unless there is a goal to acquire them for future use.

Also on p.13 is the mention of a public transportation route (the only one for the area) I would like to see a mention of a goal to get a bus line back up on Canyon Road as the topography can make it difficult for residents with limited mobility to access the bus line down on University especially if it is going to maintain it's status as a collector road.

p.14

Under Surrounding Environment; Physical Features; Provo River. "The Parks and Recreation Department and other private land owners have has made improvements (strike one of the two words please emphasis added – both are not needed and don't make sense)

p.15

Under Hazardous Parcels near the end of the paragraph you reference figure 2.1 for parcels shown in red – I believe it should be 2.2 as there is no red on 2.1.

p.17

The last bullet point near the end, just before "B. Residential" mentions connecting a future roadway to the IRT access road" (could IRT be written out as 'Indian Road Trailhead' as I believe this is the first place it is referenced in the document. Unless it stands for something else in which case it should also be spelled out.

p.18

Under Residential Agricultural (RA)

Your first sentence references a zone illustrated as light green on figure 3.1 no matter how large I zoom this on my computer I cannot find any green on this map. Should this be referencing another map?

Under Single Family Residential (R1)

Your first sentence refers to “areas shown in yellow on the map” – which map are we referring to now? There is also no yellow in figure 3.1 if I was intended to stay on the same map. Possibly you meant Figure 3.3 (p22) for both of these paragraphs?

p. 25

Who is on the TAC? Is this the people you mention in the first paragraph of the document or are they only city staff? Should we add TAC to that paragraph somewhere to be more clear?

Also on p.28 and another place you mention 3700 N as a proposed design corridor. However it is currently mostly developed with a proposed future park (not mentioned anywhere) on that street with the rest already mostly residential. If as in the bullet points you plan future development I believe you should also include requirements for increasing set backs as there may come a need to widen the street. Because of the current residential feel and the difficulty of widening the road I would prefer to see 3700 N removed from the list as a ‘Gateway’

The first bullet point under 3700 N. mentions “requiring a park strip for all properties along 3700 N’ will create a cohesive corridor and add to the greenspace. Could something be added about ‘as redeveloped’ since most of these places are already built out and requiring this immediately would actually affect the setback of some of the current homes?

p.32

Development Difficulties

In the second paragraph I suggest that the reference to Figure 2.1 (which shows annexation) should be changed to 2.2 which is the current land use map or possibly another map?

p.33

Alluvial Fans

The second sentence says: “Several alluvial fans alluvial fans” – while fun to say it is unnecessary to repeat together in the same sentence .

Under Transferable Development Rights

The second paragraph refers to them as TRD – S and then as TRD- R – is that correct? It latter refers to them as TDR in the same paragraph. Which is correct?

p.34

Culinary Water Pressure

The end of the first paragraph mentions unacceptable water pressure at ‘certain elevations’. If we know those elevations can we list them here please or show them on a map?

Thank you and the committee for all of your time and energy spent on this project!

R Paul Evans | October 30, 2024

inside City Boundary

Page 16 A proposed map of future land use is identified as the collaborative effort of City staff and the “resident-led Technical Advisory Committee.”

1. Is the Advisory Committee listed at the beginning of the Northeast Neighborhoods Plan document the same as the “resident-led Technical Advisory Committee”? If not, who are the members of the “resident-led Technical Advisory Committee”?

2. 2. Four City staff are listed at the beginning of the Northeast Neighborhoods Plan - Bill Peperone; Aaron Aardmore; Jessica Dahneke; and Mary Barnes. Were any other City staff involved in the effort to create the proposed map of future land use?

Page 18 Reference is made to RA land use identified as a light green color in Figure 3.1. There is no light green areas in Figure 3.1. Perhaps Figure 3.3 is the targeted figure?

“The areas shown in yellow on the map are proposed to be R1 or detached single-family residential.” I believe Figure 3.3 is the map and should be directly referenced.

“ADUs can help to add housing supply and density into the area while still preserving the detached single-family zoning. All ADUs must be in conjunction with an owner occupied, single-family home.” Owner occupancy is an admirable goal for homes in which an ADU is established. Until Provo City Code Enforcement can demonstrate the ability to ensure owner occupancy and limit over occupancy in existing areas where ADU’s are permitted, the Northeast Neighborhoods should not entertain the establishment of hodge-podge located ADU homes. Demonstration of code enforcement ability should be clear about the minimum and maximum timeline to achieve compliance. In addition, code enforcement ability should show the number of complaints associated with homes with ADU’s and the resolutions achieved.

Page 28 “Requiring a park strip: Some areas along 3700 North have a park strip, and others do not. Requiring a park strip for all properties along 3700 North will create a cohesive corridor and add to the greenspace.” The properties at 242 W 3700 N, 150 W 3700 N, 124 W 3700 N, and, 3724 N 300 W do not have any ability to accommodate a park strip, and, maintain the minimum required distance between sidewalks, front doors and/or home structure. This difficulty was created when 3700 N was widened. The south side of 3700 N between Provo River and University Avenue has a park strip. The north side of 3700 N between Provo River and University Avenue has a park strip only in the latest subdivision created from vacant land and a church property that is between 500 W and 450 W. Developable property on the north side of 3700 N can be required to establish a park strip, but, the existing homes on the north side must be definitively exempted from a requirement to establish a parking strip when a home remodel building permit is requested. If the entire home is to razed and a new home raised, then, a requirement for parking strip on properties on the north side of 3700 N would be reasonable.

Name not Available | October 30, 2024

This is well crafter and extensive. I am encouraged by the level of contextualization of the plan and its goals.