

Hello City Council Members,

My name is Amanda Messick. My property is right in the middle of the proposed new development. My family and I will have several units directly behind our property. I have many concerns with the proposed property.

The first concern I have is how many exceptions were given to this property. The 2 I have the most concern with are the front building setback and the rear building setback. It seems like these properties are going to be way too close to our properties which could lead to sewer, flood and landscaping problems such as overgrown trees.

The city code for front setbacks is 30' from the proposed right of way for a collector street per section 11(A)(3) of the single family attached design standards. The builder is asking for an exception to make this 20' this is a 10 foot difference. What concessions are the builders willing to give the existing homeowners/neighborhood to shorten this setback by 10 feet. The rear building setback code is 54'-1.5" per section 1(B) of the single family attached design standards. They are asking for the rear setback to be 34' which is a 20 foot difference. This seems like an extreme change in development code. In total they are asking for a 30 foot difference between code

and what they are trying to build. This is a huge number when you think about space on a lot and between buildings. The buildings should be required to meet the setback allotments. Allowing exceptions is a concession to the builder and a bad deal for neighbors. If exceptions are needed, the structures are too large for the lot they are proposed to be built on. Why have setbacks driven by the depth of the structure if they are to be ignored for the sake of building more units and larger units in a space where they don't fit?

I am curious about the city code that says "The plan exhibits the application of sound, creative, innovative, or efficient planning and design principles." If you have to ask for exceptions to setback rules then it seems the property is too small to be developed with this large of a development. It seems like this development lacks creative, innovative or efficient planning if they are trying to build a development that is larger than the property can allow.

Another concern I have is the exception the builder is asking for in relation to a retaining wall separation. The code states that a minimum landscape area of 7 feet in width must be provided between adjacent retaining walls per the city's retail commercial design guidelines. They are providing 4 feet. Again they are shorting the dimensions by 3 feet. We are now

up to a total of 33 feet difference between what code states should happen and what the developers are proposing for this area. The developer says this is not possible due to the small size of development. Again I will state, if the property is too small to develop what they are proposing then why should they be allowed to break city code to build it.

Another exception requested was a landscaped median/island being required at a major entrance to a project per section 8 (A) (2). They say that no median will be required because of the small size of the project and the configuration of the adjacent streets. There already is not an existing turn lane off of 104th onto Elliot street. The existing speed limit on 104th is 40 MPH right there. People can not properly slow down to make the turn from 104th to Elliot as it is. With more houses and parking along this street this will cause a traffic problem.

In the traffic justification it says it will only lead to about 113 new trips for this development. That is a huge number of trips for a small suburban community with a park next to it where many children play, dogs walk and baseball games are held. We already have structural damage to our streets with the amount of cars that use our small suburban streets and this will lead to much more traffic. Can you please explain to

me what the traffic numbers are and how you get them? It doesn't seem to make sense.

There is also a no parking zone on the east side of the street where the developments will be. Will that stay a no parking zone? If so there will be parking issues between the existing parking, commercial trucks hauling cars to the dealerships and the new development parking.

Along the lines of traffic there are safety concerns. That corner at the North side of this development is a traffic hazard in the winter. Many, many cars have gone through the dealership fence going too fast around the icy corner.

When we were at the city planning commission meeting one of the commissioners voted no on this proposed development because of the 6% grade. They commented on how steep this is for a street. This will lead to drainage issues for the homes at the bottom of that steep grade. Especially since the existing houses are below the proposed development in elevation. This is also a parking issue with the dangerous driving conditions.

One of the planning commissioners that voted no, voted this way because they wanted to know who would maintain the

drainage behind the properties and the HOA. This commissioner had concerns about the HOA being run by homeowners that had no interest in maintaining the swales put in.

Lastly, as a long time Westminster resident we loved living in Westminster because of the open space, parks, and space between houses. Now it feels as if Westminster is building more and more apartments or duplexes everywhere you look. We can't leave a single spot untouched. This tiny parcel of land is way too small for the amount of building being proposed on it. These massive dwellings will tower above our houses as a complete out of place eyesore. I urge you to reconsider the priorities of Westminster. Should we try to build new developments that are harmonious with the existing neighborhoods in size and planning or should we overdevelop properties allowing existing city codes to be broken.