

Responding to public comments received on revised roadway plan (R-2021-004)

Brett. I believe after listening to the testimony at the hearing, we have prepared a very reasonable solution. We have made a good faith effort. In all the letters of opposition I do not see a single section of code cited to support the opinions expressed.

The existing development with the current dead-end street is longer than the maximum legal length of a cul-de-sac. Because the current dead-end street does not connect to any other public street, it does not satisfy the City's standard for circulation and block length. The existing street was always intended to be punched through as reflected in the previous development's circulation plan. The current dead end was always intended to be temporary, not permanent. We are finishing the intended connection.

By creating a one-way access out of the development, as well as pedestrian, and bicycle access, that this property is now in compliance with the circulation, and street block standards that were previously not met. It has also removed the issue of a dead-end street which exceeded the maximum length of cul-de-sac. Lastly the construction of the street is in line with the City's Transportation plan and follows the adjacent subdivisions future street plan that was part of their approval. It takes the existing sanitary main out of private property ownership, and into a public right-of-way.

For these reasons we continue to support our proposal from last week. If staff can prepare conditions, and if we need to make any final design changes necessary to obtain preliminary approval the applicant will work with staff to do so.

Thanks again for your time on this project

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Dane', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Mark Dane