

Neighborhood Meeting: The Orchard at Farnsworth Farms

Date: Monday, July 26, 2021

Number of people in attendance: 25

Comment Summary:

1. Why did the front loaded townhomes get moved to rear loaded units along 700 East? – For Fire and Police safety requirements.
2. His concern is largely the same as Mark Cuillo's. As long as changes are mandated only for the City Requirements he is fine with them.
3. Wants to understand everything that has changed and what changes are considered significant? – Rear setbacks are increased. The elevations have changed because it is a farmhouse theme.
4. Wants a detailed list of every change that was made from the original site plan that was shown to the City Council.
5. Supports the project, and he believes Joe and Nate have been great to work with thus far. Doesn't want that item to get lost within the criticisms of the project.
6. Concerned about wall height. It has been changed from a 6 foot fence to an 8 foot wall around the entire project. All homes around perimeter will be ramblers – single level.
7. Happy for the 8 foot precast wall between the project and the condominiums to the north.
8. Tried to contact the applicant(s) multiple times, but was never contacted back.
9. Will the roof height be less than 25'? – Applicant: Currently proposed at around 27' for perimeter units due to the farmhouse theme and roof pitch that accentuates the farmhouse theme. In return the homes are narrower to allow for more mountain views. Homes have been strategically placed to maximize mountain views. Went out with an architect to look at mountain views and maximize them.
10. What is on the southwest corner? Applicant: Detention pond with a trail around it.
11. Setbacks on south perimeter homes appears close? Applicant: they are approximately 22 feet from the south property line.
12. Will grade be raised or lowered on west side? Applicant: They will match grade on existing soil levels.
13. Concerned with potential flooding to the neighbors. Applicant: They will ensure no flooding exists.
14. Gates – concerned about stacking of cars obstructing the bike lanes.
15. What is the exact distance from the sidewalk to the gate? Applicant: Approximately 67 feet he believes, but is not completely sure right now.
16. Width of roadway around the loop and between rear loaded units? Applicant: Not sure at this moment.
17. Queuing for gates – What type of access for gates and where are the keypads? Very concerned that the queuing will not be sufficient. Wants more details about how the access will work. Will keyfobs be used? Applicant: They are still working through those details. They are absolutely thinking about those details and working on the final plan.
18. Wants a copy of the redline comments from the City.
19. Wants all details before the applicant will go to Planning Commission.
20. Where the keypad is going could be a significant change that requires going back to City Council
21. The rear loaded units appear to have less parking square footage than the front loaded units.
22. This plan does not meet the commitment they made to the City Council.
23. Is there an island or no island at the entrances. Applicant: No answer yet.

24. When will in person Planning Commission meetings be allowed? Mayor has not made a decision yet.

25. Do you know the speed of the gate? Applicant: Doesn't know yet.

26. What is the distance up to the gate? Applicant: We'll get back to you.

27. What are the turnaround details of the gate? Applicant: Process to clarify is still underway between them and City engineers/staff.

28. Are their vehicle gates? Applicant: yes. Will it be in the site plan that goes to PC? Yes. Are their pedestrian gates? Yes. Where are the pedestrian gates? Still working with City staff on details.

29. Is this still a right in right out? Applicant: They are in compliance with requirement for a UDOT road.

30. Brooke: right in right out was discussed as depending whether a median will be constructed.

31. Gates: He originally requested a 100' setback from the right-of-way. This appears to be too short.

32. Water infrastructure – not enough pressure and the pipes keep failing. This will create more demand on the system and will cause even more problems.

33. Terrified as to the access around his neighborhood. Many children in the area.

34. Worried that a right in right out is not good, and vehicles will use the condo area to the north as a shortcut to access this project. Does not want a median put on 700 East.

35. What fencing is along 700 East? 3 rail fence? Applicant: Yes

36. What entry monumentation will there be at the accesses? Applicant: Still working through those details.

37. Pedestrian walking path along 700 East? Applicant: Don't have final details on that as of now. Still working with consultants and City staff.

38. Is there a metal fence along 700 East? Applicant: Don't have the details on that.

39. Will there be RV parking for perimeter units? Don't know yet.

40. Is the number of gardens still at 26? Don't have that information at this time.

41. Height of perimeter houses limited to 27 feet? Yes.

42. The elevations of the homes – does that remain shiplap siding and board and batten, etc... Are they still proposing that. Applicant: We don't know at this time.

43. 8' wall still committed to be rhinorock or precast stone. Yes – what we've discussed before is what we are committed to.

44. Do we have HOA information? Not at this time.

45. 24' setbacks were committed to, but this appears to be different.

46. Why was the City scaling back the amount of guest parking?

47. Is there going to be a median on 700 East? Brooke: Depends on UDOT – we don't have the authority.

48. Not happy with the bait-and-switch, the applicants don't have the details. The applicant should get another public opportunity to get the details. They are not meeting their commitments.

49. The Council should know that we need details. Also agrees with Mark (the main person asking the questions) and furthermore requests that another neighborhood meeting be held before this goes to PC.