

Tooele General Plan and Transportation Plan Update STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #4

December 2, 2015

Transportation

The Draft Transportation Plan was distributed and reviewed with Steering Committee members. Comments on the Draft Plan include:

- Rural Character Section – ATVs might use the space between the road and the multi-use path; appropriate maintenance and drainage are also a concern in these areas.
- What material would the multi-use path be? Most likely asphalt.
- No curb and gutter are shown in cross-sections. Add a discussion in the text that discusses types to be used. Maybe treatments would be related to density? Note: This document is a general plan-type document and won't specify standards for typical roadway sections.
- Tooele County has a Rural Typical Section that is either being developed currently or has been developed recently
- Local Street (Rural vs. Non-Rural) – Sidewalk not always applicable? Maintenance of the sidewalk becomes an issue
- Adoption of the plan and preservation of the corridors is necessary to implement the Transportation Plan

Land Use

The Draft Plan of the General Plan Update was distributed and reviewed with Steering Committee members. Comments on the Draft Plan include:

- On pg. 1-7, the comment from a public meeting “over-appropriated by 50%” might be inaccurate. This comment could be summarized instead of directly quoted (exact comment will appear in the Appendix of the Plan).
- How can we make the Open Space areas in the Plan have teeth? Open Space often gets moved (traded). Need to legally define Open Space requirements in terms of development. The current P.U.D. for the County needs to be reworked so it supports cluster development and defines Open Space requirements. The County cannot designate private property for a specific (non-development) use unless they are planning on purchasing the property...but they can impose clustering and maintenance of a certain amount of Open Space in their ordinances.
- Regarding the Future Land Use illustration (pg. 2-21):
 - The area south of SR-138 marked as sensitive lands are not sensitive lands (they have been approved for development).

- Change Rural Residential density from 5-20 acres to 1-20 acres? We have heard throughout the process that 5 acre lots are a challenge. Areas that currently been approved as 5-acres lots should be maintained as 5-acres.
 - Language is regarding mixed use and density residential is vague. (More graphics that help explain these categories are to come.)
- Low density has challenges, such as septic systems causing the ground water to be unsafe. Sewer and water systems need to be considered and put in as development happens to prevent such situations.
- Areas with 1-acre lots often lack community open space (e.g. parks to meet the programmed, recreational uses of the area). Residents in these areas have to travel to neighboring areas/cities to play soccer, etc.
- Open Space has flexible uses—uses that change over time. As P.U.D.'s go in, those open spaces will become defined.
- Uncertainty causes fear. People worry that things will change in the future. That is why the Plan's Guiding Principles are important. It gives the County something to fall back on (e.g. when P.U.D.'s come in...you can look at the Guiding Principles and determine whether or not the P.U.D. is in alignment with those principles)
- How do you establish a certain look like Park City has? Need design review boards and adequate staff to review. It is easier to accomplish this if you have an existing specific look to you are trying to preserve and then work to maintain it. Summit County has an approach to this that differs from Park City and might be worth looking at.
- The next version of the Draft Plan will have photos and drawings that illustrate what things could look like.