

Dear Planning & Zoning Commission:

I just wanted to submit a few technical questions as to how the proposed ordinance change to Title 8, Section 4 (allowing projections into setbacks) would be administered. I was trying to think of the many inevitable scenarios that are possible given the fact that there are several thousand vacant platted lots in the unincorporated county which can potentially have a house construction onsite.

1. Just as a point of clarification, this ordinance would not allow projections outside of building envelopes. Correct?
2. How would this exception be administered in areas located within the Natural Resources, Wetlands, or Hillside overlays? I know that in some developments, building envelopes and setbacks were specifically designated to ensure that construction would not disturb or impact these sensitive areas. In some developments, these setbacks were used to ensure appropriate separation distances between structures, septic fields, well, and/or overlay areas. Setting aside questions about separation distances, and instead thinking about this from a disturbance perspective, longer walkways and driveways could create significant disturbances of sensitive areas.
3. Similarly, I wondered if there could potentially be a situation where projections into setbacks would impact the scenic corridor, or other scenic values that were specifically designed to be protected through the usage of setbacks.
4. I was a little confused by the proposed wording: *Planned Unit Development subdivisions with lots less than 2.5 acres in size are not entitled to the architectural projections listed above . . .* Does this mean that the lot in question must be larger than 2.5-acres, or all of the lots within the development must be larger than 2.5 acres? It was unclear to me. That said, there could conceivably be a situation where a 2.5-acre lot abuts smaller lots (ie: 1-acre) in a PUD. In that situation, projections within the setbacks of the 2.5 acre lot could limit the buildable area within the smaller lots because of the require separation distances for septic fields and domestic wells.

I appreciate the opportunity to add these questions into the dialogue. And thank you once again for all of your hard work in the service of our community.

Sincerely,
Anna Trentadue

Anna Trentadue
Program Director and Staff Attorney

~~~~~

November 12, 2012

RE: P&Z Public Hearing 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, Nov. 13--amendment to allow architectural projections to protrude into setbacks

Dear Planning & Zoning Commissioners,

I apologize for not submitting these comments earlier, but I was waiting to read the staff report and other public comments, and now realize I have waited too long, as today is a holiday and the courthouse is closed. I respectfully request that you read and consider the following brief comments before you make a decision regarding this proposed amendment:

Based on personal experience when my husband and I lived in Teton County, Wyoming, I object to allowing decks (whether covered or uncovered) to protrude into any setback that is less than 30 feet, in every zone, including in every planned unit development. (Currently, that would mean in the side setbacks, which are 15 feet.) Decks are where people hold parties or hang out with families and friends, and the noise level can be very obtrusive to the

next-door neighbors, especially if the neighboring house is built with the minimum setback. If a deck is allowed to protrude 6 feet into the normal side setback, that deck could be 9 feet from the property line. If the neighbor built a house and deck following those same rules, the 2 decks could be 18 feet apart, which I think is far too close for privacy and noise issues. We've lived next to a deck that was allowed to protrude into the setback, and it was offensive (even though our deck was farther away).

In conclusion, I ask that the proposed amendment be changed to allow decks to intrude up to 6 feet within 30-foot setbacks, but not be allowed to be built within a 15-foot setback.

Sincerely,  
Alice Stevenson  
Victor