



ACTION ITEM REPORT

Item Title: Consideration and ACTION to approve an appeal on the Planning and Zoning Commission's denial for a variance of the length of the cul-de-sacs within the proposed Falcon's Landing Subdivision exceeding required maximum length of 600 ft..

Recommendation:

City ordinance allows for cul-de-sacs to be no longer than 600 feet. Some properties do not lay out well so longer cul-de-sacs are needed so not so much of a development is roads. The best solution is to have multiple ways out in case of an emergency. The longest cul-de-sac is proposed to have 32 homes on it and the middle cul-de-sac is proposed to have 26 homes on it. Busses or emergency vehicles have difficulty turning around in a cul-de-sac that is not large enough. The planned diameter of the cul-de-sac meets the city requirements and is large enough for busses and emergency vehicles to turn around. There are existing cul-de-sacs longer than 600 feet that have been approved through the years for various reasons. Busses and emergency vehicles access each of these streets. The streets are: Resaca Retreat – Approximately 1575 feet; Alvarez Court – Approximately 1950 feet; South Cuates Drive – Approximately 1020 feet.

Across the state, typically 600 feet is the maximum length. Cities range from as short at 200 feet and as long as 1,200 feet (with a limit of 28 homes).

CONS: Only one way out, emergency vehicles or other issues could block access to the rest of the street causing an inconvenience for residents, limited parking or no parking along the cul-de-sac, the lots in the cul-de-sac are generally smaller and odd shaped making it more difficult to fit homes, driveways, and decent back yards with all of that causing homes to be closer together causing more noise, more children activities that some don't want,

PROS: Less traffic, not a through street so usually only vehicles of residents that live on the street, safer environment, quieter environment, better sense of community, lower crime rates, more privacy, better for children and pets and reduced risk of accidents, etc.

There is no right or wrong answer as to allowing the variance. There are benefits and legitimate arguments can be presented for both sides. I personally live on a cul-de-sac that is approximately 4500 feet long. We love it as there is no through traffic, we know when a vehicle is around that shouldn't be, we never have burglaries, there are no safety concerns and there has only been 1 road blockage for less than 2 hours due to an accident in 38 years. Other people may like living on a through street. There probably is a place for both to exist.

I have included the requirements for a variance and how they should be granted.

I have discussed with the developer to adjust the development to be in compliance without the need for a variance. However, he decided to appeal it. I suggested the one cul-de-sac street be reduced by 7 feet to be in compliance. Then I suggested he connect the other 2 streets with the proposed cul-de-sacs where the 20-foot easement is, with a street. He can use the 20 feet drainage easement plus 30 feet to make a 50-foot right-of-way for a standard street width of 32 feet with the drainage all on one side so it is not under the street. Then on the south side of Osprey Way, reduce the 70-foot lots to 65 feet and on the north side of Red Tail Way reduce the 70-foot lots to 66.25 feet. He would be able to keep the same number of lots, they would just be smaller, and there would not be a need for a variance. The rest of the lots would not be affected.

I recommend the approval of the appeal and to overturn the decision of the Planning & Zoning Commission for the following reasons: The developer has designed the property available to have larger lots than required to more closely conform to the development in the area, and not having the cul-de-sacs as they are will reduce the lots sizes of about 15 lots. It would also increase the cost of the development driving up the costs of the lots and ultimately the home prices. The cul-de-sacs will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare and not injurious to other property in the area but in fact bring a more safe, secure and quieter development.