

George Burton

Subject: Hillside Code Update

Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 1:25 PM

Subject: RE: Hillside Code Update

Hi George,

Thanks for reaching out to me and asking my opinion. The one change that is being considered that I think works against the better good of the general public, as well as it is not in the best interest of the hillside owners property rights, is the driveway. Penalizing the driveway in lot coverage does not always accomplish a better design for all concerned. There are often locations on a lot where a house will situate more naturally on the site which will require a longer driveway. Short sighted thinking would say, lets discourage longer driveways so people will put their homes lower on the hill. I have often seen hillside lots that have the best location to place a home, further up the hillside. A flatter part of the lot may exist where less retaining walls will be needed or the house may just naturally sit in the lot better. There are also cases where a driveway will lead to a location where the home is less viable from neighboring properties and public streets. A very good example of a project like this that was just recently permitted, was designed by Brent Kendle. The address is 5416 E Desert Jewel. Brent did a wonderful job in placing the house behind the hill in a hidden location. When this house is finished, you will drive by and hardly know a house is there. Under the proposed rules, the house would not be approved and would have been placed 40' back from the street, right on the face of the hillside. Good architects and designers will plan the home to work with the site. Penalizing them for the driveway will not promote better design and less unsightly walls, but probably hurt. This is a big one in my opinion. I did not see anything else that jumps out at me.

Please feel free to call or email if you have any specific questions or if there is anything I can do to help.

Thanks,
John Schultz

Schultz Development corp.