

Jan 10, 2022

Conditional Use Permit # Z0483-21-C

My name is Clair Coy and I am writing in response to the Conditional Use application above.

I was in attendance at the last planning commission meeting about this topic and wanted to address some of my concerns here.

- 1) The Planning Commission was asking that they put in sidewalks as one of the requirements. It sounds as though the applicant doesn't want to fulfill that requirement, It appears it was due to cost, partly. I am not sure if they just got the one quote but this is the cost of doing business if it makes it safer for the kids and our community, especially. I was also surprised, applicant claims "very few would be coming to our school on foot". How do they know that? They don't know who all is going to enroll do they? This seemed like a big stretch because there is no way to know who is going to be enrolled and how they are getting there in the near future and in the years to come. As someone who walks that area daily, and I was also here when it was a school before, sidewalks would really help. It seems like not only would they be a safer option for the kids that are being walked to and from school, it would also help the pedestrians that are coming through the area know better where the cars can pull in and pull out, and where they are safe to walk. To me, sidewalks are a non-negotiable to keep the flow there safe, as it will already increase traffic and with all the in and out, it would really help. I know to keep my car off the sidewalks, and I also know where to drive and not drive with the proper markings that will also follow once sidewalks are in. I have talked to some of my neighbors who also walk the area and they have some of the same concerns. In the council packet on the page where the applicant is having rebuttal:

*The section of the city code dealing with conditional use, states that "conditions that are found necessary to protect the best interests of the surrounding area" can be added to the Conditional Use approval. Since, in this case, there are no other sidewalks on either side of Glen Echo St., except on one small section on either side of Tyrone Way, we do not feel that adding a side walk in this one section will add much of any value to the community." My response: **Sidewalks would be more than beneficial on Glen Echo as there are tiny little footpaths that are not even wide enough for your feet and then you are having to walk where the speeding traffic is. Honestly, it shouldn't matter where there are sidewalks to the applicant as it has nothing to do with their application which is regarding only their property and I think we should all want to make the area safer, especially in front of a school where there will be children coming and going.***

- 2) I felt like the planning commission had many unanswered questions between themselves in the meeting and I think it was largely because the applicant wasn't in attendance. However, there were many things they had questions about with the application itself and what the applicant plans were as a whole. One of the things they mentioned was about the new playground possibly

not being big enough to “set back” from the front of building as what is required by the County. I am not sure they even ever answered whether it was big enough or not. They said the applicant “walked it off”, which doesn’t sound like it was measured. Applicant had a possible solution if they needed more space, of using the treed area in the back of property. One of the councilors said they didn’t like that idea with the storm we had last winter and what could happen if any branches would fall or anything when kids were there and went on to explain they may need to fall some trees if they wanted to do that. Another councilor mentioned since this is an application for a daycare/preschool that the State would come in and check them out and tell them what could and couldn’t be done. It is what happened next that bothered me the most. Everyone relaxed. It was like any question they had before, they no longer had. Just because the State may or may not come in to look at things doesn’t relieve the Commission of their duty to be sure all questions are answered and that is a safe, necessary, and viable option for our community. It is still the commissions responsibility to hear the public testimony and not excuse it or even consider carrying over in order to have time to answer some of the public as well as own questions.

- 3) I would like to ask that the council consider the sidewalk piece necessary and please also review that meeting from Nov 16th and see what some of the concerns were from myself as a community member and also some of the concerns of the councilors as well before making any final decisions on this application. Going forward, I think it is important for the commission to keep in mind that when you are in a decision-making position on behalf of our community, you should always take whatever time is necessary to answer all questions before approvals are issued no matter who else may come and look at the property simply because it just has nothing to do with our local responsibility. Looking at the options in the packet, Option #1 would be my vote if I were voting. I also have major storm water issues at my home as my home takes the storm water from all neighboring streets on both sides of me. There are 2 catch basins in front of my home that work over time and overflow often. Our garage is flooded many times during the winter. Anything that is required for storm water control is a good thing for us and other neighbors, I am sure.

Thankyou for your time and consideration of this matter.

Clair Coy