

HACTF TEDS SCOPING MEETING DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. We should have standard spacing for pedestrian and street lighting for collector streets and above. We don't need to do a site lighting iso-foot candle analysis for every project. The site-lighting plan is a submittal requirement in Title 21, not TEDS.
2. The HOA lighting trails will only work in higher end subdivisions. What about sidewalks that do not connect to anything? The code requires a sidewalk to be installed but if the adjacent street is not constructed, the sidewalk would be lit up with nowhere to go. Is it worth the cost to install this lighting for a sidewalk that won't be used? Will the city provide necessary lighting when adjacent streets are improved?
3. The 35-ft max driveway width is a problem for sites with higher semi-truck access and needs to go back to 40-ft.
4. Staff wants to get away from radius curb returns on commercial/industrial sites and use a typical driveway cut to avoid all the ADA ramp issues and conflicts. I agree... It's also a lot less expensive to construct.
5. I would like to see an option where we can put public sidewalks in 14-ft MPE's rather than having to put in wider ROW's. It would seem easy to just add this standard language into the current definition of a MPE rather than having to go back and prepare separate legal and maps when this happens.
6. Parking requirements for R-12 Zones. The code currently does not address off-lot parking requirements for R-12 and the City's approach is to default to R-8's requirements. Given the flexibility of the R-12, we have a project that the home itself is the lot so technically the driveway is off-lot. This should be utilized as off-lot parking. Discussion needs to be what the requirements are and a basis for where the requirements come from.
7. **Title 21, not TEDS.** Retaining wall discussion and the implementation of retaining walls in subdivision plans. Do we standardize this in the code rather than stating whether it is deemed reasonable to the director? Also, retaining wall flexibility in lot specific grading plans. I know this is already under the works, I just have not seen anything and do not want to lose sight.
8. **Title 21 Requirement, not TEDS.** Trails along the active transportation corridor being required to be constructed. This makes sense in the grand scheme of things but how can this be tied to capital improvements from a timing perspective? If a sidewalk on a site is constructed and the City has no plans for connection within 10-20 years, is it worth constructing the sidewalk at that time or just providing the space for a sidewalk? Maybe even a DG trail for a compromise?

9. **Curb ramp discussion, this is located in standard contract documents.** I know this is being worked on internally in the city as well but would like an update when we can see details so we can provide input. This has been a cost increase in engineering and construction over the past couple of years. We have so many different types of ramps out there and would like to standardize this. I have had many complaints from contractors about the constructability of some of these ramps as well. It works on paper but there is hardly any construction tolerance resulting in ramps being replaced or constructed differently.
10. **Title 21 Requirement, not TEDS.** Are sidewalks necessary on roads with less than 10-20 lots?
11. Look into the impacts of TIS requirements to include or emphasize bike and bed analysis instead of just traffic. It seems like there was something about pedestrian crossing and a lot of references in TEDS to the bike and ped plan or active transportation corridors.
12. Search the document for complete streets references and Bike and Ped Plan references so we can fully understand how much the TEDS effectively codified and created mandates out of adopted visionary policy like the Bike and Ped Plan and active transportation corridors.