

**6.01: Receive Update on Proposed Plat Known as Northfork Meadows located Near Puma Street and Alpine Drive; Case of Paxmar (Project No. 17-126).**

**Presentation**

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to receive an update and provide general policy direction prior to the Developer (Paxmar) submitting a Preliminary Plat for official review. The City Council previously reviewed this case on June 27. Direction at that time was to host a public engagement workshop. The City Council noted two (2) topics to focus on:

1. Density Transitioning
2. Reliability/Consistency of the Comprehensive Plan

Community Development Director Gladhill reported the original concept has undergone Sketch Plan Review with the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission outlined a number of concerns indicated in the attached minutes from June 13. The City then held a public workshop on August 3, 2017. The City Council discussed next steps for review of this project on August 22nd. Concept #1 as outlined below was presented to the City Council. Subsequent to that discussion, the Developer provided a second concept to consider at this time (all 65-foot-wide, detached single-family lots, no detached townhomes). Staff provided a more detailed presentation of the requested and requested feedback from the Commission.

**Commission Business**

Chairperson Bauer summarized the comments made by the Planning Commission at a previous meeting. He asked if Paxmar would be willing to consider another parcel for their project to eliminate the need for a rezoning.

\_\_\_\_\_, Paxmar Development, commented on the proposed development and stated all plans were preliminary in nature. He reported one parcel would be geared toward empty-nester villas. He noted the other parcel would be 132 units. He explained the proposed lot width (65 feet) was necessary in order to make this development economically possible. He understood there were a lot other parcels in the City that would accommodate 80-foot lots. He anticipated this parcel would have to sit and wait it out, if the Commission did not support the proposed lot width. He described how his proposed development would assisting in raising property values for surrounding property owners. He understood that this was only a sketch plan and noted he appreciated any feedback from the Commission.

Val Kruger, 15210 Kangaroo Street, stated she and her husband live just east to the proposed development and have lived there for the past 43 years. She expressed concern with the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. She did not support there being no buffer between her rurally zoned home and the proposed medium density subdivision. She commented that 93% of her neighbors have supported a petition that opposes the proposed project. She recommended the City uphold the Comprehensive Plan and current zoning for this site (low density residential). She feared the proposed development was lacking green space and would greatly increase traffic in her neighborhood.

Chairperson Bauer questioned how many lots would be within the development if the project was low-density residential.

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ stated the project was originally 150+ lots and was scaled down to 132 lots. However, after hearing from the neighbors this project was reduced even further to 101 lots. He explained the project did not work financially with 80 foot lots as this would only yield 70 to 80 lots.

Leslie Clark, 15150 Kangaroo Street, asked if Paxmar would be willing to keep the 80-foot property width for the homes that will abut the existing neighborhood. She explained she did not have a large number of trees in her rear yard and was hoping she wouldn't have to look into a wall of homes.

Jan Groth, 15240 Kangaroo Street, commented the second proposal seemed a fit better given the size of the adjacent lots. She understood that the field would be built on at some point in the future, but stated the parcel was not zoned for 65-foot lots.

Community Development Director Gladhill understood PUD requirements and density transition were issues that still needed to be addressed by the City.

Commissioner Anderson questioned if the developer would consider having 80-foot lots adjacent to the existing homes.

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ stated on the east side of the development he could support having 80-foot lots if this would gain him neighborhood support. It was noted this would reduce the project by three lots.

Ms. Clark explained she opposed the development having townhome units on small lots. She stated her biggest concern was the need for a buffer or transition area between the new development and existing homes.

Ms. Kruger agreed a buffer between the two neighborhoods was key.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if any of the diagrams presented this evening met the Council's requests.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated the Council has not seen the most recent scenario with the wider and deeper lots.

Commissioner VanScoy stated he could not support a PUD at this time as he was not understanding the benefits to the City from the proposed project.

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ explained the benefits were the neighborhood would have covenants that would ensure high quality homes and building materials. In addition, he could dictate which

homes got built on which lots, while also requiring additional landscaping along the east property line. He commented on how he could work with the City on Puma Street.

Community Development Director Gladhill anticipated the City could continue to work with the applicant to refine the PUD further.

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ stated he was willing to compromise to have 80 foot lots along the east property line and would be willing to have additional screening in order to create a buffer.

Commissioner VanScoy encouraged staff to speak further with the applicant regarding the 80 foot lots along the east property lone, along with a potential buffer.

Commissioner Nosan stated she was originally against this development, but was pleased how all parties were coming together to improve the buffer and spacing of the houses along the east property line.

Community Development Director Gladhill asked if the Commission was willing to support a Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the proposed project.

Commissioner VanScoy stated he would have difficulty supporting a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Chairperson Bauer thanked everyone for their input and he looked forward to all parties continuing to work to reach a compromise for this development.