

Paxmar Recommendations for City Support of Northfork Meadows Addition

The following talking points were provided by the Developer of Northfork Meadows (Paxmar) as suggestions for supporting a change to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential.

Please note that City Staff does not necessary support nor endorse each of these items. City Staff is avoiding responding to each of these talking points to avoid a loop of 'point/counter-point'.

Reasons city should consider approval:

1. Have a developer who is willing to pay almost 60% up front for overall projected costs of Puma extension (total estimated costs puma street extension \$1.4 million- developer portion \$800,000). [Staff note: this cost-share agreement has not been reviewed by the City Council. It would still obligate the City to certain future expenses.]
2. Plan increases density, which will increase long-term tax revenue.
3. Not feasible to develop under straight [Low Density Residential/R-1 Residential District].
4. Plan fits to area- Not a lot of amenities to area and is basic flat field located next to business park to south, multi- family to west, busy street to north and single family to east.
5. Would increase rooftops to attract commercial/business users in new business park and existing COR.
6. Give community more choices on housing stock for area and not limit to [one] builder.
7. Decrease city exposure of failure to [recoup] fees by allowing multiple builders/product being built.
8. Finishes entire area with least amount of prolonged roads under construction.
9. Shows strong support to business leaders that city's growth is important- lots of housing options for workforce.
10. Would give city a surge of cash with lots of [fees], [Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) and [Water Availability Charge (WAC)] fees being paid. [Staff note: the goal for the City is not to maximize collection of fees. Fees are being collected to offset impacts of development and to pay for infrastructure needed to serve the proposed development. Staff would recommend that this not be a finding to support the request.]