





**CITY OF SPARKS, NV
COMMUNITY
SERVICES
DEPARTMENT**

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Marilie Smith, Administrative Secretary

Subject: Report of Planning Commission Action
PCN16042

Date: February 9, 2018

RE: PCN16042 - Consideration of and possible action, for a site 3.47 acres in size located at 3650 Wedekind Road, Sparks NV, of;

- A request for voluntary annexation into the City of Sparks. Upon annexation the parcel shall convert from a Washoe County zoning designation of E-1 (Estate Residential 15,000 sq. ft.) to City of Sparks SF15 (Residential Single Family) zoning and;
- A request to rezone the site from SF15 (Residential Single Family, 15,000 square feet) to SF6 (Residential Single Family, 6,000 square feet) zoning.

Please see the attached excerpt from the February 1, 2018 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Commissioner VanderWell. I move to approve Conditional Use Permit CU17-0009, associated with PCN17-0061, adopting findings C1 through C5, and the facts supporting these findings as set forth in the staff report, and subject to the four attached conditions of approval.

CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: We have a motion. Any second?

COMMISSIONER BROCK: Second. Commissioner Brock.

CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Thank you.

Any discussion?

No discussion. All in favor?

(Commission members said "aye.")

CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Any opposed?

The motion carries.

We'll move on to public hearing now PCN16042. This is a consideration of a site, 3.47 acres in size, located at 3650 Wedekind Road in Sparks. And it's a request for an annex, annexes -- to join the City of Sparks. Excuse me. And with another, a second hearing motion will be on it for the zoning of this parcel.

Karen, please.

MS. MELBY: Good evening, Planning

1 Commissioners. Karen Melby, Development Service
2 Manager.

3 Before you today is a project that consists of
4 two requests. The first one is a voluntary annexation.
5 And the second is a rezoning of the site. And you see
6 here on the vicinity map, it's outlined in red. It
7 includes both these properties. They're approximately
8 three and a half acres in size.

9 On June 15th of 2017, the Planning Commission
10 approved a City-initiated Comprehensive Plan amendment
11 from Low Density Residential to Intermediate Density
12 Residential for this property. Also during that meeting
13 on June 15th, an annexation petition and rezoning
14 request from single SF15 to SF6 was before you. The
15 Planning Commission recommended that the City Council
16 deny that proposal based on findings of the annexation
17 of the property could require the annexation of Wedekind
18 Drive.

19 On September 25th, 2017, after being presented
20 with a proposed new primary access from Garfield Drive,
21 as opposed to access on Wedekind, the City Council has
22 remanded that back to the Planning Commission for your
23 review, based on the new information.

24 Therefore, that's why we are before you tonight
25 with this project.

1 The voluntary annexation, as I said, consists
2 of the two parcels. You can see here there's a small
3 parcel within the larger parcel.

4 The other request, as I stated, is from
5 existing SF15. Upon annexation, the property would be,
6 come in as zoned SF15. And the applicant is requesting
7 to bring the zoning to SF6.

8 Before you today, as I stated, is it the same
9 request as you had reviewed on the 15th, with the change
10 that they are now requesting access off of Garfield, as
11 opposed to Wedekind.

12 The access is a 65-foot-wide access, and it's
13 all on the east, eastern boundary of the church. So
14 here's the church property. It's along this eastern
15 boundary coming into the property. You might actually
16 do better just seeing it. It's right here, coming into
17 the property.

18 In reviewing the annexation findings, A1, which
19 pertains to the conformance of NRS 268, the properties
20 are contiguous to the City limits, and the annexation is
21 being requested by the only property owner on this
22 property, which conforms to NRS 268.

23 A2, which is the conformance with these
24 findings in our Sparks Municipal Code for zoning, A is
25 the location of the property. The properties are on the

1 south side of Wedekind Road and are contiguous to the
2 City of Sparks limits on two sides. They're consistent
3 down this side and this side.

4 B is the logical extension of the City limits.
5 City utilities are in proximity to this property, and
6 access will be via a private easement through the First
7 Church of Nazarene of Sparks. And the internal streets,
8 when they do develop this property, are proposed to be
9 privately maintained, which minimizes any cost to the
10 City of Sparks.

11 C, which is the need for expansion to
12 accommodate the planned regional growth, the property is
13 within the City of Sparks Sphere of Influence in the
14 regional plan. There is an affordable housing shortage.
15 With redevelopment, this could modestly increase the
16 region's supply of single-family housing.

17 D is the location of existing and planned water
18 and sewer services. The neighboring single-family homes
19 to the east and south -- so these homes here and here --
20 are within the City limits and are currently served by
21 City water or TMWA water and sanitary sewer. The
22 utilities are close to the proximity of the property.
23 The sanitary sewer cannot be provided to this property
24 until the interceptor at Tyler Way is improved by the
25 City. The developer will have to pay for the extension

1 from Tyler Way interceptor to their property.

2 E, the goals met by the proposed annexation.
3 Goal MG6, because the property is adjacent to older part
4 of Sparks, which have 6,000-square-foot lots that are
5 served by City services. Other policies are MG7 and
6 policy CF1.

7 This application was initially placed on hold
8 when it was originally submitted until the sanitary
9 sewer capacity upgrade was approved by the City Council.
10 That is now in our CIP and is intended to be completed
11 later this year. They will not be able to start
12 construction on this property until the sanitary sewer
13 is available to their property. Upon annexation, the
14 Sparks Fire Station Number 1 will provide fire and
15 emergency response. And they are estimated to be within
16 the six-minute response time.

17 F, the efficient and cost-effective provisions
18 of City services and capital facilities. I've
19 previously discussed that under E.

20 G, the fiscal analysis. The applicant provided
21 a fiscal impact analysis and an updated letter
22 addressing the new access off of Garfield Drive. In the
23 fiscal impact analysis update letter, they estimate that
24 the fiscal impacts from this annexation and the future
25 single-family development will be a positive of .

1 approximately \$230,600 over a period of 20 years. The
2 assumption is that the easement will be a private
3 easement, and the internal roads will be also private.
4 The estimated 20-year revenue to the Road Fund is about
5 \$83,000.

6 H, Washoe County adopted a Community Management
7 Plan. Staff has talked to Washoe County staff, and they
8 did not have any comments or concerns about this
9 annexation, because it is located within the Sparks
10 Sphere of Influence.

11 I, the annexation creates any islands. The
12 parcels to the north -- so these parcels up here -- are
13 within Washoe County. And then, also, there is -- this
14 one parcel here is also in Washoe County. It's staff's
15 feeling that this will not be creating an island because
16 this is within the City. And this parcel would be
17 contiguous still, because Wedekind Road is in the
18 county.

19 Any other factors, which is J. The City cannot
20 provide sanitary sewer, as I stated, until the Tyler
21 interceptor improvements are completed.

22 Back to findings, in Finding A3, this
23 conforms -- conformance to the Comprehensive Plan within
24 the City's SOI, or Sphere of Influence, plan and the
25 seven-year annexation plan. The City has exerted

1 planning jurisdiction in this area in the Sphere of
2 Influence plan in 2002. The City's Annexation Program
3 has expired, and we are working on doing a new one.

4 A4, Finding A4, public notice. Per the Sparks
5 Municipal Code and NRS, public notice was published in
6 the Reno Gazette-Journal on January 19th, 2018, and 130
7 letters were mailed to property owners within 750 feet
8 of the property.

9 Now, to review the zoning findings. Zoning
10 Finding Z1, which is the consistent with the Sparks
11 Comprehensive Plan. The goals and policies that are
12 relevant are Goal MG4, Goal MG6 and Goal H1, which
13 encourage infill redevelopment and allows the applicant
14 to redevelop their property with a higher density.

15 For Policy CF1, once the Tyler Way sewer
16 improvements are completed later this year, the City
17 will be able to provide sanitary sewer.

18 And the last policy, H2, provides -- allows
19 them to provide a higher density or more affordable
20 housing in this region.

21 Zoning Z2, surrounding land uses. The subject
22 properties are located in an area of mixed single-family
23 residential. To the north are large lots,
24 single-family, and in the unincorporated Washoe County.
25 Immediate to the east is a large unannexed parcel.

1 However, farther east are single-family homes on
2 6,000-square-foot lots. To the south, within the City
3 limits are single-family homes on approximately
4 6,000-square-foot lots. The redevelopment of these
5 properties is consistent with the single-family homes
6 that are located within the City limits.

7 The Finding Z3, which is public notice. Notice
8 was sent to property owners, 750 feet, which would total
9 130 notices. Again, it was published in the Reno
10 Gazette-Journal on January 19th, 2018.

11 Staff is recommending approval of both the
12 annexation and the rezoning request. And I wanted to
13 remind you that you will have to do the approvals or
14 your motions in two separate motions.

15 That concludes my presentation. I'm available
16 for questions.

17 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Any questions from
18 Commissioners?

19 Then, thank you, Karen, very much.

20 Is the applicant present?

21 MR. EVANGELATOS: Mr. Chairman and members of
22 the Sparks Planning Commission, for the record, I'm Greg
23 Evangelatos, commercial and city planner, representing
24 the Lius. And, again, I think, Karen's done an
25 excellent job summarizing and kind of going over the key

1 issues.

2 We recognized a year ago that there's a
3 challenge relative to the impacts of Wedekind Road.
4 With your action, we kind of rethought our approach.
5 And we approached the Nazarene Church. And over fairly
6 four to five months, we've had a good negotiation with
7 them. I think, it's mutually beneficial. And believe
8 that that eliminates the traffic impacts on Wedekind.
9 Which there was concern of the neighbors at the time of
10 the initial neighborhood meetings, as well as the
11 Planning Commission hearings.

12 We believe that this is in conformance with
13 your adopted Comprehensive Plan. We believe it's a good
14 infill project. This region is crying for affordable
15 housing. This is an area that needs a shot in the arm
16 in terms of reinvestment. And, I think, this is a good
17 first step.

18 So we're in agreement with the recommendation
19 of staff. Garrett Gordon is the attorney representing
20 the Lius. He, basically, negotiated the easement. He's
21 here this evening, as are the Lius. And we're available
22 for any questions that you might have on this now or the
23 conclusions on the testimony.

24 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Do Commissioners have any
25 questions?

1 MR. EVANGELATOS: I might add that some of the
2 issues relating to the actual traffic or the actual
3 infrastructure requirements will be addressed in the
4 tentative map. So tonight you're discussing the
5 annexation and the rezoning. You're looking at the
6 intensity of the property and the applicability of your
7 rules relative to bringing it into the City and giving
8 it a designation. Subsequently, you will be addressing
9 the physical impacts to the community of the
10 infrastructure.

11 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Sir, I think, your
12 Commissioners, you know, most of that. Thank you very
13 much.

14 I will open the public hearing on this case.
15 And anybody wishing to speak on this item may come
16 forward. Wait a minute.

17 MS. SMITH: I have four cards.

18 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: We have four. I'll call
19 these in order. Walter Wills.

20 MR. WILLITS: Willits.

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Willits. Sorry.

22 MR. WILLITS: Walter Willits.

23 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: And I'm sorry.

24 MR. WILLITS: Good evening.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Mr. Willits, you have three

1 minutes, please.

2 MR. WILLITS: Thank you. Good evening. I'm
3 Walter W. Willits, a property owner here in the City of
4 Sparks. I've been a property owner for approximately 15
5 years. I'm opposed to the annexation because I don't
6 want to see my property or my neighbors' property
7 decrease in value. Now, if they're going to do
8 something as far as construction is concerned, my
9 suggestion is that it be something that's going to be
10 commensurate with the properties that are there.

11 And I'm speaking on behalf of my neighbors and
12 myself. That's about it. Any questions, sir?

13 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Thank you very much for
14 your input.

15 MR. WILLITS: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Sara Fausett.

17 MS. FAUSETT: Thank you. And I'm speaking on
18 behalf of me and my neighbors.

19 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Will you --

20 MS. FAUSETT: Sorry.

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Will you state your name
22 again.

23 MS. FAUSETT: My name is Sara Fausett. And we
24 live on Wedekind Road.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Thank you.

1 MS. FAUSETT: Directly across from this
2 proposed project.

3 The first thing we would like to ask is an
4 extension for postponement of decision for case number
5 PCN16042 on the basis that there are some discrepancies
6 in the fiscal impact analysis numbers.

7 One, the proposed revenue for the General Fund
8 presented for the June 15th, 2017 meeting was \$143,000
9 over 20 years. However, the new estimate for the same
10 revenue is \$230,000. And an \$87,000 discrepancy would
11 not intend to actually allow for positive fiscal impact
12 to the City. On page 61 of the Comprehensive Plan, the
13 revenue of this, over \$341 after 20 years.

14 We would like to postpone any action on this
15 case until further and more transparent fiscal
16 clarification can be achieved.

17 Another discrepancy is that in Finding Z2, page
18 28 of the request document, the claim that this property
19 is bordered on two sides, east and south, of existing
20 City IDR, Intermediate Density Residential, housing is
21 not true. There is only City of Sparks IDR zoning on
22 the south side. There's a very large approximately
23 one-acre lot directly abutting the entire east side.
24 This property is not incorporated in the City, nor does
25 it have any public utilities.

1 Therefore, Finding Z2 is not correct of the
2 surrounding land usage. So it follows from above.

3 One of the following arguments illustrate why
4 this development does not fit into the City of Sparks
5 Comprehensive Plan. Defined description of the
6 Comprehensive Plan for LDR, Low Density Residential,
7 Table 1 of eventual land uses, page 110 of the plan,
8 specifically states that the LDR category contains a
9 number of established neighborhoods. Change is not
10 anticipated or encouraged in these areas. It is only to
11 be assumed that this is because the value and security
12 of this type of property was clearly recognized when the
13 zoning designations were initiated.

14 Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Thank you very much.

16 Beth Ross.

17 MS. ROSS: I said I didn't want to speak. But
18 I'm opposed to it.

19 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Thank you very much.

20 How did Norman?

21 MR. ROSS: Same thing. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Same thing. Thank you very
23 much.

24 Anyone else that would like to address this?

25 Seeing none, I'll close the comment period and

1 bring it back to the Commissioners for discussion and a
2 possible motion, please.

3 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Mr. Chairman?

4 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Commissioner Carey.

5 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6 This is Commissioner Carey.

7 Karen, I had some, some questions about the
8 fiscal impact analysis. I believe, in your staff report
9 you mention that there's a -- the new access being
10 provided off Garfield, as opposed to what we had back
11 here in June, off Wedekind. There's a \$230,000 positive
12 fiscal impact to the city, in this proposed --

13 MS. MELBY: That's what's estimated in the
14 updated letter for the fiscal impact analysis.

15 COMMISSIONER CAREY: And, okay, so that's down
16 from, what was it, \$2 million dollars with the previous
17 proposed project?

18 MS. MELBY: Yeah, I don't know exact numbers,
19 but.

20 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Over 20 years or
21 something?

22 MR. ORNELAS: Armando Ornelas, Assistant
23 Community Services Director.

24 Commissioner Carey, members of the Planning
25 Commission, the difference in this instance is that by

1 moving the primary access off of Wedekind and onto
2 Garfield, basically, the City does not have to take on,
3 strictly speaking, a responsibility for Wedekind Road or
4 that section of Wedekind Road. And so, basically, it
5 went from a significantly negative fiscal impact to, you
6 know, showing a positive fiscal impact.

7 Now, as was noted in the staff report regarding
8 the fiscal impact analysis, you know, I think, to some
9 extent, staff has consistently raised concerns over the
10 methodology and in particular some of the assumptions
11 about the revenue side of it. But we feel that the
12 updated fiscal analysis is such that, in this, when you
13 evaluate the case as a whole, that the other findings
14 can be made that there are enough positive factors here
15 that whether it's, you know, a couple hundred thousand
16 over or a couple hundred in the red, if you will, we're
17 in range, if you will, of where the other findings, the
18 other considerations allowed staff to make a
19 recommendation of approval to.

20 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you. Appreciate,
21 appreciate that.

22 MR. ORNELAS: I mean it's not an exact science,
23 right. And at the end of the day, fiscal analysis
24 involves a set of assumptions. And, you know, you
25 tweak, modify the assumptions, you get different

1 results. But on balance, if you will, if you look at
2 all of the factors that were considered in terms of
3 staff's review of the case, of the request, we concluded
4 that we could recommend approval.

5 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you. Appreciate
6 that.

7 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Okay. Any further
8 questions?

9 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yeah, Mr. Chair,
10 Commissioner Fewins.

11 Karen, you said that there is a question from
12 the public on Finding Z2 with the surrounding existing
13 land uses. And I thought you did a good job on your
14 staff report. I'm just -- when you look on the City
15 plan, and you find existing land uses like that we're
16 looking on tonight, what are some factors that you
17 usually take into consideration? It's, you know, it is
18 bordered on the west and to the south. And there is
19 that to the east. Can you just elaborate a little bit
20 more how you found Finding Z2?

21 MS. MELBY: That it's contiguous to the City
22 along this boundary and the west boundary. And you can
23 see in this map. This is the -- oh, that's the zoning.
24 I'm sorry.

25 Oh, I guess, I don't have the land use maps

1 anymore, because that was previously reviewed. But you
2 can see where the zoning, and this is the property line
3 here.

4 I'm not sure exactly what you're asking. I'm
5 sorry.

6 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Well, you could find that
7 it does conform to the existing neighborhoods because it
8 is two of the four sides.

9 MS. MELBY: It's consistent with the
10 neighborhood to the south and then to the farther east,
11 that the sides of what they're proposing, as presented
12 in the fiscal impact analysis, and the zoning that they
13 are requesting, which is single-family 6,000, which
14 means that they would have 6,000-square-foot lots. They
15 are asking for something that's consistent with the
16 neighborhood in the City, within the City limits.

17 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Okay. Thank you, Karen.

18 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Any further discussion on
19 this?

20 All right. Then, motion. I'd like to remind
21 the Commissioners that we're making a motion on the
22 annexation. And, yeah, that first, please.

23 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Mr. Chair?

24 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Commissioner

1 VanderWell. I move to forward recommendation of
2 approval to City Council of the voluntary annexation
3 request for PCN16042, based on consideration of findings
4 A1 through A4 and the facts concerning these findings as
5 set forth in the staff report.

6 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: I have a motion. Do I have
7 a second?

8 COMMISSIONER READ: Commissioner Read. Second.

9 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Commissioner Read, thank
10 you.

11 We have a motion and second. And any
12 discussion?

13 If not, all in favor?

14 (Commission members said "aye.")

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Any opposed?

16 The motion carries.

17 Before we take the motion on the zoning, I will
18 have to open the public hearing again. Anybody wish to
19 speak on this?

20 MS. FAUSETT: On the zoning?

21 UNIDENTIFIED MAN: On the zoning?

22 MS. FAUSETT: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: On the zoning.

24 MS. FAUSETT: Yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MAN: I'd just like to

1 reiterate --

2 MS. FAUSETT: Well, clarify that there's the
3 one-acre lot. On this one-acre lot that's right next to
4 it on the east side, it kind of creates a peninsula of
5 the county, because we're all county. And this, so it
6 kind of is somewhat an island. And they want to come up
7 to here as an access. But directly across here, it is
8 not, they have a whole acre that's directly on the east.
9 So they only have this one border that doesn't -- it's
10 conflicting with the Z2 zoning, basically, is what I'm
11 saying.

12 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Thank you.

13 Karen, can you enlighten us on that?

14 MS. MELBY: I think, we just discussed that,
15 but.

16 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: I thought we did, yes.

17 MS. MELBY: Yeah. I think, that was the
18 question that Commissioner Fewins asked.

19 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Right.

20 MR. ORNELAS: You need to probably close the
21 public hearing before you take any questions. Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Right, I was supposed to,
23 but. Anyone else want to speak on this?

24 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Come on up.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Please state your name and

1 address please.

2 MR. LANCE: My name is Peter Lance, and I live
3 at 3575 Wedekind.

4 And just briefly here, there has been a few
5 major changes to what was proposed the last time we were
6 in this chamber with you. And, you know, I would like
7 to be more familiar with the impact or the differences
8 and how, you know, that changes things.

9 And so I would, I'd like there to be a
10 postponement on a decision in this case, just in order
11 that we can be more informed about what is. Because it
12 went from egress and from Wedekind, and now it's on
13 Garfield. I mean that's, you know, that's a real
14 different thing. And I'm just not familiar enough now
15 with the situation to feel comfortable about, you know,
16 knowing how I feel about it reasonably, pro or con. But
17 I would appreciate it if we could postpone this decision
18 so we could, the neighbors and what have you could be
19 more ready to, you know, know what, how we feel about
20 it.

21 And, and my only other question was, the idea
22 that I just -- I'm just not sure, just with what I do,
23 am familiar with, if, you know, the Comprehensive Plan,
24 if it fits in that well with that plan.

25 That's my request.

1 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Thank you, sir.

2 Anyone else before I close this public hearing
3 and bring it back to the Commission?

4 Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing and
5 bring it back to the Commissioners for discussion and a
6 motion.

7 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Chairman Petersen,
8 Commissioner Fewins.

9 I appreciate the work that staff's done on
10 this. I just want to bring it to the public that
11 annexation and zone changes that are requested are very
12 thoroughly looked at by this Commission. And fiscal
13 impacts are something we take very, very serious.

14 And to answer the gentleman's question before,
15 when it was, the access was off of Wedekind Road, it did
16 very negatively impact the City as far as fiscal
17 analysis over a period of time. And the applicant then
18 went to work and found, hey, let's find a way to make
19 this work.

20 And when you talk about the Comprehensive Plan,
21 you know, finding 6,000-square-foot homes, it does, it
22 is adjoining to the neighborhoods that I see to the
23 south. And even though that one to the east is not in
24 the City, and it is an acre of land just a little
25 football's throw away to the 6,000-square-foot lots.

1 So I'm going to vote in favor of this, because
2 I think that the Comprehensive Plan does need infill,
3 and it does call for infill, and that is exactly what
4 this is doing. So I'm going to be voting in favor for
5 it.

6 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Anybody care to make a
7 motion? Go ahead, sir.

8 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Chairman Petersen,
9 Commissioner Fewins again. I move to forward a
10 recommendation of approval to the City Council for the
11 rezoning request for PCN16042, based on the
12 consideration of Finding Z1 to Z3, and the facts
13 concerning these findings as set forth in the staff
14 report.

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: We have a motion. Do we
16 have a second, please?

17 COMMISSIONER READ: Read seconds.

18 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Thank you.

19 All in favor?

20 (Commission members said "aye.")

21 COMMISSIONER CAREY: One more. Can we have
22 discussion?

23 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Oh, yes.

24 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. This
25 is Commissioner Carey, for the record.

1 Back when this item was put forth in -- for the
2 Comprehensive Plan use amendment, I did feel that IDR
3 was an appropriate, was compatible with the surrounding
4 area. With respect to the proposed rezoning request, I
5 feel that SF6 zoning that is proposed is compatible as
6 well, too.

7 I didn't support the annexation and the
8 rezoning back in June because we weren't able to make
9 the findings because of the access issue. I feel that
10 now that this, this parcel has been annexed into the
11 City, access is being provided off of another City
12 street, I think that that will help alleviate the other
13 impacts that were brought up in the previous public
14 hearing and in the hearing tonight.

15 So I'm going to support the motion.

16 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to
17 make those comments on the record.

18 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Thank you.

19 If there are no other comments, all in favor?

20 (Commission members said "aye.")

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSEN: Any opposed?

22 The motion carries.

23 We'll move on to general business items.

24 PCN17-057, consideration of and possible tentative map
25 request for a 344-lot single-family subdivision, Kiley