



REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL ACTION

MEETING DATE:	August 2, 2017	<input type="checkbox"/> Motion
DEPARTMENT:	Community Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resolution
DIVISION:	Community Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance - Introduction
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance - Adoption
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing

TITLE:
General Plan Amendment: Ghiotto Family Properties

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:
Approve the request to amend the City of Yuma General Plan to change the land use designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential, for property located at the northeast corner of 15th Street and Avenue B. The applicant is Ghiotto Family Properties L.L.C. (GP-10782-2017). (Community Development/Community Planning) (Laurie Lineberry)

REPORT:
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION:
On July 10th, 2017, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to recommend APPROVAL (4-1, with Hamel voting no, Hammersley absent and one vacancy) of the General Plan amendment request to change the land use designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential. As required by state statute, the City of Yuma Planning and Zoning Commission held an earlier public hearing on this item on June 26th, 2017, in order to take additional public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – EXCERPT FROM PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES (7/10/17):
QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

“Tyrone Jones – Planning and Zoning Commissioner asked if the Commission could approve changing the land use designation of a property that was currently in the County. **Rodney Short, Deputy City Attorney** explained the Commission would be approving an amendment to the General Plan. **Jennifer Albers, Principal Planner** stated this was a General Plan Amendment request and the City did plan outside of the corporate limits. She added the rezone process would not occur until this property was in the City.

“Jones asked for clarification on who determined the annexation of this property. **Albers** stated that City Council made the ultimate decision of the annexation, but more than fifty percent of the property owners of the area to be annexed would need to be in agreement with the annexation, as well as more than fifty percent of the value of the annexation needed to be a part of the request.

“Chris Hamel, Chairman, Planning and Zoning expressed his concerns with traffic issues that could occur with this proposed development.

APPLICANT / APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE

“Kevin Dahl, 1560 S. 5th Avenue, Yuma, AZ, stated there were ways of mitigating traffic issues. He added that Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential land use designations were both essentially apartments. He shared vehicle trip generation numbers, with commercial uses generating a significantly higher number of trips than High Density Residential.

PUBLIC COMMENT

“Bobby McDermott, 1423 W. 17th Street, Yuma, AZ, expressed her concern with traffic issues that would occur if this property was developed as an apartment complex and stated the only access to this property would be one way in and one way out. She added an apartment complex was not compatible with the surrounding uses.

“Betty Borland, 1173 S. Angus Way, Yuma, AZ, expressed her concern with traffic on Avenue B and the amount of children in an apartment complex. She stated the number of children would impact the surrounding schools. She added that there was growth in Yuma and vacant properties would be developed.”

PUBLIC COMMENTS – EXCERPT FROM PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES (6/26/17):

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

“Tyrone Jones – Planning and Zoning Commissioner asked for clarification on the General Plan Amendment public hearing process. **Jennifer Albers, Principal Planner** explained that General Plan Amendments were required by the State to have two public hearings. She added that the Commission would take action at the second public hearing on July 10th.

“Jones asked for clarification on how staff takes public comments into consideration. **Albers** explained that water, sewer, traffic, availability of lands for development, and public comments were all aspects staff takes into consideration for General Plan Amendment Requests.

“Jones asked for clarification on what was adjacent to the east of this property. **Albers** said the property to the east was undeveloped and was currently zoned Medium Density Residential (R-2) with Planned Unit Development (PUD) Designation Overlay.

“Jones asked if the only in and out access point to this proposed development would be on Avenue B. **Albers** explained if apartments were developed on this property a traffic study would be required, and any traffic issues would be addressed at that time. **Fred Dammeyer – Planning and Zoning Commissioner** asked for clarification on when the traffic study would be completed. **Andrew McGarvie, Engineering Manager,** said the traffic study would be completed at the time of development or during the rezone process. **Albers** added that this property was currently in the County and the applicant could not request a rezone until this property was in the City. She added that this property was currently zoned County Limited Commercial (C-1) and Rural Area – 40 acre (RA-40) and would be annexed into the City this year.

APPLICANT / APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE

“Kevin Dahl, 1560 S. 5th Avenue, Yuma, AZ, said this site had property rights and would not remain vacant. He explained that the General Plan Amendment process was the first step of many steps before this site was developed. **Dahl** added that an apartment complex would generate less traffic than a commercial use on this property.

“Chris Hamel, Chairman, Planning and Zoning expressed his concern with traffic issues on Avenue B.

“Jones expressed his concern with changing the land use designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential. **Dahl** explained that this proposed land use change would be

an increase of 24 units from what was currently allowed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

“Stephen Shadle, 1400 S. Hettema Street, Yuma, AZ, said he was opposed to this proposal. He expressed his concern with traffic issues on Avenue B and 16th Street. **Shadle** said this property was surrounded by subdivisions and suggested developing single family homes to enhance the value of this property.”

FISCAL REQUIREMENTS	CITY FUNDS:	\$0.00	BUDGETED:	\$0.00
	STATE FUNDS:	\$0.00	AVAILABLE TO TRANSFER:	\$0.00
	FEDERAL FUNDS:	\$0.00	IN CONTINGENCY:	\$0.00
	OTHER SOURCES:	\$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00	FUNDING FOR THIS ITEM IS FOUND IN THE FOLLOWING ACCOUNT / FUND / CIP:	
	TOTAL:	\$0.00		
	FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT:			
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	SUPPORTING INFORMATION NOT ATTACHED TO THE CITY COUNCIL ACTION FORM THAT IS ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK: 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.			
	IF CITY COUNCIL ACTION INCLUDES A CONTRACT, LEASE OR AGREEMENT, WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ROUTING THE DOCUMENT FOR SIGNATURE AFTER CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL? <input type="radio"/> Department <input type="radio"/> City Clerk's Office <input type="checkbox"/> Document to be recorded			
SIGNATURES	CITY ADMINISTRATOR:		DATE:	
	Gregory K. Wilkinson		7/24/2017	
	REVIEWED BY CITY ATTORNEY:		DATE:	
	Richard W. Files		7/24/2017	
	RECOMMENDED BY (DEPT/DIV HEAD):		DATE:	
Laurie Lineberry		7/17/2017		
WRITTEN/SUBMITTED BY:		DATE:		
Jennifer L. Albers		7/12/2017		