

Powell Grand

Considering EACH issue on its individual merits, I consider the value statement to the city - the **business proposition**. The starting position for any development is, and should be, at the base level, **NO** variances. Planning and Zoning (P&Z) should use variances **sparingly** and **only** after the value proposition to the community is fully understood.

Multiple development and planning consultants have weighed in on residential development, concluding:

At best residential development will be neutral to the city. The cost of the services provided is barely covered by the "revenue" from the development.

We should not stop accepting residential development, but we must balance population density with appropriate commercial (income producing) development. And we need to be smart about all of the development that is approved, promoted, or solicited.

With that said, Powell Grand, on paper, is an attractive (although dense) mixed use/residential development with **multiple** variances *recommended* by the Planning and Zoning commission. These variances must be addressed and resolved if the proposal is to gain full support of Council.

This all apartment development could have a negative impact on the community. I would encourage the developers to table this issue until they are able to resolve the variances to the community's and Council's satisfaction. Although P&Z has *recommended* this development, Council's responsibility is to consider the value proposition, thoughtfully weigh any variances that have gotten past P&Z that are *out of code*, and decide what is best for our community.

The proposal before council as-is has multiple variances. The most egregious of which are as follows, in no particular order:

Siding type - Vinyl

Not permitted by Powell code

Height - 3 stories

Not permitted by Powell code

Density – almost 8 units per acre

This is a complex issue.

Powell zoning allows density on *Gross Acreage*. This is an issue I have been and continue to lobby against. Density should be based on the density affected acreage not the Commercial AND Residential acreage. While existing code stands, a more simple solution should be considered.

All of the variances are granted by P&Z for "*other community improvements*," YET those improvements are not clearly documented in the proposal and neither is who will be paying for them.

Furthermore, IF this is a truly a "RETIREMENT RESORT," it needs to be age restricted. In addition to the aforementioned, I have more than once argued the fact that this project is entirely apartments; this is a concern for me and many of our constituents. IF all other issues can be resolved, the issue of age restricting this property MUST be addressed. Simple lease restrictions are not sufficient. The property deed itself must be age restricted, such that any future owners of the complex cannot convert the development to a more impactful use.

The developer has stated that they do not want to get into policing the age restriction. This is accomplished with the leaseholder, no further discussion is really needed.

Boomerang Children, returning from college, unable to find work, stay at home with Mom and Dad. This situation does not impact the schools or infrastructure and they will eventually move out on their own, making it a non-issue. The leaseholder is 55+.

Older gentleman or gentlewoman, loses a spouse but finds a younger mate.... Who is the leaseholder? No issue.

For all of the above, please table this initiative until all of the above issues are resolved to our community's satisfaction.