

From: [JOSEPH PITTI](#)
To: [Darci Carlson](#)
Subject: CHD Letter for PC
Date: Tuesday, February 19, 2019 7:34:51 AM

Dear Planning Commission -

I am writing to you as an absentee member and concerned citizen regarding item A4 on the upcoming February 20, 2019, Planning Commission meeting.

My concerns are not with the design or concept of a cottage neighborhood per the AIL proposal, but whether this parcel is an appropriate use for the proposal itself. As a commission, we must ask ourselves whether the current zoning requirements are better suited for the subject property. I would argue that they are. The development underlined with the current zoning requirements of 3 duplexes or 6 units is less impactful on the subject property that has been designated on the FLUM as Agricultural Residential. The General Plan also states in 5.1.4 that "Housing may be more practical in the commercial zones if incentives are provided that encourage mixed-use developments and maximize the use of the available land."

To argue that the Wilson Cottage Neighborhood property is comparable is irrelevant. It was proposed in a setting that was more densely populated than the current overlay zone change request. The neighboring rock shop, 4-plex apartment building, restaurant and Coleman/Rayner project of densely populated buildings, was more suitable to a cottage neighborhood in an area that already had higher density surrounding it.

Town Code 10.9B.1 VALLEY RESIDENTIAL - The valley residential (VR) zone is established to ... retain land in parcels large enough to provide efficient and attractive residential development which preserves the historic open agricultural and farm type impression of the area. (Ord. 2013-11, 12-11-2013) The proposed higher density development contradicts the concept of a historic open agricultural and farm type impression of the area. The descriptors of the nature of the VR zone are ones that we should fight to maintain and should be maintained under the current zoning requirements of the underlying VR zone.

The current parcel for consideration is surrounded by homes and open space. The current zoning requirements would keep in tact the parcel's open agricultural feel while providing a developer the opportunity to propose a project that would better fit the current nature of the surrounding area. I want to be clear, I am not against any development on the subject property, I firmly believe that the conceptual buildout of three duplexes is a better fit and more suitable for the parcel.

I urge you to think carefully consider the outcome of an approval and the potential negative impacts on a valley residential zone that will be permanently lost as a result. DCD has told us that we have wide latitude when approving or denying this overlay zone change request. Were I in attendance at the commission's February 20 meeting, I would cast my vote to deny the proposal based on the premise that current zoning density standards are more appropriate for the current zone.

Regards - Joe Pitti

Teach InfoWest Spam Trap if this mail is spam:

[Spam](#)

[Not spam](#)

[Forget previous vote](#)

REMEMBER: Never give out your account information, password, or other personal information over e-mail.
