

**PLANNING COMMISSION WRITTEN COMMENTS****HAMLIN RESERVE (Z24000146A and BDG2400020)****Item heard on August 12, 2025****Comments received as of August 25, 2025****Z2400046A****Hamlin Reserve**

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| CHAIR CAMERON          | Vote: No  |
|                        | Comments: No comments were provided.  |
| VICE-CHAIR<br>CHAGARIS | Vote: No  |
|                        | Comments: outside the UGB and numerous concerns over the definition of a "conservation" subdivision were raised   |
| BAILEY                 | Vote: No  |
|                        | Comments: There was significant community representation in opposition to the project. Community members provided detailed accounts of their reasons for not supporting it, with the most common being that they had worked diligently and collaboratively with city planning to establish the UGB line just two years ago. This request seeks to reverse that agreement. Additionally, it was expressed that the project would not benefit the community as a whole. Traffic is already a challenge in the area, and the proposed addition would likely exacerbate the issue |
| CAPERS                 | Vote: No  |
|                        | Comments: No comments were provided.  |
| CZAJKOWSKI             | Vote: No  |
|                        | Comments: This proposal is wildly inconsistent with the comprehensive plan. It does not address any clear community need. It is also difficult to see any justification for further expansion into a critical watershed.  |
| KOPAC                  | Vote: No  |
|                        | Comments: Proposal is for a conservation subdivision of up to 81 single-family units outside the Urban Growth Boundary. The UGB was only recently established and is important for the protection of our watershed and agricultural land. While some community members acknowledged merits of the design including a buffer to protect natural areas, the application did not meet the test to demonstrate why it should challenge the UGB, and many residents expressed concern about the community engagement approach of the developer.                                    |
| NEUNKIRCHNER           | Vote: No  |
|                        | Comments: Proposal falls short in justifying annexation. As members noted, the proposal failed to address the negative impact on the community and did not meet the minimum standards of the UDO.   |
| PIONTAK                | No  |
|                        | Comments: Misalignment with 4 components of the comprehensive plan; concerns with infrastructure support costs required from the city during and after the development is built without adding community benefit. No clear need for this development in this area   |

|          |  |
|----------|--|
|          | that justified the change from county to city place type map. Current zoning allows for development- the justification for this change is insufficient. Strong community engagement against the project.   |
| RITCHIE  | Vote: No   |
|          | Comments: This proposal is outside of the Urban Growth Boundary, inconsistent with the place type map, and did not offer a convincing reason for adjusting either policy.  |
| WILLIAMS | Vote: No   |
|          | Comments: The application was inconsistent with the Urban Growth Boundary and the place type map. In addition, the community opposed this development due to the lack of community benefit and the increasing traffic. One community member also emphasized the desire for conservation development to meet the conservation development ordinances in order protect the environmentally sensitive areas that they impact.   |
| WOUK     | Vote: No   |
|          | Comments: This application is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan as this project is outside the Urban Growth Boundary. There was significant community opposition, with a consistent message being that the new Comprehensive Plan was just adopted two years ago and this parcel was significantly not included within the UGB. According to the Comprehensive Plan, rezoning and annexing outside the UGB should only be allowed if there is a public health/safety issue, if the Comp Plan's goals are reached and it does not expand into the Critical Watershed. This project demonstrates no public health or safety issue, does not reach any goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and expands into the Critical Watershed. |