

Adam Zack

From: Scott Lommel <scottlommel@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 6:04 PM
To: Adam Zack
Subject: Questions for the planning commission for upcoming meeting RE: Browne's nursery relocation

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Questions for the San Juan County Planning Commission:

A lot of the questions in the SEPA were deferred as not applicable or to be determined later as no formalized plans are developed. With all that information on environmental impact missing, will the SEPA process be repeated with that information included and assessed before the town annexes the parcel and/or building begins?

Can the Owner request housing development as an option at a later date with this designation change and subsequent annexation?

With the planned designation of the town to make the parcel light industrial, is it possible and what would be required later to subdivide the land, if the owner wanted to move forward with the original application containing multi-family housing as a plan?

It states in the staff report that access to the nursery will only be off of Mullis. Just to be clear in case we misunderstood something, does this proposal involve using Cedar St or Apple Tree Ln as access roads now or in the future?

Can you explain the contradiction between the SEPA check list number 9 Housing sub section A answer "NA this is not a housing project" and Stephanie O'Day's email to Duncan Wilson on December 20 2018 stating that the owners would like to use the parcel for affordable housing and need water and sewer for the project? (It appears the application was resubmitted but asking to be clear) See below:

In a memo:

O'Day offices state "retaining the right to use the back of one or both properties for affordable housing purposes" (dated dec 20th, 2018)

O'Day offices state " the current application is separate and distinct from the initial application. A discussion of affordable housing at this juncture on the property is irrelevant...." (feb 11th, 2019)

Does that mean such an approval or request is not it the works in the future once the annexation takes place? In other words can that request be made later if the current proposal is approved in its updated form with that request of housing omitted?

Reading the report it says something along the lines of the owner needs to develop the land in accordance to the proposal, after the reclassification from County to UGA takes place. Is this correct? Also is this also true in regards to the planned building of the nursery if/when the town annexes and approved the plan?

Can the owner switch gears 100% after annexation and apply to have all the newly designated land slated for apartment complexes, scrapping all plans that were laid out in the beginning that allowed the transition from county to UGA to town?