

**Diana C. Walthers**

**From:** Flinn Fagg  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 18, 2008 9:02 AM  
**To:** Diana C. Walthers  
**Subject:** Neighborhood Meeting: SDR-29658

Start: 6:10pm  
 Public: 1  
 Applicant: 4  
 Staff: P&D - 1; NS - 1; Metro -1; Ward 5 Liaison - 1 (Note: Councilman Barlow and Commissioner Goynes were also in attendance)

The applicant described their development experience, and briefly explained that 1/3 of the proposed project area will be devoted to apartments, and 2/3 will be devoted to condominiums.

The following questions and concerns were raised by the member of the public:

- There was a concern about traffic generated by the project impacting traffic on Decatur and Smoke Ranch; the applicant explained that a traffic study had already been completed, and there will be little impact to Decatur. The applicant also explained that the principal entrances to the project would be from Rancho.
- There was also concern about the existing driveway layout around the office/industrial uses; the applicant explained that the access driveway around the office uses would end in a cul-de-sac so as to prevent cut-through traffic.
- A question was raised as to the existing off-premise signs on the site; the applicant explained that the signs would be removed.
- There was a concern raised about the existing Budget Suites property to the south, and the fact that the applicant is constructing additional apartments in the area. The applicant indicated that the apartments would be on 6- and 12-month leases and would require deposits, unlike the Budget Suites facility.
- There was a concern raised about the lack of open space; the applicant explained that although they were not providing to full amount required by code, three separate recreation areas would be provided on site, and that they would pay \$160,000 towards park development on account of the shortage of open space.
- There was a question raised about the variances that were needed to develop the project as proposed; the applicant noted that they needed a variance for the open space, and a parking variance (approximately 40 parking spaces below that which is required by code).
- The applicant asked if the development would be gated; it was indicated that there would be walls around both the condominiums and the apartments.
- The representative from Metro raised concerns about lighting and safety; the representative from Neighborhood Services raised concerns about the homeowners association and maintenance of the property.

Flinn Fagg, AICP  
 Planning Manager  
 P: 702.229.4848  
 F: 702.384.1397

Submitted after final agenda

11/18/2008

Date

Item

22