

MEETING RECORD

Advanced public notice of the Planning Commission meeting was posted on the County-City bulletin board and the Planning Department's website. In addition, a public notice was emailed to the Lincoln Journal Star for publication on Tuesday, October 21, 2025.

NAME OF GROUP:	PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE, TIME, AND PLACE OF MEETING:	Wednesday, October 29, 2025, 1:00 p.m., Hearing Room 112, on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10 th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.
IN ATTENDANCE:	Lorenzo Ball, Dick Campbell, Brett Ebert, Gloria Eddins, Bailey Feit, Cristy Joy, Rich Rodenburg, Cindy Ryman Yost, David Cary, Steve Henrichsen, Shelli Reid, Jacob Schlange, and Laura Tinnerstet of the Planning Department, media, and other interested citizens.
STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:	Regular Planning Commission Hearing

Chair Joy called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the room.

Chair Joy requested a motion approving the minutes for the regular meeting held October 15, 2025.

Motion for approval of the minutes made by Campbell; seconded by Eddins.

Minutes approved 7 -0: Ball, Campbell, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, and Rodenburg voting "yes". Ryman Yost abstained. Cruz absent.

Chair Joy asked the Clerk to call for the Consent Agenda Items.

CONSENT AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:

October 29, 2025

Members present: Ball, Campbell, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg and Ryman Yost. Cruz absent.

The Consent Agenda consisted of the following items: Annexation 25009, Change of Zone 25024, and Special Permit 13013A.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed relating to site visit.

Campbell moved approval of the Consent Agenda; seconded by Eddins.

Consent Agenda approved 8-0: Ball, Campbell, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg, and Ryman Yost voting "yes". Cruz absent.

Note: This is Final Action on Special Permit 13013A unless appealed by filing a Notice of Appeal with the City Council or County Board within 14 days.

ANNEXATION 25008, TO ANNEX APPROXIMATELY 13.12 ACRES ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SW CORNER OF S. 70TH & YANKEE HILL ROAD.

AND

CHANGE OF ZONE 050681, AN AMENDMENT TO ADD APPROXIMATELY 13.12 ACRES AND 161,000 SQUARE FEET OF COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREA TO THE EXISTING PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) FOR THE WOODLANDS AT YANKEE HILL PUD, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SW CORNER OF S. 70th & YANKEE HILL ROAD.

AND

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT 25006, TO AMEND THE LINCOLN-LANCASTER COUNTY 2050 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO REVISE THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP FROM RESIDENTIAL- LOW DENSITY USE TO COMMERCIAL USE, AND TO ADJUST THE FUTURE GROWTH TIER DESIGNATION FROM TIER 1, PRIORITY C TO TIER 1, PRIORITY A, ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SW CORNER OF S 70TH & YANKEE HILL ROAD.

PUBLIC HEARING:

October 29, 2025

Members present: Ball, Campbell, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg and Ryman Yost. Cruz absent.

Staff Recommendation:

Conditional Approval for Annexation 25008

Conditional Approval for Change of Zone 050681

Approval for Comprehensive Plan Amendment 25006

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed relating to site visits.

Staff Presentation:

Jacob Schlange, Planning and Development Services Department, 555 South 10th Street, Lincoln, NE, came forward and presented an overview of the three related applications—a comprehensive plan amendment, a change of zone, and an annexation—explaining that the requests are interconnected and would be presented together.

Schlange stated that the annexation involves approximately 13 acres at the southwest corner of South 70th Street and Yankee Hill Road. Although the area is currently designated Tier 1, Priority C in the Future Growth Tier Map, the site should be considered separately from the area to the west due to a steep grade change. While the broader area is classified as Priority C because a gravity-fed sewer cannot readily serve it, this site can be served by city services.

Schlange explained that the comprehensive plan amendment would change the Growth Tier from Tier 1, Priority C, to Tier 1, Priority A, to reflect the site's serviceability. The request also includes an amendment to the Woodlands at Yankee Hill Planned Unit Development (PUD) to incorporate the 13-acre area, located directly west across South 70th Street, into the existing PUD. The proposal would allow development of 15 commercial buildings—thirteen in Block 60 and two in Block 61—each on its own lot.

Schlange noted that the existing Future Land Use Map identifies the area as low-density residential, and that the amendment would change the designation to commercial use. The northern portion of the property lies within the pipeline planning area, where the Comprehensive Plan discourages new residential development. Additionally, the grade change makes connecting Marlin Lane to the property to the west difficult, further limiting residential feasibility.

Schlange discussed a deviation approved by LTU allowing a right-in-only access at South 69th Street. Although the location does not meet standard access management spacing requirements, the right-in access would provide a direct entrance for future commercial traffic and help reduce traffic at the nearby roundabout; a right-out movement would not be permitted.

Schlange stated that the underlying zoning would be R-3, but PUD regulations would follow H-4 Commercial District standards. Schlange noted that H-4 zoning is designed for suburban commercial use and exists in several locations adjacent to residential zoning, including elsewhere within the Woodlands at Yankee Hill PUD.

Schlange concluded that discussions with LTU regarding Watershed Management and traffic details are ongoing and may be addressed further during the hearing.

Staff Questions

Rodenburg asked what types of uses are permitted within the H-4 Commercial District.

Schlange responded that while he did not have the use group table memorized, the H-4 district allows a range of commercial and office uses and generally accommodates heavier commercial activity than an "O" Office District.

Ebert asked for clarification, noting that the property would technically be zoned R-3 but would follow H-4 regulations, and inquiring whether there was anything that made adherence to H-4 a requirement.

Schlange explained that the property would be incorporated into the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD), which serves as the zoning overlay. Schlange stated that the underlying zoning for the entire PUD is R-3, but within it, certain portions follow B-2 use regulations and others follow H-4. Schlange noted that areas on the east end of the PUD already follow H-4 standards, while commercial areas in the southeast corner were approved under B-2 regulations. Schlange clarified that, consistent with the existing PUD, the proposed addition would retain R-3 as the underlying zoning but follow H-4 regulations.

Applicant Presentation-

Christina Melgoza, Krueger Development, 8501 South 78th Street, Lincoln, NE, appeared on behalf of the applicant. Melgoza stated that the proposal continues the Woodlands development and presented visuals to illustrate the project. Melgoza noted that the office is within the Woodlands PUD and that several commercial buildings have been constructed in the area in recent years, providing context for the proposed development.

Melgoza described the architectural style of the proposed commercial buildings as transitional to the surrounding residential neighborhood, incorporating materials such as stone, brick, and cement hardy board, with pitched shingled roofs to avoid a harsh industrial appearance. Melgoza highlighted the location of a retaining wall and noted that the roof lines of the proposed buildings would be lower than those of adjacent properties, minimizing visual impact. Lighting would be directed toward the parking areas to reduce spillover to neighboring properties, and landscaping features would be included throughout the site.

Melgoza discussed potential uses for the buildings, noting that while no tenants have been secured, examples from the existing Woodlands development include a chiropractor, pediatric dentist, veterinarian, and party planner. Melgoza emphasized that the buildings are intended for ownership rather than long-term lease, targeting small business owners.

Melgoza concluded by requesting the Commission's support for the project and noted that E&A Consulting would provide further details regarding the engineering aspects of the development.

Staff Questions

Campbell asked Melgoza about the existing screening to the south and west, noting that several letters had expressed concern regarding its adequacy.

Melgoza responded that while many of the existing trees would be removed as part of development, the proposed 10-foot retaining wall along the property line would allow for some remaining foliage. Melgoza added that efforts would be made to protect the roots of trees along adjacent property lines.

Campbell asked Melgoza whether any additional screening would remain in the back area.

Melgoza explained that planting trees in that location would be difficult due to a 14-foot grade drop. Melgoza noted that the retaining wall sets the elevation such that additional screening is likely unnecessary but confirmed that the existing trees in the area would be removed.

Campbell asked about the depth of space between the upper wall and the second wall on the west side of the retaining wall.

Melgoza stated she was unsure what Campbell meant by the “upper wall and second wall.”

Campbell clarified, referring to the west wall and the one step down from it.

Melgoza explained that the step-down appearance is due to the computer-generated rendering and that the steps equate to approximately one foot, so it will be a singular wall.

Campbell noted that there is a 10-foot separation between the upper wall and the abutting neighbors, ensuring the retaining wall does not go directly to the property line, and asked if a current photo of the area could be referenced.

Melgoza agreed and confirmed that the existing space shows limited trees on the west side, mostly at the north end and mid-south.

Campbell asked about the south end, noting a lack of plant material, and asked if that was correct.

Melgoza replied that there are quite a few trees and foliage in the area, even if not clearly visible, but stated that there is not a great way to preserve it on the development side of the property line.

Campbell asked if Melgoza would be open to filling in spaces on the neighbors' properties to create a fuller screen.

Melgoza responded that Rick Krueger, who is not present, would need to answer that, but indicated the team is generally willing and able to work with neighbors in situations like this, so it could be a possibility.

Rodenburg asked Meloza if a fence or other safety measure would be provided along the 10-foot retaining wall to prevent a fall hazard.

Meloza responded that the engineers will determine what is required for safety along the wall.

Rick Onnen, E&A Consulting, 2077 N Street, Lincoln, NE. came forward and stated that the height of the retaining wall would vary, from approximately 5 to 6 feet in some areas to as high as 14 feet in others. Onnen noted that certain portions may be tiered to reduce grading requirements and that there would be space at the top of the wall for landscaping, such as shrubs, to help soften the visual impact. Onnen emphasized that the wall would be set back at least 10 feet from the property line, providing additional buffering. Onnen further noted that no

parking areas or building entrances would adjoin neighboring properties, resulting in a relatively subdued rear view of the buildings with minimal activity, and that the buildings themselves would likely shield nearby residences from parking lot lighting.

Staff Questions

Rodenburg asked whether the retaining wall would include a railing to address fall hazards, rather than concerns about the view.

Onnen responded that there are code requirements for walls above a certain height and within a certain distance of walking paths, which would require a railing. Onnen stated that all necessary codes would be followed.

Chair Joy asked Onnen to clarify the setbacks shown on the site plan, specifically regarding the 30-foot setback from the property line to the buildable area and how it relates to neighboring properties.

Onnen explained that the buildings will sit on individual lots within the 30-foot area, with the structures themselves slightly smaller than the lot. Onnen noted that fire doors at the back of the buildings cannot swing past the property line, and there may be a four- to five-foot sidewalk along the back, depending on fire exiting requirements. Onnen confirmed that the retaining wall would be within the 30-foot setback.

Chair Joy asked if the retaining wall starts at 35 feet, referencing the hard line shown on the site plan.

Onnen clarified that the retaining wall would be within the 30-foot setback.

Chair Joy acknowledged the response and confirmed that her question was answered. Joy then asked if there were any other questions from the Commission.

Eddins asked for clarification regarding the retaining wall setback. Eddins noted that Onnen had stated the wall would be approximately 10 feet off the property line, and asked if that would place the wall at the 20-foot mark within the 30-foot setback.

Onnen confirmed that this was correct and added that, in areas where the wall needs to step, the setback would likely be divided into two 10-foot sections.

Eddins acknowledged the clarification and expressed thanks to Onnen.

Onnen stated that he would first review the requested waivers associated with the development. Onnen then described the project as an upscale version of the Trade Center located on South 56th Street and Old Cheney Road.

Feit responded that she agreed with Onnen's characterization of the project.

Onnen stated that the facility is approximately 160,000 square feet on 13 acres, which is comparable in density to another facility of 260,000 square feet on 24 acres. Onnen noted that this project incorporates updated landscaping and stormwater requirements, resulting in a different mix of green space. Onnen explained that primary site access would be from the roundabout at South 70th Street and Yankee Woods Drive, with a secondary access from Yankee Hill Road temporarily allowed during construction of the roundabout.

Onnen then reviewed the requested waivers, which include reductions in setbacks, non-typical roadway sections, reduced paving width, street width, and street trees to accommodate the proposed roadway with on-street parking. Onnen also discussed a waiver to flood regulations (Section 2753) regarding minimum flood corridor requirements due to site constraints and recent changes at the roundabout intersection.

Onnen stated that, to accommodate proper advertising of the new waiver, a continuation of the entire application is being requested for all three items.

Ryman Yost asked for clarification regarding changes noted in the staff report and memo, specifically Section 2.14.4 on minimum flood corridor requirements. Ryman Yost inquired whether the new change required a continuation for the entire application or only one of the three items.

Onnen responded that a continuation would be requested for the entire application.

Campbell asked for confirmation of the continuation request. Onnen confirmed that a continuation would be requested for all three items.

Onnen addressed a modification related to temporary access at the connection on Yankee Hill Road. Onnen explained that the staff report had originally restricted use of this connection before the issuance of any building permits. Onnen stated the request would be revised to allow a maximum of 25,000 square feet of building occupancy. Onnen noted this adjustment is a contingency to enable some construction and occupancy if roundabout construction is delayed, as this connection would be the only access until the roundabout is completed.

Campbell asked Onnen about the anticipated schedule for the roundabout.

Onnen responded that multiple factors are in play, with funding being the primary consideration. Onnen noted that potential "Lincoln on the Move" funds and directed impact fees are being reviewed and that the goal is to begin construction next year, though timing is not yet finalized.

Eddins asked whether the applicant had met with nearby neighbors.

Melgoza responded that a neighborhood meeting was held earlier in the week on Monday. Notices were sent not only to residents within the standard 200-foot radius but also to those along 68th Street and Bolton Avenue down to Rebel Drive. Melgoza estimated that about 80% of those invited attended. Melgoza said the discussion was generally positive, with few surprises

on either side. Melgoza noted that while residents are often cautious about change, many expressed interest in seeing more commercial options close to home. As the current head of the Woodlands HOA, Melgoza added that neighbors often ask when more nearby amenities will be available. Melgoza said they appreciated the feedback and want to ensure the project fits well with the community and minimizes disturbance to existing residents.

Campbell asked Chair Joy whether individuals who testify today would have the opportunity to testify again if the hearing is continued for two weeks. Chair Joy deferred to Steve Henrichsen for clarification.

Steve Henrichsen, Planning and Development Services Department, 555 South 10th Street, Lincoln, NE, came forward and explained that the applicant had requested a continuation of the public hearing to allow additional time to work on the project. Henrichsen noted that the general practice is for individuals to testify only once—either at the initial hearing or at the continued hearing. However, if new information arises in the interim, such as a previously unmentioned waiver, residents may provide additional testimony related specifically to that new information.

Ryman Yost confirmed that this approach would allow residents present at today's meeting to testify, even if they are unable to attend the continued hearing.

Henrichsen added that individuals who testify today may also submit written comments during the two weeks preceding the continued hearing.

Chair Joy asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, the discussion concluded.

Proponents:

No one approached in support.

Neutral:

No one approached in a neutral capacity.

Opposition:

Claire Briney, 8900 S. 68th, Lincoln, NE, 68516, came forward and testified in opposition to the proposed development at South 70th Street and Yankee Hill Road. Briney stated that the project would threaten the character, natural integrity, and livability of her family's property, which has been their home for approximately 50 years. Briney described the personal and historical significance of the land, noting trees planted by her father, a peony garden inherited from her grandmother, and a natural spring that supports native habitat.

Briney expressed concern that the development would result in the removal of trees and shrubs, the construction of retaining walls and fencing, and a 10-foot grade change near her property line, all of which would negatively affect privacy, noise buffering, and safety. Briney also raised concerns about incompatibility with the surrounding area, increased traffic, and inadequate infrastructure to support commercial use, particularly near schools and pedestrian crossings.

Briney noted that potential benefits cited by the developer—such as increased tax revenue and contributions to local schools—would not directly benefit her neighborhood, which lies outside the Lincoln city limits. Briney characterized the project as serving private interests rather than long-term community needs and urged the Commission to deny the annexation request.

Staff Questions-

Campbell asked Briney whether the plant material she discussed was entirely on her property.

Briney responded that the plantings extend across the property line, noting that root structures have grown into neighboring properties, and expressed concern that construction of the retaining wall could remove or degrade this natural barrier.

Campbell then asked Briney to identify the types of plants along the property line.

Briney stated that they include honeysuckle, cedars, pines, elms, and willows, particularly in the gully and water flow area.

Matthew Green, 727 S. 52nd Street, Lincoln, NE 68510, came forward and spoke on behalf of his mother and father-in-law regarding the proposed development. Green expressed concerns about several requested waivers, stating that the project represents a fundamental change to the neighborhood's character, which has long been quiet and family-oriented. Green noted that local roads are already overcapacity due to recent housing and school developments, and that the developer's proposed road improvements address only the area immediately adjacent to the property.

Green further raised concerns regarding the waiver request for proximity to existing residences, citing insufficient justification or mitigation for noise, traffic, and visual impacts. Green also criticized the developer's request to waive sidewalk requirements, emphasizing that sidewalks are essential for connectivity, safety, and accessibility. Green concluded that the annexation, as proposed, constitutes irresponsible growth at the expense of existing residents and urged the Commission to deny the application.

Carolyn Bosn, 6433 Country View Rd. Lincoln, NE 68516, came forward and introduced herself as a state representative for the area, speaking in opposition to the proposed development. Bosn noted that many neighbors share concerns previously expressed by Briney and Green. Bosn focused on safety and infrastructure issues, emphasizing that the proposal involves rezoning established residential acreage and annexing it from the county to city use. Bosn highlighted that the current neighborhood has 50-foot setbacks, whereas the proposed development would allow 30-foot setbacks (effectively 20 feet from the property line), raising compatibility concerns.

Bosn also noted that while previous development along Yankee Hill has been successful, this situation is unique because it directly affects existing residential properties. Bosn raised concerns about insufficient infrastructure, particularly the lack of completed roundabouts south of Yankee Hill to manage additional traffic, which Bosn described as a daily safety hazard.

Bosn further expressed concern over the requested waiver for sidewalk access, noting the presence of nearby elementary schools and the safety risk for children walking along 70th Street and Yankee Hill Road. Bosn concluded that, given these unresolved safety, traffic, and infrastructure issues, she opposes the proposed development.

Staff Questions

Feit stated that the Planning Department recommends denial of the waiver, emphasizing that sidewalks should be installed. Feit noted that the department fully supports sidewalks and considers them important.

Chair Joy thanked Commissioner Feit for her point, asked if there were any other comments or questions, and then thanked her again for her testimony.

Commissioner Rodenburg asked whether a traffic count report and possibly an accident report for South 70th Street could be provided in two weeks.

Schlange stated that he was unsure about obtaining an accident report, but noted that a traffic report had been submitted as part of the application and reviewed by LTU. Schlange added that some issues regarding the temporary right-out on Yankee Hill still needed to be resolved. As part of the traffic review, plans were adjusted to include a roundabout at South 70th Street and Yankee Woods Drive, which was not part of the initial proposal but was determined to be the better approach.

Rodenburg noted that LTU had approved the traffic report as submitted.

Campbell asked if a memo from the Planning Department showing the traffic study could be provided, and Schlange confirmed that it could.

Feit asked how soon, according to long-term plans, South 70th Street is expected to be widened from two lanes to four lanes.

Henrichsen explained that, at a micro level, as part of this application, the applicant is agreeing to improve 70th Street from Yankee Woods Drive to the roundabout at 70th and Yankee Hill, bringing it up to urban standards. This segment would serve as the main access to and from the development, with left turns managed through the roundabout. The timing of this work could take 16 to 24 months, depending on construction phasing.

Henrichsen noted that the most recent traffic count on 70th Street, taken in 2024, recorded 9,000 trips. For context, at the point where 70th Street meets Old Cheney Road, which is four lanes, traffic counts reach 26,000 trips. While 9,000 trips are significant for a two-lane road, it is considered suitable for the location. Henrichsen acknowledged that left turns can be challenging during peak hours. Regarding long-term plans, the city's CIP does not currently schedule widening 70th Street further south due to limited funding, and prioritization of street improvements is determined by the City Council. Henrichsen noted that citizens approved the continuation of the Lincoln on the Move tax last spring, and the city is planning its use over the

next eight years, which could potentially accelerate improvements in coordination with developers.

Eddins asked Henrichsen about traffic at Standing Bear High School and whether the 9,000-trip count for 70th Street in 2024 occurred before the school opened.

Feit provided the information, noting the 2024 count, while Henrichsen stated that the exact timing was uncertain. It was clarified that Standing Bear opened in 2022, meaning the traffic count occurred after the school had been in operation for several years.

Henrichsen and Eddins thanked Feit for providing the information.

Feit asked whether the City Planning Department is concerned that the new development may not provide services typical of a complete neighborhood, such as a grocery store, gas station, or daycare, and whether it might cause existing businesses in the city to relocate south. Feit acknowledged that it may be difficult to predict, but asked if there is concern about potential vacancies in current city commercial spaces or a lack of space for businesses.

Schlange responded that there is a perceived demand for additional commercial development in the southern part of Lincoln. Schlange explained that the H4 zoning for this location allows several types of uses, including some of the services Feit mentioned, such as early childhood care facilities. While not an exhaustive list, Schlange noted that H4 zoning provides a variety of options that could meet everyday neighborhood needs.

Applicant Rebuttal:

Onnen came forward and addressed concerns about sidewalks, explaining that the sidewalk along the east side of 70th Street in this area is planned to be replaced or constructed as a trail along the east side of the drainage way running parallel to the street. Onnen noted that the right-of-way on the west side is somewhat constrained, and although there had been consideration of using a sidewalk through the development in place of a west-side sidewalk, LTU did not support that approach.

Onnen clarified that there will still be sidewalks along the fronts of the buildings on both sides of what is being called 63rd Street, but there will not be a sidewalk along the west side of the street's parking apron, resulting in a non-traditional placement. The sidewalks are positioned to serve the buildings effectively.

Onnen also addressed a comment regarding setbacks, confirming that there is a 30-foot setback from the property line, with buildings required to be set back further if there is a door swing, effectively maintaining the 30-foot measurement.

Staff Questions-

Feit noted that the first concern was that the retaining wall appeared to reduce the setback.

Onnen confirmed that the retaining wall is within the 30-foot setback.

Feit clarified that her comment was simply intended to indicate the source of the concern.

Onnen explained that setbacks do not regulate retaining walls, and Feit acknowledged this clarification.

Campbell asked for clarification about a sidewalk along 70th Street/Yankee Hill Road that extends just south of the roundabout, then crosses the street and continues to the north. Campbell inquired whether, from that point south, the presence of the drainage ditch makes it impossible to install a sidewalk.

Onnen explained that the drainage ditch runs along the east side of the street.

Campbell asked about the south or west side of 70th Street, referring to the dotted lines behind buildings 12, 11, and 10, and inquired how that area would be handled.

Onnen explained that the sidewalk on the south or west side of 70th Street will be in a more traditional location for an arterial street, though it may be slightly closer to the curb due to space constraints. Onnen noted that discussions with LTU are ongoing, as they prefer to construct this section like the existing cross-section on Yankee Hill Road, which includes one lane with a paved shoulder and a ditch—conditions that do not easily accommodate a sidewalk. Onnen added that they are considering whether it makes sense to pave an additional six feet to allow for a two-lane configuration in each direction and include a sidewalk, but these decisions are still under discussion and largely dependent on funding.

Ryman Yost asked whether the 3D image accurately shows the sidewalk that curves around the roundabout and how it connects to the rest of the lot. Ryman Yost noted that the sidewalk appears to be intended for pedestrian crossing and sought clarification on how it integrates with the surrounding area.

Onnen explained that the sidewalk shown in the 3D image reflects what currently exists. Onnen noted that the existing sidewalk terminates at a certain point but would continue down along the west side. Onnen added that the sidewalk might be slightly wider at that location, with a planned width of five feet.

Melgoza added that, during discussions with Planning and LTU, they had offered to extend the sidewalk running south along 70th Street into the development and route it in front of the buildings, providing a potentially safer pedestrian path away from the heavily trafficked street. However, LTU felt that this might be confusing for pedestrians, though the option had been proposed.

Onnen asked Melgoza if there were any additional issues she wanted to address.

Melgoza responded that she did not have any additional concerns, acknowledging that there may always be slight differences of opinion. Melgoza noted that while some may not view the development as holding long-term value for the neighborhood, they disagreed, citing similar commercial areas, such as the Trade Center, that have benefited both the neighborhood and

the city. Melgoza emphasized that they work closely with Planning to ensure projects align with long-term planning and expressed hope for support from the Commission.

Onnen added that he wanted to address a point regarding whether this area would provide services for the community, noting that there is commercial space on the east side of 70th Street designated for those types of uses. Onnen mentioned that there had been discussion about potential uses, such as a grocery store.

Melgoza added that the corner is essentially surrounded by commercial zoning, and while there had been ideas for a grocery store or similar uses on the caddy-corner property, those plans had not yet materialized. Melgoza noted that the larger commercial spaces are better suited for such uses than the opposite side of the street, which could be more intrusive to nearby residents. Melgoza emphasized that the intention is to provide quieter services that transition into the residential neighborhood.

ANNEXATION 25008, CHANGE OF ZONE 050681, COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT 25006
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION

October 29, 2025

Campbell moved to defer the public hearing for two weeks; seconded by Eddins.

Campbell noted that the two-week deferral would provide time to address outstanding questions and stated his support for the proposal.

Motion to continue the public hearing for Annexation 25008, Change of Zone 050681I, and Comprehensive Plan Amendment 25006 for a two-week deferral carried 8-0: Ball, Campbell, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg and Ryman Yost voting "yes"; Cruz absent.

Campbell moved to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting of October 29, 2025; seconded Eddins.

Motion to adjourn carried 8-0: Ball, Campbell, Ebert, Eddins, Feit, Joy, Rodenburg and Ryman Yost voted "yes." Cruz absent.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 pm.