

08/13/2025

Hello and good day Chair and Commissioners,

I live adjacent to the 4831 Tillery Road property and have numerous concerns with the proposed rezoning and tentative development plans (from 3 lots / 3 units to 5 lots / 10 units).

I would also like to make the committee aware that I drove by the 4831 Tillery Road daily 08/03/2025 – 08/11/2025 and photographed the property (see below). There was no observed signage on the property as required and acknowledged with the application.

Location and Visibility

The sign must be posted on the nearest adjacent/frontage street and in a location clearly visible to vehicles traveling in either direction. If the property has more than one street frontage, the sign should be placed along the street that carries more traffic. Planning staff may recommend a preferred location for the sign to be posted at the time of application.

Timing

The sign(s) must be posted not less than 12 days prior to the scheduled Planning Commission public hearing and must remain in place until the day after the meeting. In the case of a postponement, the sign can either remain in place or be removed and reposted not less than 12 days prior to the next Planning Commission meeting. The applicant is responsible for removing the sign after the application has been acted upon by the Planning Commission.

Acknowledgement

By signing below, you acknowledge that public notice signs must be posted and visible on the property consistent with the guidelines above and between the dates listed below.

08/01/2025

Date to be Posted

08/15/2025

Date to be Removed

Have you engaged the surrounding property owners to discuss your request?

☒ Yes ☐ No

☒ No, but I plan to prior to the Planning Commission meeting

 Applicant Signature

Applicant Name

David Presley

Date

8/23/2025

In addition to non-compliance with public signage, the rezoning report findings and staff recommendations, I would like to present additional arguments in support of denying the rezoning 8-H-25-RZ (4831 Tillery Rd) from RN-1 to RN-2.

Best regards,

Daniel Sullivan

201-281-5539

1. Access and Traffic Safety Concerns Beyond “Inadequate Access”

- **Intersection conflict risk:** The proposed shared driveway’s proximity to Farris Drive creates a “decision point overload” for drivers approaching the intersection, increasing crash potential.
- **Emergency vehicle access:** A narrower shared driveway serving multiple lots could impede fire truck and ambulance access, especially given the grade and turning radius on Tillery Road.
- **Pedestrian safety:** Increased lot yield means more driveways or vehicle trips, raising risk for pedestrians—particularly if sidewalks are absent or incomplete.

2. Infrastructure & Utilities

- **Stormwater runoff:** Reducing minimum lot size from 10,000 to 5,000 sq. ft. increases impervious surface area, potentially exacerbating drainage and erosion on a hillside property.
- **Utility strain:** While water and sewer lines exist, adding more homes in a constrained-access location can put disproportionate load on older local utility lines without planned upgrades.

3. Hillside Protection Overlay (HP)

- **Slope disturbance:** Smaller lots encourage denser construction, leading to more grading, vegetation removal, and destabilization of hillside soils.
- **Erosion and sediment risk:** RN-2 lot sizes may lead to steeper driveway cuts and retaining wall construction, increasing long-term maintenance and environmental impact.
- **Visual impact:** Denser development on hillsides often creates bulkier visual profiles, affecting neighborhood character and viewsheds.

4. Neighborhood Character & Precedent

- **Lot pattern mismatch:** RN-2 lots are half the size of RN-1, disrupting the existing rhythm of homes and yard space in a well-established neighborhood.

- **Precedent risk:** Approval could trigger similar RN-1 to RN-2 applications nearby, leading to incremental erosion of the large-lot single-family fabric.
 - **Incompatibility with historical stability:** Over the past two decades, the area has remained stable without significant RN-2 intrusion—changing this risks long-term cohesion.
-

5. Plan Consistency & Policy Compliance

- **Plan intent vs. literal allowance:** Although LDR technically permits RN-2, the General Plan's Development Policy 9.3 prioritizes compatibility and context. The physical access and hillside constraints conflict with that policy.
 - **Sector plan context:** The Northwest City Sector Plan emphasizes sensitive infill that complements existing scale and lot configuration—this change would not.
-

6. Lack of Demonstrated Need

- **No substantial change:** The zoning ordinance requires showing substantially changed or changing conditions. In this case, surrounding land use patterns remain the same; there is no external driver necessitating a shift to RN-2.
- **Sufficient RN-2 elsewhere:** RN-2 properties already exist nearby with more appropriate access; rezoning here would not fill an unmet housing type need.

08/03/2025 – 226PM



08/04/2025 – 130PM



08/05/2025 – 645PM



08/06/2025 – 332PM



08/07/2025 – 619PM



08/08/2025 – 732PM



08/09/2025 – 649PM



08/10/2025 – 455PM



08/11/2025 – 210PM

