

# PATTERSON IRRIGATOR

www.pattersonirrigator.com

Monday, NOVEMBER 30, 2023

## Annexation of development property up to forty people

By Meg Matthews  
Patterson Irrigator

Just outside of the Patterson city limits, there are more than 1,000 acres upon which developers want to build 5,500 homes. For that to transpire, the property must be annexed onto the city. Come April, voters will cast their ballots to decide whether that will happen. In a somewhat ironic twist due to procedural rules of annexation, Patterson residents will not be doing the voting - only the 40 registered voters who currently live on the property will decide.

The Zacharias and Baldwin project has been in the works for about five years. City Manager Ken Irwin says the property's current residents have been kept abreast of what was being planned the entire time. Last year, the City Council approved the master plans, which set up the ground rules for the development. All signs seemed to point to go. That is until participants at a public hearing caused an election.

"All that's required to trigger a vote is 25% of the residents who live there to protest," said Mayor Michael Clauzel at a recent city council meeting. "That's all that's required to push it to this next level."

According to documents filed with the city, the Zacharias project area is 1,158.4 acres



(south). The Baldwin Ranch project area is 68.7 acres located at the south end of Baldwin Road and is contiguous to the Delta-Mendota Canal (west), the City of Patterson Corporation Yard (north), and agricultural uses (east and south).

There are eight stakeholders involved in the project: Keystone Ranch LLC, Lakeside Hills LLC, Leroy Deldon, Eagle Valley Investments LLC, Larry K. Buehner, John Potter, Friedrich Family Ltd. Partnership and Josaphine Traina Ltd. Partnership.

Guided by the City's General Plan, development in the two areas is comprised of commercial and residential use including mixed density housing, retail shopping, and business park use in the Zacharias project area.

City Planner Joel Andrews provided some

(LAFCO) because that's the law. LAFCO gave the city's application a green light in July. However, there were still more hoops to jump through before LAFCO would give its final stamp of approval.

"There were a few other steps after that and one of them was that there was a protest hearing where registered voters who are landowners in that area could say I am not in favor of this or things like that," said Andrews. "And so that meeting was held and there were enough people who protested to trigger an election. We'll be requesting that the Board of Supervisors place on the April 9th ballot a special item for the registered voters who live within the annexation area to vote on whether they're in favor of annexing that area or not. Also, we'll be requesting that the Stanislaus County



responsible for the cost.

"There is a process and a method to annex a piece of property," said Irwin. "You have to show that it's going to be able to sustain itself. It has to show all of the facilities that are going into that area: the roadways, sewer, water, storm drain, everything that we've done over the last 5 years. And all of that has been paid for through the developers. We have contracts with each of the developers within that area that clarify all the work that's done for that development, for that annexation, they pay for. It's all paid for by them contractually."

osity, how much will this cost," said Alves. "We don't have that information yet," said Andrews. "The Registrar's office doesn't want to give estimate. All costs that are involved in that would be passed onto the developers." During a public comment period, one resident pressed on the cost issue. "No offense, but we have not done a good job of holding the developers accountable to pay for the things that they're supposed to do," said Candace Weyrauch. "So how do I know that I'm not going to be paying for this election?"