

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

DATE: September 12, 2016

TIME: 4:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Vice Chairperson Buelow, Commissioners Boettcher, M. Olson, Ballard, Porter, Shortridge, and Paddock

ABSENT: Commissioner Hahn and L. Olson

STAFF PRESENT: City Planner Carlos Espinosa and City Planner Mark Moeller

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairperson Buelow at 4:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes – May 23, 2016 & August 22, 2016

The minutes from the Commission's meeting of May 23, 2016 were reviewed. The following amendments made:

- Commissioner M. Olson stated that Hans Zietlow's comments at page 2 paragraph 4 should be modified in that her recollection was the Mr. Zietlow did not encourage the Commission to support the Comprehensive Plan and Zone Map Changes.
- Commissioner M. noted that during the public hearing, a number of individuals had presented themselves as Y Board members, she suggested that the transcript of the meeting be reviewed to better define which of those persons were either representing themselves or the Y directly. Mr. Espinosa replied that staff would attempt to better define this.
- Commissioner M. Olson noted that the last of her three reasons presented in recommending denial of the motion should be modified to reflect the fact that a reclassification of the present traditional neighborhood designation of the Y block would not be consistent with the City's present Comprehensive Plan.

Although shown as absent, Commissioner Ballard was present at the meeting.

Given the previous, the consensus of those present was to defer approval of May 23rd minutes until revisions had been made.

The minutes from the Commission's meeting of August 22, 2016 were unanimously approved as submitted.

Discussion – Development Code Update

Vice Chair Buelow then called on Carlos Espinosa to provide introductory comments of this afternoon's meeting. Mr. Espinosa noted that Jeff Miller and Rita Trapp were available this afternoon to provide additional discussion pertaining to the Unified Development Code. At this point, he called on consultant representatives to lead Commission discussion.

Rita Trapp began by noting that this afternoon's meeting would generally represent the last formal discussion that the Commission will have on the Development Code Update Project before a preliminary draft of the document is presented on October 10th. Prior to the planned Joint Planning Commission/City Council Meeting of October 24th, the Commission will be asked to assist in developing major topics for discussion during that meeting. Following the Joint Planning Commission/Council Meeting, the draft will again be revised by November 4th for a presentation during an open house to occur during the week of November 14th.

Commissioner Shortridge noted that, as part of this afternoon's discussion, he would like to finalize limits of proposed downtown mixed use districts.

Ms. Trapp stated that although the Commission could certainly do that, she suggested following the agenda developed for this afternoon's meeting. Given the agenda, the first item of business discussed related to an updated development procedures table. Ms. Trapp noted that this table had been presented to the Commission during a past meeting and generally outlines points of procedure to be followed in making various land use decisions. Of these procedures, she explained that the more notable related to the concept of reducing public hearings. As an example, she explained that under current procedures, a typical project requiring a subdivision would require the submittal of a preliminary plat. This plat would be subject to a public hearing and decision by the Planning Commission alone. If approved, the developer could move to the final plat which, under current process would require Planning Commission public hearing followed by a formal decision of City Council. Under revised procedures, although the Planning Commission would continue to hold a public hearing of a preliminary plat, a decision of the plat would actually be made by Council. A final plat submittal for the project would simply require a decision by Council. No public hearing for the final plat would be held. Additionally, whereas the current process for a zone map amendment requires public hearings by both the Planning Commission and Council, this would be reduced by one public hearing to be held by the Planning Commission with a final decision by Council.

Ms. Trapp noted that the table had been reviewed by the City Attorney, and from that, the table had been further modified in some areas.

Following Commission discussion, it was moved by Commissioner M. Olson and seconded by Commissioner Paddock to recommend that requests to modify the

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 12, 2016
PAGE 3

Comprehensive Plan be subject to public hearings by both the Planning Commission and City Council.

Upon discussion, Commissioner Porter suggested that a public hearing by the Commission would be adequate. In that event, he felt that the Commission's recommendation could carry more weight at the Council level.

Commissioner Porter also noted that under a two hearing process, he felt that participants would be more inclined to attend the Council hearing, where the decision is actually made.

Commissioner Shortridge suggested that under a two hearing process, the first could create a greater interest in a subject at the Council level.

Commissioner M. Olson suggested that the second hearing at the Council level would have significant value.

Commissioner Paddock noted that although he understood the value on a two hearing process, for those who are actively involved in an issue, it can be frustrating. As an example, he cited the City's preparation of the Bluff Ordinance a number of years ago in which many hearings were held and ordinance language was changing constantly. However, he felt the two hearing process would be very beneficial in amending a document that had been approved by the City as a whole.

Following further discussion, the question was called and the vote of the Commission was as follows: ayes: M. Olson, Boettcher, Paddock, and Shortridge; nays: Ballard, Porter, and Buelow.

Vice Chair Buelow declared the motion adopted.

At this point, Jeff Miller picked up the agenda by reviewing revised form-based design standards proposed mixed used districts. These standards are reflected on Exhibit A of the Commission's permanent minutes. In this presentation, Commission discussion focused on proposed regulations that would permit front yard setbacks within proposed mixed use districts. Generally, front yards could be the same as the average of those found on a block front to a maximum of ten feet for nonresidential buildings and 20 feet for residential buildings.

Commissioners Shortridge and Porter suggested that given applications to the Central Business District, green space, although certainly, should be located in rear yards. It was noted that modified front yards setbacks would not apply to historic districts located within the Central Business District. In these cases, building would be located at the front property line for historic continuity.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 12, 2016
PAGE 4

Commissioner M. Olson suggested that the allowance of space between the front property line and the building could add value to property owners desiring to allow seating in the fronts of their buildings.

In reviewing form based standards with the Commission, Mr. Miller emphasized that this new section of the UDC will be filled with graphics serving to illustrate requirements.

Mr. Miller explained that the form based section also included standards pertaining to the development of high density residential uses within all residential districts. In these, he noted that standards were generally consistent with those pertaining to mixed use districts. Again, illustrations would be included to help describe standards.

Commissioner M. Olson noted that standards do not include requirements pertaining to pitched roof styles. The consensus of those present was that if a multiple family structure included a pitched roof, working material should be consistent with those found in surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Miller stated that he would take a closer look at this issue.

In response to a question by Commissioner Shortridge, Mr. Espinosa stated that permitted uses of mixed use districts would no longer be subject to specific lot size requirements.

In addressing the next item on the agenda, Mr. Miller stated that minimal changes are being proposed to the off street parking requirement. As applied to proposed mixed use districts, no parking requirement would apply to commercial uses where the number of dwellings exceeding 4 per property would be subject to one space per dwelling unit, beginning with the fifth unit.

At this point, Mr. Miller suggested that the Commission move into discussing the form of final downtown mixed districts.

Commissioner Shortridge stated that the present map currently shows an approximate 3 block area at the south west corner of the downtown mixed use district as being labeled either downtown fringe or R-3. Additionally, the block located westerly of this larger area, including the site of the YMCA, he has designated as downtown fringe. He subsequently made a motion to designate this approximate 4 block area as mixed use downtown core. The motion was subsequently seconded and upon discussion, Commissioner M. Olson, Porter, and Buelow noted concurrence with it. Commissioner Paddock stated that he also favored the concept in that there appeared to be no compelling reason to retain the YMCA block as fringe if three blocks easterly are designated as part of the downtown core.

When the question was called, the vote of the Commission was unanimous to accept the motion.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 12, 2016
PAGE 5

Commissioner Shortridge noted that, as currently proposed, fuel stations along with automobile sales and leasing would be permitted within both downtown core and fringe areas. Given his recollection, Commissioner Shortridge also noted that fuel stations are not subject to specific setback requirements from residential districts, auto sales and leasing enterprises are subject to 50 foot buffers.

In consideration of the previous, Commissioner Shortridge suggested that, in his opinion, fuel stations and auto sales and leasing operations were not appropriate for the mixed use downtown core area, but would be within the downtown fringe area if subject to a 150 foot buffer requirement from residential districts. Following further discussion, Mr. Shortridge presented a motion to eliminate automobile fuel stations along with sales and leasing operations from the mixed use downtown core area, and to permit these uses within mixed use downtown fringe areas if all are subject to a 150 foot setback from residential districts.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner M. Olson and when the question was called the vote of the Commission was unanimous to approve the motion.

It was noted that the previous motion would serve to create a few non conformities within the mixed used downtown core. Some of these would include the Freedom Station and Cars 'n Credit.

In addressing the definition section, Ms. Trapp noted that amendments will include the creation of new definitions needed to define terms which are currently not defined. In addressing this section, she noted that designated historic districts would be added as overlay districts. Additionally, she would be checking the definition of brewery types to make sure that they are consistent with State law.

Although not fully developed at this point, the UDC would be expanded to include landscaping standards as part of this, present standards do require that off street parking areas for more than 3 vehicles are required to be screened on each side which adjoin or face premise situated in any residential district or institutional premise by a wall or solid fence of acceptable design. This wall or fence may not be less than 4 feet or more than 6 feet in height.

Upon discussion of the previous, Commissioner Porter moved to limit the maximum height of a parking lot wall to no more than 4 feet. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shortridge and when the question was called, all but Commissioner Paddock voted for the motion. Mr. Paddock noted that although he did not necessarily feel the proposal was unreasonable, rather he was unsure what the 4 foot height would physically do in terms of preventing use of the parking lot.

In addressing sign standards, Ms. Trapp indicated that the scope of the project did not call for creating a new sign ordinance. However, she understood that some may have concerns of current restrictions.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 12, 2016
PAGE 6

Commissioner M. Olson stated that a large concern of hers relates to what happens to signs once they are abandoned. In her opinion, they should be removed immediately.

As noted by Mr. Miller, Miss Trapp stated that, as the draft UDC continues to evolve, more and more graphics, including photographs will be incorporated into it. Again, the focus of graphics will be to help better define new regulations that will come from the UDC. As such, many will be included within mixed use districts sections. Given current scheduling, she reminded the Commission that the draft UDC should be available on October 10th.

Other Business

Vice Chair Buelow stated that a slate of officers for the coming year will be created by a Nominating Committee to be appointed at the next meeting. As such, this should be an item of formal business for that meeting.

It was noted by some that they had received copies of an email from the owner of Sugar Loaf Ford expressing concern of flooding of the lower part of this property during a recent rain storm. Mr. Espinosa responded that staff was aware of the concern and was in the process of responding to it.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned.

Mark Moeller
City Planner