
CALL TO ORDER Planning Chairman, Larry McCourtie, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. January 17, 2012.

ROLL CALL we acknowledge that all members are present

Commissioners: Chairman Larry McCourtie, Claire Lackie, Terry Thompson, Rex Robbins

Absent:

Staff: City Planner, Darryl Piercy and Planning Secretary, Trisha Tolley

Quorum Established.

APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 19, AND OCTOBER 17, 2011 PC MINUTES (NOVEMBER 21, and DECEMBER 19, 2011 MEETINGS WERE CANCELLED)

Minutes of September 19 and October 17, 2011 were approved without discussion. M/S Robbins/Thompson

REVIEW OF ITINERAT MERCHANT

Darryl Piercy, City Planner noted that the committee had discussed the issues revolving around the itinerate merchant and mobile vendors in the city, and was asked to request that the city council re-open up those section of the code for further review and discussion. In December it was taken back to the council and asked for some direction on how to proceed and they agreed, with some reluctance to allow the planning commission revisit the idea and issues surrounding the itinerant merchants and mobile vendors, although they felt that they had already had a pretty lengthy discussion two years ago regarding the same topic and felt they had addressed it, but they were willing to listen to other issues that the planning commission had. Mr. Piercy passed out the existing code that was pertinent to the discussion. He didn't feel the planning commission was prepared at this meeting to discuss the matter, but would bring this up at the February meeting and talk about any specific issues or concerns about the current code and how we would change the code to address that topic. The committee agreed.

CONSIDERATION OF AMORUSO REZONE REQUEST

Amoruso's had a request to rezone the property that they plan to purchase and build a home located at 720 S Reynolds Road. A building permit application was submitted to the city for a new residence, which at that time it was noticed that the zoning was commercial zoning which was not adequate to support a construction of a residence. In further discussions it became apparent that the area where the building was to take place historically had a residential use and in fact continues to have residential use on an adjoining property of 4.7 acres, and the property that we are looking at is 4.7 acres, totaling just under 10 acres. The property was included in a block of properties that were part of an application for an annexation several years ago. Under that annexation, the entire block was rezoned to commercial. Exploring further it was found that it was not the intent to make these properties non conforming use, which is what it did. It is the belief of the staff that the property was not intended to be zoned commercial. The port has adjacent property which they intend to develop in the commercial way and its belief is that it got swept up in the whole annexation effort and it should have been zoned for residential use. The reason for annexation was to obtain city water and not to develop the property commercially. The Planning Commission members believe it would be appropriate to allow this property to revert back to a residential zone for the two 4.7 parcels that are contained in the letter and do not believe there would be any adverse happenings to any commercial development on the adjacent properties and would allow the current property owners to enjoy the benefits that they anticipated on having when annexed into the city.

Mr. and Mrs. Amoruso as well as the adjacent property owner Mrs. Meek and a representative from the Port District Mr. Beardsly, were present. In the letter that the Amoruso's submitted there was a Suburban zoning being requested which we feel that is very appropriate for the size of lot and the use intended. This matter needs to be heard by the planning commission, and their recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council, they need to take action to modify the existing zoning map and we intend to take that forward depending on the Planning Commission recommendations. It was stated that the annexation would remain the same, only the zoning would change.

The issue of water services was brought up and it was clarified that there is water at the existing residence. One of the issues is to get water to the second lot so that a new residence can be built. First we have to solve the zoning issue. We do have a document that's been prepared and reviewed by council that would allow for connection to city water in a unique fashion until such time that a main water line has come down to that location. Mr. Piercy felt that for now we believe we have a solution to provide water to the second lot that would satisfy the use that is being proposed. The second property does not have a water meter, but this agreement would allow both properties to be connected to the same water meter, or a second meter set using the same water line so that a water line would avoid having to be ran down the full length of the frontage of the Port Districts property to serve these two lots. This would utilize the existing line until the Port District develops their water system. Mr. McCourtie indicated that he had

visited with Mr. Beardsly with the Port District and let him know what the issues were; Mr. Beardsly indicated that the port would be putting in a main line down Reynolds road in the next couple of years. Mr. McCourtie also visited with Mr. Amoruso and learned what he wanted, which was to have the property rezoned as an S-1 zone. After Mr. McCourtie researched what an S-1 zoning was he thought this would be acceptable and wanted to make a recommendation to let this family tap into the existing water line so that they would be able to build their new residence. Mr. Amoruso indicated that when the new water line was put in he would tap into it and get his own meter.

Mr. Amoruso indicated that at this time he would like to get this process expedited for the fact that they have been living in a camp trailer for the last two months because of the zoning issues it is taking a lot longer than anticipated. If possible he would like to not have to go through the whole process of the public notice, if this has to happen it would be very much appreciated if they could get this in the January 23, Council meeting. Mr. Piercy indicated that we do have to go through some process. At the very latest it would be presented to the council at the February 13th meeting. Mr. Thompson was wondering if the water system needed to be a looped system. Darryl stated that it would need a looped system. The long range plan would be to have a looped system coming back down tying into the west existing cities system or back down highway 26 to his understanding.

Mr. Robbins was concerned that there were no other S-1 zones in the city and was wondering if that would be a challenge for anyone. He felt it was a good spot for the S-1 zoning being on the edge next to the county. Mr. Piercy feels that it would be appropriate zoning for this area also; it is a nice interface with the rural zone directly across from the city boundary. The comprehensive plan has provisions to allow for the Suburban levels of developments which are these one acre or greater lots. It fits and he doesn't see it as a spot zone. Mr. Beardsly thought this would be a good thing also. He felt that this would make the Port Districts transition easier. Mr. Robbins motioned that the committee approve the correction of the zoning that took place during the annexation and make it an S-1 zoning like it should have been done the first time. M/S Rex/Terry

ADJOURNMENT

Having no other business at hand Chairman Larry McCourtie asks for a motion to adjourn the meeting the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 21, 2012 M/S Thompson/Lackie

Meeting adjourned at 6:29 pm.

By: _____ Date: _____
Trisha Tolley, Planning Secretary

NOTE: These are abbreviated minutes that contain all motions and business conducted. These meetings are taped; a complete record of the minutes may be obtained by contacting the Planning Commission Office or a verbatim copy of these minutes can be ordered at the requestor's expense.