Members present: Rolf Hafslund, Gene Flynn, Jeanne Marnoff, Lance Schmitt, and Sally Schultz
Absent: Tom Sand and Jeff Will
Staff present: Corrin Wendell, Senior Planner, Emily Bodeker, Planning Intern and Joanne Foust, Consulting Planner
Others Present: Thom Boncher and three others

1.0 Call to Order

Vice Chair Gene Flynn called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order at: 6:30 p.m.

2.0 Adopt Agenda

Motion by Marnoff, seconded by Schmitt to adopt agenda as presented. With all in favor, the motion carried 5-0.

3.0 Approval of Minutes

A. February 12, 2013 Regular Meeting Minutes
Motion by Hafslund seconded by Marnoff to approve the February 12, 2013 meeting minutes as presented, the motion passed 5-0.

B. February 26 Special Meeting Minutes
Motion by Schmitt seconded by Schultz to approve the February 26, 2013 special meeting minutes as presented, with all in favor the motion passed 5-0.

4.0 Public Hearings

5.0 New Business

A. Zoning Code Draft

Foust introduced the Zoning code draft to the Planning Commission. She explained that staff has been bringing sections and presented a DRAFT zoning code for their review. She noted the underlined text indicates new text or existing text moved to a new location. Strikethrough text indicates text to be removed and highlighted areas are informational notes. Wendell went through sub packet B in their PC packet which were City Code items affected by the proposed changes in the zoning code.

Commissioner Hafslund made a suggestion that the Planning Commission shouldn’t act as the Board of Adjustment and appeals, Planning Commission can gather data but Council should take action.
Staff responded that they can make those changes so that item reads the correct way and Planning Commission remains in an advisory role.

Hafslund also asked staff about the R-O-W width change from 50-60 ft to 24ft.

Staff answered that they made changes for consistency but they will check the 24ft with the City Engineer.

Foust went through the next sub packet that detailed information that the zoning code could potentially include. The sections Foust went through were:

Satellite Dishes:
Hafslund asked about number 4 dealing with limiting multi residential buildings with satellite dishes to only having two. He didn’t want to limit the number of dishes in case building owners don’t provide tenants with cable. Staff suggested changing the language to Single Family Residential.

Residential Pools:
Staff suggested moving the definitions of residential pools into the definition section to remain consistent. Hafslund also suggested removing therapeutic from the definition of spa.

Home Occupations:
Foust explained that staff explained that this section could be an individual section in the zoning code instead of having home occupations under each residential section in the zoning code. The proposed language broke home occupations into two different types, permitted home occupations and special home occupations. Schultz suggested changing the number of children permitted in a home day care to the number that is allowed through the licensing process. Hafslund also suggested that staff include something about licensing being required if necessary.

Towers:
Intern Bodeker suggested including language or a section about wind mills or wind turbines. Hafslund also suggested including information on solar power requirements and regulations.

Driveway Access Points:
Staff noted that there had been some requests and language on number of driveways/access points was not clear. Staff suggested limiting number of curb cuts for single family use unless it meets setback requirements, access to major roads, and impervious surface coverage.

Wendell went through packet D which looked at the layout and the Table of Contents. She noted that staff suggested including a table of residential setbacks and requirements to make that section of the zoning code more user friendly and visual.

Foust also discussed removing the Rural Residential section of the City’s Zoning Code. The Comprehensive Plan Map has guided existing RR district properties to transition into the R-1 Single Family district. When these properties are rezoned, the RR district section of the zoning code would no longer be utilized and will then be removed as the City would not have any RR properties remaining in the City.

Wendell explained that the schedule of the Zoning Code is:
- Draft to City Council on April 1st to review
- Clean Copy to Planning Commission for April Meeting
6.0 Old Business

A. Chapter 11 Zoning Map Amendment to R-3 District

At the February 12, 2013 meeting Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to accept input on amendments to the Zoning Map to rezone the following parcels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PID Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>229180090</td>
<td>720 Syndicate St</td>
<td>I-1, Light Industrial</td>
<td>R-3 Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229180100</td>
<td>716 Syndicate St</td>
<td>I-1, Light Industrial</td>
<td>R-3 Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229180110</td>
<td>900 Syndicate St</td>
<td>I-1, Light Industrial</td>
<td>R-3 Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the hearing Planning Commission reviewed a letter from Union Pacific Railroad noting they felt the proposed residential zoning was in conflict with the adjacent industrial zoning and the safety of residents. The Planning Commission tabled the action to gather more information. Staff brought the item to the Safety Committee on February 26, 2013 and discussed Union Pacific’s concerns. The safety committee found the parcels to be sufficient distance from the railroad ROW, but recommended the zoning ordinance to include a 100’ setback in residential districts from the railroad ROW for properties developed after April 2013.

Foust noted that the response from the railroad indicated that they do not have a suggested setback and believe it’s contrary to policy to have a RR next to a residential zone.

The Planning Commission discussed and believed that a 100’ buffer would affect a lot more areas in town and that 100’ may be too restrictive. The Planning Commission agreed they were not in favor of a buffer from the railroad.

*Motion Hafslund to rezone the following parcels (229180090, 229180100, 229180110) to R-3 to conform with the comprehensive plan, and to look at this area in the future comprehensive plan updates to see if R-3 is the right residential zone. Second by Schmitt with all in favor the motion passed 5-0.*

7.0 Planners Report

Next regular meeting April 9, 2013

8.0 City Council Member Update

(absent)

9.0 Commissioner Report

No report.
10.0 Adjournment
Member Marnoff made a Motion, Schultz seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m. The Motion was approved unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,
Emily Bodeker, Planning Intern