

Planning Commission
February 7, 2005

Chairperson Schneider called the regularly scheduled meeting to order at 7:10 PM.

The following members were present: Lisa Cramer, James Montgomery, Sandy Ramsey, Cindy Maas, Ken Smith and Cristi Boyle-Barrett. Also in attendance were staff members Gwen Rousseau, Dan Staley and City Administrator Dave Schmidt.

Maas stated she is really frustrated with what we are doing. She feels like we kind of don't know what we are doing. She is to the point of washing her hands from this whole thing. She would like a little more direction from Administrator Schmidt and Staley. She feels we need to get this moving and not hash over every little item. Administrator Schmidt asked her to be more specific. Maas stated last meeting there was discussion regarding designs; maybe we should have had more pictures for examples. Regarding the front, rear and side yard setbacks, give pros and cons. She was very frustrated when she asked for Administrator Schmidt's opinion at the last meeting and he didn't have one. Administrator Schmidt stated she is right he doesn't give his opinion because it is up to the Planning Commission. She would like to know how the rest of the commission feels. Smith stated he agrees in some ways, however, sometimes it does take longer to get everyone on the same page.

Smith asked if Maas was able to speak to her roofer regarding the pitch of roofs. Maas stated she had not but will discuss this issue later in the meeting. Montgomery asked if everyone was able to read the handout that Rousseau sent. Schneider stated what it basically says is we can't make any rules singling out manufactured homes. Any rules we make would apply to all homes. We can change the pitch of the roof but it would have to apply to all homes. Maas stated she feels a 3:12 pitch is too flat. Discussion ensued. Boyle-Barrett stated our housing element addressed the fact that affordable housing needs to be included and in order to keep the costs of housing down, we need to have lower standards such as the 3:12 pitch. It was decided by the Planning Commission to have the pitch of roofs at 3:12.

Smith moved to approve the minutes of the February 3, 2005 commission meeting. Ramsey seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Zoning Code:

The front porch encroachment and rear yard patio cover and deck encroachment will be consistent through out the code. The other consistent policy will be for the maximum height of accessory structures (in all sections 4.B & E. need to be combined with new language). Duplex dwelling standards in all residential zones need to be changed to single car garage rather than two-car garage.

MDR-8 Zone:

3.D.) There was discussion about the side yard setbacks in the MDR-8 Zone. It was decided on by the commission to have them 5 feet on both sides with a total of 10 feet.

Need to add a similar provision to the MDR-8 Zone for senior housing with a minimum square foot lot size of 2,000 square feet.

5.) Should read: each duplex dwelling shall have an attached or detached single car enclosed garage per unit and no more than one duplex dwelling may be constructed upon any lot, regardless of the size of that lot. This needs to be changed in all the residential zones.

HDR Zone:

1.A.1.) Should read, for multiple-family dwellings and duplex dwellings, the minimum lot size shall be five thousand (5,000) square feet except as permitted within a Planned Unit Development or Clustered Housing Development.

1.A.2.) Should read, for senior citizen housing, the minimum lot size shall be two thousand (2,000) square feet except as permitted within a Planned Unit Development or Clustered Housing Development.

1.B.3.) Should read, for senior citizen housing, the maximum lot coverage of the primary dwellings unit(s) shall be seventy (70) percent. The maximum of all impervious coverage, including driveways and sidewalks shall be eighty-five (85) percent.

3.D.3.) For senior citizen housing, fifteen (15) feet.

Administrator Schmidt stated he would like to add provisions into the code regarding the off street parking. It is middle of the line code, not too restrictive and not too lenient. It was the commission's consensus to add it.

NMU- Neighborhood Mixed Use:

Intent and Purpose: There was a long discussion regarding the density for residential and whether or not to require a certain percentage of the buildings has to be commercial so we don't just get high density residential. Possibly add a condition that the ground floor has to be commercial or as discussed having a certain percentage. Dan and Gwen will have new wording to have thresholds on the residential density and making sure commercial gets added.

1.A.1.) Should read, for single family dwellings, the minimum lot size shall be five thousand (5,000) square feet except as permitted within a Planned Unit Development or Clustered Housing Development.

1.A.2.) Should read, for multiple-family dwellings and duplex dwellings, the minimum lot size shall be five thousand (5,000) square feet except as permitted within a Planned Unit Development or Clustered Housing Development.

1.A.3.) Should read, for senior citizen housing, the minimum lot size shall be two thousand (2,000) square feet except as permitted within a Planned Unit Development or Clustered Housing Development.

1.B.3.) Need to make this consistent with the HDR zone.

3) Commercial setbacks will be 0 feet all the way around (front, side and rear); Residential will be the same as HDR.

Final discussion on Central Commercial:

There was a large discussion at the last meeting regarding the setbacks for the Central Commercial zone. After another lengthy discussion the commission's consensus setbacks are: Front – 20 feet, Side – 0 feet, corner – 0 feet and rear – 10 feet.

Transportation Element:

The commission had a discussion on the street widths for the local access streets. Staff is recommending a 60 foot right of way on local access. Rousseau recommends a smaller street width on the local access because it slows down the traffic. Her recommendation is for a 28 foot road width with parking on both sides; this would then make it a 14 foot wide travel lane. Administrator Schmidt stated you need a minimum of 20 feet of unobstructed access for emergency vehicles. If you have a 28 foot road, you could only have parking on one side of the street. In order to have parking on both sides, the minimum width would be 32 feet. These regulations can be further discussed within the subdivision code. Rousseau stated the question is whether or not we want to have these regulations in the comprehensive plan and just leave it in the public works design guidelines. Administrator Schmidt wants the commission to be advised if it goes in the public works guidelines, it will not come back to the Commission, it will go to the Council. It was the commission's decision to leave this in with a 60 foot right of way and adding an exception clause for PUD's and subdivisions.

Administrator Schmidt stated we have advertised on the Public hearing for the Transportation Element and the Zoning Code only.

The next meeting will be February 15, 2005 at 6:00 PM.

With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 9:59 PM.