

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tracy Davis, Jim Herreid, Alice Thomas, Suzie Nakasian, Greg Colby, Richard Schulte and Steve Rholl

ALSO PRESENT: Community Development Director Brian O’Connell, City Planner Dan Olson, Recording Secretary Sandra Bremer

1) Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

Chair Davis called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

A motion was made by Schulte and seconded by Thomas to approve the agenda of February 4, 2010. All in favor. Motion carried.

2) Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Schulte and seconded by Rholl to approve the regular meeting minutes of the January 21, 2010. All in favor. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Rholl and seconded by Schulte to approve the minutes for the work session of January 28, 2010. All in favor. Motion carried.

3) Unfinished Business Action Items: None

4) New Business Action Items: None

5) Reports and Discussion Items:

a) Continue Review of Implementation Matrix and Draft Land Development Code

Olson reviewed his Staff report of the items that Staff was to work on from the last meeting. The creation of a “green edge” will be delayed until later so that it is done in relation to Ag, development holding, and conservation subdivisions.

The members agreed in Section 3.11.1(H)(1) that “mature trees” would be replaced by “protected trees.”

There was discussion of the ridgeline and protecting the view shed of the hill.

The members felt that Figure 3.17 was alright as proposed by Staff with the shaded streets. The members approved the proposed Table 3.11-3 for use in the LDC.

Staff proposed a definition for a “grid street” and “modified grid street” that members felt was okay. It was agreed that the following change would be made “...intersecting at *approximately* 90-degree angles,...(see Figure 6.2).” It was agreed that cropping off the far right side of the proposed figure would make it acceptable. Staff will come back with

proposed language that would allow for the integration of parks, schools, open spaces, etc. for the modified grid pattern.

The members felt that the definition of Modified Grid Street Pattern should be modified to read: “A network of streets that is similar to a grid street pattern, except that it is modified to incorporate curves in roadways or diagonally directed streets. This pattern is useful in areas where the roadway design must be sensitive to topography, existing development, other pre-existing constraints or other planned non-residential features of a subdivision (see Figure 6.4).” It was agreed that a new Section 3.11.3(A)(6) would be added as follows: “**Roadway and access offsets.** Roadways or other access points entering upon opposite sides of any given roadway shall have their centerlines located directly opposite each other as far as practical or the centerlines located shall be offset at least 150 feet for local residential streets, and at least 200 feet for all other roadways. Driveways on local streets accessing one, two, or three family residential units are exempt from this requirement.”

It was suggested that the existing residential be discussed separate from the new residential new areas. It was felt that the accessory uses should be discussed right after the residential new areas. It was agreed that the matrix would be used and the areas identified as “future” will be discussed after the “built” or “both” categories.

It was agreed that the order of discussion would be as follows: 1) R-1 R-2 R-3, N1-B, NC-F, PTA; 2) N2-B; 3) accessory uses; 4) Ag/open space; 5) commercial; 6) industrial; 7) zoning map; 8) future land use map; 9) General standards; 10) Definitions.

The members began review of the Implementation Matrix CI 1.4. Staff gave an overview of the neighborhood compatibility standards. It was agreed that in Section 3.5.2 it should apply to R1-B, R2-B, R3-B, N1-B, PTA, and NC-F districts.

There was discussion among the members about the definition of “block face.”

There was discussion of whether accessory uses should be exempted from the neighborhood compatibility standards. It was agreed that Section 3.5.3 E) should be removed. Add in the same districts in Section 3.5.4. It was agreed to delete Section 3.5.4 (B).

Colby left meeting at 8:30 p.m.

The members asked Staff to do a comparison of what is in the LDC and what is existing in the city and look at what is shown in Table 3.2.

There was a suggestion that the neighborhood compatibility standards should be combined with the pages around Section 3.2, including Table 3.2-1, through 3.2.3 and 3.5.1.

Staff will bring back some photos of various blocks that would show examples of what is existing in the community showing lot patterns, lot building examples, building height characteristics. This will then show how the regulations would apply to them. The members may discuss the lot coverage requirements in the future.

- b) Liaison reports: None
- c) Staff update on land use applications received: None
- d) Remarks by Chair: None
- 6) Adjournment:

A motion was made by Herreid and seconded by Rholl to adjourn the meeting. All in favor. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Submitted by:

Sandra Bremer
Recording Secretary