

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tracy Davis, Alice Thomas, Jim Herreid, and Richard Schulte

MEMBERS ABSENT: Suzie Nakasian, Steve Rholl, and Vacant Seat

ALSO PRESENT: Betsey Buckheit, City Planner Dan Olson, Recording Secretary Sandra Bremer

1) Continue review process for the draft Land Development Code

Chair Davis called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and began the discussion of the Land Development Code where the Commission left off from the last meeting.

There was discussion of the language on Attachment 1, page 119, (b) and clarifications were made. It was questioned if there are not four homes on a block and the lots are wide, there should be a distance designation on each side of the property instead of number of adjacent homes.

There was discussion on page 122 of Attachment 1 about (c) Garage Massing and what the proportion should be. The intent was to allow a two car garage and maintain a percentage of the home facing the front street but also to allow a three car garage if the home was large enough to accommodate it. It was agreed that staff would revise this language to meet the intent.

A motion was made by Thomas and seconded by Herreid to amend Attachment 1, page 121, (3) Building Height and Massing by deleting (c). Schulte voted no. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Thomas and seconded by Schulte to amend Attachment 1, page 121, to delete (4) Front Porches. Herreid voted no. Motion carried.

Section 3.5.5

It was felt there needed to be a purpose statement for the PTA district. Thomas felt that this area and what might be built in the PTA could be so different from one structure to another that it would not serve well to have regulations for every scenario that could come up. She felt minimal regulations should be done and a stronger review process. Each structure type should have different review processes.

Olson felt that language could be written that in addition to Article 5 the following standards needed to be met and then list the standards that were felt as necessary.

Thomas felt that there needed to be a parking plan required for the college buildings.

It was agreed that in Attachment 1, page 123, (3) would be deleted.

Thomas felt that there should be standards to address lighting coming from inside of a building to the outside. Staff will research to see if there is language that can be used to address this. She also questioned if there was language regarding the blocking of light. It was agreed in Attachment 1, page 123, to delete (C)(3). She also questioned if there was a section regarding loading docks that may face residential uses. Staff will note where these issues are addressed in the LDC and review at the next meeting.

Staff was asked to define the terms adjacent and facing in regards to the PTA area. Is it referring to buildings facing the college zone?

It was agreed that the accessory structures needed to be reviewed in regards to built areas even if it means they would have to review it again with regards to the unbuilt areas of the city. The members were asked to read section 2.10 for discussion at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Submitted by:

Sandra Bremer
Recording Secretary