

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION**

January 28, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gil Ning, Ron Rehm, Mark Weaver, Jean Roberts, Grant Mason, Sheree Brownson and Kyle Adams

MEMBERS ABSENT: Fred Seling and Jackie Middleton

STAFF PRESENT: Andrew Dutton

I. MINUTES

Ron Rehm moved, Gil Ning seconded, to approve the Minutes of December 17, 2014 as received. Motion carried.

II. CONDITIONAL USE

Application #CU-379. Khurram Shamsi, representing the Hartley Company, is requesting conditional use approval for a public transportation terminal at 310 South Market Street in a C-4 (Central Business) District.

The public hearing for #CU-379 was held at the December 17th Commission meeting.

Prior to the January 28, 2015 meeting, the applicant withdrew the request.

III. FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Application #SP-584. Jeremy Fry of Cypress Engineering for Xcess Limited, is requesting final development plan approval for an 11,900-sq. ft. storage building at 789 Industrial Boulevard in an M-2 (General Manufacturing) District.

Jeremy Fry, Cypress Engineering, representing Xcess Limited, stated they wished to construct a new, 70' x 170' storage facility on their property. Mr. Fry stated currently, there were two identical buildings on the property.

Mr. Weaver questioned if he was aware of Staff's comments regarding the request and if they were problematic. Mr. Fry stated he was aware of Staff's comments, and indicated that the only issue may be in combining the lots. Mr. Fry indicated he had not yet spoken to the property owner on combining the lots, but that he did not feel it would be an issue.

Ron Rehm moved to grant application #SP-584 of Jeremy Fry, Cypress Engineering, for Xcess Limited, for final development plan approval for an 11,900-sq. ft. storage building at 789 Industrial Boulevard in an M-2 (General Manufacturing) District contingent upon the applicant either combining the two parcels into one single parcel or receiving a variance from Section 1143.04 regarding side setbacks.

Mark Weaver seconded the motion.

Grant Mason voted yes.

Sheree Brownson voted yes.

Kyle Adams voted yes.

Gil Ning voted yes.

Ron Rehm voted yes.

Mark Weaver voted yes.

Jean Roberts voted yes.

Motion carried by a 7-2 vote.

IV. **MISCELLANEOUS**

Mr. Ning noted that, relating to CU-379, there were buses going in/out of the site currently and that the U-Haul operation was gone. Mr. Dutton stated because people who were using the bus system were coming in/out of the convenience store and not purchasing anything, they no longer wished to move forward with having the terminal operate from the property. Mr. Dutton stated that, relating to the U-Haul business, the operation would be re-established within the next couple of months.

Ms. Roberts stated she had discussion with many of the property owners relating to the Chase Properties request, and she agreed that the signage the applicant posted was difficult to read. Ms. Roberts stated people did not necessarily read the legal ads in the Daily Record, but felt the existing notification timeline was fine.

Mr. Weaver questioned why development plans did not require a notification to be published in the newspaper. Mr. Dutton stated for variances and Code amendments, the applicant was asking to deviate from the adopted Code; conditional uses were special uses. Development plans were such that they were for permitted uses and all of the regulations were typically met (or a variance was needed which required a public hearing).

Mr. Dutton stated the cost of the signs needed to be taken into consideration in addition to Staff's time to get notices to the residents. Mr. Dutton noted that information was posted on the City's website. Ms. Roberts suggested posting notices on Facebook or sending a separate mailing with water bills. Mr. Dutton stated the Code required, for development plans, that one sign be placed on the property for every 300' of frontage; the maximum size of sign was 3' x 4'.

Mr. Ning stated he felt a definition should be made between a public *hearing* and a public *meeting*. Mr. Ning stated for City Council meetings, people who wished to address Council had to sign up prior to the meeting.

Mr. Ning stated he could not recall, other than with Chase Properties, where the public did not feel they had an adequate opportunity to speak on a development which was presented

to the Commission and felt the Chase Properties request was more of an isolated case. Mr. Rehm stated he felt that it was. Mrs. Roberts questioned whether more could be done to get public input for larger developments.

Mr. Rehm stated short of the signs for development plans being larger, he was not sure what else Staff could do to bring awareness. Mr. Rehm noted that the City was currently working on making its website more user friendly. Mr. Rehm stated there had to be a limit to the number of letters Staff should send out. Mrs. Roberts again suggested a periodic mailing in water bills or that once the City re-launched its website, that a notice is given at that time to help people find information. Mr. Dutton indicated that residents could call or send an e-mail to City Hall and be directed to the appropriate department to obtain information.

Mr. Weaver stated he agreed with a larger sign, especially in a commercial area, and to make the website as user-friendly as possible. Mr. Weaver stated he felt periodically putting in information with the utility bills was a good option as well. Mr. Weaver stated, however, that people did not pay attention to them *until* they were really upset about something, so there was no real way to guarantee that it would not happen again.

Mr. Dutton stated Staff would need to raise its fees if larger signs were used. Mr. Dutton stated currently the cost, per sign, was around \$20, and that 3' x 4' signs were near double that. Because of the lot frontage, Chase also had to place 3-4 signs on their property. Mr. Weaver stated he felt that 1 larger sign would be better than 3 smaller signs. Mr. Rehm asked Staff to provide the Commission as to the cost of public meeting signage based on size.

Mr. Weaver stated at the beginning of Planning Commission meetings, he felt that there should be an explanation to the public that once a public hearing was closed, they would lose their opportunity to speak. Mr. Weaver stated he felt that would provide clarity "right up front". Mr. Ning questioned if a sign-up sheet would be helpful which would also help to keep things in order.

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Jean Roberts, Chairman

Laurie Hart, Administrative Assistant