

Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting  
February 12, 1975

Present: Chairman Ross, Commissioners Cutsforth, Edgerton, Hulbert and Shaw

Also Present: Planning Consultant Edwards and Supt. of Public Works Whiteside

Absent: Commissioners Johnson and Merrill and City Attorney Bettis

The meeting was called to order at 8:03 p.m.

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on January 22, 1975, were approved as presented.

Correspondence: There was a letter from City Attorney Bettis to City Administrator Wyman stating that the New Zoning Ordinance is ready for Council review. It will probably be on the Council agenda for the February 24 workshop. Supt. of Public Works Whiteside strongly urged joint sessions for dealing with ordinances, in order to clarify the intent of the Commission. It is recommended that as many Planning Commission members as possible attend the meeting when the Zoning Ordinance is read. If the Zoning Ordinance is to be on the Council agenda before the 24th, the Planning Commission secretary will let the commissioners know. The Mobile Home Ordinance was read at the Council meeting February 10. Because there has been no representative of the Council at the Planning Commission meetings and no Planning Commissioner at the Council meetings, the Council could not be sure of the intent of the Commission with regard to certain sections of the ordinance. Therefore, after making several changes, the Council decided to send the ordinance back to the Planning Commission. Chairman Ross directed the secretary to write a letter to the City Council, requesting the appointment of a new liaison officer from the Council, so that the Council will know what the Planning Commission is doing.

Zone Variance, Margaret L. Page, 310 N.E. 4th Avenue: The request is for a 3'3" variance on the side yard setback to construct a carport. Planning Consultant Edwards presented the Planners' findings, with a recommendation for approval of the variance. Chairman Ross called for proponents. Mrs. Page stated that they need the carport very badly. Chairman Ross called for further proponents. There being none, he called for opponents. There being none, the public hearing was closed. Mrs. Page was asked what sort of structure this is to be and replied that it is to be just a roof with support posts and no enclosed storage area. Commissioner Shaw moved that the zone variance for 3'3" into side yard setback be approved. Commissioner Edgerton seconded the motion. Planning Consultant Edwards asked that a statement that one reason for approval is that this entire area was substantially developed under the old ordinance, which allowed a five foot setback, be included in the motion. Commissioners Shaw and Edgerton concurred, and the motion was passed unanimously. The secretary was directed to write a letter to the applicant so that she will have an official record of the action of the Planning Commission.

Budget: The City Administrator would like the City to hire a full-time planner and would like to know whether the Commission feels that there is a need for a full-time planner or whether the part-time help which the City now has is sufficient. This was discussed at some length, and the secretary was directed to write a letter to Mr. Wyman, stating that it is the general consensus of the Planning Commission that the services received from Edwards Planning

Planning Commission  
February 12, 1975  
Page 2

Consultants is quite satisfactory and that, at this time, this is the most efficient, least expensive, way to get the work done. The Commission feels that city planning should be continued in the same manner, and that the \$3,600 figure for planning consultants' fees should be increased to \$6,000 (this is for work done by the consultants for the Planning Commission). The Planning Commission will back up any efforts to continue any on-going comprehensive plan efforts until the plan is completed.

Supt. of Public Works Whiteside asked if the Commissioners had any specific requests for aids to put into the budget. Chairman Ross asked that an overhead projector be purchased and was told that the City has one which is available upon request.

Further Business: Mr. Whiteside brought up a question regarding the handling of fencing in the Zoning Ordinance. A construction company in town has been given notice to clean up or fence in his property. He has elected to fence the area and would like to put up an 8-foot sight obscuring fence in a front yard setback, since a 6-foot fence would be easy for children to climb over. Since a building in this zone can be built up to the property line, why can't he put in an 8-foot fence instead of a 6-foot one? This is not specifically covered in the Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Ross directed Planning Consultant Edwards to look into this problem of interpretation for fencing requirements, particularly for industrial and commercial zones. This interpretation should be in the form of a policy statement from the Commission as an amendment to the ordinance.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Merrie Dinteman  
Merrie Dinteman, Secretary