

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

July 11, 2024

City Hall, Council Chambers

749 Main Street

6:30 PM

Call to Order – Vice Chair **Moline** called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM.

Roll Call was taken, and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Jeff Moline, Vice Chair
Debra Baskett, Secretary
Cullen Choi
Jennifer Hunt
Jonathan Mihaly

Commission Members Absent: Steve Brauneis, Chair
David Bangs

Staff Members Present: Amelia Brackett, Senior Planner
Matt Post, Senior Planner
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve the agenda was moved by **Baskett**, seconded by **Choi**, and adopted by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes for the March 2024 meeting was moved by **Choi**, seconded by **Baskett**, and adopted by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

- a) **Minor Subdivision and Easement Vacation – 171-187 Harper Street:**
Consideration of Resolution 7, Series 2024 regarding a recommendation to City Council to adjust a lot line and associated easements between 171 and 187 Harper Street.

Choi noted that he lived in the same neighborhood as the applicant, but did not feel that this would be a conflict of interest or that it would impair his judgement.

Staff Presentation:

Brackett introduced the presentation for the proposed plat amendment and easement vacation. The proposal was to change the existing lot boundary to align with the vacated water easement. She noted that the requested modification was for a smaller lot size than was required for the Residential Medium zoning district.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of Resolution 7, 2024 with no conditions.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Mihaly asked whether other utilities would be affected.

Brackett said no, only the ones that ran along the existing property line would be affected.

Applicant Presentation

Thomas Langer, non-resident, was the owner of the affected property. He spoke to the history of the diagonal property line, and noted that there had been an agreement between the property owners to make the existing lots rectangular in 1977. He said that the diagonal property line was only discovered by the current owners after their neighbors found that there was an easement running through their property when they were planning an addition to the house. The proposed property line had been the de-facto property line for at least 45 years.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

Joel Hays, resident, was the adjacent neighbor to the applicant. He was in support of the application. He noted that they did not notice that this was an issue until they talked to an architect about a proposed extension. He said that the property transaction had been done properly, but that the City did not properly record the transfer of land between the two lots.

Discussion by Commissioners:

Choi said that he appreciated the support from the applicant's neighbor, and said that he was in support of the application.

Baskett said that she was in support.

Hunt said that she was in support.

Mihaly said that he was in support, and noted that it would not have an impact on the neighborhood.

Moline said that he was in support.

Motion to approve Resolution 7, Series 2024 was moved by **Choi** and seconded by **Mihaly**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

b) Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Final Plat – 421 and 533 East

Street: Consideration of Resolution 8, Series 2024, regarding a recommendation to City Council for a final PUD and final plat to allow 21 townhomes and 15 single family homes at 421 and 533 East Street.

Staff Presentation:

Post introduced the presentation for the final plat, PUD and easement vacation. He noted that there had not been any significant changes between the preliminary and final PUD processes. He covered requested waivers, and explained why staff felt that they were reasonable. He also outlined proposed design and layout of the development.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of Resolution 8, Series 2024.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Mihaly asked what pedestrian access would look like, and whether there would be a standard width sidewalk on East St.

Post said that at least a 5 foot wide side walk was planned, though it could be up to 6 feet wide.

Mihaly asked whether access to downtown would be dependent on walking down East and Pine Streets.

Post said yes.

Hunt asked to confirm that there not be any egress to the west side of the development due to the BNSF railway.

Post confirmed this.

Mihaly said that his main concerns were around pedestrian access to the site, particularly from downtown and to nearby parks and open space.

Hunt asked whether the proposal would be similar to the existing Clementine and Sunnyside developments.

Post said yes.

Choi asked if staff could highlight the changes from the preliminary plat and PUD.

Post said that the changes were largely to the single family homes, specifically the arrangement of type 1 versus type 2 designs for said homes. He deferred to the applicant on the proposed changes to the fencing.

Moline asked about the timing of City Council collecting the inclusionary zoning fee-in-lieu.

Post noted that City Council had approved the fee-in-lieu with the preliminary application, but he would have to confirm exactly when the fee would be collected.

Applicant Presentation:

Paul Norquist, non-resident, highlighted the changes that had been made since the preliminary application. He said that the new “Type 2” single family dwelling was intended to be an aging-in-place home with accessible entry. He noted that there had been strong market interest in this type of housing unit. He also noted that the fence had been changed from a privacy fence to a wired fence. Regarding the sidewalks, he said that the proposed sidewalk was to be a City standard detached sidewalk, and that there would be a provision for future pedestrian access to Pine Street Plaza if it were to be developed. Finally, he also said that the height waiver was necessary due to the provision for the ADUs in the townhome units.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

Baskett asked which units would have provisions for the inclusion of ADUs.

Norquist said that the gabled form townhome units were the ones that could allow for an ADU.

Baskett asked about proximity of visitor parking.

Norquist pointed out where the visitor parking was to be located.

Moline asked why the applicant chose a single family dwelling and townhome model rather than apartments or larger buildings.

Norquist said that this was initially considered, but that the density allowance meant that it would not be viable without a density waiver.

Jesse Truman, non-resident, part of the owner group, said that the existing zoning and density rules would have limited them to a cul-de-sac with only 10 detached single family dwellings, and that anything more required a density waiver.

Hunt asked about the applicant’s intended market for the homes.

Truman said that they were aiming to appeal to a wide variety of potential customers.

Mihaly asked whether there were any historic mines that overlapped with the development site.

Norquist said that there had been mines on the site historically, but they did not pose a risk to the site due to their depth.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Staff Closing Statement:

Post noted that the required width of a detached sidewalk was 5 feet, that the required width for a treed lawn was 8 feet, and that the sidewalks directly north and south of the property were attached sidewalks.

Discussion by Commissioners:

Hunt said that she appreciated the creativity in the varying designs and types of the housing. She was in favor.

Mihaly said that he was conflicted about the proposal due to the limited pedestrian access, though he acknowledged the limitations of the site. He disagreed with the rationale that less open space was necessary due to the surrounding parkland. He was concerned that the busy streets nearby could lead residents to drive to the parks rather than simply walking. He thought that it would be positive for downtown, however, and he also appreciated that it would create new affordable housing units.

Moline noted that even though there was a park not too far away, the railroad acted as major barrier.

Choi said that he liked the final application more than the preliminary application. He said that he liked the diversity in housing types. He noted that each house would still have its own backyard, so he was less concerned about access to open space. He thought that it was a good development, and was in support.

Baskett said that she was in support. She particularly appreciated the added diversity of housing stock for the City. She wished that there could be better pedestrian access to the site, though she acknowledged the challenges in allowing for this.

Moline said that he was in support.

Motion to approve Resolution 8, Series 2024 was moved by **Hunt** and seconded by **Baskett**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – INFORMATION ITEM

a) Comprehensive Plan Update – project status informational update

Brackett provided an informational update on the status of the Comprehensive Plan. She directed all comments from Commissioners to Planning Manager Jeff Hirt.

There was a discussion about the public outreach being conducted for the Plan.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None were heard.

STAFF COMMENTS

None were heard.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Choi**, seconded by **Mihaly**, and adopted by voice vote.

The Commission adjourned at 7:41 pm.