

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
FOR THE CITY OF HAYDEN, KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO**

November 2, 2020

Regular Meeting: 5:00 PM

Council Chambers

Hayden City Hall, 8930 N. Government Way, Hayden, ID 83835

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Brian Petersen called the meeting to order at 5:00pm.

ROLL CALL OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Chair Brian Petersen	Present
Commissioner Alan Davis	Present
Commissioner Benjamin Prickett	Present
Commissioner Shawn Taylor	Present
Commissioner Brandon Bemis	Present
Commissioner Mary Howard	Present
Commissioner Corey Anderson	Absent

STAFF PRESENT

Melissa Cleveland, Community Development Director
Caitlin Kling, Legal Counsel
Donna Phillips, Senior Planner

FLAG SALUTE

Chair Petersen led the flag salute.

CALL FOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Chair Petersen asked the Commission Members if there were conflicts of interest for any items on the Agenda. There were none mentioned by any of the Commissioners.

Prior to moving forward, Chair Petersen welcomed new Commission Member, Mary Howard. This is her first meeting on the Planning and Zoning Commission.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The Consent Calendar included the approval of the meeting minutes for October 19, 2020. Commissioner Taylor made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Prickett and all present were in favor. The motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING

Jackies Family Trust Annexation, PZE-20-0021 – Public Hearing opened at 5:05pm

Introduction

Donna Phillips, City Sr. Planner, presented the background. Prior to beginning, she gave the Commission handouts that were sent to the City after Public Comment was expired. On February 6, 2020, a request to annex the subject property was received by Connie Krueger, Stonehenge Development and Government on behalf of Jackies Family Trust, to be zoned Residential (R-1). On February 25, 2020, City Council heard the request and agreed to consider the annexation contingent upon three additional requirements. Existing conditions are the homes will be Single Family Residence, with approved Accessory Living Units only. The conditions from City Council were 1) Correspondence from CDA Airport regarding proposed zone designation and possible development of the property, 2) provide will serve letters for water and sewer from applicable purveyors, and 3)

provide a trip generation letter, possible transportation analysis, and mitigation requirements as necessary. The area is directly across from Atlas Elementary School, to the west, and is currently in Kootenai County jurisdiction.

Chair Petersen asked the Commission if they had any ex-parte communication with the public prior to the hearing. All members replied with, "no."

Applicant Presentation

Connie Krueger with Stonehenge Development and Government presented on behalf of her client, Jackie's Family Trust. The trustee is Jacqueline Mabrey, who resides in the City of Hayden. The property is 4.74 acres in size. She showed an aerial view of the plot, with an existing home on the property, and where the property is relative to the City Limits. The area has had quite a good amount of annexation within the last 5-15 years, with Carrington Meadows and Giovanni Estates included. The Area of City Impact map she presented showed how the area would plan for urban development and city utilities. Ms. Krueger went on to explain how the ACI agreement with the County has the ability to be adjusted as surrounding cities grow and annex more land within their boundaries. She then went on to discuss the County's updated Comprehensive Plan, which includes ACI, and the key point where it states, "*...Once annexed, consistent with the city's long range plans, the areas within this designation are ultimately expected to be served by urban services which will then facilitate its further development and urbanization.*"

Ms. Krueger went on to explain how the applicant met all of the City Council requirements, including preliminary will-serve letters based on a hypothetical development. With that, they also had a traffic study completed which showed 17 PM avg peak hour trips and 161 avg weekday trips.

In summary, the annexation:

- Is surrounded by incorporated City and unincorporated County
- Located in an area where frequent annexation activity has occurred—by geography, the highest frequency of annexation in City
- Located in an ACI
- Meets with legislative intent for an ACI in that annexation and provision of services is planned to occur
- Consistent with County's Comprehensive Plan Border designation to facilitate further development and urbanization where once annexed, it should be consistent with the City's long-range plans and served by urban services
- The County's Agricultural Zoning designation and the agricultural uses are not compatible with an urbanizing area
- Consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan Residential designation and density overlay
- Consistent with the City's R-1 zoning (which surrounds property) and is intended for stable neighborhoods of single family dwellings on smaller lots
- Consistent with legislative intent of Idaho annexation statutes in that it allows for orderly development to efficiently and economically provide tax and fee supported services, enables development of private lands to benefit from the cost-effective availability of municipal services in an urbanizing area, and equitably allocates the cost of public services in management of development on the urban fringe
- Water, sewer, stormwater and transportation infrastructure are available and have capacity
- Preliminary water and sewer Will Serve letters have been issued by the applicable agencies
- Located on an arterial road and will generate a minimal amount of vehicle trips--as such has immediate access to adequate transportation infrastructure
- The land has no environmental conditions that in development will impact the land area itself or create off-site impacts
- The School District has not commented

- Property owner has taken steps to consult with the Coeur d'Alene Airport, who has indicated that they have no objections to a future residential subdivision of the land at the density allowed by the R-1 Zone District
- Other areas of the City are not as primed for annexation
- Excellent candidate for annexation

Commissioner Taylor questioned the annexation of Bluegrass and another. Ms. Kruger confirmed that at annexation, they were annexed as R-1.

Staff Presentation

Donna Phillips, Sr. Planner presented on behalf of the City of Hayden. She discussed the background again, the Development Team and Proposal, Standards Applicable for Annexation and Standards for Approval. She also showed images looking West, North, South, and East of the property.

She went on to explain the Infrastructure Analysis. Addresses all of A-H of 11-1-1. The application is for annexation and zoning and a conceptual development plan has been discussed with respect to the trip generation letter. No formal submittals for development of the site have been received. Whatever is allowed in an R-1 Zone, would be allowed in this designation.

As for parks required, dedication of park land is not required, however, a green space tract with a 10' multi-modal path to meet the Park Strategic Plan's and the Transportation Plan's non-motorized connectivity to the Atlas Elementary School and future park area to the west on Honeysuckle Avenue shall be required at the time of development.

Sewer will back up to the H-5 Lift Station and City of Hayden has provided a Will Serve letter. In regards to stormwater, should stormwater, runoff, or surface waters be conveyed outside of the project boundaries, then stormwater easements shall be required. Potable water and fire-flow were also addressed. Ms. Phillips stated the property is within the Hayden Lake Irrigation District and Northern Lakes Fire Protection District, and a will serve letter was provided as part of the application requirements from the Hayden Lake Irrigation District. Ms. Phillips brought a public comment received earlier today to the attention of the Commission regarding water easements. There were no water easements noted by HLID at this time.

Ms. Phillips went on to say that at the time of Annexation, any dedication of right-of-way for Atlas Road shall be to a C1 typical section. At the time of Development however, the dedication of right-of-way and construction of improvements shall be in accordance with the City of Hayden Transportation Plan current at the time of the development.

A trip generation letter was provided as a requirement of the Annexation, and due to that, another will not be required upon development. Chair Peterson asked for clarification on who decided the conclusiveness of the Traffic Study that was conducted. Ms. Cleveland let it be known that it was through a discussion between her, the City Engineer and the Transportation Plan Consultant.

When the annexation came forward to City Council, it was noted that it may be in an impact area of the Airport. As such, a comment from the airport indicated there was no issue and they just request an aviation easement.

Ms. Phillips noted the Future Land Use Map and how this area does show as residential. Agency notices were sent and we received 4 responses with no comments or concerns. Per a request from the Commission, Ms. Phillips explained that an Airport Aviation Easement is a notice to the buyers that they will have fly-over, noise, and possible construction due to the airport. This is due to the Airport being in the center of town.

Public Comments received are as follows and each were entered into the record on an 8x11 sheet of paper:

- Al Beauchene – opposed, requests 6' fence at the time of development
- Milbert Rohrbach – opposed, wants to be left alone to continue farming, and is very concerned about the amount of trash caused by subdivision development and likes his community with less people. If the annexation goes through, requests a 6' fence
- Will & Kristine Thompson – opposed, farmers with composting and manure fertilizer, etc. which create odors. They are concerned about the complaints the City may receive and request landscape buffer and fence

Staff Recommended Conditions are as follows:

1. The applicant shall enter into an annexation agreement with the City and shall abide by the terms delineated therein.
2. At the time of either site and/or subdivision development the applicant shall comply with the requirements set out in the letter from the Northern Lakes Fire Protection District.
3. Grant of "Roadway, drainage, utility & snow storage" easement and dedication of right-of-way on Atlas Road in accordance with the City's adopted transportation plan shall be required at the time of annexation. Nothing shall preclude the City from requiring additional future right-of-way at the time of development.
4. The Developer shall use the City of Hayden Sanitary Sewer system to serve future development. At the time of development, sewer shall be extended to the boundaries of the property according to the sewer master plan.
5. An avigation easement shall be recorded as a condition of the annexation agreement and prior to the publication of the Annexation Ordinance as requested by the Coeur d'Alene Airport.
6. *Public Comments: 3 of the public comments requested a 6' perimeter fence and one requested landscape buffer (this condition was added after the Staff Review was written, based on comments received prior to the PZC meeting).*

Chair Petersen asked the board for any questions. None were mentioned.

Public Comment

Chair Petersen stated the rules for Public Comment.

There were none in attendance who were in favor of the project, nor neutral.

Lynelle Dehlbom 3490 W. Bean Avenue: Opposed, their property borders the western edge of the annexation. This is in an agricultural area, with fields, animals (including roosters). The neighbors are all on well systems, which brings the quality of water they use for drinking into question. She requests a fence as well, as the animals on their properties and their crops need to be protected.

Kristine and Will Thompson 3344 W Bean Avenue: Opposed, same reason as mentioned before. The land should be used as agricultural. They grow organic foods and are concerned

about sprays and the like from a subdivision bordering their property. They are also very concerned about future complaints from a subdivision. Animals are very noisy, and the smells aren't always pleasant.

No questions were brought forth from the Commission.

Rebuttal

Ms. Krueger re-stated the key concerns, being well water, 6' fences and a general opposition to this type of land use. She went on to say that her presentation was very clear about the change in the area. These are classic concerns and they recognize that. As for the fence, she is willing to discuss that with the owner and requests she has ample time to talk to them prior to the City Council hearing. The well water has her scratching her head. There is generally no impact when city water is brought in. Under Panhandle Health, they are protected as a well-head area, but they are not at that point in this development yet.

Chair Peterson closed the hearing at 5:57pm and continued with deliberations.

Commission Deliberations

Commissioner Taylor addressed the community needs, general welfare and the Comprehensive Plans. As it stands, they are asking for R-1 which would give 5 homes per acre. Residential was not paying for itself and every developer will try to pack as many people as possible into the City of Hayden. As the prairie continues to grow out, we are not going to see any sort of difference from City to City. He'd like to see another zone between R-1 and Residential-Suburban. Maybe one that allows for minimum lots of 15,000 sqft per lot. He'd like to see us differentiated. Our Comprehensive Plan has been working on the missing middle, but we're missing the boat on residential. His recommendation is to annex the property as Residential-Suburban.

Commissioner Prickett agreed with Commissioner Taylor as far as the comments were brought forward. He understands the desire to keep it more rural. Someday the prairie will fill in and you won't be able to tell the difference between Post Falls and Hayden. Making this R-S would be a nice way to make Hayden flow.

Commissioner Howard has concerns about the Agricultural to small lots. Her question is how much is actually used for agricultural? Do they spray and it affects the residences? She wants to find a resolution to dealing with these issues.

Vice-Chair Davis agreed 100% with what Commissioner Taylor said.

Commissioner Bemis also agreed with Commissioner Taylor. We are so quick to approve all of these developments, but he feels we need to have a good blend of residential types. We need to take into consideration how these small homes are going to affect the larger properties and vice versa.

Commissioner Howard added that her concern lies with going from these larger properties to the smaller ones. We are setting ourselves up for an issue. There are going to be conflicts of noise, chemicals, etc.

Chair Petersen has two questions: do we annex, and if so, which zone? He doesn't see any issue with Annexation. They are within the ACI and meet those requirements. The R-1 requested would bring in 5 per acre. With roads and ROW, the most they'd be able to do develop would be 4 per acre. He has empathy for those who commented, but they will be surrounded by the City. Not that their comments

aren't valid, but they will have these same issues with developers. Can we recommend a condition of maximum 4 homes per acre?

Ms. Kling clarified that R-1 is as it is at the time the development comes forward. The City does have the option of creating a Development Agreement asking for not more than 3 or 4 homes per acre. We have done that before. On the fence issue, it is more of a subdivision issue, not for annexation. Homes when built generally have a fence anyway, so that shouldn't be an issue. She wanted to go on record stating that.

Commissioner Howard stated she doesn't see any issue with the Annexation, but doesn't want to give a developer a "blank check" so to speak on what can be put on the land.

Chair Petersen clarified that PZC can recommend any condition we want. A motion is made, seconded, etc. It isn't a blank check, there are codes that need to be abided by. He asked the Commission if there were any objections to the annexation in question. All were in favor of annexing the property. He went on to discuss the zone in question. R-1 or R-S.

Commissioner Taylor started the conversation stating he is probably a few months behind on bringing this topic forward, especially with the Comprehensive Plan updates well under way, but he believes there should be a zone between R-S and R-1. He believes the half-acre lots are desirable and wishes to see it as R-S.

Commissioner Howard agreed and likes that buffer of R-S for this property.

Chair Petersen stated R-1, especially based on the 17 homes slated per the Traffic Study should not be much of a concern. He is okay with the zoning of R-1.

Commissioner Prickett is leaning more towards R-S. He believes it will be best for this area.

Vice-Chair Davis thinks the buffer definitely needs to be bigger than R-1 lots. R-S seems most appropriate for this part of town.

Commissioner Bemis also believes larger lots are more in favor.

Chair Petersen reiterated the popular vote between the Commissioners as R-S, giving the property approximately 6-8 homes for development.

Commissioner Taylor made a motion to approve the Annexation with a zone of Residential-Suburban, and include staff recommendations 1-5 brought forward with the Staff presentation tonight. He mentioned the added recommendation of fencing would come forward when a subdivision request is in the works. Commissioner Prickett seconded the motion. There was no further discussion.

Roll Call Vote

Chair Petersen:	No
Vice-Chair Davis:	Yes
Commissioner Prickett:	Yes
Commissioner Bemis:	Yes
Commissioner Taylor:	Yes
Commissioner Howard:	Yes

The motion passed with a 5-1 vote.

Introduction

Donna Phillips, Sr. Planner led the presentation. The workshop that was held with PZC brought forth the information for the hearing. The chapters to have amendments are Chapter 3 Subdivisions, which will have clarifying language related to submittal requirements and review requirements for subdivisions, Chapter 6 Required Subdivision Improvements, which will have the removal of Parkland dedication requirements for subdivisions in excess of 50 acres, and Chapter 10 Boundary Line Adjustments, which will include the addition of clarifying language related to timeliness of boundary line adjustments and subdivisions and remove limiting number of deflection points.

Chapter 3 revisions would be as follows:

- 12-3-2 (A) – Adds clarifying language related to the exemption of a boundary line adjustment.
- 12-3-4(A)(1) – removes the requirement that the letter must not be older than 30 days. This was the request from the water purveyors.
- 12-3-4(A)(19) – Adds language related to possible mitigation measures to address projects which may have negative impacts. This makes the Subdivision an site Plan codes synonymous.
- 12-3-4(C) - defines who shall participate in the information provided within the staff review and what items shall be within the staff review at a minimum. This would make it an encapsulated staff review.
- 12-3-4(F) – removes the City Engineer and responsible agency as being who the application must demonstrate to that the standards have been met, which will now just be the city; and removes the timeline of two years as to when infrastructure must be constructed. This is at odds with timeliness of a phased Subdivision.

Chapter 6 revisions would include 12-6-1(B)(11) – Removes the requirement for residential subdivisions greater than or equal to 50 acres to dedicate 10% of the gross area of parkland. IDWQ made a comment about this, which is not included in the packet. However, Ms. Phillips did contact them. Their concern is the City would no longer have a dedication of parkland, which is not the case. Those plans are still in the City Parks Plan, and it is still a requirement. It will just no longer be a part of this section of code.

Chapter 10 revisions will include the following:

- 12-10-1(A) – adds clarifying language with respect to how and when a boundary line adjustment can be requested.
- 12-10-2(A) – Modify the process to expedite the process for review and approval. The original Code reads to turn in the Record of Survey with utilities, the original Deeds, and Transfer Deed. Once this is submitted, our City Engineer reviews it, makes comments and then requests the Resulting Deeds. If this was requested up front, it would reduce the amount of times the City has the file on the desk for review.
- 12-10-3(A) – Remove the requirement for a maximum number of deflection points within the boundary line adjustment. This is to be more consistent with County and surrounding cities, with CDA being the only city that does have a set number.

Staff recommends 12-10-1(A) Applicability

- The provisions of this chapter establish the requirements for adjustment of common boundary lines of platted lots or legally created un-platted lots and not to lots that are being consolidated. An application for a boundary line adjustment may be submitted to adjust a boundary between adjoining lots or parcels if the proposed boundary adjustment does not

- Create any additional lots;
- Include any lots or parcels which are not legal lots, as defined by city ordinance;
- Include any lots or parcels which have completed a boundary line adjustment within the previous 365 calendar days; or
- Create a lot...

The Commission did not have any questions for Ms. Phillips.

Public Comment

Connie Krueger had comments regarding the Boundary Line Adjustment Code. This is a tool used often and for practical purposes. The issue that brought this up for the City was when someone came in and submitted very creative ways to have boundary line adjustments, but not have the requirement for frontage improvements. As drafted, the Code needs some tweaking in regards to the 365 day requirement. Sometimes there is truly a need, for example, a well-head adjustment. She feels the Community Development Director should have the authority to allow for a minor revision during that 365 day period. Ms. Krueger clarified what a requirement for a lot line adjustment would look like, in terms of a subdivision. Once they have approval and a condition for r that approval is a lot line adjustment, but it is within that 365 days, they would need the okay to do that. She used the example of Hayden Canyon. There were a lot of existing lots and they had to be creative with moving lot lines. It is a very effective tool and she wants to preserve the integrity of what is being done here. In regards to (d) Create a lot, she believes this should be worded as “contain land where a subdivision will be proposed within 3 years. What (d) is essentially stating is that an applicant would be responsible for frontage improvements. It is tied very tightly to phased sub-divisions. She also wanted to give some history on the 50 acre parkland issue. Hayden City Code used to have parkland dedication for subdivisions over 9 acres. They moved away from that, as there was no clear corollary that if an applicant is providing that parkland, they can apply for an impact fee credit to offset the cost. It is likely being brought up to eliminate because people are paying impact fees, and the City does not want to “double-dip.” Because of the lack of the code, she can see how it could be troublesome. She mentioned the Code did provide the surety that developers of large subdivisions are thinking about parkland. The core of the issue is who pays for what and what is equitable. If the City develops an aggressive parkland position strategy and start to get ahead of development, it would be okay. Her concern with eliminating this, on the private side, is that the City will lose out on significant park opportunities. Ms. Krueger suggests looking for Ordinances that may include spatial planning where the city has right of refusal on it in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and therefore has the right to purchase the land, because she is concerned the City will lose out on that. In the Park Plan, she has noticed certain quadrants where they need to be established, plus some areas that need to be annexed. She likes the idea from a legal perspective, but from a planning perspective for community, she is concerned.

Ms. Kling asked Ms. Krueger what her thoughts are on density bonuses for multiple acres developments. Some sort of incentive to set aside parkland. The City has not been consistent with the parkland dedication, which is why we are looking to change the Code. Is this something that would be welcomed, capitalized on, or another headache? Ms. Krueger stated this is definitely something she sees happening in areas where there is a lot of demand, so in major metropolitan areas, or even in Coeur d’Alene, in the waterfront areas where there is high demand. She likes the idea. Maybe an equity analysis with an impact fee credit if the developer buys it. It may be beneficial to put a group together to talk about it. One thing she sees on the development side is that people do see the benefit of open space. They want quality of life. It’s just making the tools easy to get there, and truly understanding who pays for what. Right now the Code does not work, so she appreciates what is being done, but there may be a hole. Ms. Cleveland added that she has spoken with the City of Coeur d’Alene and Post Falls, and they do not currently require tis in their Code. They use the impact fees they collect to talk with the large developers of subdivisions and get parkland from them, or purchase with the impact fees they have collected. She believes this will work for Hayden as well. There was

talk between Ms. Krueger and Ms. Cleveland about space planning, credits against their own subdivision.

Chair Petersen brought questions forward about consideration of what Ms. Krueger brought to attention. He wanted to know how the Commission should go forward as this was not information submitted with their packet. Ms. Phillips indicated Mr. Krueger's suggestions on (c) relates to a boundary line adjustment the City just did with Cricket Estates. She likes that she added the Community Development Director is able to decide if an adjustment is major or minor, as well as the phasing of subdivisions. She is okay with the layout of the suggestions Ms. Krueger brought forth. It addresses our concerns. Chair Petersen asked if the requirement of a boundary line adjustment be determined by the Community Development Director as well. It could mean different things to different people. There was discussion regarding the parkland and reiteration on the reasons for changing that portion of the code. This part of the Code is not working and needs to be amended. The big idea is to create open space that the City is not responsible for maintaining. Once the Park Plan is updated and adopted, we can then go back to the drawing boards of impact fees and create a plan that works for the City to buy parkland where it is determined in the Park Plan, or work with developers when subdivisions go in where a park should be. Four of the parks in our Park Plan are set to be requirements when those lands are annexed. Commissioner Taylor made a comment that these four parks are going to be City maintained, which will put even more burden on the tax-payers with our tax rate less than 1%.

Commissioner Howard asked for clarification on open space versus parkland. Ms. Phillips brought up an example of a new subdivision of more than 50 acres. By Code, they would have to dedicate 10% of that project to open space, or request impact fees to make up for the 10%. The issue is that our current impact fees are not enough to buy the land and develop it. There is no way to apply the subdivision code, the impact fee code and the Park Plan to work for one park, let alone five parks. In the case of Stone Creek where they didn't have the 50 acre requirement, they requested a park impact fee to make up for the 5 acre park they should have created for their community. Their HOA maintains the park, and it is a win-win for everyone. But again, money was spent when we could have provided a community park that was much bigger. Instead it became a neighborhood park just for Stone Creek. The reasoning behind a 50 acre requirement was to try to create a park big enough that we would want to spend impact fees on (if we had them) to build the park. When the City starts negotiations on a project where impact fees can be used, we run into the issue of not enough land to develop. This is why it is broken. History recapped. Commissioner Bemis added the question of if a developer could develop said park and then donate it to the City. Ms. Kling responded that each developer would need to get their own finance counsel on the issue, but the common issue is that if we require it, they do not get a tax credit for the donation. Ms. Cleveland added that she has met with a conservatory out of Spokane that runs conservation easements and their opinion is that because it is required in our Code, they cannot donate the land because there is no value. There is no incentive for the developer to do that. Ms. Kling went on to say that our impact fees just aren't feasible. The City cannot split the difference of a fee. She understands the thought but in reality, we are just shuffling the problem around. The City is open to ideas on this issue. Chair Petersen stated the opinion that we are just here to resolve step one of the problem. More steps will follow. Commissioner Taylor voiced a concern about a rush of applications while there is no park environment in the Code. Ms. Cleveland responded that it wouldn't matter because the City is in negotiations with the developer where we are seeing a lot of growth and it is part of the annexations. Ms. Kling added that the Code the current development in question is using, those conditions are already stated as a condition of approval. Ms. Cleveland noted our other large City Park will be in the Hayden Canyon development, which has already been written in to all of their agreements. She does not believe the City will be taken advantage of because it is removed. Any annexation would still have to do that.

The Public Hearing was closed by Chair Petersen at 7:05pm.

Commissioner Taylor made a motion to recommend the approval of the revisions to the Subdivision Code including language to be added based on public testimony tonight and modified according to how the Planning Department sees fit. Commissioner Howard seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Chair Petersen:	Yes
Vice-Chair Davis:	Yes
Commissioner Prickett:	Yes
Commissioner Bemis:	Yes
Commissioner Taylor:	Yes
Commissioner Howard:	Yes

The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to report.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

There was no continuing business to report.

REVIEW OF UPCOMING MEETING CALENDER AND REPORT ON COUNCIL ACTIONS

Director's Review

Ms. Cleveland would like the next PZC meeting to only include the approvals of written recommendations from tonight's meeting since a joint workshop with City Council will be on November 17. The meeting will be very quick, and only Chair Petersen would need to be in person at City Hall. All others can call in. Planning and Zoning was in agreement. She went on to discuss City Council's actions to continue deliberations on the Stone Creek North Hearing for November 17, 2020. Foy Zone Map Amendment was approved.

Planning and Zoning Commission

November 16, 2020

- Consent Calendar
- Approval of Written Recommendation - PZE-20-0021, Jackies Family Trust Annexation
- Approval of Written Recommendation - Title 12, Subdivision Regulations
- ~~Workshop Title 11, Uses in Zones and Design Standards~~


City Council Actions

November 10, 2020

- Approval of Ordinance - PZE-19-0311, Mark's Annexation
- Public Hearing – Comprehensive and Park Plan Updates
- ~~Public Hearing PZE 20-0021, Jackies Family Trust Annexation~~

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Petersen adjourned the meeting at 7:15pm.



Shannon Drappo, Commission Clerk