

July 7, 2020

7:00 p.m.

Planning Department
Council Chambers

Notice: Due to Governor Little's proclamation on March 19, 2020 and the Stay-At-Home Order given on March 25, 2020, the doors to the meeting were locked, but notice was given to the public on how to participate via any of the following ways: Submit comments in writing; participate via internet through a Webex meeting; participate via phone through Webex meeting; and watch the meeting via live stream on the City's website.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Natalie Black, Joanne Denney, Gene Hicks, Brent Dixon, George Morrison.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Arnold Cantu, Lindsey Romankiw, Margaret Wimborne

ALSO PRESENT: Planning Director Brad Cramer; Assistant Planning Directors Kerry Beutler; Brent McLane; Brian Stephens; Naysha Foster and interested citizens.

CALL TO ORDER: Natalie Black called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

CHANGES TO AGENDA: None.

MINUTES: The Minutes for June 2, 2020 were tabled to be revisited at the next meeting. Dixon requested a re-listen to Item 4 to include additional comments he had.

1. PLAT 20-019: FINAL PLAT. Clay Subdivision Division 1.

Applicant: Barry Whitson, Keller Associates, 3153 McNeil Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

Whitson indicated that this is a one lot subdivision plat that has come to P&Z before but then it got tabled at the owners request and then they missed their time frame. They are now bringing this back to P&Z for approval to move forward to City Council.

Beutler presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Dixon asked how come the land on either side is developed, but not platted. Beutler indicated that the land was developed in the 50's and 60's and platting was likely not required at that time. Beutler stated that the area along Clay is more historic type development and the newer development has occurred elsewhere and the City's current standard is to require platting. Dixon asked if the applicant is required to put in Curb and gutter and sidewalk on his side of the street. Beutler indicated that they do a full width street with curb and gutter on both sides to manage storm water and then sidewalk on the applicant's side of the street and the east side of Clay would be the responsibility of the properties as they redevelop. Dixon asked about Clay and Burgess before the asphalt and whether they are doing sidewalk further down or just curb and gutter and paving to the existing asphalt on Burgess.

Barry Whitson indicated that he knows they are improving Clay from the north end of his property to the existing asphalt on Burgess, but he cannot recall the rest of the details, but would assume they are only doing sidewalk in front of their property.

Dixon stated that the final plat seems to be in order and makes sense.

Dixon moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Final Plat for Clay Subdivision Division 1, Hick seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. PLAT 20-019: FINAL PLAT: Fairway Estates Division 25.

Applicant: Kevin Alcott 101 Park, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Walcott explained that the final plat is in accordance with the preliminary plat and there shouldn't be any issues.

Hicks asked if Walcott was developing in littler chunks to avoid putting in a road to the Lewisville Highway. Alcott explained that Hicks is mistaken and he is just trying to stay in business and they develop in chunks that make sense to him from a business perspective and they were able to stay solvent during 2008 and they aren't going to change and there is nothing in the ordinance that requires them to do anything different than what they are doing.

Dixon asked about the elimination of lots and asked if it has been done in the last divisions, and asked Walcott to comment on what that change says as far as the market goes. Alcott stated that they have eliminated lots and that is driven by the City Ordinance that allows them to make lots bigger after the preliminary plat, but difficult to make the lots smaller after the preliminary plat, so at the preliminary plat they do the lots as small as they would ever want them, but typically they do not build them that small. Alcott stated that the market today is pushing for larger lots and development costs are significantly higher, so the lot size they have is the happy medium.

Stephens presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Dixon indicated that he does not recall the agreement to develop another 120 lots before the bridge has to be built.

Stephens stated that he doesn't have the exact details, but that Alcott pays a certain amount as each lot develops.

Kevin Alcott indicated that it is all part of the preliminary plat process they went through last year and there was a quasi-agreement, and a condition put on him by the City that they could build 120 more lots before the bridge was required and that was based on the review of the traffic counts, and the fire department has restrictions on them too.

Dixon asked if the 120 lots are single family lots because there is 2 large lots that are for possible multi-family or non-residential development being zoned R3A and R2 and the island is zoned R-2. Dixon wanted to know what counts as the 120 lots. Dixon asked if the two large lots can be added before the bridge is put in.

Alcott stated that it was very explicit in the hearings that the R2 and R3A would not be developed prior to the bridge being installed. Alcott stated that it is single family dwellings.

Stephens stated that what Alcott is stating is correct.

Dixon stated that in the future he would like them to clarify the agreement, then the question won't come up again.

Hicks suggested that they go back and dig up the minutes of the meeting last summer, because Hicks remembers the agreement different.

Cramer filled in facts on the agreement. Cramer indicated that in looking at the minutes the reason that the Commissioners might not remember the 120 lot number, because that was not the P&Z recommendation. P&Z recommended to condition the plat based upon some number of lots at which point the bridge would be triggered and that number was determined by the engineering department so when the next final plat came through with Division 23, the Development Agreement had the Engineering Department determine it was 120 lots before there would be the threshold that that the bridge would need to be built, so with each subsequent development agreement the development agreement specifies how many lots are left after that division until the bridge is built. Cramer stated that in Division 23 the Development Agreement specifies that because there were 120 lots that could be built and that division had 25 lots on the plat, it specifies that there is a balance of 95 lots before the bridge will be required. Cramer stated that it is being monitored with each division of the final plat that comes through.

Dixon reiterated in his own words what Cramer explained.

Cramer added that the motion from P&Z also conditioned that the bridge be built prior to the development of anything in the R2 or R3A zone because those are higher traffic generators.

Morrison moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Final Plat for Fairway Estates Division 25, Dixon seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

3. PLAT 20-020: FINAL PLAT: Fairway Estates Division 26.

Applicant: Kevin Alcott, 101 Park, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Alcott indicated that this is another plat filling in.

Stephens presented the staff report a part of the record.

Morrison moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Final Plat for Fairway Estates Division 26, Dixon seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Public Hearing(s):

1. PLAT 20-013: PRELIMINARY PLAT. Taylorview Homes Division No. 1. This item was rescheduled

2. ANNEX 20-009: ANNEXATION/INITIAL ZONING. Annexation and Initial Zoning of RP for Lot 2, Block 2 of the Second Amended Plat of Kinsmen Country Estates Division No. 1.

Black opened the public hearing.

Applicant: Blake Jolley, Connect Engineering, 1150 Hollipark Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Jolley indicated that this property is near the Castlerock Subdivision that is south of Holmes. Jolley indicated this is a Category A Annexation and his client is asking to be annexed into the City so he can hook up to City Utilities.

Foster presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Dixon asked if they need to plat this as a separate action. Foster indicated that they will need to plat this property.

No one appeared in support or opposition of the application.

Black closed the public hearing.

Dixon indicated that he finds the annexation and zoning to be compatible with the existing City properties to the south as well as the existing development on the subject property and the size of the lot is appropriate for the zone, and everything is in order.

Dixon moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Annexation of Lot 2, Block 2 of the Second Amended Plat of Kinsmen Country Estates Division 1, with initial zoning of RP, Morrison seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

3. ANNEX 20-007: ANNEXATION/INITIAL ZONING. Annexation and Initial Zoning of HC & LC, Approximately 44 Acres, Section 9, Township 2 North, Range 38 East.

Black opened the public hearing.

Applicant: Leslie Folsom. Folsom indicated that this is 44 acres, west of Hitt Road and north of Lincoln Road. Folsom stated that the southern portion is requested to be zoned HC and the northern portion zoned LC. Folsom believes this zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and have positioned it to be in the best possible division of the zones between HC and LC for future development and connection for a Hodson Road, and possibly Yellowstone Highway. Folsom stated that the annexation and zoning will allow the family to best position themselves for future commercial entities.

Beutler presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Black asked if there is a road that goes to the back portion that would be zoned LC. Beutler stated that there is currently not a road extension to the northern end of the property. Beutler stated that it could and it should and there would be a preliminary plat as the property develops. Beutler stated that there could be connection to Lincoln, some type of connection the west to Hodson and Quail Drive and some sort of stub road to the north and to the west.

Morrison asked what the zoning for Costco is. Beutler indicated that Costco is HC.

Dixon stated that when this area was last reviewed for Comprehensive Plan, there is some residential County development along Lincoln Road, and the idea was that the residential further to the south would grow north and there was a large area identified for low density residential. Dixon stated that these two lots are in the low density residential area, and saying that they are on the transition is stretching. Dixon stated that there is area to the south of Lincoln Road that is identified for low density residential and some activity in the last few years have bitten off chunks so now it is LC and HC and the only residential that is left is the original County development in there. Dixon feels that if this particular annexation with the requested zones goes forward there will be so little of the remaining land that is in the area identified as low density residential that we need to revisit the Comprehensive Plan in this area, especially given the development that occurred before Costco, and now with Costco going in there is a good reason to revisit the Comprehensive Plan in this area, and look at whether low density residential still makes sense in the area at all or whether it should be converted to high density residential or

commercial. Dixon asked about the proper order, whether it be amend the Comprehensive Plan first or look at individual annexation and zones that are inconsistent with the existing Comprehensive Plan first.

Beutler clarified that the Comprehensive Plan is large bubbles and not intended to follow property lines or be specific to one parcel or another parcel, and should be a general concept and idea of how the area should develop, and then they review the policies within the comprehensive plan to see how properties meet those policies. Beutler stated that it is not fair to say that this parcel is just lower density parcel and that is its only designation. This parcel is in an area that has both lower and higher density residential designations. Beutler stated that the intent was to show that this area could develop for those purposes.

Michael Kirkham, Esq., indicated that the Comprehensive Plan is not a zoning code, and the aspirational ideas that are contained within the Comprehensive Plan do not bind what the property can be ultimately zoned as. The Comprehensive Plan instead provides a touchstone on where the City sees uses and anticipated needs. Kirkham suggested looking around to see what is around that idea and see if it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and not necessarily say that the 4 corners of the parcel is not in the right color, because that is not what they should be doing, because that would be applying a zone designation, which the Comprehensive Plan is not.

Beutler answered Dixon and stated that staff agrees that the Comprehensive Plan needs addressed and things have changed, but the Commission can proceed tonight with the recommendation to City Council on this property without modifying the Comprehensive Plan.

Dixon understands the broad strokes, but when the Comprehensive Plan was updated last in this area, the broad stroke stated that there should be a large area of low density residential, and that has already had 1/3 chipped away, and with this development the 1/2 of the remaining would be gone, and then what remains would not be sufficient size to support low density residential, so we are saying that the Comprehensive Plan is wrong and we need to get rid of the low density residential. Dixon stated that maybe the Comprehensive Plan is out of date and the low density doesn't belong there.

Support/Opposition to Application:

Jake Durtsche. Durtsche founded Jacob Grant Property Management and his firm manages residential properties in Idaho Falls, Pocatello, and Rexburg and have been in business for 15 years and manage 800 units in town. Durtsche stated that there have been many multi-family properties and the absorption rates have not declined. Durtsche stated that the Kartch properties on 1st Street, Snake River Landing has expanded, and these properties are market and absorbing the units, which means they are renting out quickly when they do the original lease. Durtsche stated that in markets that they are seeing too many units the absorption rate increases and it becomes difficult to lease the properties out. Durtsche stated that the townhouse properties near Pancheri, Ammon, behind Smiths, 1st Street, these properties are seeing substantial absorption. Durtsche believes the market in general has a need for the properties as rental properties. Durtsche stated that recently they have had a lot of demand for people employed with Costco and seeing people putting deposits to hold property throughout Idaho Falls. Durtsche stated that when they market a property it rents out as quickly as they can get the property ready. Durtsche stated that Costco has increased the demand.

Black closed the public hearing.

Morrison is not surprised with this zoning request, and believes they will see a lot more in this area with Costco going in, and it seems like a natural fit. Morrison believes there will be a big expansion of business in this area.

Black stated that she thought this area would be good for high density housing, but if the market is calling for more commercial. Black stated that the northern lot being designated as LC would allow for higher density housing. Black stated that the market is asking for more housing and hopefully the LC zone could allow them to put more housing there and with Costco coming there will be a need for more business and more housing needs. Black believes HC and LC can accommodate both of those.

Morrison moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Annexation for 44 acres, Section 9, T 2N, R 38 E, with an initial zoning of HC and LC as presented, Hicks seconded the motion and it passed 3-1. Dixon opposed the motion.

Dixon opposed the motion and stated that he has no problem with the initial zoning or the annexation, but feels that the zoning requested is consistent with the surrounding zoning, is totally inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Dixon understands the Comprehensive Plan is out of date, but he feels the proper order is to Amend the Comprehensive Plan first and then look at the annexation of the property. Dixon believes that the annexation is inconsistent with the comprehensive plan as it currently stands.

Hicks asked when the Comprehensive Plan was last updated. Cramer indicated that the Comprehensive Plan was adopted at the end of 2013. Cramer stated they are currently working on the background information now, and will be starting public out reach in the fall for an updated version of the Plan.

Morrison stated that generally they don't do the Comprehensive Plan piece by piece.

Dixon stated that there was a time when they commonly did amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and they would make an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and shortly thereafter they would entertain an application that was consistent with the amended comprehensive plan, with the idea that as long as the Mayor and City Council agreed to the amendment of the Comprehensive Plan that the items could go forward. Dixon stated that it used to be standard practice to update portions of the Comprehensive Plan through amendments as needed.

Beutler agreed with Dixon and stated that they have stepped back intermittently as necessary and they could still do that if the request was completely inconsistent they would usually ask the applicant to submit a comprehensive plan amendment request, but in this case they didn't see that the request was inconsistent with the plan.

Black questioned HC from low density housing and asked if that is not a big change. Beutler stated that commercial is adjacent, and the Comprehensive Plan is not meant to run along property boundaries.

Dixon stated that through this change, they are making what was a large low density residential area on the Comprehensive Plan, no longer viable because of previous zoning and now cutting it in half. Dixon feels like if they are going to make an area of the Comprehensive Plan no longer

viable they need to make sure that is consistent with what they want to do with the Comprehensive Plan.

4. RZON 20-006: REZONE. Rezone from LM to LC, Lot 3, Block 2, Sayer Business Park Division 1.

Black opened the public hearing.

Applicant: Brandon Lee, 120 Stonehaven Court, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Lee is a Commissioner on the City's Parks and Recreation Commission, and thanked the Commissioners for their service. Lee introduced himself, born and raised in IF, involved in commercial and residential real estate for 15 years across the US and this will be the first project in Idaho Falls. Lee indicated that their intent is to construct a multi-family residential project within the LC Zoning. Lee understands that they have to look at the zoning change. Lee has attached a site plan as an appendix to the presentation. Lee understands that the Comprehensive Plan might need to be reviewed and changed to recognize the highest and best uses to parcels when they differ from the current designation. Lee outlined items from the Comprehensive Plan ways that the rezone supports the Comprehensive Plan. Lee stated that there is a current need and demand for multi-family residential in the community. Lee believes the demand will grow into the foreseeable future. Lee stated that the rezone facilitates development in an area that already has public utilities. Lee stated that the Comprehensive Plan wants the residential offerings to reflect the economic and social diversity of Idaho Falls, and foster inclusiveness and connectivity through mixed housing types. Lee stated that higher density should be located close to service areas and arterial streets, and this proposal is close to Woodruff and Lincoln, close to services such as grocery, schools, golf course, Costco, health clinics. Lee stated that this proposal provides the transitional buffer from HC across Woodruff and does provide the highest and best use to the piece of land. Lee stated that if the project doesn't move forward, the LC designation would blend and transition well from the HC on Woodruff. Lee pulled quotes from the Comprehensive Plan and had a slide illustrating them. Lee read "Neighborhoods should contain a variety of housing types and with good site planning apartments and townhouses can be near arterial streets, be directly served by collector streets, and provide an opportunity for all residents of the City to have housing which meets their needs." Lee stated that is their intent with this project. Lee performed a neighborhood outreach and contacted 11 property owners with a introduction letter, and as much as possible hand delivered the letters to the property owners and had good conversations. Lee stated that 3 property owners were excited and supportive and Dean Mortimer has provided a written statement for today's hearing. Lee stated that the other two are on the line to provide public comment. Lee spoke with Jake Durtsche regarding this project to get further confirmation with his expertise on the need and demand for this type of product in the market. Lee stated that Durtsche confirmed that the need and demand are there for this product.

Blake Jolley, Connect Engineering 1150 Hollipark, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Jolley stated that the history of this area is as follows: Property was annexed in 1979 with an initial zoning of C1 and since that date there have been multiple changes in zoning including C1, HC1 (during platting), LM (During change in zoning ordinance). Jolley stated that the change from HC1 to LM was due to what was expected to be developed in the area. Jolley stated that change does bring different aspects of the property that could be developed in a different way than what was anticipated. Jolley indicated that the property has been vacant, and as change happens the market

drives good aspects to the area, and develop the vacant parcels to utilize the existing arterials and access points.

Hicks complimented the applicant on a well prepared presentation.

Dixon asked if the applicant wishes to develop housing in the area, why didn't they request R3.

Lee stated that their requested designation came after a conversation with City staff and looking for an appropriate designation for the use they want, but also a use that would fit, if they are unable to move forward and the LC zoning would comply with the Comp Plan and fit and blend well with the other uses.

Beutler presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Support/Opposition for Application:

Jake Durtsche. Durtsche is in support of this application because he believes our town needs more multi-family and likes the area that this gives more opportunity for people to live in this area. Durtsche is seeing demand for this and this will be a good thing for Idaho Falls.

MaKay Wallace. Wallace represents Kelly Sayer who is the owner of the subject property and also owns other parcels in the area. Wallace indicated that Sayer is in support for the rezone and the intended project. Wallace conveyed that Sayer feels the rezone would allow uses like the multi-family residential to promote a healthy well balanced transitional neighborhood. Wallace believes the rezone outweighs the long standing vacant parcel.

David Adams. Adams owns the contractors rental shops off of Jones Street that would be adjacent to the property. Adams is in favor of the rezone and the land is long over due to be developed. Adams has no issues with multi-family development.

Beutler read a letter from **Dean Mortimer.** Mortimer is in support of the rezone. Mortimer is a nearby property owner and has a vested interest in the neighborhood and the rezone would allow multi-family residential to support a healthy well balanced and well transitioned neighborhood. Mortimer believes the rezone would continue the transition and development of this vacant ground which would enhance the property values in the City and provide additional safety to have people engage in the community in which they live and work.

Black closed the public hearing.

Black is familiar with the area and has spent 3 weeks in a large city and has seen wonderful developments of mixed use with commercial mixed with housing. Black feels that residential is not out of the question for this area. Black feels a good mixed use development could give the whole area a shot in the arm.

Morrison believes it is an excellent change of zoning and the property could be a boom for the area. Morrison believes this is the perfect place for multi-family housing.

Dixon stated that his comment has nothing to do with the merit of whether this makes sense for an area of high density residential. Dixon stated that there is some difficulty in getting on Woodruff, or west on Anderson. Dixon stated that his main concern is that they are using a loophole in a commercial zone to enable a residential zone instead of using a residential zone, when the stated purpose and all comments are all relative to developing this for residential, not

commercial. Dixon has a problem with using a commercial zone as a backdoor to provide for residential through a zone that shows the primary purpose is “A”, but it also allows B,C,D, so we will ask for zone A because we want D.

Black believes any of the uses for the suggested zone would fit in this area. Black stated that if residential will make sense in this area. Black is comfortable with all uses in this area and that is what she likes about the LC Zone in this area. Black stated that this area is close to a grocery store, close to other amenities so there is a chance that they wouldn't have to drive. Black is comfortable with residential and commercial on this spot.

Dixon is looking at the zoning application question that was answered by the applicant and it explains how the proposed changes comply with the Comp Plan and the applicants response has all to do with housing.

Dixon stated that if they put a housing unit in this area, it is close to arterials, close to a park that the City could develop with amenities and putting residential next to a park is attractive. Black indicated that it is just a storm pond. Dixon indicated that they could develop a storm pond with grass and adding a swing set.

Hicks indicated that this could be the opening of filling in that entire area with some commercial and a lot of housing which would be good for the area.

Morrison moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the rezone of Lot 3, Block 2 Sayer Business Park Division 1 from LM to LC as presented, Hicks seconded the motion and it passed 3-1. Dixon opposed the motion.

Dixon opposed the application because he doesn't feel the zone is appropriate for the intended use and they should look at a residential zone because all the discussion has been about using the property for residential and the applicant has stated that is their intention.

Dixon pointed out that its not the first time that they have the applicant using a loophole in the zone, and they've seen it with TN as well. Dixon stated that when they evaluate the final plat they need to be based on what is written in the zone as what is allowed and what is not allowed, rather than the general statements from the Comprehensive Plan about the intent of the zone. Dixon stated that the intent is not what covers legally and legally is covered what is specifically allowed and not allowed. Dixon stated that given that he feels they are doing a disservice to themselves to have zones that are intended for A, but allow B, C, D. Dixon suggested having a single zone that allows everything and then it will be simpler. Dixon stated that he feels on the previous item that the staff's reasoning for why it fit the Comprehensive Plan is because LC can allow low density housing and so it “was consistent with the low density designation of the comprehensive Plan”. Dixon wants this cleaned up so that when they get to the point of what is allowed and not allowed they are able to clearly support what is there because what is there clearly supports the earlier planning, instead of being a loophole as an additional allowed use that has nothing to do with the Comprehensive Plan, or nothing to do with other properties in the area. Dixon wants them to tighten and say commercial zone is for commercial and manufacturing is for manufacturing, residential is for residential. Dixon stated that it's the same problem with R3A will it be an office of an apartment. Dixon believes they need to have the developer identify the zone they want for the development they want to do and let them present

their reasoning as to why that development is appropriate in that area, and let the Commission decide on the basis rather than picking something because it has a third or fourth use that fits what is really desired. Dixon feels that this sort of thing is what causes the stresses between the staff and the Commission. Dixon feels that the staff advises the applicant to choose a zone where the purpose is the 3rd or 4th use, not the primary use of the zone.

Michael Kirkham Esq. stated that as a policy if the City would like to adopt zones that have specific uses that refer back to a title, that is something the City can do. Kirkham stated that it is not illegal to have a zone that permits multiple types of uses. Kirkham stated that the history of zoning was that in the very beginning you had restricted zones that permitted fewer uses, than less restricted zones, until you got to an unrestricted zone that allowed all uses. Kirkham stated that historically zoning goes the opposite direction of Dixon's policy preference. Kirkham stated that he would encourage the Commission to not use the term "loophole" when you have a use that is permitted in the zone. Kirkham stated that the uses, when they are permitted in the zone, are not "loopholes" they are permitted uses. Kirkham stated that the Comprehensive Plan is not a zoning document, but it is a planning document and it helps the Commission and the City with a vision of how the City thinks it is going to grow. Kirkham stated that just because the designation on a map is adopted, it doesn't restrict the land area to only the use that the Comp Plan has envisioned.

Dixon agreed that Loophole is not the right term, as it is a legally authorized use. Dixon stated that he trying to state that they need to tighten the zone because the public looks at the zone and they have an expectation and then they find out that the Commissions hands are tied because the zone also allows other uses that are not in the zone description, but are allowed uses per the details of the actual ordinance, so they are legally allowed uses. Dixon stated that they need to determine where to apply the control and the place seems to be to tighten the Ordinance so they don't allow so many different uses. Dixon knows that the most negative comments from the public is when they have a zone that allows multiple things. Dixon knows the developers love it and they can develop whatever comes along, but the public wants certainty and want to know what is going to be developed next to existing residential. Dixon feels that the developer needs to pick a zone that is the use the developer wants, instead of a 2nd, 3rd, 4th legally allowed use. Dixon knows the public is looking for certainty. Dixon stated that the actual application of the ordinance would be very straight forward because the ordinance does not allow 14 different uses, and only allows 2 or 3 closely related uses. Dixon stated that the description is not the legally binding item, and the ordinance and the actual lines in the ordinance are the legally binding item and so when we are making a decision we have to make it based upon what is legally allowed, but in a lot of cases that is too flexible to provide certainty that the public is looking for.

Kirkham stated that the City could change its zoning ordinance if that is what is wanted.

Dixon is wanting the City to reassess. Dixon stated that the things that have happened with TN have proposals coming in that are having TN used in a way that has nothing to do with the description of TN. Dixon suggested that the planning staff in discussion with City Council talk about tightening some of the zones.

Black suggested discussing that when they have the meeting with the missing middle.

Cramer agreed with Black. Cramer sent a meeting invite for the phone call with Opticoast Design because those are the questions that need to be discussed in general. Cramer stated that

any time they get higher density housing any where near low density housing it is always filled with concerns about what are you getting and how does it function. Cramer stated that they know they need housing but it is hard to get anything approved other than a single family home, until it is in a spot and there is no obvious answer and there aren't standards that everyone is trusting. Cramer encouraged the Commissioners to jump on the call and be a participate in the project to look at the Codes. Cramer stated that the point of the call is to ask what the concerns are. Cramer stated that he understands that they are concerned with mixed use zones and what does it really mean. Dixon stated that he and Cramer have been in discussion about do the current ordinances give them what they think they are going to get when they have multi-family housing, or does it give things that help reinforce the publics opinion about multi-family housing. Dixon has taken pictures of recent developments and some are nice, and some need to be left to the judgement of someone else. Dixon suggested using that as a guide, stating that "I like 'A', but don't care for 'B' is there something in the specifics of the ordinance that if it were changed it would encourage for of 'A' and discourage 'B'.

Next meeting is scheduled for July 21, 2020.

Black adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Beckie Thompson, Recorder