PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING
AUGUST 27, 2013 @ 6:30 PM
LIBRARY MEETING ROOM
MINUTES

1. **Call to order**
   Chairman Tom Bailor called the Planning Commission Regular Meeting to order at 6:30 PM on August 27, 2013 in the Library Meeting Room.

2. **Roll Call**
   Present for roll call were Chairman Tom Bailor and Commissioners David Reggiani, Tom McGann, Scott Pegau and John Baenen. Commissioners John Greenwood and Roy Srb were absent.

   Also present were Planner, Samantha Greenwood, Assistant Planner, Shannon Joekay, Mayor, James Kasch, City Manager, Randy Robertson, Public Works Director, Moe Zamarron and Refuse Division Head, Brandon Dahl. There was 1 person in the audience.

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   M/Reggiani S/Pegau to approve the Regular Agenda.
   Upon voice vote, motion passed, 5-0
   Yea: Bailor, McGann, Pegau, Reggiani, Baenen
   Nay: None
   Absent: Greenwood, Srb

4. **Disclosure of Conflict of Interest**
   None

5. **Correspondence**
   None

6. **Communication by and Petitions from Visitors**
   1. **Guest Speakers**
      None
   2. **Audience comments regarding items in the agenda**
      None
   3. **Chairpersons and Representatives of Boards and Commissions**
      None

7. **Old Business**
   a. Site Plan Review Baler Facility-Recommendation to City Council (voice vote)

   M/McGann S/Reggiani moved that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council to approve the Site Plan to re-construct the Baler Building.

   McGann liked the presentation and is in favor of this motion. Reggiani thanked Moe, Sam and Shannon for putting together the information. After he reviewed the packet it seemed like the project was getting clearer and cleared and he appreciates that. He was thinking what the work was for P&Z as his impression of the project is that it is a winterization project. The intent is to replace the exterior fabric and some interior work. It left him thinking how it was going to change the site plan. The footprint doesn't appear to change, there are no additions or new out structures. He said that we are trying to put our
municipality buildings into the same realm as our commercial buildings but if it isn't
changing the site plan, he is not sure what there is for P&Z to do. He said that they looked at
the more comprehensive plan at the last meeting with different phases and this is just this
project (the bale re-construction) that is coming forward now. Pegaui said the last meeting
was trying to figure out the process: it took a while to find the appendix table but once he
did, the only thing he could see that would come into Planning and Zoning is the drainage
plan. He agrees that most of what was on there wouldn't belong at Planning and Zoning
since it didn't change the foot print, the building or major structural changes that should
trigger a review. I don't know that a site plan is necessary for this project. Separating this
project from the complete one makes it clearer. Baenen said that it doesn't seem like there
are major changes to the drainage plan and wanted to know if Kristin Carpenter's letter had
been addressed already. Moe said that the drainage plan is the original one from the original
design that is still in place. He said he will continue to bring all projects and that the
Planning Commission can pass it along (to City Council) in whatever fashion: via
recommendation or "this isn't for us". Right now, by code, he has to bring all this forward.
The fact that we paved the foot print would have been a trigger (to bring it to Planning and
Zoning). The building will now have 20 years of additional life. He asked if that fits with
everyone's expectation. The guys will now have a reasonable place to work and a safe
environment. The water is now corralled and doesn't go out anymore. Reggiani said he
was more interested in the interpretation. He would classify this (project) as deferred
maintenance and is not sure that deferred maintenance on any municipal building would
need to come if there are no changes. There is nothing for us to plan or refer back to the
Comprehensive Plan. Moe asked if we (staff) make those determinations-what is "just
maintenance". Reggiani said the paving would trigger it but was more focused on the siding
and the building. There are no design criteria to look at. Moe said he did have a problem at
Council where they didn't feel they had eyes looking at our design. I am thinking the water
plant, but that is a different subject. But still the whole topic of what comes and what doesn't
come is for another session. Reggiani said that (discussion) would be for another venue. He
also said he is curious if our lawyers weighed in on the interpretation to code. Moe said he
was reading it "face value". Sam said she spoke to the lawyer and she spoke about the first
sentence "make or cause to be made surveys, maps and plans relating to location and design"
which was the discussion, those two words (location and design). She agreed that this isn't a
location and design, but on the other end of that paragraph was the sentence that says the
remainder of the provision indicates that any improvement to a public facility must be
reviewed by the planning commission. It is all about definition. What is our definition of an
improvement? Is it maintenance or an improvement? What is our definition of design? Is a
remodel, design or not? She said if you are having a discussion about the process, those are
things you should talk about: setting the parameters-what makes it maintenance, what
makes it design? That was her summary of just that paragraph, the other sections weren't
discussed. Bailier said in his mind it is simple. This is a maintenance project that they are
doing. He said he argued this-in Anchorage, you don't need a building permit if you are going
to re-side your building or replace your windows. Now if you are making the door bigger,
than you need a building permit; any time you change the structure of the building. If a shed
is going to be added, then you need to come and give us input. The part on the last packet
that had him confused and concerned was that he was not given the recommendation to
Council of the grand plan of the burner. He wanted to see if it coincided with the
Comprehensive Plan. This packet was clear and spelled out the job, it is maintenance and it is
overdue. Sam answered John's question in that the things from Kristin's letter have already
been addressed. It was not clearly written in that email. The only thing that hadn't been
addressed was where the D1 was going to go but they are addressing those. Bailier also said
he appreciates the maintenance issues coming to the commission just to inform us so we can
tell the public what they are doing. He said it's good to be informed but not necessarily for
approval on maintenance issues. Moe said there is a design for the office, it is single story
and is going to two stories. That was not a two story office before. McGann said there is also the canopy which is structural. Bailor said this packet was more clear as to what was going to be done.

M/Reggiani S/Bailer moved to refer this back to staff. Pegau asked the reasoning for moving it back to staff. Reggiani said for all the reasons they discussed. There is nothing for P&Z to refer. He would like to start having a conversation about the bigger, site development plan, with the incinerator and chipper. The sooner we talk about those things and having public comment, the better. Pegau said in referring this back to staff we have concurrence for them to go do it since the job is a maintenance issue. Sam asked what the next step was. Reggiani said he was speaking on the motion to approve the site plan; there is no change in the site plan. If there was a desire to change the site plan that would come here. The maintenance project needs to go to Council. Sam said then we would move it forward without the recommendation from P&Z since it doesn’t need a site plan review and doesn’t fit into this section of code. We could summarize what happened in P&Z in the memo to City Council. Pegau said he definitely wants to see this moving forward. He said he would consider an alternative to pass a motion from P&Z that we recommend this funding request go forward rather than approve the site plan. Reggiani said he would consider referring this motion back to staff then follow up with a recommendation to City Council for the maintenance project.

Upon voice vote, motion passed, 5-0
Yea: Bailer, McGann, Pegau, Reggiani, Baenen
Nay: None
Absent: Greenwood, Srb

M/Pegau S/Reggiani moved that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council to approve the requested maintenance on the Bailor Building.

Upon voice vote, motion passed, 5-0
Yea: Bailer, McGann, Pegau, Reggiani, Baenen
Nay: None
Absent: Greenwood, Srb

8. Audience Participation
James Kacs, 824 Woodland Drive, said he really appreciates all the commission’s time on all the stuff that the commission tackles at these meetings. He said if there are deficiencies in the code, then pass them forward and come up with recommendations to Council to fix them and make everyone’s job smoother. That way the projects in the City could move forward.

9. Commission Comments
Bailer said that by bringing these projects forward to P&Z is one more way of getting the information out there so people don’t have to show up to Council. This major maintenance project will get a lot of questions and it is nice that we got to see it. He appreciates the simplicity of this last packet.

10. Adjournment
M/McGann S/Pegau moved to adjourn the Special Meeting at 6:54 PM; with no objection, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved: September 10th, 2013

Shannon Joekay, Assistant Planner
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