

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

1. **Call to order**

Chairman **Tom Bailer** 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 Bailer** 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 Kacsh**, 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: Bailer, 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 foot print 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 baler re-construction) that is coming forward now. **Pegau** 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. **Bailer** 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, then 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. **Bailer** 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. **Bailer** 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 Baler Building.

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

**8. Audience Participation**

**James Kacsh**, 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 10<sup>th</sup>, 2013*

*Shannon Joekay*  
Shannon Joekay, Assistant Planner