P+Z 04/08/02

Todd + Don S. absent

I. 7:55pm

II. New Business

A. S.U. 106

V. Ch mot to app; Rob. S. 2nd

Passed 5 to 0.

B. Zone Chg App No 1030

V. Chair mot to deny; Russ 2nd.

Rob. reiterate all op. ahead status.
bad idea.

Russ - inappropriate place.

Passed 4 to 0 (1 abstention).
(Rob Scherer.

C. Rob mot to app; Kevin 2nd.

Passed 5 to 0.

D. Chap. 27.

Charles 2 parts. break out

Exhibit A-1-6 & Exh. B. 1.6.

Exhibit A

Rob. totally in favor of
unfortunate that this code is put
all together.

If someone has 2/3 acres and wld like to
put a house there they'd have to put
in drain. ditches.

Ewn- open drain dit. shld not be overlooked.
shld be designed for very capacity.

also concern for person w/ large lot. do
hope variance wld be considered for
these people.
for new subdivision develop.

Robert - wld like to see an exception for
large lots.

Rob suggested "large lot"

Mona - they did say we could break down & vote on specifically. rather than deny as a whole.

---

tape Jamie Corn - If S

tape Robert - it undermines integrity of surrounding area.

---

mona

Don G. personally in favor. Section 1-A

cld be handled w/ variance.

Russ - wld feel more comfortable w/ wording of # of houses or acreage,

charles- w/all impact fees

tape

Mona - thats why its in large lot subd.

Exhibit

Robert - shld define large lot.

do request that some def. shld be added.

charles- voting on app w/ def. of large lots.

Exhibit A Sec 1.6

Robert mot to app S. code change w/ provis. that we define large lot subdivis, ~~so~~ ~~[illegible]~~ Ellenn 2nd.

Russ- what am I voting on.

The Com.

3

Rob mot to withdraw ; Don G. also wld.

Russ - wld have to exclude

Rob - if somebody tabled this - allowed city staff to come up w/. solution

Rob mot to table item w/ all commentary
do not want to penalize -
~~table~~ want to exclude individual land owner who wld like to subdivide
Russ - 2nd

~~Russ - needs~~

Tabled - passed 4 to 1 Don Glenn.

Exhibit B.
open

Mona - trying to incorp. documents into one.

Don G. Not to app: Run 2nd
Passed 5 to 0.

E. Canterbury Park R-2 PUD

Jamie Cornelius -
showed property on map.
showed difference between R-2 & have same area. but different lengths.
w/out PUD process. no zoning category for strip of detention.

Don G - what is density.
Jamie - on gross land 1.3 acres.

Charles - approx. effort. not in favor of putting res. land along the r.r. tracks. if our com. in chief (C.C.) approves they votes for it we'll support it. but were not in favor.

Jamie - exp. they are only trying address issue.

Kevin exp thats why he asked that fence barrier ~~to~~ next to r.r.

Jamie - brg pic. understand were trading off this separation w/ the PUD.

May 13th JPH date

Mona - Can req. somethin, showing det. shld be fenced

Kevin not here 8.45 pm

Kevin - ~~[illegible]~~ echo Chauman. however concerned:
2 things: ① the water is too narrow.

② ~~[illegible]~~ masonry wall shld be put up against the entire property (at least 6') along R.R.

Rob - wld be a better idea to have fence on side by res & not r.r. don't want kids in detention area.

Robert - is det area 15. acres. is it owned by MUD?

Jamie - will ask to be annex into a MUD.

Russ - will be a HOA?
Jamie - yes.

Russ - whats keep kids from playing in at as a football field

Jamie - can have screening fence.

Russ - does it need to be put in as ~~the~~ the PUD?
Jamie - yes.