

CITY OF JAMESTOWN
102 3rd Ave SE
Jamestown, ND 58401
Phone: 701-252-5900
MINUTES - Planning Commission
February 8, 2016 - 8:00 a.m.

Present: Hillerud, Paulson, Trautman, Frye, Ritter, Rath, Reuther, Fuchs, Wollan, and Klundt

Absent: Rhinehart, Bayer and Bensch

1. Chairman Hillerud opened the meeting. Commission member Trautman made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 14, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. Seconded by Rath. Motion carried.
2. Cindy Gray, SRF Consulting, highlighted several items she felt was important on the *Text Amendment – sections 6.7 and 9 of Appendix B and section 11 of Appendix C*. The need for this Text Amendment was earlier discussed with the City by NDDOT during the LUTP process. It has been reviewed by the City Attorney. Cindy Gray reviewed the ordinance's *Section 6 – Platting Procedure* with the Planning Commission.

Chairman Hillerud asked several questions. When is it determined to do an impact study and making the applicant aware of the need to do one? Cindy responded that the applicant should try to identify reasonably what their traffic impact may be, so they have that number when they first apply. Hillerud asked if improvements are needed due to a traffic impact study, who is responsible for the cost and maintenance? This amendment and the current ordinance do not address this. Cindy believes that this is something during the planning process that needs to be thoroughly discussed with the applicant. The Planning Commission asked if a traffic study will slow down the Plat Approval process. The only thing that slows down any process, Cindy related, is when the applicant “drags their feet” to get done what has been asked of them.

3. The Public Hearing was opened by Chairman Hillerud. No one came forward for the Public Hearing. The Public Hearing was closed.
4. Trautman commented that she liked the part where the engineer can review these thresholds and determine whether a traffic impact study is needed.
5. Trautman made a motion to approve the Text Amendment – sections 6.7 and 9 of Appendix B and section 11 of Appendix C. Frye seconded. Motion carried. 8:30 a.m.

Chairman Hillerud called for a 5 minute recess and then to continue with the scheduled 2016 Work Session in the conference room in the basement.

Present were the Planning Commission members who were at today's meeting, Cindy Gray and Chris Clanahan, City Engineering Department, Jeff Fuchs, Darrell Wollan, Gary Klundt, Councilman Buchanan and others from the general public.

Topics to discuss included: Subdivision Regulations – Appendix B, Zoning Regulations – Appendix C, Land Use and Transportation Plan, and other items.

1. There were various discussions about chain of command during the plat approval process, the difference between a preliminary and final plat, and storm water flexibility. Darrell is the point of contact for all concerned. He is usually the first one contacted by applicants and keeps in constant contact with SRF, the applicant and the City staff.

The Planning Commission asked to get several items added to their plat process list. An acknowledgement that the list was received by the applicant was one item. They would also like a “at the Minimum” time line chart attached to the application, so the applicant can see that they need to be timely with each stage of the process.

2. Darrell mentioned that there is a lot of communication that goes on behind the scenes in his office. The Commission asked that they see these communications or at the very least, that they are attached to the application. This will give the Commission information to better answer any questions they may have during the Public Hearings, and also see if some of their concerns have been addressed before the Planning Commission meetings are held.
3. An *Application Process* sheet was handed out by SRF.
4. The current *Preliminary and Final Plat Checklists* were reviewed. Items 9 thru 15 in the *Preliminary Plat Checklist* were discussed as some plats are brought to the Commission without a building permit or any building plan in mind. The Anne Carlsen Second Addition was a prime example. The suggestion was to have a DEVELOPER’S AGREEMENT in place when the building permit application is received.

The components and the usage of a Developer’s Agreement were discussed.

Trautman was curious as to when in the plat approval process covenant’s come into play. Covenants can be reference in the Developer’s Agreement. They don’t necessarily need to be presented with the plat. Covenants can be put on after the plat is approved by a petition of the property owners.

5. There were concerns about extra-territorial lands and how to prevent county/township approved plats that have less than ideal ROW, utility or storm water plans from being a problem when the City is asked to annex that property in. Jeff related that City initiated annexations are not popular, and the City would rather avoid them. This leaves the property owners with the ball in their court. Some of these subdivisions could be so convoluted by then that the cost to put the streets, utilities or water plans in place would be exorbitant. This problem will be discussed further at a later date.
6. Cindy suggested a separate platting process for simple re-plats so the applicant doesn’t have to go through the entire process again. NDCC says that a re-plat has to at least be presented to the Planning Commission, but both the preliminary and final could be approved/denied at the same time. She referred to it as a “Minor Subdivision” which would have its own Plat Checklist.
7. Cindy asked if a priority list has been identified from the information supplied in the Land Use and Transportation Plan. Jeff said that Council has a couple of items to complete and then they will take on this task.

Because of the time involved, it was decided to continue this work shop after the next Planning Commission meeting next month. Commission member Frye made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Trautman. Meeting adjourned. 10:30 a.m.