# CMEREJ <br> PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING 

City Hall - 131 N Main St
December 14, 2021 at 7:00 PM

## AGENDA

## CALL TO ORDER

## ROLL CALL

## OTHERS PRESENT

## AGENDA ADDITIONS

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Planning Commission Minutes June 22, 2021

Commission member $\qquad$ moved to approve the minutes of the June 22, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Commission member $\qquad$ seconded the motion.

## CITIZEN COMMENTS

## OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

## Business Items

## Consideration

2. CONSIDERATION OF SANTA FE PLAT

The City of Cheney recently purchased the 680' x 125' tract of land between Main Street and Garfield, just north of Santa Fe Railroad tracks. The City wishes to plat the property into Santa Fe Street that will run east/west, 4 lots that will be sold, and tie into Jefferson Street. The plan is to straighten the current Santa Fe Street. Due to limited traffic, there are no plans to curb/gutter/pave the road, but crushed asphalt will be used as surfacing.

Motion: Approve/decline the Santa Fe Addition Plat by owner City of Cheney.

## 3. DISCUSSION OF SANTA FE CROSSING DEVELOPMENT

Ed Laverentz owns Santa Fe Crossing at Lake Road and Santa Fe. Council previously discussed the development and the next steps must be taken by the Planning Commission. Laverentz would like to do a lot split of the north lot and re-plat the south lot into multiple lots. Currently, Santa Fe Street is only 30' wide along the south side of Laverentz's lots and is not wide enough for the standard 60' road right-of-way. The agenda item is for discussion purposes. Next steps would be a variance application and plat.

## ADJOURN

# PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 22, 2021 

City Hall - 131 N Main St
June 22, 2021 at 7:00 PM

## MINUTES

## CALL TO ORDER

## ROLL CALL

Members Present:
David Woodard, Bret Albers, Melanie Block, Steve Gile, Chad Harrison, Melissa Olthoff, David Rich, Ryan Scott. Staff Present- Danielle Young, City Admin/Clerk

## OTHERS PRESENT

Greg Kampling, Greg Williams, and Ken Terrell

## AGENDA ADDITIONS

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes February 22, 2021

Commission member Bret Albers moved to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2021 Planning Commission meeting. Commission member M Block seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

CITIZEN COMMENTS (Limited to items not on the agenda)- None

## OLD BUSINESS

## NEW BUSINESS

## Business Items

OATH OF OFFICE was administered to new Planning Commission member Melissa Olthoff

## ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Officers of the Commission shall be elected at the first regular meeting following the first of May.
Commissioner Bret Albers moved to appoint David Woodard as Chairman.
Commissioner Steve Gile seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

Commissioner Ryan Scott moved to appoint Jessa Albers as Vice Chairman.
Commissioner Bret Albers seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

Commissioner David Rich moved to appoint Danielle Young as Secretary.
Commissioner Melanie Block seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.

## Open Public Hearing

## PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER VARIANCE APPLICATION AT 811 N LINCOLN TO BUILD A GARAGE WITHIN 25' PLATTED BUILDING SETBACK

Property owner, Dan Fouquet, 811 N. Lincoln submitted a variance application to build a $14^{\prime} \times 48$ ' attached garage on the south side of their house/existing garage with driveway access off of 7 th Ave. The garage will be 20' wide at the west end and wrap-around behind the house $6^{\prime}$. The garage will be $6^{\prime}$ from the west property line. A variance is required because the garage will encroach into the platted 25 ' setback on the southern portion of the lot. Notices were sent to properties within 200'.

Greg Kampling spoke on behalf of the property owner, Dan Fouquet, who was not able to attend due to his job. Kampling explained that the proposed setback from the south would be the same distance as Dan and Karen Stoehr's setback to the street (Stoehr's property is located south of 811 N Lincoln). Kampling stated this distance was measured from the street to the house. Kampling stated he would like to wrap the garage around to the back of their house so the variance would be for two directions. Kampling stated the addition would match, as much as possible, the existing house and would set back 2' from the front of the existing garage.

Block asked how much room there was from the Canaan property to the west. It was stated the addition would be $6^{\prime}$ from the west property line. Gile asked how far that would be from the neighbor's house. Kampling stated it would be 12' away. Young stated the minimum rear yard was 20'.

Bret Albers asked about the dotted line shown on the map and asked if that was the setback line. Albers asked about the setbacks on the house to the south. Young explained that on a plat they can state what the building setback lines are. The dashed line is $25^{\prime}$ from the property line and $12.5^{\prime}$ feet- so the house was built right where the building setback is set. Young explained that a front yard setback is $25^{\prime}$, so the 811 Lincoln lot was platted for the house to face south on 7th Ave with the $25^{\prime}$ setback. The Stoehr property to the south was platted with the $25^{\prime}$ to the east for the house to face Lincoln Ave. Fouquet is requesting to build into the 25 ' setback line and because it's platted, the variance is required. They want to build $14^{\prime}$ down. Young stated she and Ewy marked the property pins and measured over the $14^{\prime}$ to the south and set a flag. It was roughly about 9.5-10' to the south property line.

Young explained that Lincoln Street is an $80^{\prime}$ wide street (from property line to property line) and 7th Ave is a $60^{\prime}$ street right of way. Typically, on an $80^{\prime}$ street right of way, $\mathrm{it}^{\prime}$ s going to be about $20^{\prime}$ from back of curb to property line and on the $60^{\prime}$ street it will be $12^{\prime}$ from back of curb to property line. Young stated that Fouquet is asking for the variance because he understands his house faces Lincoln and even thought the setback is $12.5^{\prime}$ along Lincoln, if you factor in the additional 10’ from the back of the curb to the property line because of the $80^{\prime}$ street right of way, if one would look at it from the street, there is about 22.5 ' from back of curb and looks similar to the setback.

Kampling stated that the new addition would about line up to the existing garage built to the west of Fouquet's property on 7th Ave.

Young stated that Kampling indicated that they're asking for a double variance. Young stated this is because they're wanting to build $14^{\prime}$ south into the setback and are also requesting to build to the west, which is technically his required $20^{\prime}$ rear yard. Young stated that if the variance isn't allowed, Fouquet could technically build straight to the west within 6' of the west property line without a variance.

Block stated she was originally concerned about the side. Gile asked why the lines were crooked on the map with the drawing of the addition and also thought the flags were crooked. Young stated it could have been because she drew the lines on the map and did not intend them to be crooked and that the property owners were having to move the flags each time they mowed. Woodard stated the intention was to build the addition square to the existing house.

Ken Terrell was at the public hearing just to visit out of curiosity to see how the City is run and appreciated them.

Greg Williams came to see how the Planning Commission was run. Williams stated there was concern about line of site from the corner. Young stated she did do a site triangle and did not find the addition to fall within the site triangle. Williams stated he also had concerns about the Canaan property's line of site to the west, but thought they had the opportunity to come and protest if they saw an issue with it, but they were not in attendance.

Kampling stated that Fouquet was willing to back off the size of the garage addition from $14^{\prime}$ to $12^{\prime}$ if he needed to.
Bret Albers asked if it was the property owner's position that because the house was turned the side yard should be considered about 7th Ave and if we're asking for a variance to go that way. If the south side is considered a side yard, then the east side would be built out of compliance because it should be $25^{\prime}$. Young stated he was thinking the right way, but that is why the property owner is stating with Lincoln Street being $80^{\prime}$, he gains an additional $10^{\prime}$ from the property line to the setback line, giving him additional space from the curb to the property line.

Gile asked what the code stated about the distance between the houses. Young stated $6^{\prime}$ is the side yard setback. David Rich asked if there would be any walk-thru doors from the west side. Kampling stated it would be off the patio.

The public hearing was closed at 7:27 pm.

## CONSIDERATION OF VARIANCE FOR 811 N LINCOLN

Woodard stated there were 5 conditions to review in considering the variance.
Zoning Code 5.33 states a Variance can be granted if the following conditions are met:

1. That the variance requested arises from such condition which is unique to the property in question, is not ordinarily found in the same zone or district and is not created by an action or actions of the property owner or the applicant.
2. That the granting of the variance will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.
3. That the strict application of the provisions of this ordinance would constitute unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.
4. That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity or general welfare.
5. That granting the variance will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of this ordinances.

Melanie Block asked for clarification on distances for the side yard as the GIS map did not look accurate. It was explained that the GIS can be skewed when looking at it visually.

Block asked to look at the other properties along 7th Ave and how close they were built to the street. Young stated that there are several sheds built along 7th Ave with several different plats, and varying setbacks, making 7th Ave an interesting street.

Bret Albers stated we want to make it conducive to live in our community, but he thinks about consistency. If someone builds on a corner lot, could they build in this same fashion and then say later they want to build here too. Albers said the house was built within the plat, even though it was turned, so in looking at the variance conditions he questions if this is something unique to the property? Or is this a situation where it is unique and if we allow building into a setback, does that negate doing a plat. If we're going to allow building outside plats and setback- then what's the reason for it? But we can't have such a strangle hold on things that it's hard to live in the city and we as a board need to be ready for the next guy who builds on a corner lot and wants to do something out to the side. Block stated the plat isn't straight all the way across 7th Ave.

Ryan Scott mentioned that the addition lined up to the other garage along 7th Ave and there were three neighbors present that didn't have an issue with it. Chad Harrison stated that if the front door faced South then we would never allow an addition to the front, but this house is kind of unique because there's still a 25 ' setback to the front of the house and Albers agreed that it is unique since it's an $80^{\prime}$ street.

Ryan Scott asked if a house could be built like this again on a corner lot. Ryan Scott asked if we would run into this again with new construction. Young explained that there are a few homes recently built on corner lots at the Back Nine where this could happen again.

Young mentioned that the Planning Commission heard a variance for Hillman last year with a corner lot and he wanted to build out to the side, but it was technically in his rear yard.

Albers mentioned Ryan's comment, that if a home was built today the front door would have to face the 25' setback. Young stated she wasn't sure that the Zoning Code specified that and there is some confusion whether a driveway or a doorway is the front of a house and it's been conveyed both ways. Melissa Olthoff mentioned her house was built similar, facing Santa Fe with the driveway towards Marshall and her property address being Marshall Street.

Young said she had tried to go through and look at corner lots throughout the city and each one seems to be different as homes face different ways and some have platted setbacks and others don't. Young mentioned the house a block south of 811 Lincoln and if that person asked to build out to the east, past the front of the houses along Lincoln? Since that house technically faces 6th Ave, but has a driveway to the east on Lincoln, she didn't know if a request to build to the east would be similar to this variance request. She thought each property would be a little different.
M. Block thought they needed to take into consideration traffic and that there were only 4-6 homes in the cul de sac.

Woodard asked if there were any other communications with other property owners. Williams stated he talked to Molyneux and he didn't have a problem with it.

Young mentioned the size of the lot is $75.9^{\prime}$ and the depth is $115^{\prime}$ and the R4 Zoning code says the lot depth should be $120^{\prime}$. Young stated they could technically call is a non-conforming lot and if it had been an additional 5' deep, the house could have been situated differently.

Kampling mentioned Lot 4 being small to the west of Fouquet's and it was discussed whether a lot split had been done prior to that house being built west of 811 N Lincoln.

David Rich mentioned that they could grant the variance with certain considerations and make it match the existing building structure, to do so in such a way to maintain the community. It was mentioned that the request is for an attached structure to be tied into the existing house.

Woodard mentioned that currently there are two lots with the same setback and if the variance is allowed, there will still be 2 lots with the same setback. It will just change, which ones are in common. Melanie Block stated the site triangle had been a concern. Young stated she could show the site triangle.

Young stated that north/south roads in the original part of town are $80^{\prime}$ wide street right of ways.

Terrell asked what designated an address and why it was Lincoln Street and if it was platted to face 7th Street, why isn't it 7th Ave. Young stated that the City office sets the address when a building permit is pulled and since the driveway and front door face Lincoln Street, it was given a Lincoln Street address.

Young stated the Zoning Code states that if there are not platted setback lines, then the building is to be $25^{\prime}$ from the front street and $15^{\prime}$ from the side right of way. Young stated this is from the property line and not from the curb. Young mentioned that if the plat had been reversed with the $12.5^{\prime}$ setback along 7th Ave, the variance would technically be allowing a $3^{\prime}$ variance since the addition would be approximately $9.5^{\prime}$ from the property line instead of $12.5^{\prime}$.

Woodard stated they could deny the variance, approve the variance request or approve with some type of modifications that are desired

Ryan Scott was in favor of approving the variance with guidelines.

David Rich moved to approve the variance with the restriction that it must match existing structure and stay within quality and design of current structure.
Bret Albers seconded the motion.
Motion carried 8-0.

Young asked for clarification that if the existing house is brick, then the addition is to match the exterior and Rich replied that if a home had $1 / 3$ brick that it would be to carry the design and quality of the structure to the new addition. Motion carried 8-0.

## ADJOURN

David Rich moved to adjourn at 8:01 pm.
Block seconded the motion. Motion carried 8-0.


David Woodard, Planning Commission Chair
Attest:

## Danmill Young

Danielle Young, City Clerk




## Excerpt from Unapproved Cheney City Council Minutes- November 11, 2021

## DISCUSSION OF SANTA FE CROSSING DEVELOPMENT

Ed Laverentz presented to the County. He and his wife own Santa Fe Crossing at Lake Road and Santa Fe. It is platted for two lots (a north and south lot) with a common driveway off of 391st. Laverentz asked about splitting the north lot into two lots with access off of Heather Lane and would go through the platting process for the south lot to make 4 to 5 lots with access off of Santa Fe Street. Laverentz understood there had been discussion at previous meetings regarding development along streets without curb/gutter. Laverentz asked for direction on what might be allowed before going through the platting process. Laverentz would like to develop it for single family residential to match the existing neighborhood along Heather Lane.

There is some reservation about the future of Santa Fe Street. Currently, the city owns Santa Fe Street, which is only 30 ' wide along the south side of Laverentz's lots and is not wide enough for the standard 60' road right-ofway. Laverentz asked what would be allowed to happen along Santa Fe, without knowing the future of the railroad. Administrator Young read the City Code that states with the Governing Body's approval could go away from standard street requirements. With a plat, adequate public facilities have to be available, which means the road has to be adequate to handle traffic generated by the development. Young has discussed different options with the city engineer. There is an additional 25 ' railroad right-of-way between the tracks and the City's Santa Fe property that could possibly be utilized in the future for a road right of way if the railroad is ever abandoned. This would give 55' for the Road Right-of-way, which is still short of the required 60' the engineer wants to see. Young stated the Council could state they don't want access off of Santa Fe and require access to the development off of Lake Road. Or require a cul de sac or private road in between the current two lots. They could allow entrance off of Santa Fe with the understanding that the road right-of-way is only $30^{\prime}$ and require future setbacks be put in place so if enough right of way is required, an actual road could be built later on or some type of road improvements could be required along Santa Fe, without the full curb/gutter. The city code also states it should be $3^{\prime \prime}$ thick asphalt.

Laverentz will have to go through the platting process with the Planning Commission; however, the code states the Governing Body has the ability to waive the street requirements; therefore, that is why he's present at this meeting. Councilmember Albers asked about discussing different areas of town with dirt roads that haven't been developed at a previous Council meeting. Albers thought it needs addressed, as it's been done in other areas of town. Mayor identified several problems, including the road narrowing, the house that is built on the property to the east of Laverentz's lots does not allow for the City to utilize part of Laverentz's lot as future right of way, and a cost to curb/gutter the road was outrageous a few years ago. Albers asked if the lot sizes would compare to the rest of the neighborhood. Laverentz said the lots would be larger that the other lots along Heather Lane. Laverentz stated if he split the north lot into two lots, it is just a lot split process and doesn't have to go through the platting process. Laverentz asked what was going to happen with Santa Fe Street in the future since the City only owns a $30^{\prime}$ wide section south of his lots and what will be allowed to happen? Albers thought the City was in need of buildable lots. Laverentz stated he had plenty of depth, going north to south and was willing to give up some of his lot to accommodate for future road right of way for if the railroad is ever abandoned. But the property to the east (Diskin) doesn't have real estate available to make the adequate road right of way for Santa Fe. Laverentz thought the decision made should be done that is fair and would be done for others in the future, if other requests are made.

Councilmember Kampling thought that acquiring a little more easement to the north, could allow for a future street to be built from Lake Road, but not necessarily east since Diskin's property would block the full 60' ROW. Santa Fe east of Diskin's then widens out again. Mayor Mize asked about a smaller easement that in the future the road could be moved and built? Laverentz mentioned that there is currently a $20^{\prime}$ drainage and utility easement that runs along Santa Fe, so nothing can be built within that easement. Lot would be approximately 90 ' wide. Laverentz stated the lots would be desirable and plenty deep at 199'. Councilmember Gile stated she hated to stunt growth since so many people are looking for an area to build.

Marc Bennett, lives on Heather Lane to the north of Laverentz's property. He remembered when Greg Kampling and John Hillman owned the lots there was conversation about paving Heather Lane, which would assess specials to his property. It was discussed then that if an access road was built off of Heather Lane, then Heather Lane would have to be paved. He also remembered that Santa Fe was an easement, and not a road at that time. Bennett was curious if specials were going to be assessed and where the access for the lots would be and how the houses would face Heather Lane. Bennett thought at one time it was discussed to have 3 lots off of Lake Road because access from Heather Lane and Santa Fe. It seems the development has been complicated and discussed several times. Albers asked if driveways were allowed off of Heather Lane and not requiring curb/gutter at this time. Albers asked Bennett if he saw issues with that. Bennett said if they were just single-family houses of $1500+\mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$, like his, with a single driveway going to each lot to the south, he didn't think that would be a problem. Bennett asked Kampling if he remembered why that wasn't an option. Kampling stated there wasn't an option off of Santa Fe at all when he owned it. Bennett stated he just wanted to know what was going in as he isn't keen on duplexes or apartments being built there. He understood allowing single family homes like his that is across the street on Heather Lane. Also, he wanted to know if Heather Lane would be required to be paved and if so, who is going to pay for the road? Bennett also brought up the need for a sewer and has been discussed in the past.

Councilmember Albers asked about the requirement of $50 \%$ of the homeowners requesting the road be paved and it was determined from the current number of owners, that the number of residents that own lots along Heather Lane, it would be difficult to move forward with paving the road. Councilmember wants to continue growing the community, but doesn't want to cause hardship on the people that have been living in that area for a long time. Albers thought that allowing Laverentz's north lot to be split into two with access off of Heather Lane would be okay, but access for the south lot was a bigger item to discuss.

Councilmember Kampling mentioned taking an additional easement off of Laverentz's south property to be able to make the 60' Road ROW when the railroad abandons. Attorney Austin Parker mentioned that the north lot could be split with access off of Heather as a dirt road because the road was already over $50 \%$ build-out, so getting the existing property owners to agree to specials to pave the road would be hard. Parker stated Laverentz could ask for a variance from the Planning Commission. He thought the planning commission would be interested in knowing Laverentz is willing to give some land for the right-of-way. Parker mentioned filing a plat with a variance.

Councilmember Albers mentioned Laverentz might not want to go down that route of doing the plat and variance together. The Planning Commission can help give input on the growth of the community. Councilmember Kampling mentioned if Rails to Trails comes through town, then the City may not get the full $25^{\prime}$ ROW. It was mentioned that the Rails to Trails last requested the City to maintain several miles of the trail outside the City and the Governing Body was not favorable to the maintenance request and needed to be looked at from a legal standpoint.

Laverentz does not plan to do anything with the north lot until a decision is made on the south lot. There is a water line that runs in between his two current lots and if he were to put a cul de sac down the middle, the backs of the houses would face towards Bennett's house on Heather Lane. Gile didn't think Heather Lane would want to look at
the back sides of the houses from the cul de sac. Attorney Parker suggested a developer's agreement for guidance on moving forward. Councilmember Albers thought if Council was all good with splitting the north lot and taking the additional 5' of the south side of the south lot for future road right of way, and forego the requirement of curb/gutter, then a developer's agreement wouldn't' be required. Albers thought the property was unique and special circumstances have been done to get land developed. The reason there isn't a street on the south side is because there is not enough right of way. Parker stated this qualified the land for a variance since it is a unique circumstance and was inherited by the property owner due to the Railroad and Santa Fe. Albers wanted to make it known that the next new development starting from a blank slate may not get the same allowance of no curb/gutter, but due to the existing circumstance that is why the Council is willing to allow this development to happen. Kampling thought it was important to have a full 60' road right-of-way from the alley to Lake Road. Laverentz stated the homes would be similar to existing homes in the neighborhood.

Parker said Laverentz's next step should be to go to the Planning Commission to get the variance and then once the variance is acquired, he can do the plat. Albers asked what the timeline would be. Young stated there would be a Planning Commission meeting the first week of December and Laverentz could come talk to them then. The variance is about a 2 -month process because a public hearing a notice must be served. The variance is approved by the Planning Commission and does not come back to the Council. Parker discussed doing the variance and plat all at the same time. The Plat is approved by the Planning Commission and then comes to the City Council for final approval. Albers was concerned that if Laverentz did it all at the same time and the variance wasn't approved, he would be out the cost of the Plat.

It was discussed that Laverentz could go to the next Planning Commission meeting and discuss his plan with them and then he could apply for a variance first and then a Plat from the Planning Commission. Minutes from the Council meeting would be provided to the Planning Commission for them to review the discussion and see that the Council is in favor of Laverentz moving forward with the proposed development.

Young asked Council if they wanted any additional improvements to the current condition of Santa Fe. Council thought the current seal on that section of road of Santa Fe was the nicest section of Santa Fe Street. Laverentz didn't think the residential traffic along that section of Santa Fe would tear up Santa Fe, since there are already semis utilizing Santa Fe.

Bennett asked about the requirement for sewer on those lots and thought the city's sewer didn't have enough lift in that area. Storm drainage was also discussed for that area. Parker mentioned that part of the plat would address drainage of stormwater. Mayor questioned if the surface water would drain to Santa Fe? Young mentioned that a smaller type of lift station or individual sewer lift pumps had been discussed with Laverentz. Laverentz stated he preferred individual sewer lifts, like the houses on Lake Road. An engineer will look into the sewer requirements.
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