

City of Livingston Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday June 14, 2022

- 1) Call to Order: (5:36 PM)
- 2) Roll Call: (5:36 PM)
 - i) Zoning Commission members in attendance: Jim Baerg, Michael Wojdylack, Michal DeChellis
 - (1) Quorum present
- 3) Consent Items: (5:37 PM)
 - i) Approve last meeting minutes (5:37 PM)
 - (1) MD motions to approve, MW seconds
 - (2) ZC consents
- 4) Public Comment (5:38 PM)
 - i) No public comment
- 5) Agenda Items: (5:39 PM)
 - i) Old business
 - (1) No old business
 - ii) New business (5:40 PM)
 - (1) Recommendation on a Zone Map Amendment following the annexation of 9 & 21 Rogers Lane owned by Dave Haug.
 - (i) Jim Woodhull goes through staff report
 1. MW asks about railroad crossing concerns in that area
 - a. JW – only blocked twice a week, not a huge issue
 2. JB – Rogers lane is narrow and undeveloped and would need to be brought up to city standards – who would pay for that improvement?
 - a. JW – city would make sure that right of way, at the time of development, the developer would be required to pay for improvements
 - i. JB if the road is widened, then it would come from the development side
 - ii. JB is there a need for a stoplight – DOT would need to be consulted and would decide if and when a signal would go in
 - iii. JB there is only one other egress site – is that adequate in terms of public safety?
 - iv. JW – that would be an issue for subdivision to look at fire access
 - (ii) Property owner comments – Haugs

1. No one here from the Haugs

(iii) Public Comment (6:06 PM)

1. Carole Glen Lalani – 8 Rogers Lane

- a. Concerned about extra traffic that will affect the neighbor
- b. How many dwellings will they be building? Are they building over the campground?
 - i. JW – all of the campground is within this, goes from Willow to Park Street
 - ii. R3 on 10 acres could be well over 300 units if they were maxing out this space

2. Mark Sigler – 13 Carol Lane

- a. Rogers lane – is this city or county? Why isn't this in the city already?
 - i. This is a really business intersection – there is no speed limit
 - ii. Everything would need to be upgraded, shouldn't have housing until there are tons of upgrades needed

3. Bill and Kay Hunter – 20 Rogers lane – they are in the county

- a. Are they are going to be part of the city
- b. What is the development going to be like? How high will a development be?
 - i. Max height of 60 feet – could be 4/5 stories
 - ii. Don't want to change the area

4. Vicki Nelson McDonald

- a. How could you say that public safety isn't zoning?
 - i. JW – I misspoke – we totally consider public safety
- b. Just cause the owners ask for the highest zoning doesn't mean that they should get
 - i. JW – the growth policy says that we should zone this MU – MU is more dense than HC
- c. How can you assess the effect on light and air if you don't know what people are going to be building.
 - i. JW – the building code covers this effort of light and air. Says that it isn't productive to have this conversation.
- d. Reason for a public hearing is for the public to participate.
- e. JB – we are here to give a voice to the neighborhood, we are here to consider the wishes of the property owner, we also need to look at what needs to happen for the city at large

i. You can also voice your opinions again at the city commission

(iv) Zoning Commission comments

1. MD – feels like this is a really big area for HC, there could be a lot of housing here if they chose to max out this space, concerned about traffic and the feeling of the space if used to the max
2. JB – R3 – housing, churches, daycare, but no commercial
 - a. MU – same residential uses, but could do clinics, business offices, bars, restaurants – no hotels and motels
 - b. HC – put in hotels and motels, drive-ins, wholesale, gas stations, auto repair
 - c. Def need multifamily housing – if we zone it R3 then we would get that similar feel on Loves lane

(v) Motion to the city –

1. MW motions to zone this R3
2. JB seconds that
3. ZC approves of that change

iii) Recommendation on Zone Map Amendment of 1200 W. Montana Street, requested by Dan Kaul.

(i) Jim Woodhull goes through the staff report

1. JB – would like go through subdivision or site plan?
2. Jw – the application drawing could be accomplished through a site plan

(ii) Dan Kaul – property owner?/Developer?

(iii) Public Comment

1. Virginia Parskian – 1216 West Montana
 - a. How long will the build take?
 - i. Dan – try to make it quick
 - ii. Concern with the traffic on the street and with the soccer fields, there are no sidewalks
 - iii. Dan – I volunteered to build a sidewalk
2. Karen Nelson –
 - a. What levels are you planning?
 - i. Not really sure - some I will build and some that I will sell to others to build.
 - ii. You're going to build 7 small houses that are 2 stories high –
 - iii. Dan – that is likely, yes
 - iv. Those won't be great for people's views

- v. You have 25 lots and you'll end up with 50 houses and then 12 studio apts. Placing about 100 people in that small area. That is a lot of people being squeezed together
- vi. Dan – I will do my best to make this nice like I have done on other infill projects around the city. I really want to address the workforce housing needs of this community.
- vii. There are just too many houses in this area – people will be too tighter
- viii. JB – growth policy says that we are trying to build community and give people opportunities to be closer to the center of town

3. Glen Farrell – 1116 west Montana

- a. Concerned about the traffic on this road, it is fast and lots of it, also understand that packing people together decreases public safety and you have probs with crime,
- b. Encourage commission to stay away from R3

4. Mike White – developer/property owner

- a. Can't find housing for employees so I can't find any employees, jumped into this project because we are trying to solve a problem.

5. Vicki Nelson McDonald

- a. Worried about keeping the character of the area, concerned about safety
- b. This zoning has not been noticed properly because there wasn't a posting done on the actual physical property – the process needs to be restarted

(iv) Jim B and Jim W – trying to figure out what to do

- 1. Jim W – if this is the case, the ZC can make a recommendation and the City Commission might send it back to us.

(v) MW – recommends to zone this property R3

- 1. MD, JB says aye
- 2. Motion passes to go to the Commission
- 3. JW will take this question to the City to see if this was posted incorrectly

6) Future agenda items (PM)

a) Staff comments (PM)

7) Adjournment (8:02PM)

The next regular meeting will occur on July 12, 2022, at 5:30pm,