

**CITY OF JAMESTOWN**  
**102 3rd Ave SE - Jamestown, ND 58401**  
**Phone: 701-252-5900**

**MINUTES**  
**Planning Commission – November 13, 2017 - 8:00 a.m.**

Present: Hillerud, Rath, Frye, Bensch, Trautman

Others: Veil, Liebig, Blackmore, Fuchs

Absent: Ritter, Bayer, Rhinehart, Paulson

1. Approve the minutes from the October 9, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. Commission member Frye made a motion to approve the minutes. Seconded by Commission member Bensch. Unanimous aye vote. Motion Carried.
  
2. Public Hearing: Final Plat – Loose Addition

The final plat of Loose Subdivision, Lots 1 & 2, a replat of Auditor's Lots 4-7 and Lots 4-6 together with part of the NE ¼ and part of the SE ¼ of Section 4, Township 139N, Range 64W, of the fifth principal meridian, Stutsman County, North Dakota. The property is located along 81st Ave SE between 36th & 37th St SE, Jamestown, ND.

Cindy Gray, SRF Consulting Group, Inc. gave the staff report. The preliminary plat was approved without any changes on October 9, 2017 and would facilitate a land transaction. The property does not currently receive utilities from the City of Jamestown and is not being planned for development at this time. There are no traffic impacts with this replat and no change to existing zoning or future land use. Access to lots 1 and 2 will be from 81<sup>st</sup> St SE. SRF Consulting Group, Inc. recommends approval of the final plat as it meets all City of Jamestown Code requirements.

Chairman Hillerud opened the public hearing. No one appeared. Chairman Hillerud closed the public hearing.

Commission member Trautman made a motion to accept the findings of staff and recommend approval to the City Council of the Final Plat for the Loose subdivision, a replat of the part of the NE ¼ and part of the SE ¼ of Section 4, T139N, R64W, City of Jamestown. Seconded by Commission member Rath. Roll Call. Unanimous aye vote. Motion Carried.

3. Consideration of ordinance language to create a streamlined pathway for review and consideration of minor subdivisions and related ordinance changes.

Cindy Gray, SRF Consulting Group, Inc. gave the staff report. This proposed text amendment would create a minor subdivision and a stream lined review process for certain types of plats. Staff has found that the defining factor that sets apart the more "minor" subdivisions from the "major" subdivisions ins the need for new right of way. This proposed amendment to the City's subdivision regulations in Appendix B would involve the creation of a new type of subdivision submittal called a "Minor Subdivision". These plats would not require the dedication of ROW, doesn't not land lock any adjacent property, and does not fall within the corridors of any planned or proposed street as shown in the Land Use & Transportation Plan.

The Minor Subdivision amendment would create a new section in Appendix B identifying criteria for an application to qualify as a Minor Subdivision to include an application submitted to staff, staff review, a public hearing for consideration by the Planning Commission, and approval by the City Council.

Cindy also reviewed an amendment relating to lot mergers now processed by the City Assessor's office. Lot mergers do not remove the dividing boundary line as shown on the recorded plat; however, the lot merger renders the common boundary line ineffective for setback requirements as provided in Appendix C of the Municipal Code. This practice is not currently documented in City ordinance, so a proposed newly created section to Appendix B would recognize the existing lot merger practice with criteria for an application to qualify as a Lot Merger.

Chairman Hillerud and the Commission members discussed different scenarios and the need for lot mergers. Jamison Veil, City Assessor, stated that lot mergers would have to be within the same plat and must also be zoned the same. He stated that city staff has reviewed this amendment, but is currently waiting for the City Attorney's review.

Cindy stated that lot mergers are common practice and it would be good to have this in the amendment. Commission member Bensch discussed utility easements and how at times they can cause problems, and this minor subdivision would speed up the process.

Commission member Frye suggested the City Attorney review the proposed text amendments before the Planning Commission takes any action. Commissioners agreed.

Commission member Bensch made a motion to have the City Attorney review the text amendment proposal and to continue this discussion item to the December Planning Commission meeting. Commission member Frye seconded. Roll Call. Unanimous aye vote. Motion Carried.

4. Adjournment. Commission member Frye made a motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned.