

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON DECEMBER 15, 2014 IN THE COMMISSION ROOM AT CITY HALL IN WILLISTON, NORTH DAKOTA.

Boyeff called the meeting to order at 5:30pm. Roll Call was taken. A Quorum was present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Long, Haugen, Aafedt, Fleck, Boyeff.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Maristuen, Christensen

OTHERS PRESENT: Kent Jarcik, Planning Director; Donald Kress, Principal Planner; Rachel Ressler, Staff Planner; Samantha Neil, Staff Planner; Kelsey Vlamis, Planner/Code Compliance; Christine Edwards (Administrative Assistant); Bob Hanson, City Engineer; Jordon Evert, Assist. City Attorney; Kelly Aberly, Building Dept.

DISPOSITION OF MINUTES:

- Minutes were approved for November 17, 2014 regular meeting. MOTION BY LONG SECOND BY HAUGEN. MOTION CARRIED ON VOICE VOTE.

COMMUNICATION:

- Discussion about January 2015 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting date as the regular, third Monday date falls on a holiday. *Decision to hold the meeting on Tuesday, January 20, 2015.*
- Commission discussion about oil well pad policy.

Boyeff stated that there had been a meeting with Statoil in reference to their participation in any assessments that might come to a land-owner as a result of a roadway needing to be upgraded from standard paving to 105,500 pound paving. Boyeff stated that it was his understanding that those assessments are against the land therefore the land owners would be responsible. Since Statoil only leases land, Boyeff said the oil well pad committee is trying to find the appropriate way to bring some of that financial responsibility to Statoil. Boyeff stated that it was the desire of that committee to bring this back to the Planning Commission for clarity on what they want in the way of agreement on this issue.

Assistant City Attorney Evert stated that the reasoning for this was essentially because the trucks and rigs needed to build and maintain oil well pads take a toll on the roadway. Evert said that it is important that a policy be put in place that will be fair to all oil companies that might be involved in a similar situation within the City limits. Evert suggests this as a road maintenance agreement.

Discussion involved:

- Special assessment taxes cannot be placed against oil companies; those must go against the property owner. If the City had already planned for a road (such as 58th St.) to be a 105,500 pound road because of generalized truck traffic, is it fair to ask an oil company to pay a portion of the costs. If the road is planned only as a standard roadway and has to be increased to a 105,500 pound road simply because of an oil well pad then the discussion of the oil company financially participating in the difference between standard paving and 105,500 pound paving comes into play. All property owners on an affected street would be assessed a special tax in order to pay for the paving, including residents who have no need for the upgraded road paving.

- The general feeling at the committee meeting that if a certain street was going to be paved to 105,500 pounds regardless of the presence of an oil well pad, Statoil didn't feel it was fair to charge them for something that was planned anyhow. Conversely if an oil company is going to be asked to share in the cost of upgrading a road to 105,500 pound road then why not the other trucking companies that use the same roads.
- How will the number of wells on a site tie into the wear and tear on the road and should that be a consideration in assessing special assessments to the oil company.
- Oil well sites are tied into pipelines which actually decreases the amount of their truck traffic on a road vs. commercial businesses create their own truck traffic regardless of oil well pads.

Commissioners were asked to think about what they would like to accomplish through the oil well pad committee. Ideas on cost sharing, what triggers the cost sharing and how to divide it should be emailed to Boyeff.

- Request for Planning Commissioners to participate on the advisory committee for the Joint Comprehensive Land Use Update. *Commissioner's Christensen and Aafedt will serve on this committee.*
- January 2015 meeting will need nomination and election of Planning Commission seats; volunteers for a nominating committee were requested. *Commissioner's Fleck and Boyeff will serve as the nominating committee.*

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

a. Proposed Ordinance 1008 amending Section 25 (G), modifying residential parking requirements – Staff

Boyeff introduced this first public hearing (as above) and asked Ressler to present. Ressler stated that this ordinance was proposed in response to a lack of parking in new apartment complexes. Ressler explained that the requirement is two spaces for each multi-family unit and one space for each efficiency unit. Staff has determined that many garages sit empty or filled with storage items, leaving those spaces unavailable to the general apartment area, forcing cars onto streets and causing safety concerns due to overcrowded streets.

Ressler directed Commissioners to a list of issues in each of their packets. She stated that the City has observed quite a few issues with multifamily parking within the city. City staff has made these observations over the last two years:

- In open garages, we have observed many being used as storage spaces.
- In open garages, we have observed many used as gathering spaces.
- Post snow storms (for the last two years), we have observed tire tracks, and have noted very few tracks moving in and out of garages.
- Both sides of neighboring streets are parked surrounding apartment complexes in town. In many cases, this comes from a single apartment project.
- We have received a request for and granted the ability for one apartment complex to utilize two lots that had been designated as twinhome lots as extra parking because the parking on their lot could not handle the demand. The Planning
- Commission granted this request, which used 4 lots.

- We have received a second request from an apartment complex that does not have vacant nearby lots and wants to build extra open parking into their setback to accommodate the vehicles parking in the street. We have explained that this is not allowable within the ordinance.
- We have received requests from private property for no parking sign because there are so many vehicles utilizing on street parking around apartment complexes.
- Garages and driveways are not large enough for the oversize vehicles used in Williston – garages are long enough but not wide enough, and drive aisles barely accommodate large vehicles' turning radii.
- Many people have personal and work vehicles, so at least one vehicle is present at all times.

Ressler said that parking calculations are made on the assumption that those spaces can be shared – that there is turnover in the parking, ensuring that spaces are available for those who need it, and making allowances for the fact that one apartment may have only 1 car while another might have 3. Shared parking, however, does not work when individual garages are involved, since those spaces are effectively always filled, even if they are not filled by cars. Since there has been almost no provision of any common parking areas, Ressler stated that this forces cars onto streets, which leads to overcrowding and safety concerns.

Ressler stated that proposed Ordinance 1008 modifies the parking requirements for multifamily dwelling units and efficiency apartment units. It does not change the parking requirements for single family and duplex homes. This ordinance will change the requirements so that only parking that is provided in common lots (outdoor, interior, or underground) will be counted toward the fulfillment of parking requirements. Any parking that is in individual garages will not count toward fulfilling the required amount of parking. Apartment complexes may still provide individual garages, but those will be in addition to the required amount of parking. The ordinance also widens the required drive aisle for drive aisles that enter garages to 35 ft.

Ressler said that at the December 1, 2014 ad hoc meeting, discussion focused on the original version of the ordinance, which included the ability to count 50% of any attached individual garages toward the required parking count. The ad hoc committee determined that this was not necessary. Ressler stated that the ad hoc committee was in favor of this ordinance change.

Ressler stated that after drafts of these ordinances were sent out to the Williston Home Builder's Association and various developers, she had been contacted for clarification of reasoning behind the proposed changes. Ressler provided the list (above) to them and she asked for written comment from anyone wishing to do so. Summary of the comments Ressler had received were that certain developers had made larger garages on their properties; this should be a management problem, not developer/builder problem; rents would have to go higher in order to cover costs of providing more parking; if developers stopped building garages it might be detrimental to long term use; and the City should meet with developers/builders. Ressler stated that there had been focus group meetings on this issue.

Aafedt stated that it seemed if there was enforcement of the number of people living in an apartment that would cut down on over parking. Ressler said that first, enforcement is an issue but also that as of now garages count as parking space, if an apartment has only one vehicle but are assigned a two-car garage then there is a parking space that is unusable. Fleck supported Aafedt's statement and said that over parking was an enforcement issue and that legal tenants should not be punished.

Haugen stated that even if there are two people living in an apartment it is a safe bet that they already have two vehicles and if one of them also has a work vehicle they are going to be over parked; Haugen said he feels this proposal is long over-due, a great idea.

Boyeff opened Public Hearing and asked for input from the audience. Terry Metzler, Granite Peak Development, supported the enforcement and stated that it was up to both the City and the Developers/Property Managers. Metzler stated that removing the garages would be detrimental to apartment rental. Bill Murphy, realtor, said that over parking is not an issue exclusive to apartments. He stated that on his street there is no parking to be found, one neighbor has seven vehicles. Murphy stated other similar concerns (broken down vehicles and camper trailers parked on streets, haven't moved in weeks to months) and questioned that if the City could not enforce the ordinances in place (overcrowding in residences) then how will they enforce new ones? Rick Leuthold, Sanderson Stewart, added that as an engineer he believed the 35 ft. drive aisles proposed in this ordinance to be illogical. While understanding the overcrowding and parking issues but he wanted to point out that the current 26 ft. width is standard and do-able. Widening the drive aisles will take more acreage to build.

Continuing public comment, Jill (last name unknown), manager of Eagle Crest Apartments, stated that their management addresses parking from the beginning. Each lease states that a garage must be used for parking, not for storage. Items may be stored in the garage but must still allow vehicle parking. A list is kept of each tenant's vehicle and license plate number and the management team actively monitors the parking areas. Kelly Aberly of the Building Dept. asked Jill how many of her renters opt to pay the extra monthly rent for a garage rationalizing that if there are empty garages there is a constant threat of over parking. Jill stated that she actually has a wait list of current tenants wanting to rent an extra garage if one becomes available in order to park their second vehicle in.

Lee Scully, Ruger Properties, stated they have looked in the garages on their properties and that 85% of them were indeed used for parking while the other 15% were used for storage. Of that 15% percent, some of them were actually 2nd garages rented for the purpose of storage and even with that they have had no off-street parking issues. Scully also stated that "current problems will not be solved by new ordinances, only by enforcement".

Aberly stated that it is completely possible that the garages are being used for parking but that meant vintage cars, boats, 4-wheelers and like. Ressler responded that removing the garages eliminates the ability to have them used for that purpose. Scully stated that would only force those items to take up other parking stalls. Scully said that this ordinance would effectively take away an amenity that is important to renters. Ressler stated that mini-storage would then need to be used.

Metzler stated that there would have to be some creation of the demand for mini-storage. Jarcik interjected that the City just isn't seeing any requests for them and eluded to the fact that storage items must be going somewhere such as those garages. Metzler replied that if there is no enforcement there is no reason for people to look for mini-storage.

Boyeff called two last times for more public input; hearing none he closed the public hearing and asked for the wishes of the Commission.

Long first asked Ressler if expanding the drive aisles would better accommodate the parking issues. Ressler answered, "not on its own". Aafedt then asked if and/or how this proposal would affect existing buildings and stated that if they are not affected then nothing would change; ordinance has little to no effect. Ressler stated it was the hope of the City that the new ordinance would be an incentive for property management to participate in enforcement.

Aafedt said that this ordinance would force developers to have to purchase more land to build on and provide parking needs and their desire for a garage which in turn would create even higher rent prices which is not an acceptable situation.

Boyeff asked how this could be enforced. Jarcik answered that it is difficult at best. The City cannot do surveillance to see how many people are actually in an apartment so it is hard to get enough evidence to take it to court.

MOTION BY HAUGEN, SECOND BY LONG, to recommend approval of Ordinance 1008 amending Section 25 (G), modifying residential parking requirements. AYES: Long, Haugen. NAYS: Fleck, Aafedt, Boyeff. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

Assistant City Attorney Evert stated that the Planning Department staff could still elect to take the ordinance forward to the City Commission as presented with no recommendation.

b. Proposed Ordinance 1009 amending Ordinance 960,962 and 993 – Staff

Boyeff introduced proposed Ordinance 1009 and asked Ressler to present. Ressler explained that Ordinance 1009 modifies and consolidates Ordinances 960, 962, and 993, which changed the overall sign requirements, changed the digital messaging requirements, and changed the allowable zones for billboards, respectively. We are looking at this ordinance because, due to the pace and scale of development in town, we have seen many signs of this type in the City and need to regulate them.

TEMPORARY SIGNS, OTHER: Require a permit from the Building Official through the process described above under PERMITS REQUIRED if the sign is over 32 square feet or over 6 feet tall.

- SIGN, SUBDIVISION/APARTMENT COMPLEX IDENTIFICATION: A sign bearing the name of the subdivision or apartment complex, which also may include the phone number of a leasing agent if used for an apartment complex. No more than two monument style subdivision identification or apartment complex identification sign per major entrance into the subdivision or complex from a public right of way, not exceeding a total of 32 square feet, and is no more than 8 feet tall on an arterial street and no more than 6 feet tall on any local or collector street.
- CONSTRUCTION: A sign indicating the responsible architect, engineer, contractor, or financing agency, which is placed on premises where construction, repair, or renovation is in progress. The maximum allowance of these signs is 1 per lot, which is no more than 32 square feet. Such signs shall be removed by the architect, engineer, contractor, or financing agency upon the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or other completion of work. This is intended to be a project identification sign, with contact information for the above entities, and not an off-premise commercial advertisement.
- LAND DEVELOPMENT: A sign installed and permanently affixed on vacant land which identifies the land developer, building, architect, engineer and or financing agency and could include information about the property. The requirements and maximum size of land development signs are specified in Section 25.G. Land development signs can include contractor information, but are not off premise business advertisement signs. These signs are meant to convey information about an entire development or project.
 - Shall be installed only on vacant land for which a grading or building permit has been issued.
 - Shall be only freestanding signs.
 - Shall have only static messaging. “Coming Soon”, “Developer”
 - May be in place for up to one year, with consideration for extension based on the amount of land developed.

- Shall not total more than 128 square feet of sign face per street frontage for a single development. Except for one sign of 64 square feet, no sign may exceed 32 square feet. Signs constructed on a single frontage must be at least 300 feet apart.
- Shall be considered separately from identification signs for new subdivisions.
- Land development signs can include: for sale signs, coming soon signs, owner information, and/or contractor information.
- **REAL ESTATE:** A sign that advertises the sale/rent or lease of the entire property as differentiated from multi-family and multi-tenant commercial lease signs. The sign identifies the owner or agent, contact information, and general classification of property. No more than one such sign may be displayed on each street frontage of the property. Signs for sale shall be removed by the seller upon the closing of the sale. These signs are considered separately from land development signs. Real estate signs are broken into two categories:
 - Signs in R-1E, R-1A, R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-5, R-6 and R-7: no more than one sign, not exceeding six square feet in area, advertising an individual property for sale, lease, or rent, or indicating "Vacancy" or "No Vacancy" may be erected on any street frontage.
 - Signs in C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1, M-2, or M-3: No more than one sign per street frontage, not exceeding 32 square feet, advertising an individual property for sale, lease or rent, or indicating "Vacancy" or "No Vacancy" may be erected on any street frontage.
- **MULTI-FAMILY LEASE:** One banner or wall sign per street frontage that is firmly affixed to a building facing the adjoining public right of way and kept in good repair that is a maximum of 32 square feet advertising the sale or lease of units within an apartment or condominium complex. If a banner sign is not used, one monument style lease sign not exceeding 32 square feet constructed of finished materials (with no unpainted wood) that is maintained in good order may be used for a period of two years after a new apartment project is opened, or until all units have been leased, whichever comes first. Alternative lease style signs may be considered and approved by the Planning Director if a hardship is demonstrated.
- **MULTI-TENANT LEASE:** One banner or wall sign per street frontage that is firmly affixed to a building facing the adjoining public right of way and kept in good repair that is a maximum of 32 square feet advertising the sale or lease of units within a commercial multi-tenant building. This sign be used until all units have been leased, at which point it must be removed. If a vacancy occurs, a lease sign may be placed per the above instructions until that vacancy has been filled. Alternative lease style signs may be considered and approved by the Planning Director if a hardship is demonstrated.

Ressler stated that she had received one comment after having sent the draft out to developers that they be allowed 30 days to review this before any action taken by the Commission. Ad Hoc Committee on December 1, 2014 made a recommendation for approval.

Boyeff asked about new terms in the proposal vs. terms already in the ordinance. Multi-family Lease and Multi-tenant Lease are new terms to help with clearer enforcement and determination of what a sign is. Ressler states also that these proposed signs are more generous than a lot of other city ordinances compared to this.

Boyeff opened the public hearing and called for input from the audience. Terry Metzler, Granite Peak Development, stated that this ordinance as it relates to real estate signs needed more clarification when it comes to not having them closer than 300 ft. apart. Metzler stated that he supported the over-all ideas of the ordinance but said as example he stated that if "you" own one lot in the middle of a block and one on the corner this ordinance would be unfair. Metzler said there needed to be some room for give and take in order for people and the City to work together.

Bill Murphy, realtor, agreed with Metzler's request for clarification but mostly wanted to point out that there were several people who should be involved in such discussion that were never even notified of proposed ordinance such as the President of the Williston Board of Realtors. Murphy requested that the Planning Commission table this matter and allow "those people" a chance to meet with the City Staff before any decisions were made.

Rob Gammel, Peterson Group, spoke to support the delay and suggested a working group meeting giving more than one week's notice. He stated that one of his issues with proposed ordinance is with apartment buildings being allowed 32 sq. ft. of signage and condos only being allowed 6 sq. ft.; Gammel said he would like some time to hear the reasoning behind that.

Boyeff called twice more for public input. Hearing none he closed the public hearing and asked for the wishes of the Commission. Long asked if this was something that could be sent back to a discussion group as it sounded like there was a lot of interest and many interested parties had no input to this point. (Builders Association, Board of Realtors, Apartment Association) Aafedt suggested that "non-involved" parties should be included in discussion as well to balance wants and needs; to express what the general public would like to or not like to see.

MOTION BY LONG, SECOND BY FLECK, to table Ordinance 1009 amending Ordinances 960, 962 and 993 and send it back to the committee for more revision. AYES: Long, Fleck, Boyeff. NAYS: Haugen, Aafedt. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

c. Proposed Ordinance 1010 modifying 968(M) modifying signage requirements in the R-2 zone – Staff

Boyeff introduced public hearing on Ordinance 1010 and asked Ressler to present. Ressler stated that with proposed Ordinance 1009 being tabled, there was no need to present this one as it deals further with modification of signage requirements for home occupations, and all sign requirements in the R-2 zone.

Boyeff opened public hearing as this had been advertised. No public input was heard.

MOTION BY AAFEDT, SECOND BY LONG, to table proposed Ordinance 1010. AYES: Long, Fleck, Aafedt, Boyeff. NAYS: Haugen. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

d. Proposed Ordinance 1011 modifying Sections, 9L, 10L, 11L, 13L, 14L, 15L and 16L of Ordinance 613, updating signage allowances – Staff

Per Ressler's statement concerning proposed Ordinances 1009 and 1010, no public hearing was opened; no Commission discussion was had concerning proposed ordinance 1011 as it deals further with modification of signage requirements in all other residential zones except for R-2.

Boyeff opened public hearing as this had been advertised. No public input was heard.

MOTION BY FLECK, SECOND BY AAFEDT, to table proposed Ordinance 1011. AYES: Long, Haugen, Fleck, Aafedt, Boyeff NAYS: None. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

e. Administrative review plat, a rearrangement of Block 1, Cenex Subdivision into Lots 1R, 2R, and 3R, 15 12th Ave. E, City of Williston, - Shawn Sabin/Sabin Metals

Boyeff introduced this public hearing (as above) and asked Kress to present. Kress stated this is an administrative review plat to rearrange Lot 1, Block 1 of the Cenex Subdivision. At the ad hoc meeting it was determined that there needed to be some revisions to the plat in regard to unnecessary dedications. Kress provided a revised plat to the Commission and stated that this plat proposed to divide one lot into three —Lots 1R, 2R, and 3R, with the following acreage and access:

Lot Number	Acreage	Access
1R	2.66	East Broadway and 7 th Avenue East
2R	14.68	7 th Avenue East
3R	26.85	12th Avenue East

Kress talked about discussion at the December 1, 2014 ad hoc meeting and updates to those things since that meeting as follows:

RIGHT OF WAY FOR 12th AVENUE and 7th AVENUE DEPICTED ON THE PLAT: The City Engineer clarified that the right of way for 12th and 7th depicted on this plat does not need to be depicted; the distinctive boundary of the plat should only be around Block 1 of the Cenex Subdivision and not continue into the streets. ***Planning staff has contacted the surveyor and directed these ROW's be removed from the plat.*

EASEMENTS NOT DEPICTED ON THE PLAT: The City Engineer pointed out that a water and sewer line along the north property line of Lots 2 and 3 and a major sewer line and easement through Lot 2 are not depicted on the plat. ***Planning staff has contacted the surveyor and directed these easements be depicted on the revised plat.*

RECONFIGURATION OF LOT 2 and 3: The committee directed Planning staff to contact the applicant and discuss the City Engineer's recommendation that the lot line between Lots 2 and 3 be moved to the west, closer to the existing city sewer easement, as this would allow a more effective use of the property. The City Engineer noted the applicant could straighten out that sewer line at his expense. ***Planning staff contacted the applicant as directed and he determined, after further discussion with Planning and Engineering staff, to keep the current configuration of lots. The City Engineer advised that a road could be built over the sewer line as long as the applicant encased that portion of the sewer line under the road in steel before building the road.*

PLATTING OF 2nd STREET: The City Engineer observed that the applicant may wish to consider platting 2nd Street through this property as a continuation of the existing 2nd Street to the west. There was a question of whether this road would end in a cul-de-sac on the west end of the project site or whether there is sufficient room on the north side of the existing electrical substation to put a road through. If this street were platted, the buildings along the Delaney Rearrangement, adjacent to the north side of the project site, would back up to a city street. The ad hoc committee did not require platting of 2nd Street, but directed Planning staff to contact the applicant and propose platting this street. *** Planning staff contacted the applicant as directed. The applicant stated the he "still needs time to discuss this internally as it is the first time we have considered this, so we will evaluate and address in the future, not at this time. "* Kress expresses again that this was a suggestion not a requirement of ad hoc.

FIRE SPRINKLER WATER PRESSURE: The Fire Chief and City Engineer discussed the water pressure and existing fire water pump for this project site. Currently, there would probably be

sufficient water pressure for a smaller warehouse-type building, but not for a larger one. The Fire Chief noted that we would not be able to actually determine the water pressure until AE2S has completed their analysis of the water system. The Fire Chief noted buildings with over 10,000 square feet of area must be sprinklered. Kress said that at this time, Sabin Metals is the only building on the land.

Fleck asked if it were the desire of the City to have 2nd St. to run though to 12th Ave. Hanson said it is not, it was just a suggestion.

Boyeff called three times for any public input; hearing none he closed the public hearing and asked for the wishes of the Commission.

MOTION BY LONG, SECOND BY AAFEDT, to approve the rearrangement of Block 1, Cenex Subdivision into Lots 1R, 2R, and 3R, 15 12th Ave. E, City of Williston, contingent on addressing all staff comments. AYES: Long, Haugen. Fleck, Aafedt, Boyeff NAYS: None. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

f. Administrative review plat, a rearrangement of Lots 11 and 12, Block 11, Borsheim Subdivision into Lots 11R and 12R, 1905 44th St. W, City of Williston -MSK Inc. and David L. Mischke/ Darryl Kleyer

Boyeff introduced the public hearing (as above) and asked Kress to introduce. Kress said this is an administrative review plat to rearrange Lots 11 and 12, Block 11, Borsheim Subdivision into Lots 11R and 12R, Block 11.

Kress stated that the current lot sizes are:

Lot 11: 0.32 acres

Lot 12: 0.32 acres; and

The lot sizes after rearrangement will be:

Lot 11R: 0.48 acres

Lot 12R: 0.16 acres

Kress explained that these lots are zone industrial and that there is no minimum lot requirement in and industrial zone so these lots are acceptable. Both lots currently have access to 44th Street; their access will be unchanged.

At the December 1, 2014 ad hoc meeting there were no issues and the committee had no objection to the proposed rearrangement.

Boyeff opens the public hearing and asks for public input. After calling three times and hearing no input he closed the public hearing and asked for the wishes of the Commission.

MOTION BY HAUGEN, SECOND BY FLECK, to approve the rearrangement of Lots 11 and 12, Block 11, Borsheim Subdivision into Lots 11R and 12R, 1905 44th St. W, City of Williston. AYES: Long, Haugen. Fleck, Aafedt, Boyeff NAYS: None. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

g. Administrative review plat to create Sublots 9 and 10 out of existing Sublot 3 and adjacent unplatted property in Sec. 35, T155N R101W, 218 58th St. W, City of Williston - Mountrail Williams Electrical Cooperation (MWEC)/MWEC and Kermit and Nina Heen

Boyeff introduced the public hearing (as above) and asked Kress to introduce. Kress first stated that this is one of two administrative review plats requested by Mountrail Williams Electric Cooperative (MWEC) to be presented at this meeting. Kress said this first plat is to enlarge the existing Sublot 3 that the MWEC office and shop is on. As the property to be added to the existing MWEC subplot is being cut out of unplatted property, the remaining unplatted property is also created as a subplot, Sublot 10, though no development is proposed on this subplot.

Kress stated that Sublot 9 will take access, as Sublot 3 currently does, from 58th Street West. Sublot 10 does not take access through the current MWEC property; it takes access from a turn-off along Highway 2/85.

The plat depicts an 80-foot wide road easement. This easement is to be dedicated to the City by a separate document, with the dedication noted on the plat.

The December 1, 2014 ad hoc committee had no objection to the administrative review plat. Kress concluded staff presentation and stated that Chris Brostuen was available to answer any questions as MWEC's representative.

Boyeff asked Brostuen if MWEC was comfortable with the 80 ft. road easement dedication and Brostuen indicated that they were. Boyeff then opened the public hearing and asked for public input. After the second call for public comment a brief discussion was had with Hanson and Kress regarding access off of Hwy 2 and the ND DOT desire to limit additional access. Kress stated that this plat only keeps in place the current access and that any future development would likely not be allowed direct access to Hwy 2 and instead would need to gain access from 6th Ave.

After calling a third time for public input and hearing none, Boyeff closed the public hearing and asked for the wishes of the Commission.

MOTION BY LONG, SECOND BY AAFEDT, to approve the administrative review plat to create Sublots 9 and 10 out of existing Sublot 3 and adjacent unplatted property in Sec. 35, T155N R101W, 218 58th St. W, City of Williston. AYES: Long, Fleck, Aafedt, Boyeff NAYS: None. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: Haugen.

h. Administrative review plat, a rearrangement of Lot 1, Block 4 Wright Subdivision into Lots 1R and 2R, 120 53th St. NW, City of Williston - Karissa Teske/Neil Slaaen

Boyeff introduced the public hearing (as above) and stated that this item ties into item 8(a) under new business, a Special Use Permit. Boyeff asked Neill to present. Neill first indicated the area of this administrative review and explained that the intended purpose of this was for a small drive-thru restaurant. Neill said this administrative review was for a lot split of an existing lot located in the M-1: Light Industrial zone. The lot is currently occupied by U-Haul Neighborhood Dealer. Lot 1R will occupy 0.35 acres, and Lot 2R on the north portion of the existing lot will occupy 0.11 acres. There is no minimum lot size in an M-1 zone.

Access will come in off of the frontage road and exit into the alley on the west side of the lot. The applicant is proposing a restaurant on this lot.

Contingent on approval of the administrative review, the applicant must pave the required parking, drive aisle, and alley from her lot to 53rd Street. U-Haul will also be required to clean up their lot.

Water is available on the adjacent street. Sewer will be available from on-sight septic which will have to be approved by the State and the applicant has begun that process. Neill stated that the approval processes of the State takes eight to ten weeks and no construction can begin until that approval.

Aafedt asked for clarification of which lot the proposed restaurant is intended to be built on. Neill said that lot 2R is the intended site. Aafedt questioned how anything could be done on 0.11 acres. Neill explained that what the applicant actually intends amounts to a "glorified coffee kiosk". The difference is she intends to sell fresh juices, bagels, muffins and such which do not fit in the definition of a kiosk. The building will provide a small dining area with one table, and as is required there will be one restroom. There will be parking for three vehicles but it is the applicant's intention that this be mainly a drive-thru business.

Haugen posed the question to City Engineer Hanson about the septic system as he thought that the City wasn't allowing them. Hanson stated that at this time there is no sewer in the area but that he hopes that when the improvements to the Fair Grounds road are completed that will change. Hanson said that the septic system on that lot should be ok to handle the addition of the proposed restaurant. Karissa Teske, applicant, interjected that with this lot split the septic will actually be on her lot with the drain field on lot 1R.

Other items of discussion were:

- Fire chief said access was ok but the alley way would need to be kept clear and posted. Nearest fire hydrant is within the regulatory distance but would require complete obstruction of Hwy 2; Neill added that this problem exists now for the businesses currently operating in the area.
- Stacking – Teske stated that the window for the drive-thru was 140 ft. from the frontage road. Neill stated that would allow for 4 -5 vehicles; Commission had concerns about vehicles backing up onto the frontage road.
- Using the alley as an exit way. City traditionally has opposed using an alley way for primary ingress or egress, Hanson stated that is especially true where an alley is used as a buffer between commercial and residential zones. Commission hesitant to start a precedent of allowing that. Commissioner Long however pointed out that the alley in question is not really an alley, it is only drivable for a short distance. Hanson stated that there is no garbage pick-up in this alley.
- Resetting the lot and building to avoid using the alley as ingress/egress. Neill stated that had been looked at but with the existing building on proposed lot 1R there really isn't enough room.

Boyeff opened the public hearing and asked for any input from the audience. Hearing none after calling three times he closed the hearing and asked for the wishes of the board.

MOTION BY FLECK, SECOND BY HAUGEN, to deny the administrative review plat, a rearrangement of Lot 1, Block 4 Wright Subdivision into Lots 1R and 2R, 120 53th St. NW, City of Williston. AYES: Fleck, Aafedt, Haugen. NAYS: Long, Boyeff. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

With denial of the administrative review, Boyeff asked Assistant City Attorney Evert if the SPU could or should still be heard when it is time. Evert answered that without the lot to place the business on there is no ability to grant the SPU so it should not be heard.

- i. **Administrative review plat, a rearrangement of Sublot 2, Section 22, T154N R101W, into Lots 1R, 2R, and 3R, 3005 2nd St. W, City of Williston - Jack Blotsky/ Jack and Sharon Blotsky**

Boyeff introduced the public hearing (as above) and asked Neill to introduce. Neill first indicated the location of this property and that is in the M-1: Light Industrial zone. The lot is currently occupied by two shop buildings. The applicant is requesting to have the existing lot split into three, one-acre lots. Neill said the middle lot (2) will be a flag lot in order to have access onto 2nd Street West. Lot 1 will have access onto Front Street W. and Lot 3 will have access onto 2nd St. west. A 40 foot easement runs on the north side of the property, starting at 32nd Ave west and continues until 26th Ave. W. Neill explained that 26th Ave. then curves down and joins up with 2nd Street W. providing access to Front Street.

Neill stated that this lot has access to rural water and each lot will have an individual septic system.

This item was discussed at the December 1, 2014 ad hoc. Part of the discussion focused on access to the easement road (2nd St. W- the frontage road). It was discussed that there has been a DOT project proposed for reconstructing 32nd Ave intersection which might limit access to 2nd Street; lots 1 and 2 take access from 2nd Street. However the DOT project will not block 2nd Street so if 32nd St. was blocked the applicant would still be able to access 26th St. W. and around onto 2nd Street. Neill stated that staff spoke with the applicant and Blotsky did not want to change the configuration of the lots. Since he would still have access to roads from each lot we do not see an issue with this.

Boyeff stated that during ad hoc, it was proposed that Blotsky dedicate 30 feet of right-of-way (on the east side of the property) to the City for the road and Blotsky's neighbor to the east to dedicate 30 feet, making it a 60 foot right-of-way. The committee suggested providing an easement that could be extended or dedicated to the City at some point instead of the flag lot. City Engineer Hanson stated that the plat as it stands now is fine and said the City cannot second guess the future of 2nd Street in reference to the DOT project.

Boyeff opened public hearing and asked for any public input. After calling three times and hearing no public input he closed the public hearing and asked for the wishes of the board.

MOTION BY LONG, SECOND BY AAFEDT, to approve administrative review plat for the rearrangement of Sublot 2, Section 22, T154N R101W, into Lots 1R, 2R, and 3R, 3005 2nd St. W, City of Williston. AYES: Fleck, Aafedt, Haugen, Long, Boyeff. NAYS: None. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

j. Administrative review plat to create Sublot 14 from a portion of the SW1/4SW1/4, Section 34, T155N, R101W, corner of 54th St. NW and 13th Ave.W, City of Williston - Mountrail Williams Electrical Cooperation (MVEC)/Orville Erickson

Boyeff introduced the final public hearing (as above) and asked Kress to introduce. Kress indicated the location of the plat and states that there is an electrical substation already on the parcel. Kress explains that there is a five-acre parcel that is being cut out of an unplatted quarter section and said that since it is only five acres there is no requirement to plat the remainder of the quarter section.

The property is zoned A: Agricultural. No zone change is proposed. Utility substation lots that have no habitable structures on them and that are not intended for any other development are an exception to the 10-acre minimum lot area requirement of the A: Agricultural zone.

During the December 1, 2014 ad hoc meeting some of the discussion included:

LANDSCAPING: The ad hoc committee noted that some form of landscaping should be done around the project site. Chris Brostuen, representing the applicant, stated that the substation is fenced

currently. Kress said that landscaping could be installed on the outside of the fence similar to what is done now with oil well pad sites.

DEDICATION FOR RIGHT OF WAY FOR 138th AVENUE NW/ FUTURE 32nd AVENUE WEST: Kress said there was discussion about requiring a 50-foot right of way dedication along 138th Avenue NW which will become 32nd Ave. W. in the future. Discussion also included the practicality of continuing 32nd Avenue north along the section line road (138th Avenue NW) due to topographic constraints and whether 50 feet was available for dedication along the west side of the project site due to the location of the existing substation. Kress stated that the plat currently shows a 17 ft. right-of-way and said that should actually show a 17 ft. dedication; therefore the City would be asking for an additional 33 ft. Kress said that planning staff contacted the applicant and surveyor and asked that the 50-foot ROW dedication along 138th Avenue NW be added to the plat; the applicant had no objection to giving a 50 ft. ROW. Kress clarified that the dedication would actually be to Missouri Ridge Township rather than the City since the land sits outside of the city limits.

Boyeff asked for clarification of the dedication. His concern is that the same dedication is not being made for 58th St. on the north side and also he wondered why the dedication couldn't be left as an easement for now rather than ROW. Hanson says dedication is cleaner; the township keeps and maintains the road. In further discussion Chris Brostuen, representing MWEC, stated that it would not affect them either way. (re: adding 50 ft. ROW dedication on the north)

Boyeff opened the public hearing and asked for input from the audience. After calling three times for input and hearing none the public hearing was closed. Boyeff called for the wishes of the board.

Fleck stated that since the applicant's representative, Brostuen, had indicated it didn't bother them either way, he felt that a full 50 ft. ROW should be dedicated on both the west and north side of the plat incase either road ever has to be constructed.

MOTION BY FLECK, SECOND BY LONG, to approve administrative review plat to create Sublot 14 from a portion of the SW1/4SW1/4, Section 34, T155N, R101W, corner of 54th St. NW and 13th Ave.W, City of Williston., contingent on 50 ft. easements on both west and north of the plat ****DISCUSSION**** dedication vs. easement and landscaping; Fleck **AMENDED MOTION** to say contingent on a 50 ft. ROW dedication on the west and north of the plat and contingent on landscaping of the substation per City ordinance. **SECOND BY LONG.** **AYES:** Long, Fleck, Aafedt, Boyeff. **NAYS:** None. **ABSENT/NOT VOTING:** Maristuen, Christensen. **ABSTAINED:** Haugen.

COMMITTEE REPORT:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Boyeff asked Kress to address the items of unfinished business.

- a. Special Use Permit (SPU) request for the expansion of an existing oil well drill pad site located on Section 2, Lot 3, T154N R101W, City of Williston – Statoil Oil & Gas LP/Nancy Beard**

Kress stated that an agreement regarding payment of specials, as directed by the ad hoc committee, has not been reached as of the date of this fact sheet. The applicant has requested this item be tabled until the December 15, 2014 Planning Commission meeting.

b. Special Use Permit (SPU) request to allow a contractor yard in the A: Agricultural zone located at the corner of 54th St. W and 16th Ave. W, City of Williston – Zack Lebsock/Spyder Oilfield Services

The applicant's representative advised planning staff that the applicant is still not prepared to take this project forward and requests it remain tabled.

c. Special Use Permit (SPU) request for a gravel pit in and A:Agricultural zone, Lot 1, Block 2, Saddle Ridge Subdivision, City of Williston – Go Aggregate, LLC

Kress reminded the Commissioners that the City Commission heard the request for the zone change at their November 12, 2014 meeting but were unable to come to vote with only 4 members present all votes were tied. This item remains tabled until a future City Commission meeting.

The SPU will not come before the P&Z Commission unless the City Commission approves the zone change at a future meeting.

Kress concluded his updates and said that Ressler would present the final unfinished business item.

Motion by LONG, second by CHRISTENSEN to table Items a, b and c of Unfinished Business. Carried on voice call.

d. Special Use Permit (SPU) request for a quasi-institutional home in an R-2: Single Family and Townhouse zone located at 308 4th Ave. E, City of Williston - The Guardian House

Boyeff introduced the last item of unfinished business (as above) and asked Ressler to present. Ressler reminded the Commission that this is a request for a quasi-institutional in an R-4 zone that was presented at the November 2014 meeting. The Commission vote to table this until all inspections and required repairs/upgrades were made.

Ressler stated that as of December 15, 2014 all building and electrical inspections have been approved and signed off on. Ressler added that the Veteran's Administration also inspected the Guardian House with even more stringent requirements than the City and approved them.

MOTION BY AAFEDT, SECOND BY HAUGEN, to approve the SPU request for a quasi-institutional home in an R-4: High-rise multifamily zone located at 308 4th Ave. E., City of Williston, known as the Guardian House. ****DISCUSSION**** Fleck stated he would like to hear more about the back-ground checks. Michael Shaw, representing the Guardian House, spoke about the national criminal and sex offender background check that they have used since the November meeting. He told the Commission of the number applicants he has had, the number of them that were flagged and the number that have been deemed ineligible for the services of the Guardian House based on those checks. Shaw stated that the Guardian House found their chosen background check provider to be very effective. Boyeff called for the vote.

AYES: Long, Fleck, Haugen, Aafedt, Boyeff. NAYS: None. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

a. Special Permitted Use for a restaurant in the M-1 zone, Lot 1, Block 4, Wright Subdivision, 120 53rd St. NW, City of Williston - Karissa Teske/Neil Slaaen

This SPU was in conjunction with Public Hearing (H), and Administrative Review. Since the Administrative Review was denied, there was no basis to grant the SPU therefore it was not heard.

b. Special Permitted Use for safety equipment store, coffee shop, and safety training facility in the M-1 zone - Jon Greiner/ New Products Marketing Corp.

Boyeff introduced this item of new business (as above) and asked Ressler to present. Ressler stated this property has been proposed for a coffee shop, training facility, safety and training related retail store, offices, and a shop. The coffee shop will be open to the public but is mainly meant to serve the training facility and offices within the building. Ressler said that a restaurant is allowed as an enumerated special use in the light industrial zone; this appears to be an appropriate place for such a use, given the apartments to the east and the uses of the rest of the building. The surrounding area has very few commercial businesses, so this could be appropriate. Ressler explains that the training facility is an enumerated special permitted use. Some retail is allowed in M-1. However, a safety store is not specified but other things similar are so it was added to the SPU.

The coffee shop intends to have hours from 5:15am to 8:30pm, Monday through Saturday. The training facility is intended to have around 20 people present for about 3 days a week.

The property is accessed from 44th St, 16th Ave W, and 45th St.

Ressler stated that the property does need to increase the amount of paved parking to 34 spaces. They also need to fully pave their access into the lot. Some of that access is in the public right of way which is fine as long as it is not used for parking. They will also need to provide some street trees where possible. Ressler said the landscaping ordinance allows discretion on previously built lots in the Borsheim Subdivision, so the City will work with the applicant to provide trees along 16th, 44th and 45th.

At the December 1, 2014 ad hoc meeting discussion focused on whether this was an acceptable location for a coffee shop and on who would be utilizing the shop. Ressler said that the fire chief expressed concern for the safety of people walking across 16th Ave. for coffee. It was determined that this situation would be better once street lights are up.

Ressler said that the necessity of street trees was also debated and it was determined that they should be placed, if at all possible to do so without impeding sight triangles.

Haugen asked to see a layout of the parking. Ressler referred the Commission to the aerial photo of the lot and building and pointed out parking and access. Ressler stated that there may not be enough parking right next to the building but pointed out lots on the property that can be used to provide parking and that this will be fully worked out at the building permit stage. Haugen also asked about fire walls with a multi-tenant situation. Louise Skaare, applicant representative, stated that fire walls are in the plans to be submitted for a building permit.

Fleck asked about how everything will lay out within the building; Louise Skaare again answered by pointing out on the building plan, which was provided in the Commissioner's packets, how the proposed lay out looks with offices on the second-floor and retail, coffee shop and training rooms on the ground floor. Skaare pointed out that each the coffee shop, training facility and retail shop have their own entrance/exit.

MOTION BY LONG, SECOND BY FLECK, to approve the Special Permitted Use for a coffee shop, training center, related safety and training equipment retail, office and shop in the M-1: Light Industrial zone, contingent on paving and landscaping according to city standards and addressing all staff comments. AYES: Long, Fleck, Haugen, Aafedt, Boyeff. NAYS: None. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

c. Special Permitted Use for daycare in the R-2 zone, 2013 23rd St. W, City of Williston - Debbie Lientz

Boyeff introduced this item (as above) and asked Neill to present. Neill stated that it was the request of the applicant to table this item for one month allowing her time to complete fire and building inspections.

MOTION BY FLECK, SECOND BY HAUGEN to table item C of new business. Motion carried on voice call.

d. Final plat of National Guard Subdivision on an unplatted 171 acres in Sec. 9, NE intersection of 139th Ave. NW and 54nd St NW/26th St. W, City of Williston – Hagan Family Partnership/Sanderson Stewart

Boyeff introduced this item (as above) and asked Kress to present. Kress reminded the Commission that this plat is outside of city limits but sits within the extra-territorial jurisdiction. He stated that a hearing for the annexation of portions of the west ½ of Section 9, T154N, R101W, including the entire property included in this subdivision has been scheduled. The City Commission will take action on that annexation at their January 13, 2015 meeting.

Kress continued by stating on November 25, 2014, the City Commission approved the preliminary plat for the National Guard Subdivision, to create six new lots on 171 acres, contingent on addressing all staff comments.

The City Commission also approved a future land use amendment for Lot 1, Block 2 (approximately 26 acres) of that plat from the "Residential" designation to the "Public/Institutional" designation for a future National Guard armory. The future land use amendment is contingent upon recordation of the final plat; it will not become effective until the final plat records. Kress reminded the Commission that when that is ready to go forward in the future it would come back to them in the form of an SPU.

The property is currently zoned A: Agricultural, except for the Block 1, Lot 1, which is the City-owned sludge pit and Sublots 3 and 4 are zoned M-2: Heavy Industrial. No zone change is proposed.

Kress pointed out each proposed lot and stated their intended use as follows:

- Block 1, Lot 1: Existing city sludge pit to remain
- Block 1, Lot 2: Future low density residential
- Block 2, Lot 1: Future National Guard Armory
- Block 3, Lot 1: Future school development
- Block 4, Lot 1: Future low density residential
- Block 4, Lot 2: Sewer lift station (dedicated to City)

No development is proposed at this time, except for the following public streets:

- 44th Avenue West, running north from 26th Street to continue through the project site and along the west side of the new high school in the property adjacent to the north;
- 32nd Street West, continuing west from Harvest Hills to intersect with 44th Avenue.

- Prairie Commons Street, continuing west from Harvest Hills to intersect with 44th Avenue.

Kress explained that the project site will take access from these three streets. Additional streets will be created at the time of future platting. A portion of the cost of the developing these streets will be undertaken by the City as a way to promote and develop the school development. The Development Agreement will be specify what the developer's responsibility will be in relation to the City's in the build out of these streets.

Kress stated that it was staff's recommendation to approve the final plat and concluded his presentation. Rick Leuthold and Terry Metzler were available to answer questions.

MOTION BY FLECK, SECOND BY HAUGEN, to approve final plat of National Guard Subdivision on an unplatted 171 acres in Sec. 9, NE intersection of 139th Ave. NW and 52nd St. NW/26th St. W, City of Williston, contingent on addressing all staff comments and a signed development agreement. AYES: Long, Fleck, Haugen, Aafedt, Boyeff. NAYS: None. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

e. Final plat for the proposed St. Joes Subdivision, an unplatted 36.154 parcel northeast corner of the Intersection of 32nd Ave. W and 11th St. West, City of Williston – Hagan Family Partnership/Sanderson Stewart

Boyeff introduced this item (as above) and asked Ressler to present. Ressler stated this was a plat is for 48.733 acres, in the SW ¼ and SE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 15. This property is not currently annexed into the city; however, it is within the City's extraterritorial jurisdiction. The zone change from A: Agricultural to C-2: General Commercial is for 16.701 acres on the south side of the project.

Ressler stated that Lots 1 and 2 of Block 1 are intended to remain Agricultural and eventually proposed to be donated to the St Joseph's Catholic School. Lot 1 of Block 2 is also proposed to remain Agricultural at the moment.

The plat shows the dedication of Bison Drive through the property, following an alignment laid out by the comprehensive plan and the update that AE2S did earlier this year. Ressler reminded the Commission that at the Planning Commission meeting on the preliminary plat, the Slingsby and Fretlands, surrounding owners, attended and requested to be involved in finalizing that alignment. Staff did look at the alignment of Bison Drive prior to the City Commission meeting and Ressler pointed out two options that were discussed. It was determined that an alignment for Bison Dr will need to be finalized, in the same way the alignments of other streets are finalized, in the near future. Ressler said that Fretland's and Slingsby also attended the City Commission meeting on the preliminary plat and again requested they be involved in finalizing the Bison Drive alignment. Both parties were assured by staff and the City Commission that they would be involved. Mr. Slingsby expressed a second concern about the placement of a school on a major roadway and asked that that be considered when a site plan was proposed.

Ressler stated that the Development Agreement will state that when these lots are developed is the time they will be required to come into compliance with the City regulations for storm water detention and HOA's and CC& R's will need be approved and filed.

Discussion was had about two lots that would only have access off of Bison Drive and would not have accesses onto 32nd. Ressler stated that there is a lot in the Hawkeye plat to the west that has access onto 32nd Ave. and it was determined that if that driveway were replicated on this plat it would be doable however that will only access the commercial lot. The school itself will only have access from Bison.

Ressler stated that the final plat is intended to go to the City Commission on December 23, 2014 and concluded her presentation.

Boyeff clarified with Ressler that Lot 2 would take access through Lot 1. Ressler stated that the two lots are intended to develop together for the school.

MOTION BY LONG, SECOND BY AAFEDT, to recommend approval of the final plat of 48.733 acres, the proposed St. Joes Subdivision, in the SW ¼ and SE ¼ of the SW ¼, Section 15, T154N, R101W, City of Williston, contingent addressing all staff comments and a development agreement being recorded. ****DISCUSSION**** Fleck asked about access to Lot 4. Rick Leuthold, Engineer, stated that Lots 3 and 4 are intended as commercial property. He stated it is thought that an access from 11th St. W. and 32nd Ave. W., each would align with an access across from across those roads and then the lots would circulate traffic internally. Fleck asked about St. Joes interest in Lot 1, Block 2. Leuthold stated that was not part of the agreement and that Block 2 was only created after the ad hoc committee requested an alignment for Bison Drive be shown on the plat. Further discussion was had about surrounding property owners and the condition of that parcel. AYES: Long, Fleck, Haugen, Aafedt, Boyeff. NAYS: None. ABSENT/NOT VOTING: Maristuen, Christensen. ABSTAINED: None.

f. Final plat for East Side Industrial Subdivision located in the SW1/4, Sec. 17 and the NW1/4 of Sec. 20, T154N, R100W (east of County 9 and south of the landfill, City of Williston – Ames Engineering

Boyeff introduced this item of new business (as above) and asked Ressler to present. Ressler stated the staff and applicant would like to have this matter removed the agenda at this time and would bring back at a future date.

No action necessary.

g. Final plat for an unplatted parcel in Section 2, T154R, R101W, to be called Cottonwood Subdivision, a 7.7 acre Tract in Lot 4, City of Williston – Dennis and Kimberly Visser/Vantata Design/Westrum's Land Survey

Boyeff introduced this item of new business (as above) and asked Ressler to present. Ressler stated the staff and applicant would like to have this matter removed the agenda at this time and would bring back at a future date.

No action necessary.

DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING: January 20, 2015

MEETING ADJOURNED.



Kent Jarcik, Williston Planning Director

APPENDIX
to the
DECEMBER 15, 2014 PLANNING AND ZONING COMISSION MINUTES

- Special Permitted Use for safety equipment store, coffee shop, and safety training facility in the M-1 zone - Jon Greiner/ New Products Marketing Corp.