

FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES
April 6, 2010

A regular meeting of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Planning Commission was held in the Assembly Chambers, Borough Administration Offices, 809 Pioneer Road, Fairbanks, Alaska. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Tom Marsh, Chairman.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Marsh Tom Temple
Jennifer Peterson David Pruhs
Ian Michael Hebert Nello Cooper
Pamm Hubbard Joy Huntington

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brian Flemming Michael Wenstrup

OTHERS PRESENT: Bernardo Hernandez, Director of Community Planning
Jim Lee, Deputy Director of Community Planning
Jeff Bouton, Planner III
Mark Mussman, Planner III
Melissa Kellner, Planner II
Cynthia Klepaski, Asst. Borough Attorney
Marnie Long-Boehl, Secretary

A. ROLL CALL

B. MESSAGES

1. Chairperson's Comments:
None
2. Communications to the Planning Commission
 - **Mr. Hernandez** introduced Joy Huntington, our new Planning Commissioner.
 - **Mr. Hernandez** stated that on March 18th there was a work session with the Borough Assembly and they wanted to know about all the projects like the Land Suitability Maps. The Assembly wanted to know why we didn't use Goal #1 of the Comprehensive Plan in making our Findings of Fact.
3. Citizen's Comments – limited to three (3) minutes
 - a. Agenda items not scheduled for public hearing.
None
 - b. Items other than those appearing on the agenda.
None

C. *MINUTES

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of Consent Agenda passes all routine items indicated by asterisk (*) on agenda. Consent Agenda items are not considered separately unless any Planning Commission member or citizen so requests. In the event of such request, the item is returned to the general agenda.

MOTION: To approve agenda and consent agenda, including minutes of previous meeting by **Mr. Temple**, seconded by **Mr. Hebert**.

Objections

None

MOTION APPROVED

E. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

F. PUBLIC HEARING

CU2010-007 A request by Kenneth Hoop and James Miller for conditional use approval of an aircraft landing field in the Rural and Agricultural-10 zone on TL 2600 in the SE ¼ of the SE ¼, Section 26, Township 3 North, Range 1 West. **(located west of the Elliott Highway and south of Treasure Street)**

Mark Mussman presented the staff report. Based upon staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended approval of the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Cooper asked if there was a requirement to have an environmental impact study done for this type of project.

Mr. Mussman replied not to his knowledge.

Mr. Pruhs asked if **Mr. Mussman** perceived any safety hazard when the planes came in on final approach or were taking off from the runway – safety hazards for the neighbors.

Mr. Mussman said no.

Mr. Marsh asked if this is location is closer to Chatanika River.

Mr. Mussman replied that it is approximately 15 minutes north of Fox.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Heidi Strader, resides at 4259 Treasure Street, pointed out the location of her residence on the overhead. She is a little concerned about noise issues but as long as the location of the runway will remain in the location stated it probably will be fine.

Mr. Hebert asked how she accessed her lot.

Ms. Strader said that they enter on the left hand side of RA10 - to the southeast corner.

Mr. Marsh asked if there are snow machines in her area.

Ms. Strader replied a few snow machines and 4-wheelers.

Mr. Cooper asked where the runway is going to be in comparison to where her property is located.

Ms. Huntington needed clarification from Staff about the west lot – is it vacant.

Mr. Mussman stated according to the Borough Assessor's information – it showed no improvements on the west lot.

Mr. Hebert asked if there was a full time residence to the southwest in the 40 acre block.

Ms. Strader communicated that they are getting in the process to build this summer.

Mr. Hebert asked where they would access their lot.

Ms. Strader replied from the same direction that she comes in – from the west side, a third to halfway they would enter their lot.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any further questions.

Dan Buckholz, resides at 4259 Treasure Street, main concern is there is a clause written into the permit stating that does require the applicant to stay on the eastern side in the north south approach.

James Miller, applicant, stated that the concerns of the runway changing directions – it will not happen because there is no other place on the property that would be usable for the runway. Noise issue – they only have small aircrafts. It will be 2 to 5 years before they are established out in that area.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Pruhs asked what type of plane is being flown.

Mr. Miller advised that it was a home built.

Ms. Huntington wanted clarification on the statement about 2 to 5 years being established – does that mean that traffic will pick up or will it remain the same – more buildings being built.

Mr. Miller said that he will have built a structure to live in and will be using the air strip more regularly.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any more questions.

None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION Move to approve **CU2010-007** with four (4) conditions and three (3) Findings of Fact by **Mr. Temple**, seconded by **Ms. Peterson**.

Discussion

Mr. Temple concurs with Staff recommendations. It sounds like an appropriate use of the land. He is in favor.

Ms. Peterson agrees with **Mr. Temple** and believes this is a good use of rural land for a private landing strip.

Mr. Hernandez announced that generally there are four (4) Findings of Fact but one (1) was omitted – the Finding stating whether or not there is adequate sewage capacities, transportation facilities, energy and water supplies for the proposed conditional use. He suggested that the Planning Commission could add another Finding of Fact if they choose.

Mr. Hebert moved to modify the Findings of Fact as follows, seconded by **Mr. Pruhs**:

4. There are adequate public service facilities to support the proposed use as very little is needed.

Mr. Marsh asked if there was further discussion on the Findings.
Finding was added: Unanimous vote.

Mr. Hebert wanted to add a condition stating that the runway is built along the eastern border of the property.

Mr. Hebert moved to add the condition and seconded by **Ms. Hubbard**:

Mr. Marsh asked if there was further discussion on adding the Condition.

Mr. Temple had further modifications to the Condition and **Mr. Hebert** concurred with the changes.

Ms. Klepaski said that she understood from the Staff report that there was inconsistencies between the drawing and the narrative as to whether its 30 feet or 50 feet wide.

Mr. Mussman clarified with the applicant whether it should be 30 or 50 feet wide.

Mr. Mussman said 50 feet.

Mr. Marsh asked if everyone was in agreement with the following condition:

5. The landing strip shall be no less than fifty (50) feet wide and located according to the site plan submitted with the conditional use application.

Condition was added: Unanimous vote.

ROLL CALL

Eight (8) in Favor: **Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hebert, Ms. Peterson, Mr. Pruhs, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Temple, Ms. Huntington, Mr. Marsh.**

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION TO APPROVE, PASSED.

PUBLIC HEARING

RZ2010-004 A request by the University of Alaska to rezone Government Lot 2, Section 5, Township 1 South, Range 1 West from Rural and Agricultural-5 to General Commercial or other appropriate zone and Government Lot 3, Section 5, Township 1 South, Range 1 West and N1/2 SE1/4 and N1/2 SW1/4 SE1/4 and Tract C, Section 32, Township 1 North, Range 1 West from Rural and Agricultural-5 to Mineral Lands with Special Limitations or other appropriate zone. **(located north of College Road and east of Farmers Loop Road)**

Melissa Kellner presented the staff report. Based upon staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended approval of the proposed ordinance.

Ms. Peterson asked if the Alaska Dog Mushing Association's (ADMA) trails are protected.

Ms. Kellner replied that they are part of the Borough's Comprehensive Trail Plan. There is an agreement between the University and the Borough that these trails can be on the University's property but that agreement has a 90 day cancellation.

Mr. Peterson pointed out on the zoning map that it looks like General Commercial would be a compatible use in the area. She wanted to know if there are any General Commercial uses in those zones that wouldn't be allowed in Light Commercial.

Ms. Kellner replied that she did not believe that of the developments in the General Commercial zone wouldn't fit in Light Commercial. In Light Commercial they would be limited to 5,000 sq ft. without a Conditional Use.

Mr. Cooper wanted clarification on the previous conditional use.

Ms. Kellner said that the most recent conditional use was from 1987 and there was a site plan associated with the conditional use that showed where the mining was to take place. Since that time, excavation has expanded beyond those boundaries. The title changed in 1988 that no longer allowed mineral extraction in the RA5 zone.

Mr. Cooper asked who is responsible for over sight.

Ms. Kellner commented that in 1987 Great Northwest was not the lessee but it is University of Alaska owned land.

Mr. Cooper asked if the University of Alaska would be responsible for over sight.

Ms. Kellner replied the University of Alaska would be responsible for over sight.

Mr. Cooper asked if Great Northwest receives this Light Commercial rezone – who will be responsible to keep them in compliance.

Ms. Kellner said that the code is enforced through complaints. If the Borough receives complaints, our Code Enforcement Officer would get in contact with the business owner and work with them to bring them back into compliance with the zoning.

Mr. Cooper asked if it would be appropriate for Great Northwest to acquire their wetland permits prior to rezoning.

Ms. Kellner said that they are working with the Corp to obtain their wetland permits.

Mr. Hebert asked why the vegetative buffer only was recommended through Government Lot 3 and not Government Lot 2.

Ms. Kellner said that at the time of the Staff report, she had not received any complaints and was unaware that it was a concern. She spoke to the Parks Department because they own the property to the south of Government Lot 3 and they agreed that it was appropriate. If the applicant agrees, Staff believes it would be appropriate to have a buffer on those properties as well. Government Lot 3 is proposed to be Mineral Lands and Government Lot 2 is requested to be General Commercial Lands so this is more at risk to be subject to the mining activities that are immediately adjacent. She pointed it out on the overhead.

Mr. Hebert wanted clarification that there is still one parcel of Multi-family adjoining the proposed Light Commercial area.

Ms. Kellner answered that it is two lots and pointed it out on the overhead.

Mr. Hebert asked who the owners were of the two lots.

Ms. Kellner named the two owners to be Florie Wilcoxson and Donna Schallock.

Mr. Hebert affirmed that Staff received letters from the two residential owners in the Addendum stating that they were interested in purchasing the land. Do you think it is appropriate to have a buffer space in that location?

Ms. Kellner agreed if the applicant agrees to the buffer space.

Mr. Pruhs stated that it looks like a historic mining activity that is being encroached upon by residential and light commercial development. Staff is putting operational conditions of 7:00 am to 9:00 pm. Who will stop their operation if it is still running after 9:00 pm.

Ms. Kellner pointed out that Staff is limiting the hours of operation to the eastern half of Tract C which is the closest mining operation to College Estates. No mining would be taking place in the commercial zone.

Mr. Pruhs asked if there were a complaint, is there a fast remedy or is it through the court system.

Mr. Hernandez said that our Code Enforcement Officer would talk with them and they have agreed to these terms already.

Mr. Hebert asked about Great Northwest current operations.

Ms. Kellner replied that they are allowed to continue except gravel extraction from the pond. Their stock piles would fit under the intent of outside storage for landscaping and greenhouses in the Light Commercial zone.

Ms. Peterson announced that she was on the Platting Board when the College Estates was zoned so she does not know what happened at the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Hernandez said that it was already zoned General Commercial.

Ms. Kellner announced that she researched the zoning history and it was originally rezoned to General Commercial to allow for an animal park.

Mr. Marsh has a concern about the conflict of traffic at the truck entrance which is also the entrance to College Estates. The peat operation has been operating for some time and the residents piggy-back on that entrance.

Ms. Kellner replied yes – that is correct. The College Estates Subdivision was platted in 2006.

Mr. Marsh stated that it was up to the developer of College Estates to make sure the traffic restrictions were enforced in their subdivision. Is there anyone else that uses this road?

Ms. Kellner replied that she heard from a member of College Estates that they are having problems with traffic from the Farmers Market.

Mr. Marsh asked if it should be enforcement on College Estates to put signs up on the road.

Ms. Kellner explained that there are signs up now.

Mr. Marsh asked about the edge of the pond and College Estates – it looks like there would be room for some planting along the bank to help buffer the area.

Mr. Hernandez said that there is no reason that planting couldn't happen – you might ask the property owners.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other questions.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Sharon Boko resides at 1860 RJ Loop in College Estates. She said that Great Northwest has been a good neighbor. They water their road regularly to keep the dust down. They operate only in the summer months. The residents of College Estates belong to a home owners association, they plow and maintain the one way loop around the subdivision. The truck drivers are courteous and do stay to the right. With the heavy loads – the roads are in poor shape at the intersections. She would like to see the road situation addressed in some manner. She would like to see a vegetation buffer between the residential property and Great Northwest's property. She would like the setbacks for Great Northwest's property to be substantial and restrict building next to the fence or road area. She would like to see that no customers of Great Northwest use RJ Loop.

Ms. Peterson asked **Ms. Boko** if she was aware that she is zoned General Commercial.

Ms. Boko did not know what the zoning was on her property but she will be taking measures to change the zoning.

Ms. Peterson said that all these commercial uses were happening around your subdivision when you moved in – what did you think of the situation.

Ms. Boko said that it wasn't an obnoxious use in the neighborhood right now but if a commercial building does get built up to 5,000 sq ft and they build it on or close to the edge of the property that would be objectionable to the home owners. She would like to see the restrictions placed on the property so that the buffer is substantial.

Robin Dodson, resides at 1965 RJ Loop, is president of the College Estates Home Owners Association. She had questions on usage of RJ Loop by Great Northwest – a one-way going the wrong way. She talked about the existing cyclone fence next to a residential lot – she would like to see a buffer added. College Estates Home Owners Association maintains the road – snow removal and resurfacing.

Mr. Pruhs asked **Ms. Dodson** if she had read the operational land use lease that Great Northwest operates under the University of Alaska.

Ms. Dodson replied no.

Mr. Pruhs wanted to know if the University of Alaska keeps Great Northwest in road compliance. He told Ms. Dodson to talk with the University of Alaska about the road concerns – the person to talk with is Kristi Sherman.

Florie Wilcoxson, resides at 3140 College Road, does not agree with changing the Government Lot 2 to General Commercial. The proposal to Light Commercial and hours of operation would be good. Government Lot 2 is directly behind three lots that have residential uses. For years there was a green zone behind the lots until recently the current owners have this diminished. The residents have offered to buy the property directly behind their lots and the offer was refused. The home owners would like to see a condition in the rezone that would state that the existing vegetation remains.

Mr. Marsh asked which house was Ms. Wilcoxson – the center one.

Ms. Wilcoxson replied yes.

Mr. Marsh said that it appears the land on the other side of your property line is cleared into the University of Alaska property.

Ms. Wilcoxson answered yes.

Mr. Marsh pointed out that she has been using that property for some time.

Ms. Wilcoxson said that it's been cleared for a long time.

Mr. Marsh asked if there was a 25 foot buffer line that would cut into the area.

Ms. Wilcoxson said that it would not give any tree break because it would still be grass. She would like to see the vegetation stay as is.

Mr. Marsh announced that would be a large buffer.

Ms. Wilcoxson agreed.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were further questions.

David Wilcoxson, resides at 3140 College Road, expressed that they did offer to buy the property from the University of Alaska. They sent a second letter this spring to see if the University of Alaska would reconsider their offer. We would like to see a buffer zone.

Mr. Hebert said that it appears to the east that you are bordering Light Commercial and to the west there is General Commercial.

Mr. Wilcoxson clarified to the east it is Light Commercial – across the street is Light Commercial and next to us is Single-family or Multi-family.

Mr. Marsh asked if he was aware of the requirements for Light Commercial – a 15 ft buffer and a site obscuring fence between the Light Commercial and Residential – do you find this adequate.

Mr. Wilcoxson replied no.

Mr. Pruhs asked what kind of buffer would be acceptable to you.

Mr. Wilcoxson replied 50 – 75 feet.

Russell Peterson, representative of Great Northwest, explained that the adjacent land next to Great Northwest was zoned General Commercial. It was built after the existing peat pit. The peat pit started around 1979. The subdivision was built in 2006. Great Northwest built the chain link fence that is bordering the property as a buffer and to provide safety. Great Northwest and the University of Alaska disagree with the hours of operation. Great Northwest only works in the summer months and if they have a large project in the summer they have limited time to get the project completed – it could hamper their competitive advantage. It's rare that Great Northwest would have to work over the hours proposed but would like to have the opportunity if the need arises. This rezoning will not increase mining operations or truck traffic. Great Northwest production is based on how many jobs they have. Great Northwest developed the road in the subdivision but the subdivision uses its access. The residents located on College Road appear to be encroaching on University of Alaska property as seen on the overhead. Great Northwest is one of the only suppliers of peat and topsoil in the Fairbanks area.

Mr. Cooper asked about the wetland permit.

Mr. Peterson explained that they have the permit. The permit is only required for the additional lands that Great Northwest is acquiring not for the existing peat pit.

Mr. Pruhs asked how long the land use lease is with the University of Alaska.

Mr. Peterson answered that they are in negotiation right now for 100 additional acres of property – he believes they come up for lease every five years.

Mr. Pruhs asked Staff about the hours of operations – he understands that a business can't be restricted. He asked if Great Northwest has had any restrictions to their hours of operations in the past.

Mr. Peterson said no – this would be new restriction.

Mr. Pruhs asked if they had any problems in the past with their late night operations.

Mr. Peterson replied no.

Mr. Pruhs asked if Great Northwest had talked with the neighbors about setbacks and buffers for zoning.

Mr. Peterson replied no.

Mr. Pruhs asked if they talked with the University of Alaska about designating certain areas for a buffer zone – he sees a big issue with the operational equipment near the residents. He thinks there should be a buffer zone.

Ms. Peterson wanted to see the map on the overhead for Government Lot 2.

Ms. Kellner explained that the dotted area on the overhead map is east half of Tract C – this is where mineral extractions would still be permitted under the hours of operation.

Ms. Peterson asked if Great Northwest was opposed to the hours of operation.

Mr. Peterson said yes.

Ms. Peterson asked if this restriction will affect their work in the summer.

Mr. Peterson said that the access road will run directly through the area of the hours of operation restriction – it could affect us.

Ms. Peterson asked if there was any other access route.

Mr. Peterson replied not currently.

Ms. Peterson asked if Great Northwest was leasing the area right up to the residence property. Does Great Northwest have any plans to clear out that area?

Mr. Peterson said not really but that it could be a potential use for a staging area for landscape materials.

Mr. Marsh asked if Great Northwest is looking to expand the existing pond to the north.

Mr. Peterson said yes for peat and silt extraction.

Mr. Marsh asked if Great Northwest was aware with General Commercial or Light Commercial there is a buffer zone and fence requirement.

Mr. Peterson said that they are aware of it but the current zoning is General Commercial.

Mr. Marsh asked if Great Northwest was interested in late night hours exceeding the 9:00 pm – that would involve the dredging operation but not the trucking operation or would Great Northwest be trucking at that time of day.

Mr. Peterson replied if they were running a night shift.

Mr. Marsh wanted to know when the last time was that they ran a night shift.

Mr. Peterson said several years ago.

Mr. Hernandez asked if Great Northwest would have problems with the hours if they were prevented from excavating after 9:00 pm but were permitted to drive through the property with restrictions.

Mr. Peterson said that if they could drive through the area that would be ok.

Mr. Hernandez asked what the rate of truck traffic is on an average day.

Mr. Peterson replied 2 to 100 depending on the job.

Mr. Hernandez asked about the truck traffic – do you see it as a problem for the residents with the large vehicles.

Mr. Peterson does not see it as a problem – we are courteous on the road.

Ms. Huntington wanted clarification on the customer traffic – they are not allowed on RJ Loop Road. She asked what Great Northwest will do to control the access of the customers.

Mr. Peterson said that they have a locked gate available and signage posted.

Ms. Huntington asked about the property where the fence is that the residents wanted trees to be planted in that location – is Great Northwest opposed to this.

Mr. Peterson communicated that they should not bear the cost.

Ms. Peterson said that Staff suggested the zoning be Light Commercial – does Great Northwest have an issue with this zoning.

Mr. Peterson said no - just the hours of operation restriction.

Mr. Marsh has a question on the access road – is this access paved to the gate.

Mr. Peterson said that the approach is paved then it turns into a gravel road.

Mr. Marsh said that a portion of the road that is used by residents of College Estates – that part is paved.

Mr. Peterson replied that he believes so.

Mr. Marsh asked if Great Northwest maintains it during the summer months.

Mr. Peterson communicated that they have to keep it in working order.

Anton Johansen, resides at 1887 Arctic Loop Circle, is a representative of Great Northwest. He talked about the buffer zone – Great Northwest has had the pit for several years. When they built the subdivision, Great Northwest put up the chain link fence. He does not have an objection to a buffer of trees being planted on University of Alaska property but it is not Great Northwest responsibility to plant those trees. The developer of the subdivision should have thought about a buffer zone before building the houses. He talked about when the subdivision was built – the developer agreed that there was going to be a two way access until it got to the one way on RJ Loop Road.

Mr. Pruhs explained that he sees a need for a buffer zone where the Schallock and Wilcoxson homes are located. Has Great Northwest thought of keeping those trees in place in that location?

Mr. Johansen said that he has not thought about that buffer zone but if he were those residents he would have the same concern. That is the University of Alaska property and if determined to have a buffer zone it should not be the entire area.

Mr. Pruhs asked if that buffer would have negligible impact on Great Northwest operation.

Mr. Johansen agreed.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any further questions.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION Move to approve **RZ 2010-004** with three (3) Special Limitations and four (4) Findings of Fact by **Mr. Temple**, seconded by **Ms. Peterson**.

Discussion

Ms. Peterson wanted clarification on how many feet is from the back of the Schallock and Wilcoxson house to the other side of the wooded buffer.

Ms. Kellner pointed out on the overhead that the corridor is 50 feet wide – so this area is 150 feet wide.

Mr. Pruhs would like to amend Special Limitation #2, seconded by **Ms. Hubbard** and clarification to this recommendation by **Mr. Hebert** as follows:

2. Hours of operation, excluding transportation of materials, are limited to 7:00 am to 9:00 pm on the eastern portion of Tract C, further identified as S1/2 SW1/4 SE1/4 Sec 32, T1N R1W FM, as indicated in Attachment 1.

ROLL CALL

Eight (8) in Favor: **Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hebert, Ms. Peterson, Mr. Pruhs, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Temple, Ms. Huntington, Mr. Marsh.**

Zero (0) Opposed:

Motion to modify Special Limitation #3 and add Special Limitation #4 by **Mr. Hebert**, seconded by **Mr. Temple** to read as follows:

3. A vegetative buffer of 25 feet shall be left undisturbed on the southern boundary of GL 3 adjacent to North Shanly subdivision.
4. A vegetative buffer of 25 feet shall be left undisturbed on the southern boundary of GL2.

Mr. Temple asked Staff if they could see both of these boundaries on the overhead.

Mr. Hebert made a motion to modify Special Limitation #3 and add Special Limitation #4.

Ms. Klepaski needed clarification if this included the buffer along College Road.

Mr. Hebert wanted to make a motion to modified Special Limitation #4.

Ms. Peterson added that the concern is where the property borders residential zones.

Mr. Hebert added that the residential is currently zoned General Commercial.

Mr. Marsh added that there are currently only two lots that are zoned residential.

Mr. Hebert wanted Staff to clarify what North Shanly is zoned.

Ms. Kellner addressed North Shanly being zoned Rural and Agricultural-5.

Mr. Hebert commented that North Shanly didn't look like 5 acre lots.

Ms. Kellner said that they are 16,000 sq ft lots. They are non-conforming lots and are all undeveloped.

Mr. Marsh asked if they were Borough property.

Ms. Kellner said that 59 of the lots are owned by the Borough including the first row adjacent to the Mineral Lands.

Ms. Peterson wanted clarification on Special Limitation #3 buffer and Special Limitation #4 buffer are bordering residential zones.

Ms. Kellner replied that's correct. The property zoned Light Commercial is developed residentially.

Ms. Peterson is not concerned with residential areas that are mis-zoned.

Ms. Hubbard agrees with **Ms. Peterson** but she is wondering if we could re-word it so when the residential becomes rezoned that they have a buffer as well.

Mr. Marsh asked if the residents rezone their property - will a buffer zone be required.

Mr. Hernandez stated that is a tough question. If this property adjacent to the home owners is already there – there could be some type of Grandfather Rights to not have the buffer.

Mr. Pruhs asked if the Planning Commission could use certain addresses in the Special Limitation.

Ms. Hubbard would not like to see the University of Alaska or Great Northwest not provide buffering in this area just because they are rezoned improperly now.

Ms. Peterson is concerned about who was there first – Great Northwest was in operation for a number of years. She would find it unfair to put in requirements to Great Northwest against College Estates knowing that College Estates was built there knowing who their neighbors were.

Mr. Hernandez understands how they feel about adding a buffer for the residents that are mis-zoned.

Mr. Temple wanted to see the properties being discussed on the overhead. He asked how close the houses were to Government Lot 2.

Ms. Kellner replied very close.

Mr. Temple asked if there was a setback requirement there.

Ms. Kellner replied that there is a setback requirement of 5 feet.

Mr. Hernandez announced that these houses were built in 1951 and zoning did not take place until later.

Mr. Temple was concerned what kind of buffer should take place – would Great Northwest be required to plant some trees or would it just be required not to develop within that 25 feet.

Ms. Kellner said that would be the Planning Commission's call. The intent of the vegetative buffer of North Shanly was to leave it as is.

Mr. Temple stated that Staff is recommending to leave it as is for 25 feet on the boundary.

Mr. Pruhs added – could we say the current vegetative buffer.

Ms. Kellner said that was the intent for the North Shanly buffer.

Mr. Hebert's intent for the motion was to have a buffer of 25 feet on Government Lot 2 – a buffer that was undisturbed – the trees would grow back. It appears that the occupants to the south of the proposed rezone have been using the Owner's property. There is a boat and a garden in that area. The Owner of the proposed rezone area needs to leave this area alone.

Mr. Hernandez wanted to take a 5 minute break to rewrite Special Limitation #4 to read as follows:

4. A vegetative buffer of 25 feet shall be left undisturbed on the southern boundary of GL2, excluding where it fronts College Road. In order to buffer the residential uses to the south from commercial uses on Government Lot 2.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any comments on the language.

Ms. Peterson wanted to talk about the 150 feet of buffer – the reason that 150 feet keeps coming up is that the real vegetative buffer on those properties doesn't start until 75 feet in. Giving a 25 foot buffer is not helpful but the Planning Commission has never provided a 150 foot buffer in the past.

Mr. Hernandez said that he has never seen 150 foot buffer.

Mr. Hebert agrees with the language.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any objection to Special Limitation #3 and Special Limitation #4.

Mr. Temple discussed the language in the Special Limitation about changing the wording to add the word - residential in part of the use to the south.

Ms. Klepaski said the use is residential but the zone is Light Commercial.

Mr. Temple added that the use is subject to change within the zoning.

Ms. Klepaski said yes.

Mr. Hernandez replied that's correct.

Ms. Klepaski said what would be the justification of having a buffer zone between Light Commercial and Light Commercial.

Mr. Temple said that is something we need to think about. Why can't we say we need a buffer without having to justify in our Special Condition.

Ms. Klepaski said that she doesn't think you have to.

Mr. Temple would like to take out the phrase "in order to" and end it with "College Road" as follows:

4. A vegetative buffer of 25 feet shall be left undisturbed on the southern boundary of GL2, excluding where it fronts College Road.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any comments.

Mr. Hebert motions to amend the language, seconded by **Mr. Temple**.

Mr. Marsh said that the applicant applied for General Commercial and Staff proposed Light Commercial.

Ms. Peterson agrees with Light Commercial zoning.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any further discussion.

Mr. Marsh said that the MOTION before the Planning Commission is for Mineral Lands and Government Lot 2 to Light Commercial with four (4) Conditions with Special Limitations and four (4) Findings of Fact.

ROLL CALL

Eight (8) in Favor: **Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hebert, Ms. Peterson, Mr. Pruhs, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Temple, Ms. Huntington, Mr. Marsh.**

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION TO APPROVE, PASSED.

PUBLIC HEARING

RZ2010-005 A request by the Tanana Chiefs Conference and the City of Fairbanks to rezone all of Block 208A, Fairbanks Townsite, from Multiple Family Residential to General Commercial or other appropriate zone and a portion of Lot 208, Rickert Homestead, also known as TL 27, Section 16, Township 1 South, Range 1 West from Single Family Residential 10 to General Commercial or other appropriate zone. **(located on the west side of Cowles Street West and the south side of 16th Avenue)**

Mark Mussman presented the staff report. Based upon staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended approval of the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions for Staff.

Mr. Temple inquired about the current trees on the northern boundary – what is the depth.

Mr. Mussman answered no less than approximately 50 feet in width at the narrowest point of the vegetation.

Mr. Hernandez added that Staff recommend this buffer – 50 feet could be too wide and 20 feet could be adequate. The intent is to buffer the residential uses from the commercial uses.

Mr. Hebert asked if this will have to go to the Platting Board. He asked about the road right-of-way.

Mr. Hernandez said the applicant will be able to answer these questions.

Mr. Marsh asked about the pedestrian walk way.

Mr. Mussman replied that is an issue that they are looking into – the applicant may be able to answer this question.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were further questions for Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Mike Hersey, resides at 1505 Bluebell Street, has concerns on the buffer zone. He does not agree to 20 feet of buffer. He believes the vegetation is 75 to 100 feet in width. He is testifying today to make sure there will not be road access through this area. He would like the buffer zone to stay as it is now.

Mr. Hebert asked **Mr. Hersey** if he has seen the proposed driveway development.

Mr. Hersey said no.

Mr. Hebert asked what type of public involvement you have had with the applicant.

Mr. Hersey replied none – he saw the signs and the Dear Property letter. He asked for a copy of the proposed plan.

Deborah Seeger, reside at 1206 16th Avenue, affirms that she was never approached by the applicant. Her neighbor told her about the sign. She is wondering if this facility is really needed – couldn't they add on to their existing structure. She has concerns about additional noise, traffic, and access. There are a lot of children in the neighborhood and she would like the buffer left undisturbed.

Mr. Hebert asked if the buffer was left and the building's main activity was to the south – will that buffer you from the noise.

Ms. Seeger said no – they still hear the snow removal vehicles and generators kick on and off – the hospital is farther away from us.

Mr. Pruhs asked how many stories the structure will be.

Ms. Seeger did not know.

Brad Lowery, resides at 1226 16th Avenue, was excited about having a park close to his home – Bluebell Park. His concern is for public safety – increase foot and vehicle traffic. He does not agree with a 20 foot buffer – would like the buffer to stay the same. He is glad there will be Special Conditions. He is disappointed that the neighborhood did not get to see a final site plan.

Robert Seeger, resides at 1206 16th Avenue, has concerns about the buffer being wide enough. He talked about the current bike path. He would like to see posts every two feet to stop any vehicle traffic. If the buffer vegetation is removed, maybe some kind of fence can be installed to that area.

Mr. Hebert asked where the current bike path is in relation to the roadway and the buffer.

Mr. Seeger pointed it out on the overhead.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other questions.

Victor Joseph, applicant, said that this has been a long process. This project started out with our need for today but the demand for the next 20 years. They have out grown the existing facility they are currently residing in. Through a long process, they were able to secure land from Fairbanks Memorial Hospital (FMH) and with the City of Fairbanks. They would like consideration with the 20 foot buffer – the footprint of the building needs to be on the north side of the property because this is the cleared area and the conditions of the soils on the rest of the property. Most of the impact will happen on the south side of the building. There will be some parking for employees in the back of the building. All road access will be happening from Cowles Street side.

Jacoline Bergstrom, applicant, emphasis on the way the building is on the lot – it will allow for access from Cowles Street. This is an out-patient medical facility. This facility is a needed facility – their lease will end at FMH by the time this structure will be available. They serve Fairbanks and the Interior of Alaska – they are the health facility for Indian Health Services for the whole interior.

Mr. Hebert asked about Special Limitation #2 about the primary vehicular access – can this be changed to all vehicular traffic shall come from Cowles Street.

Ms. Bergstrom said that would be ok.

Mr. Hebert asked if they would agree on some type of barricades to insure that Lathrop continues to be pedestrian traffic. On the preliminary plat, there was a right-of-way extending to Cowles and that appears to be vacated – what is the process you are doing to insure that.

Ms. Bergstrom asked if he was referring to the bike path.

Mr. Hebert stated that it appears in the preliminary plat that Lathrop extends to Cowles – is that a true right-of-way – 60 foot right-of-way.

Mr. Marsh stated that it appears that the right-of-way has been vacated – there is a utility easement and a walkway easement.

Ms. Bergstrom is aware of the utility easement and the requirements for the easements. They are looking into how they can configure the bike path.

Mr. Joseph added that the bike path would be within the appropriate limitations – if it is going to cost a million they will not do it.

Mr. Pruhs asked the applicant about the issue they had with the buffer.

Mr. Joseph explained that the buffer zone is very limiting to what they can do. They may want to extend the building in the future and need the extra space – a buffer would limit what they could do in the future with the building.

Mr. Pruhs said that this is zoned single-family right now.

Ms. Peterson wanted clarification on what buffer they had a problem with – the existing language or the 20 foot buffer.

Mr. Joseph replied that a 20 foot buffer would be sufficient.

Ms. Bergstrom said that the way it was worded – no less than.

Mr. Temple asked how deep the line of trees is on the north boundary between your property and 16th Avenue.

Mr. Joseph doesn't know but has heard it might be 50 feet plus.

Mr. Temple asked if with their current plans they intend to cut into at least 30 feet into the buffer zone.

Mr. Joseph stated, if needed, they would want to have that capability.

Mr. Temple can't your building be shifted 30 feet to the south to keep that buffer for the neighbors.

Ms. Bergstrom said if they shift the building too far south they would run into easement and wetlands.

Mr. Temple said moving it 20 feet would create a problem with an easement.

Ms. Bergstrom said we would be getting close to the easement and the soil conditions on the second lot are not that good.

Mr. Joseph said the north end of the project where it is cleared that is the preferred location for the facility. The footprint is going to be fairly large and it will be two stories. We would use the space where the buffer is for additional parking spaces for employees.

Mr. Temple asked if he agreed that there is other room on the proposed property for the parking lot.

Mr. Joseph replied if that was our only plan but we are looking at a twenty year plan that may have an expansion for the facility. They want to design a complex that will work for today but will be able to expand in the future if needed.

Mr. Temple stated if leaving the row of trees in place as a buffer – can your project still go forward.

Mr. Joseph said that they will have to work with what they will be given but that is not their preference. If they could have a fence other than a buffer to keep out some of the noise – they would like some flexibility.

Mr. Temple asked if they would prefer installing a high, sound minimizing fence instead of leaving the tree buffer.

Mr. Joseph said that it comes down to cost and what is the most economical for the project.

Mr. Temple asked if he understood that when changing a residential area to a commercial area, there comes a duty to protect the wishes and rights of the neighbors.

Mr. Joseph expressed his desire to become a good neighbor.

Mr. Hebert asked about the preliminary footprint from March and the latest footprint – why was the structure moved more towards the north side.

Ms. Bergstrom said it was based on the easements and to have more parking on the south side for access to the building.

Mr. Joseph added that the majority of the operations are going to be towards the 8:00 am to 5:00 pm time frame. There will be some services after that but they will be limited.

Mr. Cooper wanted to know about the proposed corners of the building from the centerline.

Mr. Joseph could not answer this question. There have been concerns about the location of the building. He explained that it has been a long application process and they were trying to find the best access from their facility to FMH.

Mr. Marsh asked if they were looking for any access to the north.

Mr. Joseph stated that the access would all be from Cowles.

Mr. Marsh asked if there would only be one driveway for employee parking and the general parking.

Mr. Joseph stated more or less.

Mr. Marsh asked about the future development.

Mr. Joseph said if it was needed or required to maximize the whole land purchase.

Mr. Hernandez asked how they were going to address the pedestrian facility – are you going to build a raised sidewalk.

Mr. Joseph explained that they did have some preliminary discussions on the pedestrian walkway and they never came to a conclusion but they will have to figure out more details in the plan.

Mr. Hernandez was concerned if people would be walking through parking lots and cars.

Ms. Bergstrom stated around the parking lot.

Mr. Hernandez asked if the pedestrian walkway be raised.

Ms. Bergstrom said that they would relocate the walkway.

Mr. Marsh believes that the walkway will be separated from the parking lot.

Mr. Joseph does not want anyone to walk through the parking lot – he would want it relocated around the parking lot on the outskirts.

Mr. Hernandez asked if there is an easement there currently.

Mr. Joseph said yes. They are still trying to figure out how to relocate the walkway to the outskirts of the property at this time.

Mr. Hebert asked if they would agree to a Special Limitation to provide a pedestrian walkway easement from Lathrop Street to Cowles.

Mr. Joseph replied within reasonable cost – to provide an easement and not state which type would be reasonable.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other questions.

Roxi Lawery, resides at 1226 16th Avenue, is concerned about the parking for employees on the back side of the building. We want to address the concern about foot traffic as well as car traffic. They say that they house about 378 employees and that is a lot of foot traffic and a lot of activity right up next to the neighborhood. She has concerns during the construction phase of noise, dust, and children in the area.

Laura McGuinn, resides at 1096 Tyrol, has an Aunt that lives in this area and this employee parking lot will be right in front of her house. Her children play there. Without elevation drawing for this proposal and a definite footprint is disturbing. Will the garbage trucks and deliveries be using the back parking lot? Will we be able to see a final proposal of the Medical Facility? These are her concerns.

Mr. Hebert asked if she would feel comfortable with the Special Limitations to read all vehicular access has to be limited to Cowles Street.

Ms. McGuinn said yes.

John Burns, Attorney for Tanana Chiefs, has been a part of this process. This has been well advertised when they were meeting with the City of Fairbanks – the project is not new. There is no intention to have access other than Cowles Street. From the Lathrop perspective, the Emergency Response Team might need access. He spoke about the design of the facility and parking lot. They will also be dealing with the City of Fairbanks and the Landscape Review Board. Tanana Chiefs intend to be good neighbors.

Mr. Cooper asked if there was a soil analysis.

Mr. Burns said there is one but he has not reviewed it. Tanana Chiefs has to follow designs standards that meet IHS.

Ms. Hubbard asked about the noise from the building itself that would bother the neighborhood – have there been discussions on this perspective to minimize the noise from your building.

Mr. Burns does not know at this stage about the sound proofing but he knows that it will be an 8 – 5 operation.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were further questions.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION Move to approve **RZ 2010-005** with three (3) Special Conditions and two (2) Findings of Fact by **Mr. Temple**, seconded by **Ms. Peterson**.

Discussion

Mr. Hebert moved to modify Special Limitation #2 to read as follows and second by **Mr. Temple**:

2. All vehicular access shall be limited to Cowles Street.

Ms. Hubbard asked what was meant by all primary vehicular access.

Mr. Hernandez stated it could be emergency access other than primary access.

Motion to modify Special Condition #2 is **APPROVED**.

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Hebert moved to modify Special Limitation #3 to read as follows and seconded by **Mr. Pruhs**:

3. Twenty five (25) feet of the existing vegetation on the north property line of Lot 208A shall remain to provide a buffer to the residential use.

Mr. Hebert spoke of the right-of-ways and the tree line on the overhead. He believes the tree line could be 70 – 80 feet. The cleared area has thawed out soils – this is the best place to build a structure. The contour of the lot shows that they should be as far north as possible. Keeping the building as close to the north lot line will keep foot traffic at a minimum.

Mr. Temple agrees with the applicant that this medical facility is needed. He believes this would be the best possible use of this land. He concurs with Staff's recommended special limitations. He believes the existing buffer is 50 foot or less – it might be 30 feet. As the current buffer stands, it is an acceptable buffer to the residential properties to the north. This property is currently zoned residential and we should be sensitive to the neighborhood. He believes that this current buffer should stay as is.

Ms. Peterson concurs with **Mr. Temple** but thinks that we should put a number on the footage like 40 foot rather than the 25 feet.

Mr. Pruhs concurs with **Ms. Peterson**.

Mr. Temple agrees that stating a number for footage makes sense but we don't know what the buffer measure is at this time. His question is how wide the right-of-way is and could we use this number to determine how wide the buffer could be by looking at the picture on the overhead.

Mr. Hernandez said that the right-of-way is 60 feet.

Mr. Marsh said that he thinks 25 feet is a reasonable buffer.

Mr. Temple asked if it was appropriate to make a motion for a certain number of footage at this point – we have a motion on the floor for 25 feet at this time.

Mr. Temple amended **Mr. Hebert's** motion to increase the buffer to 50 feet and **Ms. Peterson** seconded.

Mr. Hebert asked **Mr. Marsh** if it would be appropriate to make this area an open buffer district.

Mr. Marsh did not want to complicate things.

ROLL CALL

Three (3) in Favor: **Ms. Peterson, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Temple**

Four (4) Opposed: **Mr. Hebert, Mr. Pruhs, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Marsh**

MOTION TO APPROVE, DENIED.

Ms. Peterson amended the motion to 40 feet, seconded by **Mr. Temple**.

ROLL CALL

Five (5) in Favor: **Ms. Peterson, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Temple, Mr. Hebert, Mr. Pruhs**

Two (2) Opposed: **Mr. Cooper, Mr. Marsh**

MOTION TO APPROVE, APPROVED.

Ms. Peterson moves to add Special Limitation #4 that will maintain a pedestrian right-of-way around the edge of the property, seconded by Mr. Pruhs.

Mr. Hernandez recommended Special Limitation #4 to read as follows:

4. A public walkway that does not conflict with parking shall be built from Lathrop Street to Cowles Street within one year of the facility becoming operational.

Ms. Peterson moved to accept the language for Special Limitations as stated by **Mr. Hernandez**, seconded by **Mr. Pruhs**.

Motion to add Special Condition #4 is approved.

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any further discussion on the rezone.

Mr. Hebert asked how we would go about limiting the amount of parking on the north side.

Mr. Marsh replied that we have already set the buffer and that is limits enough.

ROLL CALL

Seven (7) in Favor: **Ms. Peterson, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Temple, Mr. Hebert, Mr. Pruhs, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Marsh.**

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION TO APPROVE, APPROVED.

Mr. Marsh asked **Mr. Hernandez** what was the cut-off time for Planning Commission meetings.

Ms. Huntington stated that the rules are that the Planning Commission meetings will not proceed past 12 midnight.

PUBLIC HEARING

OC2010-003 A proposal amending Title 18 of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Code of Ordinances by establishing a downtown supporting commercial zoning district, retail hot spot zoning district, downtown core development standards and adding definitions. (Ordinance 2010-09)

Jeff Bouton presented the staff report. Based upon staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended approval of the proposed ordinance.

Ms. Peterson wanted clarification if changes had been made in the past to add zones to Title 18.

Mr. Hernandez gave a few examples of zones that were added to Title 18.

Mr. Pruhs asked if this was an adaptive aspect since Title 18 was created in 1984.

Mr. Hernandez said that Title 18 was adopted in 1988.

Mr. Pruhs replied that this is an adaption to what our future needs will require.

Mr. Hernandez replied that it is a natural progression – as our Comprehensive Plan changes – to implement the plan you have to adopt tools and that's what we are doing by adding zones.

Mr. Marsh asked about the City Council meeting.

Mr. Bouton explained that the City Council met last night and postponed action on this resolution that would address this proposed ordinance. The resolution had proposed amendments.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any more questions for Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Don Pendergrast, resides at 1358 Springs Field, attended a number of Vision Fairbanks meetings along with several hundred other people. From his prospective – the results of these meetings were good sound vision statements. He is in favor of this ordinance.

Chris Miller, resides at 410 2nd Avenue, was a former Planning Commissioner and he did get involved with this process of Vision Fairbanks and is still wanting to see it go forward. He attended the City Council meeting last night and they have two issues with the ordinance – ground floor professional office space and glass window tinting. In downtown Fairbanks, we have central business district everywhere – everything goes – there is no density to anything. Vision Fairbanks would like to see a tool for some protection to retailers. We want to get the downtown area to be retail or supporting retail – tourist attractions. We need to define the space downtown. On the list of permitted uses of the retail hot spot area, there is ground floor retail uses. It does not list what is permitted above ground floor retail uses so we need to add: B) Permitted above ground floor uses are all uses in the supporting commercial business district. He encourages you to keep this process moving forward.

Mr. Pruhs added that in the newspaper it looked as if there is a general distrust of all things planning.

Mr. Miller said that they like the idea but there is some resistance to all things planning. He believes in planning – things don't get accomplished if we don't plan. Downtown Fairbanks at this time is not planned.

Mr. Pruhs thanked **Mr. Miller** for his time.

Mr. Hebert feels the retail hot spot is too limited. He asked if Mr. Miller thought that pet stores and animal grooming shops, which are currently in the retail hot spot, are more appropriate uses than an art gallery.

Mr. Miller explained how there was a process of elimination to come up with this list from the General Commercial list.

Mr. Hebert addressed the ground floor façade has to be 28 feet back from the center line of a road that is less than 56 feet – he believes this is limiting.

Mr. Miller communicated that the problems we have downtown are gravel parking lots – it is because some of our right-of-ways originate from 1905. The right-of-ways are not adapted to our current use. This ground floor façade setback is trying to make a small step to have a wide enough right-of-way to accommodate the traffic, pedestrian traffic, snow removal, and allow for visibility. The City of Fairbanks engineers were involved in this decision.

Sue Sprinkle, resides at 211 5th Avenue, lives and works downtown. She owns a business downtown. She has been a part of Vision Fairbanks since it started. She just found out that her cabin downtown is Central Business District – she would like to update the Fairbanks downtown area. We need businesses that are open after 5:00 pm and on weekends. She is in favor of this ordinance.

David Van Den Berg, resides at 410 Cushman Street, is the Executive Director of Downtown Vision Fairbanks. This ordinance is a land use issue for downtown Fairbanks to guide and attract development downtown. This is for property owner rights to seek that their property will appreciate in value because of compatible uses on adjoining properties. He is in favor of this rezone.

Ms. Huntington needed clarification about Pawn Shops in the retail hot spots – looking at Community Goals in Vision Fairbanks – maintaining and improving character – pawn shops don't seem to fit into the picture and she doesn't see it as improving the character.

Mr. Van Den Berg stated that Pawn Shops draw people - it draws traffic back and forth.

Mike Prax, 1015 Meadow Rue – North Pole, thinks that we need to be careful about this ordinance. He gave examples of decisions and discussions that were made at this meeting tonight that he did not agree with. His recommendation is to place an amendment on this ordinance to prevent the administration or the Assembly from imposing these zoning codes without the consent of the property owners.

David Hayden, resides at 147 3rd Avenue, lives in the downtown area. He trusts his government and speaks in favor of this rezone. These zones are to protect the rights of other retail property owners. If these zones go into effect – when a property is sold it would stay a retail property with the new owner. This protects the rights of the adjacent owner. He gave examples of poor planning in the downtown area including the parking garage without retail stores developed on the first floor.

Mr. Hebert asked if **Mr. Hayden** would see a benefit of other permitted uses in the downtown retail hot spot. He is concerned that we don't have a conditional use within the retail hot spot for some other uses that could be compatible.

Mr. Hayden replied that he is not too sure of the process. This question should be directed towards someone else.

Asa Dowdy, resides at 1051 Eastwood Lane, does not agree with putting restrictions or extra zones in the downtown area. He is not in favor of this ordinance.

Mr. Hebert asked what kind of retail stores draws him into Fairbanks.

Mr. Dowdy said restaurants and may be Big Rays.

Darrell Kniffen wants to see revitalization in the downtown area. He is unsure of this ordinance.

Mr. Hernandez made a Point of Order to the Chair to stop the meeting at midnight or suspend the rules.

Mr. Marsh asked if there was anyone else wishing to testify tonight.
None.

Mr. Pruhs asked to continue with the ordinance.

Mr. Hernandez recommends that the Chair close public testimony and postpone the decision. Mr. Miller came up with an amendment to the ordinance that Staff will have to address. We can make a decision at our next meeting on April 20, 2010.

Mr. Marsh said that since there is no one left to testify – public hearing is closed.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION Move to postpone **OC2010-003** with one (1) Finding of Fact by **Mr. Temple**, seconded by **Mr. Hebert**.

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

H. NEW BUSINESS

I. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

1. FMATS
None

2. Title 17 Rewrite Project
None

3. Vision Fairbanks Update
None

4. Comprehensive Plan Advisory Board (CPAB)
None

5. Other Commission Comments
None

I. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 p.m.