

**7.04: Consider Request to Rezone Property Identified by PID #35-32-25-32-0062 from R-1 Residential (MUSA) to E-1 Employment (Project No. 155); Case of Rocky Mtn Investment LLC**

Community Development Director Gladhill reviewed the staff report and recommendation from the Planning Commission that the property remain as R-1 Residential (MUSA).

Councilmember Riley referenced the triangle piece of property and asked if that is owned by 6250 and is unimproved.

Community Development Director Gladhill confirmed that is owned by 6250 and is unimproved and perhaps used as yard space. He stated that there is not currently any outdoor storage or parking for that area.

Councilmember Kuzma asked if the additional fencing would help support a rezoning of this parcel.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that fencing could help but a variance would also be needed for transitioning and it would still be clear that outdoor storage is occurring. He stated that notification was provided to the neighboring property owners and no comments were received so perhaps the neighbors do not mind, but again noted that variances would be required to allow that activity.

Greg Dahlheimer, Rocky Mountain Investment Group, stated that he was not trying to be unlawful as the tax statement identifies the property as commercial/industrial. He stated that he believes that the property is already fenced.

Jeremy Anderson, Countryside Services, stated that this property is fenced with a gravel entrance that he has maintained for a number of years. He stated that his intention would simply be to continue to store trailers on the property as he has done. He stated that he has pictures of neighboring commercial properties that have fences and outdoor storage. He stated that he could not see a resident wanting to build a home on this property. He noted that when the neighboring blacksmith holds a class, both sides of the road are packed full of vehicles and he has even allowed shared parking on his lot for the classes. He stated that some of the neighboring property owners have even stored trailers on this property. He stated that the neighbors all get along and he plows out the other businesses for no charge. He acknowledged that there are eyesores in the area but did not believe that his property was one of them. He stated that he is growing his property and is looking for a small lot to store trailers. He stated that he would comply with any necessary conditions. He stated that the blacksmith building next door would not be ideal to be located next to a residential property. He stated that he desires to continue the activity that he has done on the property. He stated that his business has grown from four employees to ten employees and is simply looking for a little additional space for the trailers. He stated that his business sells and services snowplows and even services the City snowplows.

Councilmember Johns asked if this parcel is part of 6315 and would be subdivided or whether it is a separate piece.

Community Development Director Gladhill confirmed that this is a separate parcel.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that he would support rezoning.

Councilmember Riley agreed that this would seem to be a difficult position for a residential home to be constructed. He asked if there are any additional factors that could be added to help provide transitioning.

Community Development Director Gladhill noted that variances would be required and therefore if the direction would be to support rezoning, staff would bring additional details back for further discussion. He noted the overall goal to improve the image of Highway 10 as well.

Acting Mayor LeTourneau stated that one of his thoughts was the desires of the Highway 10 image. He stated that there is a desire and discussion around how Highway 10 is viewed as people drive through the community and what the community wants that corridor to look like as a representation of the City.

Councilmember Shryock stated that she would also support rezoning as she does not believe that this would become a residential property. She stated that in the long-term perhaps there would be a purchase of the property by the adjacent property. She stated that the Highway 10 discussions will be a process over time but believed that the residential area is fairly set, and this would fit more with the employment district. She agreed that fencing would be appropriate to ensure that the residents in that area have some buffering.

Acting Mayor LeTourneau agreed with the comments made and stated that he would be interested in having a discussion about rezoning. He stated that he would also be interested in compliance with code and wanted to ensure that any issues of noncompliance would be addressed through this process.

Mr. Anderson stated that his ultimate goal would be to purchase the adjoining property as well.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that he would support language that requires aesthetic improvement.

Motion by Councilmember Kuzma, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to direct Staff to prepare an Ordinance for introduction at a future meeting to amend the zoning designation of the Subject Property from R-1 Residential (MUSA) to E-1 Employment District. While the properties to the east and north are zoned E-1 Employment, the Subject Property also abuts residentially zoned parcels to the west and south.

Further discussion: Councilmember Riley stated that he would like clarification as the statement was made that the County has reflected this property as commercial/industrial and asked if that classification should match the City zoning. Community Development Director Gladhill provided

additional information on how the County bases their classifications for tax purposes. He stated that staff attempts to clean up these situations as they arise. Councilmember Riley stated that this does point out that a property expert did not see this as residential land.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Acting Mayor LeTourneau, Councilmembers Kuzma, Riley, Johns, and Shryock. Voting No: None.