

FRUITLAND PLANNING COMMISSION

The Fruitland Planning Commission met at City Hall on Tuesday, May 2, 2017, at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present:

Leland Bonneville, Derek Bland, Darlene Kerr, Robert Worth and Jason Pearce.

Also present were:

City Solicitor Andrew C. Mitchell Jr. and Administrative Assistant Linda Powell.

Guest was: Maria Stewart

Chairman Leland Bonneville called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. and acknowledged receipt of the minutes of the April 4, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting, calling for additions or corrections. As there were none, **Mr. Bland moved to adopt the minutes as presented; Mr. Pearce seconded and the motion was approved by five votes in favor.**

OLD BUSINESS

1. Program Open Space Project (New Basketball Court)

Administrative Assistant Powell reiterated to the Commission that the City had received Program Open Space grant approval for construction of a new basketball court to be erected at the recreational park. However, the application submission process had been placed on hold due to some staff concerns. Since that time, the City Council has voted to move forward with the project and as a result the application process has resumed with the basketball court due to be completed by the end of the year (2017).

2. Camden Corner Commercial/101 S. Camden Avenue, LLC- Update

Administrative Assistant Powell reported that some of the storm water management pond work was completed. Water tie-ins have been done on Main Street and Moore Avenue. The curbing has been poured and the first layer of asphalt in the parking area has been laid and the building pad has been poured. Also, the building materials have come in and crews were working on the steel work, assembling the building shell. The shell was expected to be up in approximately 12 days. As the project was progressing efficiently, a mid July 2017 opening was still expected.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Exception Request-Chicken Coop – 107 N. Division Street

Maria Stewart came forward to present her request for a special permit to raise chickens at her residence. She stated that, while there weren't any chickens on her property at that time, she would like to get permission to raise six hens. They would be kept in a coop in the rear yard which is already enclosed with a 6-foot high privacy fence. She stated that the chickens would be incorporated into her homeschooling curriculum for her seven children. She further stated that she had written documents from her bordering neighbors, which was read before all present, and that they did not have any objections to the raising of chickens on her property.

Mr. Worth made a motion to recommend approval of the special permit to allow the raising of chickens on the property at 107 N. Division Street; Mr. Bland seconded and the motion was approved by a five to zero vote in favor.

3. Annual Planning Report to State (Draft)

Administrative Assistant Powell presented a copy of the proposed annual planning report that will be submitted to the State to the Commission and briefly elaborated on its contents. She mentioned that report was very basic as the city did not issue more than 50 new building permits and that it met the State's necessary requirements.

4. Portable Polyethylene Storage/Garage Structures

Administrative Assistant Powell informed the Commission that code enforcement has mentioned that they had been observing several temporary (polyethylene) structures that were being used for storage and/or garages and, consequently, wanted to know if the city had any specific regulations regarding the permitting of that type of structure. In addition, sample photos of the temporary structures in question were circulated among the members. She stated that as her research of the zoning ordinance was inconclusive, she wanted to get the Commission's views on the matter. As the Commission began to discuss the matter, various questions arose as to what constitutes a temporary structure in contrast to a permanent structure. Solicitor Mitchell referenced a section of the zoning ordinance that could be interpreted as a way to regulate polyethylene structures in the same manner as the city would for the traditional accessory buildings. More discussion then followed which led to a general consensus among the members that that section of the zoning ordinance could be used until the zoning ordinance has been updated to incorporate more definitive legislation on the matter.

5. Other?

Discussion shifted to the Comprehensive Plan review status. As various comments were offered, primarily relating to the reduction of the numerous residential zoning districts, there was a general consensus that a specific strategy to address the matter would need to be established going forward. It was then stated that if the Commission had accessibility to a large zoning map of the city, along with other historical and current records as it related to developmental uses and changes on various parcels within the designated districts, they would be better informed as to how to proceed with restructuring and/or eliminating the number of zoning districts within the city.

After further discussion, it was finally suggested that the members continue to review the zoning ordinance and prepare to address the aforementioned topic at their next meeting. Accordingly, the Commission then established a date for their next work session, May 16th, at 7 p.m.

General Discussion

None.

With no further business to discuss, **Mr. Worth moved to adjourn and Mr. Bland seconded. The motion was approved by a five to zero vote in favor and the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.**

Submitted by,

Linda J. Powell

Approved 6/6/17