



PLANNING COMMISSION WRITTEN COMMENTS

Item heard on September 10, 2024

Comments received as of September 17, 2024

Z2300050

3107 & 3111 East Geer Street

CHAIR CAMERON	Vote: Yes
	Comments: No written comments provided.
VICE-CHAIR CHAGARIS	Vote: Yes
	Comments: Concerns do exist over potential “overuse” of the property if this zoning change is approved additionally, the neighborhood concerns over the buffer should be addressed with a commitment from the applicant.
CUTRIGHT	Vote: Yes
	Comments: Initially had concerns about the scope expanding beyond parking and into heavy truck/vehicle maintenance. That concern still exists, but it is minor given the place types in the area and surrounding parcels. If the zoning and place types were aligned, there wouldn’t be any residential zoning.
CZAJKOWSKI	Vote: Yes
	Comments: No written comments provided.
GREGORY	Vote: Yes
	Comments: The applicant proposes to convert the site into IL for commercial freight parking and vehicle servicing, which aligns with the intended uses under the PTM designation. However, there is a notable concern regarding the lack of commitment to install a buffer that would mitigate visual and auditory impacts on adjacent properties. Given that the neighboring lots appear to contain modest residential homes, the absence of such a buffer raises potential concerns about the quality of life for nearby residents. While this issue may not be significant enough to proscribe the zoning change, I would strongly recommend that the applicant incorporate a sufficient buffer to minimize disturbances. A landscaped or structural barrier would help ensure compatibility between the commercial use and the surrounding residential area. Council should push for this element.

HUYNH	Vote: Yes
	Comments: No written comments provided.
JOHNSON	Vote: No
	Comments: Notwithstanding verbal commitments from the Applicant to manage the hours for truck access and limited maintenance work, related environmental, noise, traffic and management of property concerns remain (recognizing nearby commercial uses). Also, once this zoning change is made the Owner is not further restricted to type/scope (i.e., per document, "because this is a general zoning change request, all uses permitted in the IL district could be established in the future...". Finally at the public meeting, privacy feature(s) for screening to block view from adjacent properties was requested but not included.
KOPAC	Vote: Yes
	Comments: I had some concerns of citing additional industrial uses in a census tract that is much higher POC than the County, which the Comp Plan aims to move away from, as well as being located proximate to some residences. However, the site is consistent with the PTM, and upon visiting the site, it is consistent with much of the use of the land around it, and it is tucked away right behind a rail line. Residents did say they want a privacy screen, which the applicant said will be addressed at the site plan stage. The city should ensure that this takes place.
MACIVER	Vote: Yes
	Comments: No written comments provided.
WILLIAMS	Vote: Yes
	Comments: The IL zoning allows applicant to park commercial vehicles on the lot. Although voted yes, I have concerns with the privacy for the neighboring residents. Also, concerned that there should be restrictions for uses especially related to turning this land into IL uses that are a nuisance to the neighboring residents.
WOUK	Vote: Yes
	Comments: This land is already cleared, and the use (parking for trucks) fits the nature of the area, and it is consistent with the Place-Type Map.