



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331  
(928) 634-7943  
www.jerome.az.gov

## MINUTES

### REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF JEROME JEROME CIVIC CENTER 600 CLARK STREET, JEROME, ARIZONA TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 2025, AT 6:00 PM

*Due to the length of this meeting, Council may recess and reconvene at the time and date announced.*

#### 6:01 (0:18) 1. CALL TO ORDER

Present were Chair Lance Schall and Commissioners Becca Miller, Jera Peterson, Jeanie Ready and Lori Riley.  
Staff present included Zoning Administrator Will Blodgett and Deputy Clerk Kristen Muenz.

#### 6:01 (0:36) 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### A. The Board will review and vote on approval for the minutes of the regular meeting of 02/18/2025

Chair Schall introduced the minutes for approval and asked if there were any corrections.

Ms. Miller said the only error she saw was in adjournment; she was the one who seconded the adjournment of the last meeting.

There was some confusion on where the error was. In the body of the minutes it read "Ms. Ready seconded the motion" but in the chart the correct box was marked as Ms. Miller who seconded.

Ms. Muenz confirmed the vote box was correct.

Ms. Ready made the motion to approve the meeting minutes of the March 18<sup>th</sup> regular meeting.

Mr. Schall sought clarification that she meant to motion with a correction.

Ms. Ready confirmed her motion to approve the meeting minutes with the correction.

Ms. Riley seconded the motion.

Mr. Schall called the question. Four commissioners voted aye and Ms. Riley stated she was abstaining due to her absence from the last meeting.

##### Motion to approve the meeting minutes from the regular meeting of February 18, 2025.

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
MILLER			X			
PETERSON			X			
READY	X		X			
RILEY		X				X
SCHALL			X			

After the vote Ms. Ready sought to correct her motion stating she had used today's meeting date. She corrected that she'd like to correct her motion to approve the meeting minutes from the February 18<sup>th</sup> regular meeting.

#### 6:04 3. OLD BUSINESS

##### 6:04 (3:09) A. The board may remove from the table to discuss and vote to appoint a new vice-chair.

Mr. Schall introduced the item.

Mr. Blodgett shared the reason it's on the agenda is in March we try to do the housekeeping. However there should have been an agenda item for each election for Chair and Vice Chair. He said it was a small detail missed in error and asked the commission to entertain leaving this item on the table so that both seats could be properly agendaized.

Ms. Muenz said it can stay on the table until the next meeting.

Mr. Schall said he recalled that being the reason it was tabled last month; It was tabled because there was supposed to be a vote for both.

Ms. Muenz explained that the timing was just off.

Ms. Ready said she was reviewing the by-laws again on procedural election of chair and vice chair and in the by-laws, both are to be elected at the first meeting in March each year and can be postponed to a later time if needed. She thinks moving forward we all need to be mindful, and if there is a vacancy in between, then it's filled until election time.

Mr. Blodgett agreed confirming that March is the election months for all boards.

Ms. Ready continued that COVID threw a wrench into things and transitioning to a new Zoning Administrator it's to be expected. She said when she

initially read the by-law section, she interpreted it as we needed a full board to elect Chair and Vice Chair but she sees where it could be construed another way.

Mr. Blodgett interjected that it's one of the first questions on his list for the new legal counsel.

Ms. Ready continued that procedurally it's not addressed, it is in other sections and circumstances but not in the initial election of.

Mr. Blodgett said the consensus has been that we don't need a full board to vote for Chair and Vice Chair and this is one of his first questions for legal counsel.

Ms. Ready continued with by-laws itself she believes that it is something that board itself agrees upon how to do those things.

Mr. Schall interjected if it could be done with just a quorum.

Ms. Ready continued that it has to be spelled out in the by-laws so that we are consistent.

Mr. Blodgett asked if they would like to have a 20-30 minute meeting to review and address the by-laws for any changes or updates.

Ms. Ready said she is requesting that meeting right now, that at some point in the near future they will have that discussion. She said she also noticed the by-laws were not included in their new notebooks, she had hers from her previous notebook.

Mr. Blodgett wondered if the previous notebook had the by-laws just taken directly from the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Ready continued that she reviewed the by-laws on the website and noticed that on the title page of the by-laws, at the top, it says they were updated in 2022, however on the rest of the pages it said the last update was July 14. She said she was guessing it was really the printed date, but that overall it was confusing.

Mr. Blodgett said he would check, but it could also be reflective of other ordinance updates and not related to the by-laws directly.

There was further back and forth dialogue between Ms. Ready and Mr. Blodgett regarding the topic.

Ms. Peterson asked if it was under Zoning Ordinance Article 1 administration, Section 104 Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Ready said that's not part of the by-laws.

Mr. Blodgett wondered if it was lumped in with another document that had an update.

Ms. Ready said it shouldn't be lumped in with any other documents, it should be its own stand-alone document.

Ms. Muenz confirmed she was able to pull it up on the website to see what Ms. Ready was referring to.

Ms. Peterson asked if it was the same as Article 1 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Ready said this is not the same as the by-laws. That's the Town setting up that there will be a board under these conditions, then the board creates its own by-laws.

Mr. Blodgett said it was a good catch, and he would look into it.

Ms. Muenz said it was a question best asked of Candace who still works for Town as an independent contractor. It could have been a change in spacing or something.

Mr. Blodgett said he'd talk with her.

Ms. Ready continued that it is confusing and is easy to misconstrue.

Mr. Schall said he is inclined to cooperate with staff suggestion to table this to next month. He then made a formal motion.

Ms. Riley seconded the motion.

Mr. Schall called the question, and the motion carried unanimously.

**Motion to table election of Vice Chair to April meeting.**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
MILLER			X			
PETERSON			X			
READY			X			
RILEY		X	X			
SCHALL	X		X			

**6:14 4. NEW BUSINESS**

**(13:58) A.** The owner/applicant for 537 School Street is requesting dual-zoning (C-1 & R-2) for "use-by-right" for Residential property.

Chair Schall introduced item 4A for consideration. Mr. Schall asked what was new with this developing issue.

Mr. Blodgett shared there had been a neighborhood meeting prior to this meeting, and if approved at this meeting the next step would be a recommendation to Council for final approval. He said he did check to make sure it didn't just pertain to districts and confirmed that zoning changes require final council approval. He said this change wasn't requested by petition by the property owners but was a recommended fix by himself. He shared there is a problem on school street he identified 3 years ago, but at the time it wasn't an issue that needed to be addressed yet. Until now, the home has been sold to an individual in the legal field, who in fact is the Town attorney for the City of Buckeye and works for the same legal firm that now represents Town. He called while the house was in escrow realizing the house was in C1, at which time he was informed he would need a conditional use permit to use it as a house. A lot of the properties on School Street have done that the last decade or so, but the truth is that they shouldn't have to and they should never have had to. The idea is use by right; when you buy a house you have every expectation to use that house as a house. The conditional use is an ethical and legal issue. When School St. was rezoned, everything was blanketed and zoned as C-1.

Ms. Miller asked why that was done.

Mr. Blodgett said he did not know why.

Ms. Muenz said she believed it was because at one point there were businesses being run out of the homes on that street.

Ms. Miller asked if it was all of them.

Ms. Muenz said not all of them, but historically, using Kate's books as an example, a lot of the buildings on Main street also had entrances on School

St., so to maintain the commercial district as a whole in the area they just made that section of School St. C-1 on both sides.

Mr. Blodgett continued that it works for the 1 or two buildings that have lower store units on Main St. but creates complexities for every other building on School St.

Ms. Miller asked when the change occurred. She said she was confused it was even a thing.

Ms. Riley agreed and added if anything it should have been a dual zone.

Mr. Blodgett said he didn't unpack the decision making behind School St. He said he is trying to fix the entirety of that down the road but it's a much bigger process. He continued that he's been having conversations with others who live on School St. about the fix and Mr. McCoy was the first person to want to move forward with it. He hopes neighbors might also pick up on it as a fix. He said when zoning was done initially everything was considered legal nonconforming so it wasn't an issue and could be figured out later; later has come and property owners have changed. Now every new property owner needs a CUP to use their house as a house and is unethical in his opinion.

Ms. Miller asked why when there are so many conditional permits in town.

Mr. Blodgett said it was true continuing, when you buy a residential property, you have every expectation to use a residential property for a residential use.

Ms. Miller said she's not being a naysayer, continuing, wouldn't that be the job of the person who is selling the house to disclose that information.

Mr. Blodgett said she is correct but sometimes they don't always do that, or understand it. So there's a lot of wrong information on purpose or just because they didn't understand. He said now we have to be responsible and fix the problem.

Ms. Peterson asked if all of school street is C-1.

Mr. Blodgett confirmed most of it is.

Ms. Peterson and Ms. Ready both point out that School St. from Main to Center is all zoned as C-1.

Mr. Blodgett said for the most part all of these are residential properties. He then gives an example of someone attempting to buy a property that needs a CUP to be used as residential, but the CUP gets denied, then that person then has a house they can't legally use as a house.

Ms. Miller questioned who would deny it.

Mr. Blodgett countered it's not that it's happened, it's about the possibility that it could happen. That's what lawyers and attorneys are concerned about and now in this case, the homeowner is an attorney.

Ms. Riley commented that he's protecting his rear on this.

Ms. Miller said she understood that, and respected that Mr. Blodgett has a huge workload, but why not pause and fix the whole issue at the same time.

Ms. Peterson expressed her agreement.

Ms. Miller continued to put a pause on the need for a CUP, knowing that the fix would be coming instead of doing these 7 more times.

Mr. Schall questioned if the fix would be to dual zone the whole street.

There was some agreement regarding dual zoning.

Mr. Schall said it doesn't hurt to dual zone this lot and then go back and fix the rest of them.

Mr. Blodgett shared that there are other reasons to not dual zone everything just yet, for example language in the Zoning Ordinance. He gave an example of a triplex on the street and that our ordinance doesn't recognize tri-plex, so if we dual zone the whole street then legally that tri-plex would have to leave one of its units vacant. So for the time being fix the immediate problems and fix the whole issue once the zoning is fixed.

Commissioners expressed their understanding.

Ms. Peterson said her issue was if that person doesn't pay but everyone else did. She recommended sending this through the Board of Adjustment first then have it come back to them as a recommendation.

Mr. Blodgett said the Board of Adjustment doesn't apply in this circumstance, the Planning and Zoning board has to give a recommendation to Council of approval or denial first.

Ms. Peterson reviewed the Zoning Ordinance regarding the planning and zoning commission reads from ZO section 104 b. regarding the powers and duties of the planning and zoning commission.

Mr. Blodgett clarified that based on that technically the Planning and Zoning commission holds more power to make decisions in this capacity than the Council. He gave further explanation of the capacity in which the Planning and Zoning commission can make zoning decisions.

Ms. Peterson said she thinks that we have to refund everyone else who has paid the CUP if we're going to waive that fee for this person.

Mr. Blodgett said he could not answer that, it was a legal question. He further clarified when talking about fairness and who's paid that fee, that he's not saying to give anyone a free pass, he's saying no one should have had to pay anything for the permit at all and it has to stop somewhere. He continued that this is the first person that brought up a petition where no one previously has.

Ms. Muenz said there are instances where a CUP is applicable. Using Kate's Books as an example, she explained how a change in ownership and use of the space made the need for a CUP necessary.

Ms. Miller inquired if this is Mr. Blodgett's short term fix, is the long term fix to fix the whole street.

Mr. Blodgett answered yes, it is but he needs to fix the zoning ordinance to then fix this. He said as of now he has a 2 year window to get the zoning ordinance completed.

Ms. Peterson asked if it's the fact that he's an attorney, making Mr. Blodgett speed this up.

Mr. Blodgett answered no he identified the issue 3 years ago and was waiting for either someone to petition or have the time and ordinance language to fix it. He continued, this gentleman just bought the house and before he closed escrow called about the problem. He said he didn't wait for the petition because it was an identified problem, so he gave a recommendation on how to fix it, which then gives him use by right for residential use on a residential property.

Ms. Muenz added that section of the road only has 3 houses on it, she pointed out each home with a brief background of ownership.

Ms. Peterson said she had a friend who had a similar issue with a use permit and that the realtor is who the homeowner should be going after because the zoning has always been there.

Mr. Blodgett added that she's not wrong.

Ms. Miller commented that it's inappropriate for residential houses to be zoned commercial.

Mr. Blodgett said he agreed, adding this is a mistake on our part and we are working, as a town, toward fixing it.

Ms. Peterson said she feels like we can't do it for one person and not do it for the others. She said we need to refund the people who have paid previously.

Mr. Blodgett answered that is not what we are addressing here. Continuing, that is an entirely different issue and needs to be agendized as its own item. This is an individual application. He recognized that there is a larger problem that made this application necessary, but we can't address that problem yet as it's not an agenda item.

Ms. Peterson asked if from this point forward no one else pays the CUP.

Mr. Blodgett answered not if he could help it.

Ms. Peterson asked if this was something that now goes to Council to make sure, or do they have the ability to change it.

Mr. Blodgett shared it's the individual opportunity of the homeowner, they can choose for a conditional use permit to continue on or they can file a petition for him to help fix it.

Ms. Miller added they also don't have a need to unless it sells to a new owner.

Ms. Muenz said if it's no longer a conditional use because the properties are rezoned, then they don't need to apply for a CUP, but we can keep the CUP part of our ordinance as is, because it still applies in many instances. We don't want to get rid of them, every city needs them for certain instances, but we can fix a zoning mistake. She clarified what they were trying to do was prevent having a zoning island, so they made equal center of town C-1 regardless of how the buildings were originally built or what purpose they were built for.

Ms. Peterson inquired if this person had a choice, would they pick residential and not commercial.

Mr. Blodgett answered it depends on what the person's motivations are.

Ms. Peterson continued giving everyone dual and giving them a choice to be commercial and if you want residential then you have to do that, but to give everyone dual doesn't seem right.

Ms. Riley said they wouldn't give the whole center (of town) dual.

Ms. Peterson said that's what she was saying. Maybe individually and if they want to change it's a conditional use but to choose one or the other, not just give them all commercial. There's no parking there for commercial.

Ms. Ready and Ms. Riley both remark that it's already zoned commercial.

There was additional conversation and clarification about the dual zoning.

Mr. Blodgett clarified that he can't give a direct answer on behalf of the property owners because it depends on what their decision is. He continued once he has the zoning language in place then he can entertain the public meetings and talk about fixing the zoning for the whole street, but in lieu of that he needs individual property owners to come to him and petition for a change of zoning. He shared that he'd had a conversation regarding the same zoning topic with another homeowner who is now entertaining a similar fix to their home.

There was some brief additional discussion about other homes in the area that were lumped in with the C-1 zoning, with resident and audience member Mark Krmpotich adding that his house is on the same corner and is not a business.

Mr. Blodgett clarified that by dual zoning the properties as either R2 or R1-5 then the people can use their house as a house and won't need to pay the town every time it changes ownership.

Ms. Riley stated a business is still a business and that would not get changed.

Mr. Blodgett and Ms. Muenz both agreed.

Ms. Ready said which is why we need the dual zoning in that section because everything is intermingled. She continued we have to be consistent with the area of School St.

Ms. Peterson asked if we have dual zoning.

Several commissioners answered yes, with Ms. Riley adding that her own property is dual zoned as R1 and agricultural.

Ms. Peterson added that dual zoning is not listed and defined.

Mr. Blodgett clarified that we do not have any language or a section of the ordinance that talks about dual zoning. But zoning types are not mutually exclusive and can coexist together, but most people try to avoid doing that from a planning perspective. In planning theory you keep compatible uses together, but Jerome was designed uniquely where everything here was multiuse. We don't even have a multiuse designation to use so in lieu of those tools the best fix is to dual zone.

Ms. Peterson suggested incorporating language and definitions to clean that up.

Mr. Blodgett said he agrees and is actively working towards that.

Ms. Peterson continued that if you want to have a business you have to have so much parking, but School St. is already so filled up with parking.

Mr. Blodgett said we are not putting businesses on School St.

Ms. Peterson interjected that it's already zoned for C-1.

Ms. Muenz further added that School St. is designated as a residential permit parking only street so there can be no business parking there.

Mr. Blodgett said we don't have enough time tonight to go into parking, which produced some laughter from commissioners.

Ms. Ready said she believed Mr. Blodgett's point was to have the ordinance language cleaned up before we can move forward with a larger rezoning.

Ms. Peterson said she doesn't like the individual thing in special interests, continuing that doing this right now she would like to put something in motion for future.

Ms. Riley interjected that they need to take care of this one house right now.

Mr. Blodgett said this is a common tool in town and is not special treatment. He said he will continue to use solutions that have been used historically, adding we are going to continue seeing this.

There was some discussion on the changes necessary to ordinance before rezoning, as well as the expressed agreement that people should not

have to continue to pay a fee to use their house as a house.

Mr. Krmpotich said how about waive the fee.

Mr. Blodgett answered he doesn't have the power to do that.

Ms. Riley inquired about the zoning for the Gibson Market adding that it has always been a dual use.

Ms. Peterson remarked it could be nonconforming.

It was confirmed the building is zoned R1-5.

There was additional discussion regarding the zoning for that building and other areas where the zoning doesn't seem to fit.

Mr. Blodgett said the zoning overlay that was applied in 1977 he believes was done poorly. The people who did it did their best, but the truth is, it did put R1-5 zoning over multiuse properties. It was not a problem at the time because a lot of buildings were legally nonconforming. However, now a lot of the buildings have been renovated to last another hundred years and doing so has kicked them out of legal nonconformity, which is now starting to restrict what owners can do. He continued, a zoning rewrite/revamp is going to take a while because there is so much to it, for example there was industrial zoning off of Fourth St. He continued, for the situation in front of us this is the best solution I have in order to make things legally and ethically right for people on School St. who want the fix to use their homes legally by right as a residential property. He finished by sharing, he doesn't have a better fix for this.

Ms. Peterson said everyone on School St. needs to be aware.

Mr. Blodgett added that they did hold a neighborhood meeting to that effect and hopes that everyone on School St. will come to him for a conversation, and he will help anyone in the same situation to dual zone their homes for use by right.

Ms. Peterson asked if every home was given a flyer.

Mr. Blodgett said the meeting was put out in the newspaper and each household was mailed a letter.

Ms. Miller asked for more elaboration on the other area in town that went through a similar situation.

Ms. Muenz shared the details of the rezoning of several homes on Hampshire across from the old high school. She elaborated the rezoning from R1-5 to R2 to use a home as a legal duplex. During the process of rezoning some neighbors began to petition to also have their homes rezoned as R2. Ultimately it was passed by Council.

Ms. Peterson asked if it was the Doss' house.

Ms. Muenz said she believed so.

Ms. Peterson said she had attended that meeting because she had just recently purchased her house at the time.

Ms. Ready asked if 537 School St. is a triplex.

Mr. Blodgett said it is a duplex. He further elaborated that there have been some differing reports of a triplex at some point in its history but officially, his records and county records both indicate that it's a duplex. He further added that if there are concerns about adding a unit, this is locking it into R2 zoning, so it's no longer legal nonconforming C1 it's now locked in as a duplex.

Mr. Krmpotich remarked that there are people living in the top of it.

Mr. Blodgett clarified that the top two floors are one dwelling unit and the bottom is one unit currently being occupied by a Fire Department employee.

Ms. Muenz shared history of the home with the previous owner, who had wanted it to be an owner occupied B&B but then changed their mind to make it a duplex in C1 zoning.

Mr. Blodgett shared every time a new owner comes in, they need a new CUP which is a \$500 fee. He said he hates that anyone comes to town, to a small town government, and pay a \$500 fee to use their own house. He doesn't like the fact that other people had to pay it, but at this point he's looking at long term fixes to get the zoning done by right. He continued that he would pursue other fixes once he has better language in the ordinance, but so far this is the only easy solution without messing up other zoning aspects.

Ms. Peterson said in the definitions there is nothing for dual zoning.

Mr. Blodgett answered she is correct, adding we have other dual zoned properties. He said there is no special process, it's essentially the same as changing zoning from C1 zoning to R1-5 except you now have two zoning designations, so you have two lists of different things you are allowed to do with your property.

Ms. Muenz pointed out a property that was recently changed. She pointed out on a map of Town the area where there are properties that are half C1 and AR. She continued, the setbacks are different for both types of zoning, so one owner had his property rezoned to be C1 in its entirety, so that he didn't have to deal with different setbacks for one half of the property from the other half. She then shared he's not the only one whose parcel was half and half.

Ms. Riley inquired about what street they were looking at.

There was discussion about what used to be a historic roadway and where it connected with other roads.

Ms. Peterson said there are situations where people go to the BOA and have something done specific to a property. She then asked if we are proposing that going forward no one is going to pay for the CUP.

Mr. Blodgett answered no not at all.

Other commission members agreed, expressing that is not their decision at all.

Ms. Peterson said she has a hard time voting for this one but not others.

Ms. Riley said she looks at it as if we have to start somewhere. She continued, he brought it forward, this is the start, and others can come forward and do the same.

Ms. Miller agreed.

Ms. Peterson asked what they're doing here exactly. Are they waiving it?

Ms. Miller interjected, answering no.

Mr. Blodgett said they are voting to recommend the approval of the rezone to Council.

Ms. Peterson again clarified this was going to Council next, which was confirmed again. She then continued for this particular person and then



further because she doesn't want to do it for just one person.

Ms. Riley answered no, and Ms. Miller reiterated it is up to the property owners.

Mr. Blodgett responded that this is a process that can be used for others.

Ms. Peterson continued we are on School Street specifically.

Mr. Blodgett said yes, he continued she is thinking about the whole street and for this meeting they are talking about one particular property.

Ms. Peterson said she was saying they need to put together a package to council recommending this as a starting point and all of School Street needs to be looked at.

Mr. Blodgett said he understood now where she was coming from. He continued this commission has the authority to make some other changes over and above what Council does, but he would not encourage them to do that yet without an update to the ordinance.

Ms. Riley reiterated that Mr. Blodgett does want to make the change.

Ms. Peterson said she would like to go forward following a structure, which could include recommending situations to be looked at as a result of other decisions, for example, dual zoning in this case.

Ms. Miller interjected that she believes that is for a different conversation.

Mr. Blodgett also said they are creeping into a discussion for a larger project than what they're currently dealing with.

Ms. Peterson said that she would like to recommend it to the Council so that they can make suggestions back.

Mr. Blodgett said he would have a conversation with Council about it.

Ms. Riley said we have to address this property now, with the knowledge that anyone in this area who brings it forward will get the same consideration.

Ms. Peterson and Mr. Blodgett continued discussion regarding dual zoning, including specific terminology and ordinance language updates.

Ms. Muenz recommended the wording for their motion be to recommend to council to change the zoning per the petition from C1 to C1 and R2.

Ms. Peterson wanted to include the recommendation for Council to consider School St.

Ms. Riely said we can't do all of School St.

There was additional back and forth discussion regarding a recommendation to Council to look at fixing the zoning of School St.

Ms. Peterson said she wants more to the recommendation to Council.

Ms. Riley said they have to do that in the future it can't be done today.

Ms. Ready said it's not on the agenda to determine today.

Ms. Peterson said they'll be looking at this too.

Ms. Miller asked if the proper course of action to request from Mr. Blodgett that we would like to see it on a future agenda to address zoning issues on School St.

Mr. Blodgett said that would be absolutely the way to go. He reiterated again that it's an issue he had identified and had to wait for someone to bring the problem to him. He continued that he had to start somewhere and said he couldn't go back, and fix things already done, but he can go back and help to fix it so the next person it doesn't happen to.

Ms. Peterson said 511 School St. brought the issue to him and she knew because she was getting an earful from the owner.

Mr. Blodgett said the issue with that property is that it was operating as an active Airbnb and not a simple residential issue, there were other complications.

Ms. Peterson said no she was trying to sell it and the CUP kept stopping the sale.

Mr. Blodgett said that was one of the cases that helped him realize this is a serious issue that will need to be dealt with.

Ms. Muenz shared that house is a different case entirely. It was built after the ordinance was put in place and was not one of the homes with a grandfathered use. It was an empty lot and they had to apply for a CUP to build a residence in a C1 zoned district.

Ms. Peterson said when she bought it, she didn't think she had to pay it, so when she sold it she wasn't aware of it.

Mr. Blodgett said this goes back to the beginning of their conversation that there needs to be some accountability on the part of the owner applicant.

Ms. Peterson agreed, adding the realtors as well. When these properties are up for sale, as it stands until we change it this is the situation.

Ms. Miller asked to focus on their role and responsibility as the Planning and Zoning commission. She made the motion to approve the recommendation for rezoning of 537 School St. Adding she felt that the commission was veering off into territory that is conjecture and potentially not related to the issue right in front of them.

Ms. Ready seconded the motion.

Ms. Peterson asked for Ms. Miller to restate what her motion is.

Ms. Ready asked if they are recommending the lot be dual zoned or recommending added zoning of R2; she feels the wording could be important.

Mr. Blodgett said he is calling it dual zoning. He said he's using the term and using it consistently to not confuse people. He said it means that it enjoys two different sets of zoning designations. He restated it currently has C1 zoning and at this point you would be adding R2.

There was some discussion to clarify the motion language.

Ms. Miller restated her motion to recommend the approval of the C1/R2 zoning at 537 School St.

Ms. Ready seconded the motion.

Mr. Schall called the question, and the recommendation to approve the rezone for 537 School St., adding R2 to it's current C1 zoning is approved.

**Motion to approve C1 & R2 Dual Zoning to 537 School St.**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
MILLER	X		X			
PETERSON			X			
READY		X	X			
RILEY			X			
SCHALL			X			

After the vote Ms. Muenz clarified the next steps, sharing that Council can approve their recommendation or if they don't agree or there are protests, including from surrounding property owners, then they can hold a public hearing.

**6:527 (56:59) B.** This analysis is for a proposed lot Combination to the primary lot at 659 Giroux St.

Mr. Schall introduced item B and recused himself from the dais, because he is the owner/applicant of the lot combination for consideration.  
 Ms. Ready took over the meeting acting as Vice Chair and introduced the item for consideration by the commission.  
 Mr. Blodgett introduced the item for consideration reading from his analysis the request to combine a small parcel with the rest of the property. He said this lot combination won't have any effect in terms of buildability of the lot. He said this had been submitted a few months ago but he was trying to determine if they needed a lot survey.  
 Ms. Peterson asked if there was a building on the property.  
 Mr. Schall answered there is no building.  
 Ms. Riley asked the applicant about the location of the lot. He answered she was correct about the location.  
 Ms. Ready said this looks fairly simple.  
 Ms. Peterson asked if there was anything the applicant wanted to add.  
 Mr. Schall said no, he just wanted to get everything cleaned up for the tax bill. He said maybe in the future they'd push their garden shed over about 5 feet onto that lot, but not now.  
 There was a brief discussion about prior lot consolidation.  
 Ms. Ready inquired about question, but there were none. She then made the motion to recommend the approval of the lot combination for 659 Giroux St.  
 Ms. Miller seconded.  
 Ms. Ready called the question and the recommendation for approval of the lot combination was approved.

**Motion to approve lot combination for 659 Giroux St.**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
MILLER		X	X			
PETERSON			X			
READY	X		X			
RILEY			X			
SCHALL						X

Mr. Schall returned to the dais and Ms. Ready acknowledged that the vote included 1 abstention from Mr. Schall as the applicant.  
 Ms. Riley asked if she could make a statement prior to moving on to adjournment. She stated that next month will be her last month as she will be moving to Tennessee. She said she will be here next month, but it will be her last month.  
 Commissioners said that they would miss her.  
 Mr. Schall said he'd miss her in town and her contribution to the board.  
 Ms. Peterson asked to speak freely. She wanted to make a suggestion to change the meeting time to 6:30.  
 Mr. Blodgett said as part of their earlier conversation he would agendize looking at the bylaws and at that time it would be appropriate to look at and make adjustments to meeting times.  
 Ms. Muenz said it's more of an administrative thing as there are many places that will need to be updated.  
 Mr. Schall agreed and said it had been changed previously from 7:00 p.m.

**7:05 (1:04:35) 5. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Schall introduced item 5.  
 Ms. Ready made the motion to adjourn the meeting.  
 Ms. Riley and Ms. Peterson seconded the motion.  
 Mr. Schall called the question, and the meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

**Motion to adjourn at 7:06 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
MILLER			X			
PETERSON			X			
READY	X		X			
RILEY		X	X			
SCHALL			X			

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Chair Lance Schall, Planning & Zoning Commission Vice Chair

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Kristen Muenz, Deputy Town Clerk