

**Council Meeting
Workshop Minutes
6/12/19 – 7:15 p.m.**

Meeting was called to order at 7:15.

In Attendance: Mayor Dudley, Vice-Mayor Howell, Councilmembers Hauft, Troup and Roberts, Manager Campbell and Attorney Mora

Code Discussion on certain portions of Chapters 54 & 66, concerning parking of vehicles, boats and recreational vehicles.

Mayor Dudley stated that in last council meeting residents spoke at open forum and expressed their thoughts on certain code enforcement issues. There was consensus by council to review certain portions of chapters 54 and 66, hence tonight's workshop. Since the last meeting the Council has been provide with information and possible options for Council to consider. The Council is not limited to these options.

Council determines policy. The Council has the opportunity to discuss the code and come to a consensus on how to move forward. If the Council chooses to make changes.

A final decision does not need to be made in this workshop. It may take longer than one meeting.

Our codes need to be updated and we need to move forward.

There are 12 different actions. After each action is discussed, there will be open forum.

Action 1: Clarify Section 54-110 -Add definition for prohibiting vehicles and equipment

Vice-Mayor Howell stated that Kenneth City is a working-class Town. He doesn't think that all trucks, and box trucks should be prohibited. He believes vehicles under 23 feet should be allowed.

Council member Roberts believes that even if a landscaping vehicle is under 23 feet, the debris should be removed before the vehicle is parked in the driveway.

Manager Campbell stated the debris within the trailer would be a nuisance code.

Councilmember Troup believes 23 feet should be the maximum.

Councilmember Hauft feels that even at 23 feet, the vehicle might not be visual appealing.

Attorney Mora stated his task is to execute the will of this body. If it is in broad terms, it is difficult to enforce. It is helpful to conceptualize ideas in terms of objective criteria.

Attorney Mora stated the consensus is a bright-line rule of a maximum 23 feet, not to exceed 23 feet irrespective of the intended purpose or use of the motor vehicle, making the distinction by the nature of the vehicle, based one on how do we define some of these terms. Do we fell it is necessary to get into all these individual categories? If the Council is comfortable that as long as it is a vehicle and it is less than 23 feet it is a permissible vehicle by definition.

Open Forum:

- Bob Strawhecker, 6382 44th Ave.- suggested under the 23 feet, to put a weight limit on it.
- Erika Johnson, 5649 45th Ave N – agrees with just sticking to the length of 23 feet, vs being esthetically pleasing.
- Paul Asche, commented the term overnight needs to be addressed, along with a truck with a trailer attached. Also, what area of the Town is being talked about, residential vs commercial, i.e. semis parking at Kmart.
- Jill Frederick, 4331 56th St N – Ms. Frederick thinks the types of vehicles should be clarified, not just 23 feet and the weight.

Attorney Mora stated the code as we are addressing it is primarily addressing residential properties.

There was consensus for the purposes of section 1 to be about just the 23-foot limit, with no other restrictions at this time.

Action 2: Modify Sec. 54-113 (b) - Revise code to set limits on truck length and weight, versus basic 3/4-ton truck provision (existing).

Would modify as follows Trucks 23 feet or less in length, and less than 10,000 pounds in overall weight vs the ¾ ton language, which is in the existing code.

The consensus was less than 23 feet and the 10,000-pound limit.

Open Forum-

The following residents had concerns over the new code enforcement ordinance

- Bobbie New, 6538 43rd Ave – stated Department of Motor Vehicles does not classify what the vehicle is used for, they classify it by weight. The weight is on the vehicle registration. It appears anything Class 3 and under would meet the guidelines and Class 4 and over would not meet the guidelines.

Action 3: Modify Sec. 54-173 (b) - Define restrictions for parking on public right-of-way and clarify grass parking prohibition.

All Councilmember gave consensus about no parking any vehicle on the grass.

Parking in the public right away (street)

Mayor Dudley asked if the National Fire Protection Association guidelines explicitly prohibit roadway parking, where a vehicle will reduce the unobstructed roadway from the minimum 23 feet in the event the road has been constructed in that fashion. The Manager does not have the specific answer. Most streets in the Town are 20 feet.

Manager Campbell stated we will research this more thoroughly and provide suggestions. We do not have a more definitive answer.

The consensus was there was no parking on the grass and parking should be allowed on the roadways, subject to research on that issue with ample restrictions that may include such things as opposite driveways, mailboxes, fire hydrants, things that are also statutory.

- Erika Johnson, 5669 45th Ave N- asked if there could be a variance for Camelot, where the roads are wider.
- Lindsey Strawhecker, 6382 44th Ave. -asked if residents could park on the other side of their driveway, in the grass. Ms. Strawhecker was concerned about people parking in front of her house when she wasn't home.
- Don Nikolas, 6410 43rd Ave N- was concerned about no parking, and the concern about where people park their cars.

Action 4: Add to Sec. 54-173 (e) - "recreation vehicles must be parked on paved surface, perpendicular to main building"

Vice-Mayor stated he thinks RVs or boats should be parked on paved surfaces.

Open Forum

- Dan Kurant, 6071 50th Ave N- was concerned about boats not being able to be parked on grass, off to side of the driveway, was concerned it was not enforced in the past.
- Lonnie Gresley, 6541 44th Ave N – spoke about his motorhome, since 1993 which is parked in the driveway, 3 feet away from his neighbor's driveway, looking for consideration.
- The general understanding is that not every issue of where a recreational vehicle is parked has been addressed. The code for RVs is a sliding scale. You can have a boat in your garage, if not your rear yard, if not, the side of house, if not your driveway.

The council gave consensus that recreation vehicles must be parked on paved surface, perpendicular to main building"

Action 5: Modify Sec. 54-174 (4) - "Distance that a vehicle can be parked from the back of the curb (i.e. 3' or 5")

Mayor Dudley stated in the previous code, when talking about a lot line it depended on what street a person lived on. This code would be inconsistent.

The discussion was whether the code should be 3 or 5 feet from the back of the curb within the front yard. This is based on the bumper of the vehicle.

Vice-Mayor Howell stated the front bumper should be on driveway. RVs should be less than 30 feet and also boats.

Open Forum:

- Erika Johnson, 5669 45th Ave N- was concerned who would enforce this and she thought it was knit picky
- Dan Kurant, 6071 50th Ave N- stated he agreed with the 3-foot setback and why the length is not consistent with all vehicles.
- Bob Strawhecker, 6382 44th Ave. – was concerned about if you can't see backing out of your driveway, but parking in the road is allowed. You are more able to see past a boat, than a vehicle in the driveway.
- Lonnie Gresley, 6541 44th Ave N- in agreement with to the curb for parking, but not the length of the RV allowed.
- Sandra Green, 5912 47th Ave N – This is not a HOA community. If 3 or 5 feet is taken off the drive way, her two vehicles won't be able to park in the driveway.
- Lindsay Strawhecker, 6382 44th Ave – Ms. Strawhecker stated this is a working-class Town and that some residents have 3 or 4 vehicles, she would like the Council to consider this when making their decision.

Mayor Dudley stated she feels the Council is being flexible and compromising.

There was a consensus for a 3-foot limit tonight, for a local road.

Attorney Mora stated that if you don't want a code enforced, then don't adopt it.

Do you want a different limit for recreational vehicles?

This will pick up at a different Workshop at the second part of Option 5.

Motion to Approve:

Councilmember Troup

Second:

Councilmember Roberts

Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cindy McCarthy Matson, Town Clerk

