

Tetonia Planning & Zoning Commission  
**Meeting Minutes**  
2/3/2025

P&Z Commissioners present: Sharon Fox, Nancy Klingler, Josh Weltman, and Brandon Wood  
City Representatives: Ashley Koehler (via phone), Contract Planner, Jacque Beard, City Clerk  
Public/Applicants: Michael Adams (via phone)

**Regular Meeting**

**Sharon Fox called the meeting to order at 7:06pm**

- 1. Meeting minutes of 12/2/2024 were reviewed. Commissioner Fox made a motion to approve. Commissioner Klingler 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion. Minutes were approved.**
  
- 2. Boundary Line Adjustment- SW Corner of Teton Ave and N 6th St**

Ashley Koehler summarized the Staff Report that described the code criteria related to the Adjustment. There are 3 lots that are narrow non-conforming lots and the applicant has prepared a survey to adjust the size and orientation to help them be buildable for single family homes with Accessory Dwelling Units. The northernmost lot is too small as it is 43' wide and is subject to a 20' side street setback and a 10' interior side setback resulting in a 13' wide building envelope. The minimum house size is 20' so this lot is not buildable. And it is recommended that the application be denied or tabled if the applicant would like to revise the survey. The applicant was made aware of this denial recommendation and asked for options. Koehler described the option to combine one of the lots so there are only 2 lots created through the Adjustment. No variances would be needed. The other option is to apply for a Variance, but recommended that the applicant modify the site plan so the most minimal variance is requested. Another option is to rezone to a higher dense zone that has smaller setbacks, but it likely would not be supported since it would be considered a spot zone.

Discussion from P&Z regarding concern for crowding and to ensure there is greenspace for outside activities for the residents in this zone. P&Z agreed that a Variance could be applied for, but setbacks are there for a reason to support uniformity in the town. General comments from P&Z did not support a variance to allow for the current arrangement of homes and ADUs on the lots.

The applicant discussed scenarios with the P&Z regarding modifying the home sizes to 2 larger homes with a similar footprint as the 6 homes he is proposing now. Koehler asked the applicant if a modification to the site plan on the northern lot for a variance was even feasible for his client. He responded that the current site plan shows a 15' setback from the street, rather than 20', so is showing a 5' setback.

Adams remarked that he will have to redesign the homes and survey to know what to do next.

Koehler recommended to P&Z that the decision be tabled for the applicant to re-submit a revised plan or request.

**Commissioner Wood made a motion to table the decision on the Boundary Line Adjustment. Chair Fox 2nd the motion. Motion passed unanimously.**

### **3. Code Interpretation- RVs associated with Building Permits**

Koehler summarized the Report and referenced the Code standard for RVs that are permitted in conjunction with a Building Permit. Koehler stated that the Clerk has been administering the Code with the understanding that if the Building Permit was renewed, then the RVs is also renewed. Koehler asked for confirmation from P&Z and if any language is needed to be clarified in the Code.

Discussion on fees for renewing Building Permits and what defines an active Building Permit. P&Z stated that they support the interpretation for RVs being allowed to be extended with an active building permit only. It was suggested that language be added in either a written policy, Permit application form and or Code to clarify what “active” Building Permit means. Active implies that there is an inspection once at least every 6 months. Permits expire after 1 year and the fees to renew go up each time. P&Z also requested it be noted that RVs cannot hook onto city utilities.

### **4. Code Interpretation- Outdoor Retail Display**

Koehler described the applicable code standards related to outdoor display of retail goods. The Report outlined a bullet list of the applicable standards that were related to this use, even though the Code does not specifically call this type of land use out as a separate activity. It was summarized that outdoor retail display cannot block the sidewalks, is subject to sign and lighting standards, and if items will be stored on a seasonal basis, over 14 days, then the site plan is subject to Design Review.

Jacque gave the example for 10’ plus tall sculptures that could be installed at Tribe Artist Collective. Commissioner Fox said that this should be reviewed case by case through Design Review. Storage should also follow setbacks. Commissioners agreed that retailers should request Design review for seasonal displays and use the language for Roadside Stand. If longer than 14 days then it is seasonal and needs to go to Design Review.

**Commissioner Wood made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Fox 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:49pm.**