A regular meeting of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Planning Commission was held in the Mona Lisa Drexler Assembly Chambers, Juanita Helms Administration Center, 907 Terminal Street, Fairbanks, Alaska. The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by Mindy O’Neall, Chairperson.

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Mike Stepovich  
John Perreault  
David Brandt  
Mindy O’Neall  
Robert Peterson  
Chris Guinn  
Charles Whitaker  
Eric Muehling  
Doug Sims

MEMBERS ABSENT & EXCUSED:  
Wendy Presler  
Patricia Thayer

OTHERS PRESENT:  
Christine Nelson, Community Planning Director  
Kellen Spillman, Deputy Director Community Planning  
Manish Singh, Planner  
Melissa Kellner, Planner  
Wendy Doxey, Assistant Borough Attorney  
Mary Bork, Recording Clerk  
Bridget Hamilton, Recording Clerk in training  
Stephanie Pearson, Recording Clerk in training

B. MESSAGES

1. Chairperson’s Comments  
   There were no comments by the Chairperson.

2. Commissioner’s Comments  
   There were no comments by Commissioners.

3. Communications to the Planning Commission  
   There were no communications to the Planning Commission.

4. Citizen’s Comments – limited to three (3) minutes  
   There were no comments by Citizens.

5. Disclosure & Statement of Conflict of Interest  
   There were no disclosures or statements of conflict of interest.
C. **APPROVAL OF REVISED AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA**

Approval of Consent Agenda passes all routine items indicated by asterisk (*) on agenda. Consent Agenda items are not considered separately unless any Planning Commission member or citizen so requests. In the event of such request, the item is returned to the general agenda.

**MOTION:** To approve Agenda and Consent Agenda by **Commissioner Guinn** and seconded by **Commissioner Perreault**.

**PASSED WITHOUT OBJECTION**

D. **MINUTES**

1. Minutes from the February 27, 2018 Meeting.

E. **QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARINGS**

1. **CU2018-014:** A request by Richerd Olson, on behalf of Calvary’s Northern Lights Mission, for conditional use approval for the replacement of three existing major communications towers (425-foot KJNP-AM Antenna tower, 70-foot KJNP-FM Microwave tower and 80-foot KJNP-TV Microwave tower) in the General Use 1 (GU-1) zone on TL-1007, Section 10, T2S-R2E, F.M. (located at 2501 Mission Road, on the northwest side of Mission Road, southeast of Chena Slough). (Staff: **Manish Singh**)

Mr. Whitaker announced a potential conflict of interest where he and a customer were talking politics and KJNP came up. Whitaker informed customer he was on Planning Commission and told the customer that he could not discuss the case.

Chair O’Neall determined no conflicts exist.

Chair O’Neall announced that the CU2018-014 application, as submitted to the Community Planning Department was incomplete. The application was without a letter from the FAA, which would not allow the Commission to have jurisdiction on the matter per FNSB code. The applicant had a federally mandated deadline of August 17th to submit their federally mandated application. Chair O’Neall restricted the applicant and staff to speak about the incomplete application so that the Planning Commission could make a determination on when to hear the case.

**Manish Singh**, Staff, had no comments.

**Reginald Swedberg**, representing the applicant Richerd Olson, announced that KJNP spoke with their consultant and with an FAA official and expects comments that would satisfy FNSB requirements before the next Planning Commission meeting on May 22nd.

Mr. Guinn inquired about re-noticing in time for May 22nd.

**Ms. Doxey** declared that because this meeting and hearing was properly noticed, that there was no need to re-notice. All interested persons and community members who might be interested person were on notice and that they could be present, listening, or could check back later to see when the matter would be rescheduled.
MOTION: To postpone to a date certain of May 22nd, 2018 by Commissioner Peterson and seconded by Commissioner Whitaker.

ROLL CALL:
Nine (9) in Favor: Sims, Perreault, Brandt, Guinn, Whitaker, Peterson, Stepovich, Muehling, and O’Neall

MOTION PASSED

F. LEGISLATIVE

1. ORDINANCE NO. 2018-12: An Ordinance Amending FNSBC Title 18 Regarding Agriculture and Livestock in Various Zoning Districts including to Add Urban Livestock and Market Gardens as Allowable Uses and Adding Definitions and Standards. Staff Contact: Kellen Spillman

Declaration of Potential Conflict of Interest:

Commissioner Muehling stated he has several rentals that are co-located with a space set aside for community gardening and that it makes his property more desirable.

Chair O’Neall questioned if Commissioner Muehling ever asks for any profits from the garden that tenants would grow.

Commissioner Muehling responded he does not.

Chair O’Neall ruled no conflict exists.

Mr. Kellen Spillman provided a presentation of his staff report to include the following:

- The proposed ordinance is the culmination of approximately a year long process that evaluated agriculture and livestock uses in the Borough zoning code.
- Will introduce, regulate, and define urban livestock and market gardens.
- FNSB code does not differentiate between large scale and small scale agriculture and livestock uses; both are not allowed in the majority of zoning districts since 1988.
- The ordinance proposed to make the distinction of scale and allow smaller scale agriculture and livestock uses in the majority of zoning districts, as well as supplemental regulations.
- Two online surveys and expert interviews were conducted.
- The Community appeared supportive of allowing small scale livestock and commercial agriculture in more zoning districts.
- An Urban Agriculture Subcommittee was formed from the Planning Commission that considered nearly 1,000 survey responses, reviewed literature, and example ordinances from other communities and heard from interested stakeholders.
- Creating urban livestock and market garden as defined uses and adding them as permitted uses in the appropriate zones is consistent with the FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan.
- Helps modernize FNSB zoning code to allow more flexibility.
Questions by Commissioners

Commissioner Muehling asked if there is a definition for small scale or is the grid that defines how many animals are allowed on a given lot size what determines what small scale means.

Mr. Spillman affirmed the summarization by Commissioner Muehling and reiterated that small scale is the intention of the use.

Commissioner Muehling expressed concern that keeping odor imperceptible at the lot line seemed like a strong almost impossible to enforce regulation and followed up by asking Mr. Spillman for his thoughts.

Mr. Spillman stated there was extensive discussion about odor and the proposed ordinance does not follow what the subcommittee recommended; which was “what a reasonable individual” could perceive. Staff and Legal Department had concerns about setting a standard of what a reasonable individual would be.

Commissioner Brandt asked if the proposed livestock limitations listed ducks, chickens, turkeys, geese, beehives and miniature goats were just examples or would those be the only livestock that would be permitted under the proposed ordinance. Mr. Spillman clarified the list Commissioner Brandt read was for the urban residential zones and in those zones those would be the only livestock that would be permitted under the proposed ordinance. The rural residential zone the list of permitted livestock would include sheep, alpaca, single rooster, etc. Commissioner Brandt further questioned whether additional livestock not listed that would be acceptable. Mr. Spillman responded that was accurate and that the intention of the proposed ordinance is not to have animals others than those that are listed on line 219-221 of the proposed ordinance.

Commissioner Sims inquired if during the research of other codes were there any that were examples found in Alaskan communities. Mr. Spillman replied that there were and that Anchorage went through a very large and very controversial process that was centered mostly on chickens. He stated that the proposed ordinance is somewhat similar to Anchorage’s, in regards to chickens. Commissioner Sims further inquired if there were any other Alaskan communities that were consulted. Mrs. Kellner responded that Matsu was consulted only to a lesser extent than Anchorage.

Commissioner Sims questioned how the public was made aware that the surveys were available. Mr. Spillman explained social media was used through multiple venues, a newspaper articles were published with a link to the online version and the hard copy version of both surveys as well as members of the public sharing the surveys on Facebook.

Commissioner Sims asked why the light industrial zone was included in the urban residential category. Mr. Spillman replied that there was a lot of conversation at the sub-committee level about there being very few dwelling units in the light industrial zone, mostly caretaker units, and that the subcommittee wanted to include the light industrial zone as an option for them.

Commissioner Stepovich inquired how the square footage versus the total maximum livestock permitted in the proposed urban livestock limitations. Mr. Spillman responded that a lot of proposed limitations were developed by subcommittee members along with some of the public that attended meetings. Commissioner Perreault commented he was a member of the subcommittee and that they tried to use real world examples and compare different impacts from animals within neighborhoods in order to come up with reasonable boundaries.
Commissioner Guinn expressed concern about how enforcement of the proposed ordinance would happen and questioned whether there were a high number enforcement issues in other Alaskan communities that prompted staff to use better enforcement language in the proposed ordinance. Mr. Spillman explained that the Borough Code Enforcement Officer and Animal Control were consulted. He noted that the language used in the proposed ordinance is, in general, more specific than other communities have used.

Commissioner Brandt questioned if there had been any public concerns about allowing beehives in the smaller lot sizes. Mr. Spillman replied that there were surprisingly only a couple of specific comments in the surveys and they were included in the staff report.

Public Testimony Opened

Mr. Jesse Shadley testified that overall the proposed ordinance is a good plan and that he had attended a borough sustainability meeting where he learned there would be an estimated three days of food on the grocery store shelves in Fairbanks if there were to be a crisis. He referred to lines 272-274 of the proposed ordinance and outlined how that would be restrictive for meat purposes, 4-H and FFA kids raising animals.

Commissioner Perreault asked if Mr. Shadley lives in a rural residential zone and if he currently has animals on his property. Mr. Shadley responded that he does and that he was not aware of the current restrictions or the proposed ordinance until a week prior to the May 8 Planning Commission meeting. He stated that he currently has 2 sheep, one ram and one ewe, that he planned to have the offspring for meat every fall.

Commission Guinn questioned which lines of the proposed ordinance that Mr. Shadley referred to in his testimony. Mr. Shadley read lines 272-274 of the proposed ordinance to Commissioner Guinn.

Commissioner Whitaker inquired of Mr. Shadley in his experience how many sheep could be raised efficiently and cleanly on his 40,000 square feet parcel. Mr. Shadley explained that his sheep use his fenced-in back yard that is about a third of an acre. He further explained that 5 sheep in that space would be very reasonable.

Commissioner Muehling asked Mr. Shadley whether his fenced-in area is within the regulated setbacks for his property and if he is comfortable with the amount of remaining space outside of the fenced in area for urban agriculture. Mr. Shadley replied that yes he would be comfortable with the leftover space.

Commissioner Peterson queried whether Mr. Shadley has previously had any trouble with his sheep escaping their enclosure and if they are tagged or identified in some way. Mr. Shadley responded that he has not had any issues with escaping animals and that he has not tagged his animals previously. Commissioner Peterson further inquired if it would be reasonable to require in the proposed ordinance that the animals be tagged or identified in some way. Mr. Shadley answered that would be a reasonable requirement.

Commissioner Stepovich questioned whether Mr. Shadley has chickens on his property. Mr. Shadley replied that he does not.

Mr. Charles Thomas testified that after listening to the staff report he may not have had any reason to attend the meeting and testify. He questioned the wording used within the proposed ordinance,
referring to shall not versus will not. He stated that he doesn’t have any issues with pens and chicken coups being in public view. He expressed concern about waste being within certain proximity to water wells on properties. He supported the public surveys and stated that the results were overwhelming, but that the delivery of them was not enough and needed to reach more of the public. He clarified that he has spoken with dozens of people since the first survey was conducted and has not spoken with anyone who had even heard about the proposed ordinance. He further stated that he supports the market garden concept, but that he does not support livestock being in a residential subdivision where odor, noise, air and possibly ground water pollution would be an issue.

Ms. Jennifer May testified that she is thankful the proposed ordinance is coming up before the Assembly and it is fantastic that local and sustainable food is being recognized along with the desperate need that interior Alaska has for market gardens and urban livestock. She expressed she is very concerned about most of the restrictions and regulations that are within the proposed ordinance. She proposed a delay and reconvening of the subcommittee in which there are actual members of the farming community on the subcommittee. She clarified that a lot of the wording within the proposed ordinance is unrealistic for sustainability in livestock and gardening. She clarified that roosters can wear a crow collar that keeps them from crowing. She further clarified that without a rooster you cannot make any chicks and if only one rooster is allowed in the rural residential zone it would make it impossible to order from almost any hatchery since chickens are ordered by straight run which means you don’t know if they are boys or girls until they are grown and by even ordering chicks you would be breaking the regulations of the proposed ordinance. She explained that someone living in the urban residential zones would not be able to purchase chicks from someone living in the rural residential since in the proposed ordinance there are no animal sales allowed. She expounded that those would be completely unsustainable practices and chicks would need to be ordered in each year as replacement animals since livestock have very limited lifespan and they need to be replaced on a regular basis. She further expounded that if you cannot grow your own and you can’t purchase from the local farming community ordering in for replacements would be the only option which goes straight back to non-sustainability. She voiced her concern that there would be no onsite sales permitted in the proposed ordinance. She conveyed how unrealistic it is for farmers to sell at the local farmers market.

Commissioner Perreault asked if Ms. May understood that the restrictions for roosters only applied to the urban residential zones and the larger agricultural farming zones in general use would not fall under the proposed ordinance. Ms. May affirmed she understood and questioned if that would still fall under the category of no onsite animal sales. Commissioner Perreault restated the proposed ordinance would only govern urban residential zones and would not include large scale farms. Ms. May responded that her property would be in a rural residential zone in the proposed ordinance and would affect her property.

Commissioner Stepovich inquired of Ms. May whether it would be reasonable to have eight chickens on a 2,000 square foot lot. Ms. May replied eight chickens would be manageable on a 2,000 square foot lot with small chicken tractors and wise waste management. She explained there are poultry that have not been mentioned such as the much smaller quail that would be manageable on a smaller lot.

Ms. Laura Lowdermilk testified that the proposed ordinance is incredibly restrictive about onsite sales and that it would put an unnecessary burden on farmers and gardeners when they are already restricted due to climate and land size. She stated traffic regulations would prevent small scale farmers and gardeners from being a nuisance to a neighborhood. She voiced that small scale livestock and gardening means it is also small scale sales and the proposed regulations would take away any chance of having a financial gain. The proposed ordinance restrictions on small scale sales would not even allow for selling a dozen eggs, potatoes or tomatoes.
Commissioner Muehling asked Ms. Lowdermilk for her thoughts on how the Planning Commission might balance between someone in an outlying area wanting to sell an occasional dozen eggs and someone who lives in downtown Fairbanks where the neighborhood possibly wouldn’t want to see small scale sales of produce. Ms. Lowdermilk stated there are possibly existing traffic regulations keeping streets from being blocked or taking residents parking spots and may fall under nuisance regulations, FNSB Animal Control. She suggested there may already be regulations in place to cover small scale sales issues.

Commissioner Peterson inquired of Ms. Lowdermilk if she has chickens and to estimate how many eggs they would produce daily. Ms. Lowdermilk responded she has 8 chickens that can lay five to six total eggs each day. Commissioner Peterson questioned if one dozen eggs were sold there would be 1 car show up on a lot every two or three days. Ms. Lowdermilk answered that would be correct for her farming size.

Commissioner Guinn asked Ms. Lowdermilk if restricting small scale sales to one day per week would be a feasible way to accommodate the smaller scale farmers and gardeners. Ms. Lowdermilk replied one day per week would be feasible and also stated regulating sales to one day per week would probably not be needed.

Mr. Laurence Dunn testified he is presently a small bee keeper as well as previously farmed wheat and cattle in Oklahoma. He communicated transportation has not been addressed and that the price of gas is prohibitive to delivering small amounts of goods to be sold. He stated as a small scale bee keeper he has to allow his honey to build up for three years in order to make it profitable at the farmers market. Transporting honey to the farmers market from forty miles away is not gainful at the small scale level. He requested the Planning Commission consider transportation of goods in the small scale sales portion of the proposed ordinance. He said that bees will travel up to five miles from a hive and wondered if that had been considered when the proposed ordinance was assembled.

Commissioner Muehling inquired what method Mr. Dunn uses to advertise his honey, whether he has a sign on his property and if his sales drive up. Mr. Dunn responded he has a sign for drive up sales and uses Craigslist, social media and word of mouth to advertise.

Ms. Arlene Wright testified onsite sales should be allowed with limited signage. She expressed concern that the proposed ordinance does not address visual restrictions adequately.

Commissioner Muehling asked Ms. Wright if a blue tarp would be enough visual containment and if visual screening would be a distraction for her. Ms. Wright replied that a blue tarp would double the unsightliness.

Ms. Erica Moeller testified she supports the proposed ordinance as is and expressed her appreciation to the subcommittee and staff for the thorough job assembling the proposed regulations. She spoke about how opening farming and market gardening up within urban and rural residential areas will provide better opportunities for hydroponics gardening. She detailed how the current regulations for gardening make hydroponics cost prohibitive due to the inability to grow in a building that you already own or rent and heat. She stated she would also appreciate the ability to conduct small scale sales from her residence.

Ms. Virginia Morrall testified that three hundred responses to the surveys conducted was astonishingly low for the impact the proposed ordinance would have on the community and would
like to see future survey response levels much higher. She expressed her concern about the amount of limitations for market gardens and restrictions for onsite sales.

**Ms. Nicole Dunham** testified she is in support of the proposed ordinance with the exception of allowing onsite sales. She stated allowing onsite sales would not be disruptive to neighbors or change the feeling of the neighborhood. She communicated to the Commission that with the current state of our economy and having the ability to grow your own food and raise animals is invaluable to a people who struggle with food sovereignty and food security.

**Commissioner Muehlung** questioned **Ms. Dunham** that based on our location that the artic would self-limit the size of any operation on a personal scale and reduce onsite sales to summer months. **Ms. Dunham** responded that the artic would limit operation size and that it would be reasonable for a hydroponics farm, flower farm or a market garden to be able to conduct onsite says from May through October. She explained that market gardens could sell items such as root vegetables could be sold through January and value added products such as fermented goods, jams, jellies and other preserved foods could be sold year round. **Commissioner Muehlung** queried since the community is in the artic that the small scale operations would automatically be small in terms of the number of customers, the volume of sales and small lot sizes. **Ms. Dunham** stated that summarization would be accurate and people here would only be trying to produce supplemental income, be more self-sufficient, sustainable and that small properties would be sustainable in an artic climate.

**Ms. Beverly Wright** testified the operation sizes being discussed may not even be required to have a business license and would be small. She stated people with dogs and cats are able to breed them to sell the litters and she does not see a reason why urban livestock and market gardens should be any different.

**Ms. Jennifer Hawk** testified she supports the public testimony already heard. She expressed her opposition centralized food production areas. She stated that requiring use of a farmers market does not foster neighbor to neighbor sales or strengthen the community. She voiced that the proposed ordinance as a whole is too restrictive.

**Commissioner Perreault** asked **Ms. Hawk** whether she would prefer fewer restrictions than the proposed ordinance or no restrictions for urban areas. **Ms. Hawk** replied that the proposed ordinance is too restrictive and would like to see fewer restrictions for urban areas.

Public Testimony Closed

(The meeting recessed from 8:15 – 8:25 PM.)

Rebuttal

**Mr. Spillman** summarized that staff have attempted to make the majority of the zoning districts in the Borough more flexible for commercial agriculture and small scale livestock. He expressed appreciation for the public testimony heard. He reiterated that the proposed ordinance would affect mostly residential zones and it can be difficult to find a balance between allowing small scale commercial agriculture and small scale livestock without affecting the residential character of the neighborhood. He communicated that the Planning Commission and staff have heard the public testimony and that the onsite sale language of the proposed ordinance may need to be more specific.
Commissioner Guinn asked whether the purpose was characterized as personal use or sustainability during the subcommittee meetings. He commented that allowing onsite sales on an acre farm doesn’t seem like it would impact a neighborhood very much.

Mr. Spillman responded that original discussions for urban livestock were in regards to domestic livestock and when feedback was received from the public, the subcommittee and Mayor Kassell the purpose was changed from just domestic livestock to domestic livestock plus transitioning towards smaller commercial agriculture without fully phasing into commercial agriculture. He stated the proposed definition of domestic livestock means any quantity of farm animals raise and/or kept for personal use, occasional competitive use, or incidental sales of animal products. He further stated selling honey and eggs would be incidental sales and wouldn’t turn a residential zone into full-fledged commercial agriculture.

Chair O’Neall questioned whether individuals within the City of Fairbanks need to have a business license for incidental sales.

Mr. Spillman answered he is not prepared to answer questions about business licenses.

Commissioner Muehling asked how this ordinance would change domestic livestock in the rural estates zoning district. Mr. Spillman said that domestic livestock is currently permitted in the rural estates (RE) zone and if the proposed ordinance passed incidental sale of animal products would be allowed in the RE zone. Commissioner Muehling inquired if there would be a health and safety issue with the proximity of livestock to water wells. Mr. Spillman replied during research for the proposed ordinance livestock near water wells did not come up as a safety concern and has not found a provision for it in any peer community zoning codes.

Commissioner Brandt requested Mr. Spillman explain further the reasoning behind not allowing onsite sales in the proposed ordinance. Mr. Spillman responded that with the proposed ordinance flexibility would already be significantly increased in the residential zones and a line needed to be drawn somewhere. He further explained that the home occupation section of current zoning code allows on-site sales to a certain degree, and there is a provision outlining four or more customer vehicles at the property at once. Commissioner Brandt asked if there was any discussion about regulating signage and still allowing onsite sales. Mr. Spillman explained there are already regulations for signage regardless of the proposed ordinance being passed or not. Commissioner Perreault commented subcommittee discussion was primarily aimed at limiting the impacts to neighbors from an ongoing commercial operation next door. He stated public testimony at this meeting has attested to the desirability of onsite sales.

Chair O’Neal stated she wanted to allow subcommittee members to be able to answer questions and to also be aware of having discussion.

Commissioner Whitaker inquired about possible pollution of shallow wells and noise pollution. Mr. Spillman clarified the Borough does not have noise regulations, though the City of Fairbanks does and water wells are regulated by Alaska DEC.

Commissioner Muehling asked Mr. Spillman if incidental use to the primary use of the land should be defined. Mr. Spillman responded the intention of the proposed ordinance is that urban livestock and market gardening would not be the principal use of the property.

Chair O’Neal stated the subcommittee discussed the gender of young chickens and asked if flexibility for young chickens made it into the ordinance. Mr. Spillman communicated there was extensive discussion and consultation with members of the public about young chickens. He
explained the issue was the short life span of meat birds and the potential for someone to have an unlimited number of meat birds if there was an age limit on young chickens. He also pointed out that in the proposed ordinance the age limitations for male chickens would be limited to mature roosters.

Commissioner Guinn questioned whether the same wording could be used for other animals. Mr. Spillman said the same wording could be used, but there could be negative consequences since the number of young animals would be unlimited.

MOTION: To recommend approval of the ordinance No. 2018-12 to the FNSB Assembly by Commissioner Perreault and seconded by Commissioner Whitaker.

(Discussion ensued on the appropriate means to amend the ordinance)

Commissioner Perreault proposed that staff recommend the FNSB Assembly revisit lines 211 and 226 of the proposed ordinance. He stated there are two reasons to address the restrictions for onsite sales of food or plants; one being there are size limitations of operations and that is an effective restriction on the size of a sales operation and two being there are other home businesses that are supplemental or incidental to residential use and onsite sales of food or plants should not be singled out.

MOTION TO AMEND: To amend the main motion by removing lines 211 and 226 from ordinance No. 2018-12 by Commissioner Sims and seconded by Commissioner Whitaker.

Discussion on the Amendment

Commissioner Sims stated there was a great deal of public testimony about food sustainability and the prohibitions of onsite sales of food, plants, animals or animal products is contrary to the idea of sustainability at a small scale in residential districts that would be limited by virtue of the size of small scale operations.

Commissioner Whitaker expressed his appreciation for the amount of public testimony on the proposed ordinance and had hoped for more public to attend the subcommittee meetings.

Chair O'Neal stated her agreement of Commissioner Whitakers appreciation for public testimony.

Commissioner Muehling voiced that the proposed ordinance would be to increase the flexibility within the residential zones for incidental agricultural use. He expressed natural limits to the amount of production in residential areas and that the agricultural use would be secondary to the residential use. He stated the artificial limits established by the proposed ordinance would be on the number of animals and setback requirements. He said the natural limitations and ordinance limitations create incidental use by definition that is compatible with residential zoning and he supports removing the prohibition for onsite sales.

Commissioner Guinn stated he plans to support the amendment for the exact reasons stated by Commissioner Sims and Commissioner Muehling.

ROLL CALL:
Nine (9) in Favor:  Sims, Perreault, Brandt, Guinn, Whitaker, Peterson, Stepovich, Muehling, and O’Neall

Zero (0) Opposed:

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED**

Discussion on the motion (main motion), as amended

**Commissioner Brandt** expressed his concerns about allowing two beehives on lots as small as 2,000 square feet. He stated bee allergies can be fatal.

**Commissioner Perreault** communicated there was discussion within the subcommittee about the potential health and safety concerns with bees. He explained that potentially no lot size would keep bees inside of lot boundaries. He stated he supports the proposed ordinance.

**Commissioner Brandt** further expressed his concerns about allowing two beehives on small lots. He stated increasing the setback size for beehives would be the safer route.

**Commissioner Sims** pondered whether the smaller lot sizes would render beehives untenable.

**Commissioner Peterson** referenced line 285 of the proposed ordinance states beehive setbacks are ten feet.

**Commissioner Whitaker** questioned **Mr. Spillman** if there was subcommittee discussion about fresh water supply to keep bees from being attracted to neighboring properties. **Mr. Spillman** responded there was discussion and there are other zoning ordinances that addressed fresh water supply.

**Commissioner Muehling** reiterated his recommendations for limiting commercial sales on residential properties, restricting the use of road side signs or tables and limiting increased traffic from sales.

**Chair O’Neall** said she would include his recommendations in the Chair report to the Assembly.

**ROLL CALL:**

Nine (9) in Favor:  Perreault, Brandt, Guinn, Whitaker, Peterson, Stepovich, Muehling, Sims, and O’Neall

Zero (0) Opposed:

**MOTION PASSED AS AMENDED**

**Commissioner O’Neall** gave thanks to Mr. Spillman, Ms. Kellner and to the public. She suggested to the public to contact Community Planning to future involvement on the Ordinance.

**Mr. Spillman** stated it has been tentatively scheduled for a June 28 Assembly public hearing.

**G. EXCUSE FUTURE ABSENCES**

**NONE**
H. COMMISSIONER’S COMMENTS

1. FMATS

Commissioner Muehling relayed that there will be a lot of construction in Fairbanks this summer. FMATS officially changed its name to FAST (Fairbanks Area Surface Transportation) MPO.

2. Other

Commissioner Stepovich stated that he liked the postcard idea that was mentioned to increase feedback.

Commissioner Sims gave kudos to staff and the Planning Commission Subcommittee for the work on the Ordinance.

Commissioner O’Neill gave thanks to the clerking staff that is filling in.

I. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.