Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

October 26, 2022

1. **Call to Order at 6:03pm**
2. **Roll Call –** Chairperson DeBoer, Commissioners Lyon-Jenness, Tecca, and Bliesener, City Manager Stoddard, and ZA Harvey.
	* Motion to excuse Sara Dean by DeBoer, support by Bliesener – All ayes, motion carried.
3. **Approval of Minutes – September 28, 2022**
* Lyon-Jenness asked about page 2, #1 of the minutes – A provision that gives the PC the ability to accept maximum created parking standards for flexibility. She asked, does that give latitude to the PC? Harvey stated that it would.
* Motion by Tecca to accept the minutes, support by Bliesener - All ayes
1. **Citizen Comments**
* No comments
1. **Old Business**
2. Work Plan Item #3: Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Riverfront
* Review Revised Riverfront property Map
* DeBoer stated that the PC had looked at a map previously.
* Harvey reported that she just received the map that day. She has been working with the County to make corrections. The County did not have the correct zoning map for the City of Parchment. The County was using a general map. She sent the recent zoning map to them to match the existing zoning. For the most part the map matches now with only a few small spots that don’t quite match.
* Harvey stated that the County’s goal was to implement a new server. The County said that they were behind with the implementation and that it was not coming easily due to the all the retirements and COVID. They would like to get maps for all the municipalities.
* The mill Planned Unit Development (PUD) was not outlined originally but now is a yellow dotted boundary according to Harvey.
* Per Harvey, when the PC saw the map initially, they liked it all but needed land use data and the PUD to be included on it. The County fixed the PUD portion but not the land use information. The land use should be a column in the maps chart. Harvey will make sure that it gets added to the map if the PC wants it put on the map. It is just needed for the 21 riverfront parcels. The PC may have to generate that land use themselves.
* Harvey stated that the County put property classification in the chart to the right (residential, commercial, industrial)
* Harvey said the PC was starting with the map before anything was done with the riverfront. Only a handful of properties were affected, most are within an industrial district and all are in the PUD district. The map provided is giving the PC what it needs.
* Bliesener stated that the pink district is confusing with it matching the C1 Business District.
* Harvey said that it is hard to see when printed so small. Not sure why the County did not use the City of Parchment colors. She thinks that maybe the County is working from some other zoning database. The County color schemes are for their general zoning. Harvey will ask if it could be made to match the City of Parchment colors.
* DeBoer asked if it could be enlarged and he offered the name of Kal Blue as a business that could do that work.
* Bliesener asked if it could be mounted on a board. The City Manager said that she would have it printed at Kal Blue.
1. Work Plan Item #4: Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Supplemental Standards

(1st 3 bullet points on Work Plan) Sidewalks/Parking

* Harvey reissued the draft to the PC. The PC needed to resolve the housing for the elderly language. Harvey made the changes provided a clean copy of the proposed text.
* Harvey stated that the City of Parchment has the following language in their zoning ordinances:

House for Elderly

Convalescent or Nursing Homes

Adult Foster Care Facility

Home for the Aged

Harvey also stated that they needed to add parking standards to this part of the ordinance.

* Harvey wanted to make sure that terms matched what the PC wanted. All changes were struck out and in bold print. Adding section 14 & 15. Bullets 1-3 are in clean copy.
* Bliesener expressed her thanks for sorting out the terminology.
* Bliesener motioned to accept the final draft amendment for Article 12 Sidewalks and Off Street Parking, support by Tecca. Roll call vote with all members present voting Aye.
1. Confirm boundaries of the Special Parking District and establish on Zoning Map
* Harvey referenced Section 12.11 On Street Parking – Special Parking Districts. She asked if this section was on the existing zoning map. The City Manager will check with the attorney.
* Harvey said as a result of the PC’s conversation, she looked at the current zoning map but does not see it on there. If there are no special parking districts, then the PC will have to establish them and update the zoning map.
* Tecca asked Harvey to explain what is a Special Parking District?
* Harvey stated Section12.11 has provisions that allow for property owners to use property within the district to meet their parking requirements (parking ramps, street parking, lots, etc.).
* Tecca asked that if a facility was too far from the alternate parking then it could not help the business?
* Harvey said that the City of Parchment’s version of the public parking was designated in the business district. She said that there is not a lot of familiarity with a Special Parking District.
* Tecca asked if #15 was necessary and how likely would this come up?
* Harvey stated that businesses demonstrate why it is ok to have fewer parking spaces. Section 12.11 allows businesses to use different angles to fulfil requirements. Businesses may say we only need 15 spaces and have 10 on site but because the business is within the special parking district, they do not need to add more spaces. Section 15 reduces the amount that is required. The use of Section 12.11 is used as a way to meet the standards. It may have been added later but did not get off the ground; the City Manager will check with the City’s attorney.
* Tecca stated that the City Hall parking lot is the only public lot in Parchment.
* Bliesener commented that this provision is for new development even though it doesn’t apply now, it could into the future.
* DeBoer mentioned the former Bellisle Building lot that could be a potential parking lot. He asked for more research into this.
1. **New Business**
2. WP Item #4: Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Supplemental Standards

(4th bullet point on Work Plan)

* Harvey stated that the last bullet point in the Work Plan allows for solar power generation on rooftops. Looking at other language from other communities, the PC needs to know what is and isn’t allowed.
* Harvey continues – Assuming language is about solar panels, the PC may want solar panels in general in the City of Parchment. Residential and Non-residential, Industrial vs. Commercial use within the community (Accessory use). Different standards are provided about solar panels. Each Community has different attitudes about them. Some may like reduced regulations or they may not like free standing, seen from road models, etc. Others may not mind seeing them. The PC may look at language and take things out if not wanted (free standing, attached to buildings, roof or wall attachment, side wall, rear wall, seen or not seen, etc.) The PC may not want to allow them on small lots.
* #7 Regulations established but add a caveat if a proposal fails to meet standards; they make it a special land use criteria. Standards impact tied to adjacent properties (#7, Page 2)
* Bliesener asked if it would be safe to say that #7 could be used as a Conditional Use.
* Harvey replied yes, when someone goes for a variance. They know a city will look at their regulations to see if it is possible. Conditions such as 3 acres, 200 feet back from the road, and placement of a solar panel on the façade could be put into place.
* Bliesener asked if the PC should strike language that limits solar panels. Do we remove free standing language and use conditional zoning instead?
* Lyon-Jenness agrees that the PC should encourage people to use solar panels. Panels do need to face sunlight. Would they use accessory structure because they don’t like to look at them?
* Harvey replied that it is about the aesthetics. She could show the PC photos of solar panels that now look like roof tiles. Most communities have aesthetic concerns and no one else in neighborhood should see the panels.
* Bliesener asked what’s the difference if the accessory structure is a solar panel or a shed.
* DeBoer - #7 would give the PC quite a bit of leeway.
* Lyon-Jenness asked the group if they are worried about the description of how and where the solar panels are mounted.
* DeBoer – If the panels were painted a strange color a resident may tire of how they look or not all residents would like the look.
* Lyon-Jenness would like to be as liberal and supportive as possible. She asked how these requests would come before the PC.
* Harvey replied that they would be considered as accessory structures. They would meet the standards with permits that could be administratively approved.
* Tecca asked would it be required for them to have an electrical permit.
* Lyon-Jenness and Bliesener both stated that they would keep #7.
* DeBoer said that he would be ok with keeping solar panels as Accessory Structures. Also, including free standing language.
* Lyon-Jenness noted that there was nothing in this document that speaks to larger panels (mill site use) or is this just for residential.
* Harvey stated that this ordinance was not for utility grid facilities; she could add solar farm if the PC is interested.
* DeBoer stated that the lagoons may be a good place for a solar farm. He would like to see language regarding a mini solar farm.
* Harvey stated that last month the PC identified 1. Work Plan and 2. Housing. She feels by December 1 the Public Hearing site plan review text for parking and solar panels could be ready. PC may want to see revisions in November and wait for the Public Hearing until 2023.
* Tecca stated that he would like to forego the December meeting for the holidays. The other PC members agreed.
* DeBoer talked about the future land use map that is lacking in the Master Plan.
* Harvey said that Adams should be contacted for that future land use map so that it could be included with the Master Plan. City Manager Stoddard said that she would contact him.
* DeBoer reiterated that there would not be a December 2022 meeting.
1. **Next Meeting** – The next meeting will be on Wednesday, November 30, 2022 at 6pm.
2. **Adjournment** – Motion by Lyon-Jenness, supported by Tecca. All ayes. Meeting ended at 7:06pm.