

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
March 26, 2025

1. Call to Order at 6:00 pm

2. Roll Call – Chairperson DeBoer, Commissioners Dean, Bliesener, Lyon-Jenness, Brooks, ZA Harvey and CM Stoddard

3. Approval of Minutes – February 26, 2025

- Lyon-Jenness provided amendments to the minutes.
- Motion to accept the minutes as amended by Bliesener and supported by Brooks. All: Ayes

4. Additions/Changes to the Agenda – None

- Motion to approve agenda by Bliesener and supported by Dean. All: Ayes

5. Citizen Comments

- No comments

6. Old Business

A. Draft #2 Overlay District - review

- ZA Harvey explained that last month the PC outlined boundaries of the Overlay District, including a couple of zoning districts. She put together a list of parcels, the land use, the two districts R-T and C1, chart of buildings with the characteristics (setbacks and sizes) and the architectural facades. The standards of the overlay represent the built environment, creating commonality. Based on what is existent so that development is in sync to what is already there. She mentioned that the PC expanded the Overlay area and she wanted to discuss this with the commission members. The expansion of the Overlay area gave her pause.

- 1) (Page 1) – Boundary changed to what the PC wanted. She looked at C-1 (Central Business District) and saw that it included a couple transitional pieces. The Overlay appears to be okay. All the downtown area would be in the different districts. The PC does not want to go into C1 and R-T districts to mess up the districts; it is just to add an overlay. The north border was extended to include the downtown residents and the library was included. ZA Harvey stated that what messed her up was not the boundary of downtown. The sheets have important data analysis on them. By extending the borders it includes C-1 and R-T zoning.

Why do we need an Overlay District? An expanded area does not necessarily need an Overlay District. Look at the C-1 District which is defined by purpose, applied to the core. R-T district is designed as a transitional district that can be applied to a map (conversion, buffering). This application

would only be allowed on Riverview Drive. It will function as a transitional zone. The lots are the same, buildings are the same with the garage in the back, and sidewalk in the front. It is the only place where districts are R-T and C-1. The R-T would function as a downtown neighborhood. To do an overlay district to capture almost all R-T's would be onerous. The PC may want a form based overlay.

Option 1 (page 7) – Rewrite purpose function as a Downtown Neighborhood District. Not many changes in C-1, just added Form Base Code (FBC). The PC should talk about the configuration.

Option 2 (page 7) - Draw boundaries for Downtown District with a pure FBC approach. Detailed excerpt of the zoning map. Two Sub-districts – 1)Downtown Core = C-1 and 2) Downtown Neighborhood = R-T, leave R-T as is, no change needed. FBC is designed to have a streetscape element in it.

The premise is that instead of use, the concentration is on form interfacing with public realm. The PC will review on a site by site basis (streetscape improvements). The outcome is the same – introduction to FBC, amending districts or versions of the others. Property within the zone will be kept at R-T and C-1 (like it is).

Rezoning may cause discomfort. There is value in making text amendments without changing the zoning. Amending R-T and C-1 is easier, straight forward and more comfortable. No streetscape element.

Having the downtown bookended by commercial property may be a segue into one district instead of C-1 and C-2. Create a gateway Commercial District with a handful of standards for gateway development. It indicates to the public by leading them into the downtown with entrances that have 3-4 standards. It would make a nice cap to the Overlay District.

- Bliesener asked if there would be streetscape standards. The PC still has a sensitivity to the corridor. The gateway needs that sensitivity to the landscaping, signage (for consistency), street lighting and to guide people.
- Chairperson DeBoer said that he likes the gateways into the City. Rezoning would be a concern by the residents.
- ZA Harvey said that minor adjustments that cause rezoning is complicated to explain to others.
- Chairperson DeBoer stated that he is not in favor of rezoning.
- ZA Harvey stated that the PC could select an approach without rezoning.

- Dean agreed that people would be upset with rezoning. The Downtown District would be the simplest plan.
- Chairperson DeBoer asked if Option 2 would be full on Form Based Code.
- ZA Harvey agreed with DeBoer's statement and said that Option 1 – R-T and C-1 could have form based standards added to it. Option 2 creates two Form Based Districts.
- Chairperson DeBoer said that it was easier to leave existing districts intact.
- ZA Harvey said that she is hearing that streetscapes are wanted and to use sub-districts.
- Dean said that she likes to refer to a Downtown District even though there are two sub-districts, both being Downtown Districts.
- ZA Harvey said that the R-T and C-1 could be amended to include FBC.
- Chairperson DeBoer stated that the gateways are separate from the Downtown Districts.
- ZA Harvey said that this will provide classic gateway areas in the north and south ends of the City. District boundaries are good, may include mill property with a slight adjustment to parcels on Riverview. ZA Harvey will put together Option 2 for the PC.
- Chairperson DeBoer stated that he wanted to make sure we are going down the right path. He asked if there were any scares for the residents.
- ZA Harvey stated that no there would not be any as they were only adding standards. People will question standards. The Form Based Code relaxes use and limitations. The advantage is that the City will work within a built in environment. FBC is not retroactive – it will keep away from homes with garages in the front of the house on Riverview Drive, with no increase to taxes, people may want less windows but will have to build according to the standards. If a building should burn down, then the FBC standards would apply.
- ZA Harvey will prepare Option 2 with no rezoning per the consensus of the PC.

7. New Business

A. Existing Conditions Memo – review

- This was addressed with the previous section (Old Business). No additional questions were asked by the PC members.

B. Work Session Discussion with David Stegink, Fishbeck – action

- Chairperson DeBoer read the memo from David Stegink, Fishbeck, regarding site concepts and the structural report. Stegink would like a work session to share the conceptual plans with the public. Revisions will be sent in advance of the Work Session. A market study for further redevelopment will be performed.
- April 8 at noon is the tentatively scheduled Work Session.
- Chairperson DeBoer stated that Greg Terrill is knocking it out of the park on his property.

C. Comments from Planning Commissioners

- Chairperson DeBoer expressed his gratitude to ZA Harvey and to CM Stoddard.

D. Next Meeting – Wednesday, April 23 at 6pm.

E. Adjournment – Motion by Bliesener, supported by Dean. All: Ayes. Meeting ended at 6:59pm.