



**AGENDA**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
 Tuesday, April 17, 2018 – 5:30 PM  
**City Council Chambers**  
 125 E Avenue B, Hutchinson, Kansas

**1. ROLL CALL**

- |  |   |                                       |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Richardson        | <input type="checkbox"/> Woleslagel       | <input type="checkbox"/> Bisbee       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hamilton          | <input type="checkbox"/> Wells            | <input type="checkbox"/> Roberts-Ropp |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carr (Vice Chair) | <input type="checkbox"/> Hornbeck (Chair) | <input type="checkbox"/> Peterson     |

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Meeting of April 3, 2018.

**3. CORRESPONDENCE & STAFF REPORTS** – Motion to accept correspondence and staff reports into the official record.

**4. STUDY SESSION**

**a. ZA18-000004 – Proposed Amendments to the City of Hutchinson Zoning Regulations pertaining to Landscaping and Paving/Parking Requirements**

Request for Planning Commission discussion, review and recommendation regarding proposed changes to the City’s Zoning Regulations pertaining to landscaping and paving/parking  
*(Staff Representative: Jana McCarron)*

*Action: Motion to direct staff to proceed with proposed amendments; table proposed amendments pending further study; cancel proposed amendments*

**5. OLD BUSINESS**

- a. Resolution of Modified Meeting Dates for 2018 (Jana McCarron)**
- 1) Option 1: 2<sup>nd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesdays
  - 2) Option 2: 1<sup>st</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> Mondays

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Floodplain Changes – City of Hutchinson (Aaron Barlow)**

**7. UPCOMING CASES**

- a. CUP18-000003, 128 W 5<sup>th</sup> Ave [Duplex use in a C-4 zoning district] (Amy Allison)**

**8. ADMINISTRATIVE CASES**

- a. New Antennas on Plaza Tower – Sprint WCF18-000001 – Cancelled**
- b. Presubmittal Analysis – Dentfixers Donut Drive-through (2325B N Main St)**
- c. Site Plan Review - YMCA Parking Lot Expansion (716 E 13<sup>th</sup> Ave)**
- d. Site Plan Review – Drake Accounting Office Expansion (401 W 1<sup>st</sup> Ave)**

**9. COUNCIL ACTION ON CASES**

- a. ZA18-000003 & CPA18-000002, 329 N Van Buren St**

**10. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE** (Please limit comments to five minutes.)

**11. ANNOUNCEMENTS** – None

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

Staff Contacts:	Jana McCarron	620-694-2681	Aaron Barlow	620-259-4198
	Amy Allison	620-694-2638	Jade Shain	620-259-4134
	Charlene Mosier	620-259-4133		



**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
 MEETING OF: TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 2018

MEETING LOCATION: CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
 125 EAST AVENUE B

**1. ROLL CALL**

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. with the following members present: Jon Richardson (6/7), Janet Hamilton (6/7), Todd Carr (7/7), Mark Woleslagel (5/7), Terry Bisbee (6/7), and Roberts-Ropp (6/7). Members Brock Wells (6/7) and Darryl Peterson (5/7) were absent.

Planning Staff present were: Jana McCarron, Director of Planning & Development; Aaron Barlow, Associate Planner, and Jade Shain, Planning Technician.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the March 20, 2018 meeting were approved on a motion by Hamilton, seconded by Woleslagel, passed unanimously.

**3. CORRESPONDENCE & STAFF REPORTS**

The documents and staff reports were accepted into the official record on a motion by Carr, seconded by Bisbee, passed unanimously.

**4. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**a. CUP18-000002 – Conditional Use Permit for Firearm Sales at 1803 N Plum St.**

McCarron informed the Board that the applicant had formally withdrawn his application.

**Motion by Hamilton, seconded by Carr and passed unanimously, to accept the applicant's withdraw of Conditional Use Permit request #CUP18-000002 for firearm sales for property located at 1803 N Plum St.**

**5. OLD BUSINESS**

a. There was no old business.

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

a. 2018 Planning Commissioner Training – Module 9 & 10

McCarron provided the Module 9 & 10 training. The training covered variances, appeals, subdivisions and area of influence.

b. Town Hall Meetings – Infill Regulations – Update and assignment sheet

Amy Allison, Housing Program Coordinator, will provide the Board with a script.

**7. UPCOMING CASES**

- a) There are no upcoming cases.

**8. ADMINISTRATIVE CASES**

- b) New Antennas on Plaza Tower – Sprint WCF18-000001 – On hold for Historic Review
- c) Lot Split – 2700 N Apple Ln – Heintzman property – Approved
- d) Pre-submittal Analysis – Dentfixers – Drive-thru donut shop

**9. COUNCIL ACTION ON CASES**

- a. There were no cases considered by City Council.

**10. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

- a. There were no comments from the audience.

**11. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- a. McCarron informed the Board that City Council will move one of their monthly meetings to the third Tuesday evening of each month for a trial period of six months. This time conflicts with the scheduled Planning Commission meetings. Staff will provide new Resolution of Meeting Dates at the next Planning Commission meeting, with the top two options being the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Mondays of each month or the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesdays of each month. .

**12. ADJOURNMENT** - The meeting adjourned at 6:10 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Jade Shain, Planning Technician

Approved this 17<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2018

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_



## Planning Commission Staff Report

Public Hearing: June 5, 2018  
(tentative)

**DATE:** April 10, 2018

**TO:** Hutchinson Planning Commission

**FROM:** Jana McCarron, AICP  
Director of Planning & Development



**SUBJECT:** **STUDY SESSION: ZA17-000004**  
**Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments: Landscaping, Paving/Parking**

**FOR MEETING:** April 17, 2018

### REQUEST:

Request for Planning Commission study session to review proposed changes to the City's Landscaping and Paving / Parking Regulations

### COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONFORMANCE:

The *2017-2037 Comprehensive Plan* contains the following strategies pertaining to landscaping and parking standards:

1. Simplify the City's landscape regulations. (S.1.7.a.4.)
2. Revise existing parking standards to meet both the needs of vehicles and pedestrians. (S.1.7.a.5.)

#### Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends moving forward with the recommended changes, as may be modified by the Planning Commission and public comment.

#### Motion:

Motion to direct staff to (set a public hearing date to, table until further discussion can occur for, discontinue the process for) amending the Zoning Regulations pertaining to landscaping and paving/parking.

### BACKGROUND:

In February 2011, the City of Hutchinson adopted new *Zoning Regulations*, including a new landscaping code, based upon a point system, and new paving/parking standards. The landscaping code has proven difficult to administer because it is complex and has a challenging point system. In addition, some of the requirements of the code do not appear to be widely supported by the community. The paving/parking code is simpler to apply, but standards may be too high.

### ANALYSIS:

The community identified landscaping and paving/parking among the items to be examined as part of the City's strategic plan adopted as part of the *Comprehensive Plan* in 2017. While both projects were scheduled for 2019, recent developments and pressure from the public have pushed these standards into the limelight and staff has laid the groundwork for code amendments.

The proposed amendments would accomplish the following objectives:

Landscaping

- ✓ Simplify the code
- ✓ Eliminate the point system and convert to a system that is based on percentage of developed area and zoning
- ✓ Create attractive parking areas by eliminating the requirement for parking lot landscaping; instead offering an incentive for reduced parking requirements if landscaping islands are installed
- ✓ Improve the visual appearance of the community by focusing landscaping efforts along key corridors
- ✓ Reduce irrigation requirements by allowing for a mixture of living and non-living landscaping materials
- ✓ Allow for modest expansions (up to 30% in total area) for existing developments before requiring compliance with landscaping regulations

A full analysis is included in **Exhibit A**.

Paving / Parking

- ✓ Simplify the code
- ✓ Allow for modest expansions (up to 30% in total area) for existing developments before requiring compliance with paving / parking requirements
- ✓ Encourage redevelopment of existing properties that don't meet standards
- ✓ Reduce stormwater runoff by decreasing the amount of impervious surface required (i.e., reduce number of parking spaces & reduce the number of stacking spaces)
- ✓ Provide affordable alternatives to paving residential driveways

A full analysis is included in **Exhibit B**.

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

A DRC Meeting will be held on April 24, 2018. Comments made by other departments will be provided to the Commission as part of the follow up report for this item.

**IMPACTED PARTIES:**

The proposed recommendations will be sent to interested parties for review / comment, including: 1) Young Professionals; 2) Chamber of Commerce; 3) Hutchinson-Reno County Board of Realtors; and 4) Hutchinson Housing Commission. Proposed changes will be addressed in the public hearing draft.

**NEXT STEPS:**

The following tentative schedule is proposed.

May 14, 2018 – Public Hearing Notice published in Newspaper

June 5, 2018 – Planning Commission Public Hearing

June 19, 2018 – City Council Adoption

**EXHIBITS:**

A – Proposed Landscaping Code Changes

B – Proposed Paving Code Changes

# EXHIBIT A

## Proposed Landscaping Code Changes

Planning & Development Department – 04/10/2018


Category	Proposed	Current	Comments
<b>Landscaping Required</b>	All portions of property that are not in driveway, sidewalk, parking area or building shall be landscaped	Same, but landscaping must meet point criteria.	This is a customary urban standard. If land is not at least minimally landscaped, issues arise with dust.
<b>Landscaping Materials</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>living</b>-trees, shrubs, ground cover/vines, turf grasses <u>and</u></li> <li>- <b>non-living</b>-rocks, pebbles, sand, bark, brick pavers, earthen mounds and decorative embellishments (fountains, pools, walls, fencing, sculptures, etc.)</li> </ul>	Plantings only, with some allowance for decorative fencing	This allows for a better mix of landscaping materials, separation of plants, reduced water needs and more affordable landscaping. Irrigation of landscaping would not necessarily be needed, depending upon the plant type.
<b>Landscaping Area</b>	<p>Maximum developed area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o R-5, C-1, C-2 - 70% (R-5 is for multi-family developments)</li> <li>o C-3, C-4, CR – 80%</li> <li>o I-1, EN -- 85%</li> <li>o I-2, A-I, I-3 – 90%</li> <li>o C-5 – 100% (could have a ROW component)</li> </ul>	Landscaping is required according to a point system for the disturbed area. More points are granted for larger vegetation. A variety of species and types of vegetation are required. Vegetation must go into certain yards in certain percentages.	The current point scheme is complicated and cumbersome to administer. It is also expensive. Similar results can be achieved more affordably by limiting the amount of developed area and requiring the rest to be affordably landscaped by the property owner.
<b>Landscaping Mixture</b>	Maximum of 50% of landscaping materials shall be non-living	Only decorative fencing is allowed to count toward landscaping. All other landscaping has to be live plants, with no credit given for other decorative features.	This allows for a better mix of landscaping materials, separation of plants, reduced water needs and more affordable landscaping. Irrigation of landscaping would not necessarily be needed, depending upon the plant type.
<b>Exemptions</b>	Existing development exempt from meeting landscaping requirements, even if a parking lot is being reconfigured or a CUP or SUP is required. Single family residential, duplex and triplex development is exempt.	Changes in use that require a CUP or SUP require landscaping evaluation. Construction of 5 or more parking spaces requires landscaping installation. Changes in use that require upzoning require compliance with landscaping standards.	This would allow for changes in use and CUPs, SUPs to be approved without having to bring in landscaping or obtain variances, in cases where landscaping requirements cannot be met.
<b>Building Expansions</b>	Expansion of existing development by 30% or more requires landscape plans / compliance.	Expansions of 20% or more or 1500 SF or more require compliance with landscaping regulations.	This increases the expansion threshold, to allow for a larger addition to occur before landscaping plans/compliance are required.

Category	Proposed	Current	Comments
<b>Street Trees</b>	Installation of street trees at a separation of 40' along arterials, expressways and the Gateway Corridor for newly developed properties. Species to be determined by the Director of Parks and Facilities.	Trees required for industrial developments only and along all street types.	Street trees are required only for industrial developments, but since corridor improvements are one of the things that has been identified by the community as important, staff suggests the landscape focus be shifted here for key corridors.
<b>Screening</b>	Screening required between commercial / industrial / multi-family residential and other residential development, but a 6-foot solid fence is allowed. Fencing to go the length of the developed area (not the entire property line). Fencing would drop down to 3 feet in height in the front yard. If separated by a street or alleyway, no screening is required.	Screening fencing is required and must also have plantings. If plantings alone are selected for screening, there are specific requirements for size and spacing. Screening is required to extend the entire length of the property, even if there is no development. No provision made for dropping the screening height in the front yard	We frequently get pushback from applicants on our current standards. Plantings along a screening fence seem to be a bit too much. And, the planting screens take a long time to develop.
<b>Parking Area Buffering</b>	<p>Parking areas separated from the sidewalk/street by a minimum 3' landscape strip with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Decorative fencing and grass/turf – 3 feet in height</li> <li>○ Landscaped berm – 3 feet in height</li> <li>○ Boulders with turf, grass and rocks</li> <li>○ Ornamental plants and grasses – maximum height of 3 feet</li> <li>○ Hedges</li> <li>○ Bioswales</li> <li>○ Any combination of the above that will provide a visual break between the parking lot and the street</li> <li>○ A continuous screen is not required. Minimum screen is 75% of length.</li> </ul>	Parking areas have to have a perimeter hedge or vegetative buffer that grows to a height of at least 3 feet within 24 months of the date of the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. Sections of decorative fences or walls can be included.	Requires parking lot buffering only from the street and allows for a variety of ways to achieve the buffer. This is another requirement where we get a lot of pushback. The alternatives should help but also keep cars from being parked on the sidewalk or hanging into the street.

Category	Proposed	Current	Comments
<b>Parking Lot Landscaping</b>	Parking lot landscaping is <b>encouraged</b> . Required parking will be reduced by 4 spaces for each landscaping island or peninsula area of 200 square feet or more in size that is installed. To obtain the credit, the landscape island/peninsula shall have a minimum of 1 tree, as well as other landscaping materials.	Parking lot landscaping is required. Points of landscaping are also required for each parking space. No parking space is allowed to be more than 75 feet away from a tree.	This provides an incentive for parking lot landscaping, rather than requiring it, by giving a parking credit. Parking lot landscape islands are not popular because of the extra cost for irrigation.
<b>Mechanical Equipment Screening</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require only if located in the front yard (or corner yard on a corner lot).</li> <li>Rooftop equipment not required to be screened</li> </ul>	Screening is required unless there is a physical or topographical constraint present. Screening is from any adjoining property or street right-of-way. Rooftop screening is required.	Our mechanical equipment screening requirements have been one of the most controversial landscaping requirements we have, particularly for existing buildings.
<b>Dumpster Screening</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Required unless accessed from alley.</li> <li>Cannot be placed in front yard setback area.</li> <li>Can use chain link with slats</li> <li>Not required for polycarts, if they have securable lids.</li> </ul>	All dumpsters are required to be screened with solid materials. Only the gates can be chain link with slats. An exception is made if the dumpster is accessed from the alley.	Chain link with slats is a more affordable alternative and would be more acceptable (if not quite as attractive). We also recommend clarifying that the dumpster can go in the front yard, just not in the setback area. We have many properties where the dumpster is in the front yard.
<b>Irrigation Plans</b>	Methodology to be noted on landscape plan	Specific requirements are contained in the regulations. While alternative methods may be allowed, this is only in the case where maintenance agreements are in place.	A note on the methodology to be used should be sufficient.
<b>Timing of Submittal</b>	Required at the time of planning permit request.	Our regulations say building permit application, but that is too late in the process for review.	In practice, we have required landscape plans to be submitted at the time of planning application. There is not sufficient review time at the time of Building Permit application.



Category	Proposed	Current	Comments
<b>Timing of Installation</b>	At Occupancy, or can post a bond and have up to one year to install landscaping.	Is supposed to be installed at Occupancy or can be deferred for up to 6 months and a Temporary Occupancy Permit granted.	Tracking the temporary occupancy permit is difficult, particularly if the development is a parking lot that does not require a certificate of occupancy. Salina allows for a bond in the amount of 125% of the cost of the landscaping and one year to install. This method would be easier for the City to track and would ensure consistency across all development types.
<b>Minimum Species Diversity</b>	Eliminate this requirement.	The minimum number of species depends upon the number of trees on the site.	This is another requirement that is difficult to track/enforce.
<b>Subdivision Buffers</b>	Eliminate this requirement.	Residential subdivisions abutting major streets are required to have a landscaped buffer on the outside of any subdivision fence. Plants must be installed according to a point system.	This regulation is problematic for a couple of reasons: 1) major street is not defined in the regulations and 2) it is unclear if a subdivision fence is one that the developer must put in at the time of platting or if this requirement can be deferred until the lots develop. If the latter, there is virtually no way to implement. If the former, fencing and landscaping is required far in advance of lot sales and irrigation methods for long-term survival of plants are questionable.
<b>Point System</b>	Eliminate this requirement.	Each development must install landscaping in accordance with a complicated formula that derives a total number of points needed.	The point system is confusing and difficult to administer and explain to the public.

Category	Proposed	Current	Comments
<b>Surface Material</b>	All required parking spaces are paved with asphalt or concrete, with a concrete apron for the approach. See exemptions.	Same	
<b>Surface Material Exemptions</b>	<p>Exemptions for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing parking lots upon a change in use even if the change in use requires a CUP or SUP or represents increased parking requirements</li> <li>Additions to existing structures provided they are less than 30% of the total existing building area (primary structure).</li> <li>Overflow equipment parking areas and employee vehicle parking for trucking uses.</li> <li>Same exemptions for 1-3 family dwellings as existing, except:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No requirement for vehicles parked in the rear yard to be on a paved surface</li> <li>Paver strips allowed for gravel / dirt driveway conversions in existing neighborhoods and for overflow parking areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Single family requires slurry seal with asphalt millings, but City Engineer has said this isn't done much anymore. Paving requirements are triggered by a change in use if a CUP or SUP is required. Paving requirements are triggered if a structure is expanded by 20% or if 1000 SF expansion. Paving requirements are triggered if a property is upzoned. Overflow areas are allowed to be unpaved, if in the industrial zoning districts. Paving requirements are triggered by a change in use with a higher parking standard except in industrial areas.</p>	<p>Paving requirements for existing parking areas in the older part have town have proven to be a barrier for development / redevelopment of these properties. The proposed changes would relax the requirements so that only expanded uses or those additions that result in an increase of 20% or more of the existing structure require paving.</p> 
<b># of Spaces Required</b>	<p>Simplify table by broad category types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retail = 1 space / 350 SF GFA</li> <li>Office = 1 space / 400 SF GFA</li> <li>ETC.</li> </ul> <p>[We will look at Kansas and non-Kansas cities and see if ours are high &amp; come back with a modest recommendation for the public hearing.]</p>	<p>There are more than 11 pages of parking standards in the existing regulations, but not all of the uses in the use table are listed.</p>	<p>The current standards are difficult and do not have internal integrity. For instance, retail sales standards range from 1 space per 250 SF of GFA to 400 SF of GFA. This can impact the ability of retailers to re-use buildings. The recommendation is to make broad categories of use with the same standards.</p>

Category	Proposed	Current	Comments
<b>Loading Requirement</b>	Require all loading to occur on the subject property and not within the ROW or alley. Loading areas shall not block ADA spaces.	Complicated requirements about where loading zones can go and when loading is needed.	Loading is temporary in nature and should be approvable if it does not impact public property or required (by the federal government) parking spaces.
<b>Maximum Parking Standards</b>	None proposed	Each use type in the parking table has a minimum and maximum number of parking spaces allowed/required.	Due to the high cost of paving and the city's landscaping requirements, the maximum number of parking spaces are seldom exceeded, except that 3 variances were granted in 2013 for school facilities. This appears to be an unneeded regulation.
<b>Bicycle Parking</b>	None proposed	No spaces are required by the table has recommended spaces.	Most developments do not add the bicycle parking. This approach would incentivize adding bicycle parking and, hopefully, reduce overall parking needs.
<b>Parking of Boats, RVs and Trailers</b>	No restriction on location, so long as they are on a paved area if in the front or corner side yard.	RVs, boats and trailers are not permitted to be parked in the front yard. Parking on dirt is not allowed.	This is a frequent complaint in some neighborhoods, but the standard is unenforceable standard. Violators will remove the vehicle long enough for a second inspection to occur, only to relocate the vehicle back on the property. Many properties do not have access to the rear yard for parking. This type of standard is, in Staff's opinion, better located in neighborhood covenants and not in the City's zoning regulations.
<b>Drive-through / Drive-up Stacking Requirements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restaurants (new development) – 6</li> <li>• Restaurants (infill) – 3</li> <li>• Coffee shop / kiosk – 2</li> <li>• All other uses – 2</li> </ul>	Current standards are extensive and range from 1 for a gated parking lot entrance to 10 for a drive-through restaurant.	Most infill lots are unable to meet the requirements and four variances have been granted since 2011. This is an unattractive use of property for the few times of day that impacts may occur.

Category	Proposed	Current	Comments
<b>Shared Parking</b>	Shared parking may be allowed pursuant to provision of a Parking Study approved by the Planning & Development Director and Director of Engineering	Shared parking is allowed with a parking study submitted to the City Engineer and where a table of percentages is calculated. A formal agreement is required. Peak demands are analyzed.	This section of the code is cumbersome and has not been used in the past 5 years. The proposed changes would make it more understandable and possibly more usable.
<b>Off-Street Parking in the CR District</b>	Eliminate this section	Does not allow parking in any required yard. Does not allow for shared or off-site parking.	This section does not appear to be needed.
<b>Administrative Adjustment</b>	Consider allowing for some type of adjustments to regulations to occur "at the counter".	None permitted.	The City does not presently allow for administrative adjustments so applicants must go through the variance process if their project doesn't meet the requirements. We have had inquiries from some applicants that we consider something similar to what Wichita does. They have an administrative adjustment application and fee (\$165 for first adjustment and \$55 for each additional adjustment on the same lot). Adjustments are allowed for categories of items, with a maximum allowance granted to staff. As an example, setbacks may be adjusted administratively by up to 20% (or 50% if next to a golf course, open space or reserve area or when the required yard being adjusted is 300 or less in area). The appeal for an administrative adjustment determination is a Variance.

**RESOLUTION NO. 2018-PC-01****A RESOLUTION SETTING THE TIMES, DATES, AND PLACES OF MEETINGS  
OF THE HUTCHINSON PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THE REST OF 2018**

WHEREAS, the HUTCHINSON PLANNING COMMISSION conducts public hearings, considers various matters, and makes recommendations to the City Council of the City of Hutchinson, Kansas; and

WHEREAS, K.S.A. 12-703 stipulates that the Planning Commission shall meet at least once a month at a time and place set by resolution of the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, meeting dates and times were established for 2018 by the Planning Commission via resolution 2017-PC-01; and

WHEREAS, the Hutchinson City Council has opted to move one City Council meeting per month to a date and time that conflicts with the Planning Commission's adopted 2018 meetings;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HUTCHINSON, KANSAS, that:

SECTION 1. The regular meetings of the Planning Commission shall be held in City Hall, 125 East Avenue B, Hutchinson, Kansas.

SECTION 2. The remaining regular meetings of the Planning Commission for 2018 shall be held on the following dates:

May 1	May 15	June 12	June 26
July 10	July 24	August 14	August 28
September 11	September 25	October 9	October 23
November 13	November 27	December 11	December 20*

SECTION 3. Regular meetings of the Planning Commission shall commence at 5:30 p.m.

SECTION 4. The Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson may call special meetings of the Planning Commission and may set the time, date, and place of the special meeting.

SECTION 5. The Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson may change the time, date, and place of a regular meeting and may cancel a regular meeting.

ADOPTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION THIS 17th day of April, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jana McCarron, Director of Planning and Development

**RESOLUTION NO. 2018-PC-01****A RESOLUTION SETTING THE TIMES, DATES, AND PLACES OF MEETINGS  
OF THE HUTCHINSON PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THE REST OF 2018**

WHEREAS, the HUTCHINSON PLANNING COMMISSION conducts public hearings, considers various matters, and makes recommendations to the City Council of the City of Hutchinson, Kansas; and

WHEREAS, K.S.A. 12-703 stipulates that the Planning Commission shall meet at least once a month at a time and place set by resolution of the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, meeting dates and times were established for 2018 by the Planning Commission via resolution 2017-PC-01; and

WHEREAS, the Hutchinson City Council has opted to move one City Council meeting per month to a date and time that conflicts with the Planning Commission's adopted 2018 meetings;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HUTCHINSON, KANSAS, that:

SECTION 1. The regular meetings of the Planning Commission shall be held in City Hall, 125 East Avenue B, Hutchinson, Kansas.

SECTION 2. The remaining regular meetings of the Planning Commission for 2018 shall be held on the following dates:

May 1	May 15	June 4	June 18
July 9*	July 23*	August 6	August 20
September 4*	September 17	October 1	October 15
November 5	November 19	December 3	December 17

SECTION 3. Regular meetings of the Planning Commission shall commence at 5:30 p.m.

SECTION 4. The Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson may call special meetings of the Planning Commission and may set the time, date, and place of the special meeting.

SECTION 5. The Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson may change the time, date, and place of a regular meeting and may cancel a regular meeting.

ADOPTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION THIS 17th day of April, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jana McCarron, Director of Planning and Development