



1. ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm with the following members present: Logan Leuenberger (8/9), Terry Bisbee (8/9), Jane Gamber (7/9), Darryl Peterson (7/9), Jackson Swearer (7/9), Valerie Roberts-Ropp (6/9) and Jon Richardson (8/9) (Chair).

Planning Staff present were Ryan Hvitlæk, Director of Planning & Development and Amy Allison, Senior Planner.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the July 14, 2020 meeting were approved on a motion by Peterson, seconded by Bisbee, passed unanimously.

3. CORRESPONDENCE & STAFF REPORTS

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

4. PUBLIC HEARING - None

5. OLD BUSINESS

- a. Study Session ZA20-000003 – Text Amendment: Signs in the P/I District and Uses -

Request to Section 27-812 (Signs Permitted for Public and Institutional Uses and the P/I Zoning District) of the Hutchinson Zoning Regulations, concerning regulations related to public and institutional signage.

Allison presented the amended proposal which bases the required reduction on if the lot frontage is adjacent to a residential district or use as opposed to the property. For example, if a P/I property has multiple frontages and the sign is proposed to be on a frontage that is adjacent to only commercial, the sign can be installed to the maximum height proposed in table 27-807. However, if the frontage is adjacent to a residential use or district, the maximum sign height shall be reduced by 50%.

Cindy Proett, Luminous Neon, clarified that the 50% reduction allowed for maximum sign height of 12.5 feet along arterial streets. Staff confirmed.

The revised language will be presented at the August 11, 2020 Public Hearing.

6. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Health Impact Checklist Presentation

Kari Mailloux, Hutchinson Community Foundation, presented the Kansas Health Institute's Health Impact Checklist. The Health Impact Checklist is designed to assist policymakers in drafting policy that considers the social, economic, and environmental conditions and how that policy will impact the

community. Mailloux requested an opportunity to work with the Commercial Overlay Sub-District Committee to conduct an analysis of the proposed ordinance based on the checklist. The proposal is supported by the Reno County Health Equity Work Group.

Gamber wondered how COVID-19 would impact the checklist, would there be other areas the checklist should consider? Mailloux agreed that the pandemic is highlighting the need to conduct these additional analyses of policy to help when health concerns like COVID arise.

Leuenberger supported the proposal. Jackson agreed, and was willing to spend more time reviewing the proposal as a committee member. Bisbee would like to hear more about how this checklist would be used to study the proposal but was concerned that the checklist would negate the ordinance if the results did not come back favorable. Mailloux said that the checklist does not take a stance on policy, it just provides more information to make an informed decision. Bisbee would like more guidance to think through all the factors used to review in the checklist.

Peterson asked once the additional information has been gathered and the checklist is completed, what happens then? Mailloux said that the results would be presented to the Commission for the review. Potential amendments could be made at that time to address concerns. Bisbee asked whether the goal was to make everyone more aware of these conditions or to take steps toward creating a city policy that would require all ordinances be reviewed by the Health Impact Checklist. Mailloux responded by saying that while creating that policy would be great, that is not what the Health Equity Work Group is trying to achieve with this proposal. The work group would like an opportunity to test the checklist on a proposal that would directly impact health outcomes, like the Commercial Overlay District.

Hvitlæk stated that the Health Impact Checklist would be a different lens that the Planning Department and Planning Commission rarely use to review the Zoning Regulations. However, this does give the Commission the opportunity to review some of the recommended policies, like bicycle parking, to analyze that need. Richardson agreed that the review would be worth the time.

Bisbee wondered if we would like at past decisions to determine whether opportunities were missed.

General consensus approved allowing the Commercial Overlay District Committee the opportunity to review the proposed ordinance based on the Health Impact Checklist.

7. UPCOMING CASES

a. August 11, 2020

- ZA20-000003 – Signs in the P/I District and uses
- ZV20-000001 – Accessory Structure Sidewall Height

b. August 25, 2020

- ZV20-000002 – Screening Fence Material

7. ADMINISTRATIVE CASES

- a. SIT20-000003 – 3,000 SF Office Building (On Hold)
- b. ADJ20-000003 – Maximum Accessory Structure Sidewall Height (Approved)
- c. ADJ20-000004 – Side Yard Setback for Accessory Structure (Pending)

8. COUNCIL ACTION ON CASES - None

9. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE – None

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Hvitløk updated the Commission on the two Planning Commissioner vacancies. Recommendations have been sent to the Mayor, for approval in the August City Council meeting. Hopefully both positions will be filled by the next Planning Commission meeting.

11. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Allison, Senior Planner
Approved this 11th day of Aug 2020

Attest:  _____

Ryan C. Hvitløk, AICP
Director of Planning & Development