



**1. ROLL CALL**

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 6:31 pm with the following members present: Logan Leuenberger (9/10), Terry Bisbee (9/10), Jane Gamber (8/10), Darryl Peterson (8/10), Jackson Swearer (8/10), Valerie Roberts-Ropp (7/10), Robert Hickman (1/1), Rod Calhoun (1/1) and Jon Richardson (9/10) (Chair).

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

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the July 28, 2020 meeting were approved on a motion by Swearer, seconded by Peterson, passed unanimously.

**3. CORRESPONDENCE & STAFF REPORTS**

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

**4. PUBLIC HEARING**

1. ZA20-000003 – Text Amendment: P/I District and Uses Signage

Request to amend Section 27-807 Maximum Sign Area and Height and 27-812 Signs Permitted in for Public and Institutional Uses and the P/I Zoning District of the Hutchinson Zoning Regulations, concerning regulations related to maximum area and height for P/I signage.

Allison presented an overview of the proposed text amendment. A request from Luminous Neon to review the maximum height and area allowed for public and institutional properties and zoning district was received by the Planning Commission. After reviewing the ordinance, it was determined that the current code places more restrictive standards on public and institutional signage regardless of where the property may be located. The Commission directed staff to prepare an ordinance that would allow signage for P/I properties that are comparable to neighboring properties, while mitigating any negative impacts that may fall on adjacent residential properties.

The proposed ordinance amendment for Sec. 27-812 now references table 27-807 which bases sign area and height off the street classification of the adjacent street like commercial and industrial properties. However, if a P/I property is less than 5 acres and is adjacent to a residential use or district, including properties separated by a street or alleyway, the maximum height of the sign must be reduced by 50 %. The proposal is intended to allow for bigger signage while reducing the impact on neighboring residential areas and creating a transition in sign height. Additionally, staff is recommending reducing the maximum sign height for signage allowed along a residential street from 20 feet to 10 feet in Sec. 27-807.

The proposal has been reviewed at the July 14<sup>th</sup> and July 28<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meetings.

Cindy Proett, Luminous Neon, had no comments.

Swearer motioned to approve ZA20-000003, to amend Sec. 27-807 and 27-812 for signs related to public/institutional uses and districts and residential street maximum height, seconded by Bisbee, passed unanimously.

## **5. NEW BUSINESS**

### 1. 2021 – 2025 Capital Improvement Program

Hvitløk presented staff's presentation for the 2021 – 2025 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The Planning Commission is required to review the CIP annually and determine if the proposed projects listed follow the Comprehensive Plan. Staff has reviewed each project listed and have made a determination of compliance. Staff recommends approval of the 2021-2025 Capital Improvement Program as presented.

Calhoun asked why the end date of some projects have already passed. Hvitløk explained that those projects were listed in the Comprehensive Plan Strategic Plan which is used as a guiding document for projects and programs listed in the CIP. While the City has tried to complete all items listed in the Strategic Plan, some of the projects have had to be pushed back to later years due to a change in priorities, lack of funds or lack of staff.

Hickman wanted to know if this year's request varied from previous years' CIPs. Hvitløk stated that generally the projects that were scheduled for 2021 are still being funded in some form. Some projects have been phased out so later phases will be completed in later years. However, there are a few projects that have been pushed back to later years due to the COVID pandemic but that is not unusual even in a normal year. Generally, the estimates shown are in keeping for the budget City Council has set for 2021. Bisbee agreed that it is common to see projects moved out to later years due to larger than anticipated costs or staffing. Hvitløk reminded the Commission that some projects are usually always funded, like water or sewer repair, because those projects are funded through specific accounts created for that item and funded outside of the general fund (utility billing, stormwater fees, etc.).

Leuenberger requested more information on the proposed new fire station scheduled for 2022. He asked if the need for a fire station is based on population, etc. Hvitløk said that the fire station request is based on an in-depth study conducted by the Fire Department that reviews trends such as population, location of existing stations, call frequency and response times. Richardson included that the proposed station would include new technology that other stations do not currently have and would be made available to all fire stations within the department.

Swearer motioned to approve and make a finding that the 2021-2025 Capital Improvement Program meets the spirit and intent of the 2017-2037 Comprehensive Plan, seconded by Gamber, passed unanimously.

### 2. Side Street Front Yard Fence Regulations

Hvitløk presented a request made by a property owner within the City to review the current Zoning Regulations pertaining to fences in the side street front yard of corner properties. He explained

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
MEETING OF: TUESDAY, August 11, 2020

that the current regulations do not permit a fence in excess of 3 feet if solid or 4 feet if 50% transparent are permitted to be installed within the side street front yard of a corner lot. This is a common regulation in communities because a fence of that height could block a neighboring property's line of sight when entering and exiting their property as well as create an unsightly view for other property owners.

The requestor would like to construct a 6-foot privacy fence that would extend in front of their neighbor's house by approximately 10 feet and then reduce the size down to 3 feet once the fence nears the street.

Swearer asked if this case is unique and should be submitted as a variance request. Hvitløk explained that staff had initially recommended the property owner apply for a variance but that they decided they would not like to apply and instead request the Commission to review the existing regulation. Bisbee felt that the request should be submitted as a variance and that the regulation is suitable as written. The Commissioners agreed. Staff will notify the property owner of the decision not to review the ordinance further.

**6. UPCOMING CASES**

- a. None

**7. ADMINISTRATIVE CASES**

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

**7. COUNCIL ACTION ON CASES**

- a. ZA20-000002 – ADUs in the R-5 District (Approved)

**9. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE** – None

**10. ANNOUNCEMENTS** - None

**11. ADJOURNMENT** - The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Allison, Senior Planner  
Approved this 25<sup>th</sup> day of Aug 2020

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

Ryan C. Hvitløk, AICP  
Director of Planning & Development