

**MINUTES OF THE  
OAK CREEK PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2020**

Mayor Bukiewicz called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners were present at roll call: Commissioner Hanna, Commissioner Sullivan, Commissioner Carrillo, Alderman Guzikowski, Commissioner Oldani, Commissioner Siepert and Commissioner Chandler. Alderman Loreck was absent. Also present: Planner Kari Papelbon, Director of Community Development Director Seymour, and Assistant Fire Chief Mike Havey.

Planner Papelbon read the following into the record:

The City of Oak Creek is authorized to hold this public meeting remotely during the COVID-19 public health emergency under the March 16 and March 20 advisories from the Office of Open Government in the Wisconsin Department of Justice and subsequent Common Council approvals. Per the advisories and approvals, this meeting being conducted via Zoom video conference with telephone conferencing capabilities was duly noticed per the City of Oak Creek Municipal Code and Statutory notice requirements more than 24 hours in advance of the meeting. Members of the public have been advised of the options for participation via direct mailing to property owners within 300 feet of a proposal, via the COVID-19 information page on the City's website, via social media, and via the information contained on the meeting agenda. This meeting may also be viewed at the City's YouTube page, the link for which was contained in all aforementioned notice methods. The meeting recording will also be accessible on the City's YouTube page within 48 hours.

Plan Commissioners and participants are initially muted upon joining the meeting. Plan Commissioners and staff have the ability to mute and unmute their microphones throughout the meeting. Please mute at all times except for roll call, motions, voting, and when recognized by the Chair. Roll call and voting will occur per the usual and customary procedure, starting from Plan Commissioner seating positions south to north in the Common Council Chambers (e.g., Hanna, Sullivan, Carrillo, Loreck, Bukiewicz, Guzikowski, Oldani, Siepert, Chandler). The Chair will facilitate questions and comments by calling on each Plan Commissioner, or by requesting the use of the "raise hand" function in the Zoom webinar control panel. Only speak once you have been recognized by the Chair or moderator.

Applicants, their representatives, and all other participants who wish to speak will be unmuted

- When there is a direct request for information from the Plan Commission or staff;
- When the participant utilizes the "raise hand" function within the Zoom webinar control panel, and the moderator verbally indicates that they are unmuted;
- When a phone participant dials \*9 to indicate they wish to speak, and the moderator verbally indicates that their line is open.

When unmuted, all participants must state their name and address for the record, then proceed with comments or questions.

Questions and comments may also be entered into the Q&A function within the Zoom webinar control panel. Staff and/or the moderator will monitor this function during the meeting, and provide the information requested. There shall be no private messages or side conversations during the meeting utilizing the chat or Q&A functions. Chat and Q&A messages are part of the public record.

## **Minutes of the July 28, 2020 meeting**

Alderman Siepert moved to approve the minutes of the July 28, 2020 meeting. Alderman Guzikowski seconded. On roll call: all voted aye. Motion carried.

### **RELEASE OF EASEMENT DOCUMENT BRANDYWOOD APARTMENTS AND RIVERWOOD ARMS ESTATES 8900 20 S. WOODCREEK DR. AND 500 W. RIVERWOOD DR. TAX KEY NOS. 859-9017-000 & 859-9030-000**

Planner Papelbon provided an overview of the request to approve the Consent to Release of Easements between Brandywood Apartments and Riverwood Arms Estates (see staff report for details).

Alderman Guzikowski commented that these properties are within his district and expressed he is disappointed to see the tennis courts go.

Commissioner Chandler asked Planner Papelbon to clarify whether the release was for creating more parking.

Planner Papelbon clarified the release was for access and use of the existing tennis courts, and had nothing to do with future use as parking.

Commissioner Chandler asked if the use were to change to parking, would it then come back to Plan Commission.

Planner Papelbon replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Hanna moved that the Plan Commission approve and recommend Common Council approval of the Agreement for Release of Easements and Consent to Release of Easements submitted by Bernard Kearny, Quarles & Brady, on behalf of Brandywood Estates LLC & Legacy/Riverwood LLC, for the properties at 8900 20 S. Wood Creek Dr. & 500 W. Riverwood Dr. Commissioner Siepert seconded. On roll call: all voted aye. Motion carried.

### **ZONING CODE UPDATE DISCUSSION REVIEW AND DISCUSS DRAFT ARTICLES 2-4 OF THE PROPOSED ZONING CODE**

Planner Papelbon gave a brief overview of Article 2 as follows:

#### Article 2: Establishment of Districts

- B-1 eliminated in favor of moving small handful of parcels to other B districts better suited to their existing use.
- Nomenclature of other B overlay districts changing slightly.
- 27<sup>th</sup> St. Overlay Districts to be looked at.
- New PUD Overlay District.

Ms. Jackie Wells of Houseal Lavigne Associates, consultant for the Zoning Code Update project, addressed the Commission and gave a brief synopsis of the Zoning Code updates she would be covering.

Article 2: Establishment of Districts

- As previously discussed by Planner Papelbon.

Article 3: District Specific Standards

- Bulk and dimensional standards revised based on appropriateness analysis included in Diagnostic Report.
- Lot width calculation refined for lots that abut a cul-de-sac.
- Yard setback modifications enhanced to address patios, decks, fire pits, yard art, air conditioning condensers, generators and more.
- Permitted and conditional uses consolidated to tables.

Article 4: Use Specific Standards

- Consolidates current standards that exist throughout the code to make more user-friendly.
- New standards proposed for more uses to be allowed as-of-right to establish specific standards for Conditional Uses.

## **NEIGHBORHOOD RETAIL AND SERVICE USES**

- Limited to 2,500 square feet of gross floor area.
- Main entrance oriented towards the primary street.
- Off-street parking and loading of use that fronts onto an existing or proposed arterial or collector roadway, as identified in the Oak Creek Comprehensive Plan, may be located in the front, side, or rear yards of the primary building.
- Off-street parking and loading of use that fronts onto any other roadway type shall be located on the side or rear of the primary building.
- Maximum of 1 curb cut shall be permitted per street frontage unless otherwise approved by the Plan Commission.
- Service areas, dumpsters, and utilities shall not be visible from rights-of way.
- Pedestrian access shall be provided to the building entries and parking areas connecting to the sidewalk at the street frontage.

Mayor Bukiewicz asked how parking for a business in a residential neighborhood would affect the neighborhood.

Ms. Wells referenced the two off street parking requirements listed above.

Mayor Bukiewicz questioned if a “for-profit business” in a residential neighborhood would be responsible for their own snow removal and trash collection, in particular Community-Based Residential Facilities (CBRFs).

Planner Papelbon replied that a CBRF is not considered a commercial or retail business, and that all property maintenance is the responsibility of the landowner. Depending on where a CBRF falls in the Statutory requirements, they may have either residential or private trash pick-up.

Mayor Bukiewicz expressed his desire to have CBRFs be responsible for their own trash collection.

Planner Papelbon explained that CBRFs are meant by Statute to blend in with their neighborhoods so that they are indistinguishable from any other residential home. As such, they are offered the same City trash service as the other homes in their neighborhood.

Director Seymour added that community living arrangements of less than eight beds are permitted by right, in any single-family residential district by state law, but said the City did have some leeway over the Conditional Use Permits for larger facilities to possibly require private trash collection.

Commissioner Siefert asked about businesses being run from a residential home.

Ms. Wells replied there needed to be clear distinction between “home occupations” and “neighborhood service” use, which would be addressed in the definitions.

Planner Papelbon expressed that staff was looking for a way to provide a range of options and City support for residents to start with a home occupation that could possibly grow and transition into a neighborhood retail service business and beyond.

Mayor Bukiewicz brought up an example of a resident doing car bodywork out of their garage, and asked what impact that would have on the City.

Ms. Wells explained that would not be a “neighborhood service” use as covered in the definitions.

Commissioner Hanna asked about the impact of retail traffic in a residential neighborhood.

Ms. Wells responded that limiting the square footage of such businesses to 2,500 square feet helps control the number of patrons and traffic at any one time.

Commissioner Hanna stated her preference to limit the neighborhood services businesses to arterial and collector roads. Commissioner Hanna also expressed concern over the enforcement of such businesses.

Ms. Wells explained that the neighborhood businesses would still require Conditional Use Permits, and the City could revoke it at any time for non-compliance

Planner Papelbon stated there are certain qualifications in place for the revocation of a Conditional Use Permit in the signed Conditions and Restrictions attached to them, as well as separate conditions within the Zoning Code. Planner Papelbon indicated that a Zoning Code enforcement update would be forthcoming.

## **VEHICLE-RELATED USES**

- Autobody Repair
- Car Wash
- Fuel Sales
- Fueling Plaza
- Service Station

Ms. Wells gave a brief overview of updates to “Vehicle-Related - Permitted and Conditional Uses,” asking the Commission for feedback on where throughout the City they thought these uses were appropriate.

Commissioner Hanna expressed her desire to see vehicle-related businesses located on arterial or collector roads rather than local roads, keeping a reasonable distance from high-traffic intersections.

Mayor Bukiewicz asked which category an auto detailer would fit into.

Planner Papelbon and Ms. Wells agreed “auto detailer” would most likely fall under “auto body repair” or “service station,” depending on the definition of each.

## **ACCESSORY BUILDINGS**

- Two (2) accessory buildings shall be permitted per lot.
- On lots less than or equal to one-half (0.5) acre and accessory building shall:
  - not exceed 1000 square feet or 75% of the livable area of the principal building, whichever is less. Livable area shall not include basements.
  - have a maximum height of 20 feet.
- On lots greater than one-half (0.5) acre, and accessory building shall:
  - not exceed 1200 square feet or 75% of the livable area of the principal building, whichever is less.
  - have a maximum height of 20 feet.
- An accessory building shall be located either:
  - completely within the required rear yard and a minimum of 5 feet from side and rear lot lines;
  - completely within the buildable area of the lot and to the interior side or rear of the principal building; or
  - as permitted in Section 17.0303(b) Yard Setback Modifications.

Ms. Wells told the Commission they were being asked for input on the number, size and location of accessory buildings allowed on a lot.

Planner Papelbon explained the difference between an “accessory building” (an enclosed structure with three or four walls) and an “accessory structure” (an open-sided structure, such as a pergola or gazebo). Planner Papelbon asked the Commission to pay particular attention to “lean-to” like attachments, which often get enclosed over time. Planner Papelbon suggested that such structures be considered “accessory structures” even though they are open-sided.

Alderman Guzikowski referenced a particular temporary structure on Oakwood Road, and asked if it would fall into this category.

Planner Papelbon replied that a temporary structure is not considered a permanent accessory structure.

Ms. Wells said that current Code limits the number of accessory buildings and structures to two per lot. The Code update proposes separating accessory buildings from accessory structures, to allow two of each on a lot.

Commissioner Sullivan expressed concern that two accessory buildings and two accessory structures on a residential lot seemed excessive, especially in a residential area where you could potentially have two 1,000 square-foot buildings in a backyard.

Ms. Wells suggested making the 1,000 square-foot limit an aggregate of both accessory structure(s), providing an example of one 1,000 square-foot structure, or two 500 square-foot structures, or any deviation thereof.

Planner Papelbon asked Commissioners to keep in mind the half acre/greater than half acre lot size requirements, and the limitations imposed on them for accessory buildings. Planner Papelbon questioned Commissioner Sullivan whether he would consider more square footage allowances for accessory buildings on lots larger than one acre.

Commissioner Sullivan replied that he would consider it.

Planner Papelbon stated that accessory structures were designed to be accessory to, or diminutive to, the principal structure (home). She explained that a few years ago, a district Alderman requested a Zoning Code Amendment to allow for larger structures because he thought the Code was too restrictive. Planner Papelbon agreed with Commissioner Sullivan that it was appropriate to impose limitations on certain parcels.

Director Seymour added that it was important to distinguish between not just the size of a parcel, but the location of the parcel. He stated that he would like to see language that excluded those parcels located within subdivisions from the overall half-acre description.

Mayor Bukiewicz gave an example of an older home that needed to be rezoned before it could have a two-and-a-half car garage added.

Planner Papelbon expressed the need to determine what was appropriate and where, to satisfy the Commission, the Council and the residents.

Alderman Guzikowski provided an example of a constituent in his district who was having difficulty with their accessory project, and asked how the Code changes may affect them.

Director Seymour replied that the intent of the Code was to ensure that accessory structures are not bigger than the houses they are accessory to, adding that the danger in trying to be accommodating to individual circumstances often leads to unintended consequences. Director Seymour stated it was important to establish acceptable community standards, and explained that, provided an individual can prove a hardship, there is a procedure to request a variance.

Ms. Wells provided a visual explanation of how the location of a permitted accessory structure would aid in controlling its size. The Code update proposes three different locations: the rear yard, the side yard or on a corner side yard.

### **ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (attached, external or internal)**

- Primary building shall be the primary residence of the owner of the property.
- Not greater than 800 square feet or 50% of the size of the primary building, whichever is less.
- Located to the rear of the primary building.
- 1 entrance on the front façade of the primary building, entrances to ADUs on the side or rear façade.
- The primary building and the ADU shall be served by 1 common driveway.
- ADU parking shall be in addition to the parking space(s) required for the primary building, shall not be located in the required front yard setback, and shall not be a tandem parking space.
- Similar in character including roof pitch, eaves, building materials, windows, trim, color and landscaping.

Ms. Wells provided an overview of “Accessory Dwelling Units – Permitted and Conditional Uses.” Addressing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), arose from a recommendation in the Comprehensive Plan to encourage and increase density where appropriate. As currently proposed, ADUs would be allowed in the Rs-4 and Rd-1 districts, but analysis shows they are more appropriate in lower density districts. So as not to impact the character of residential districts, the proposed Code updates are designed to ensure an ADU doesn’t change the appearance of a residential home from the street or add to on-street congestion.

Mayor Bukiewicz asked if there was a minimum size requirement for an accessory dwelling, and if a tiny home was considered one.

Ms. Wells replied that she was not sure if Wisconsin required a minimum square footage, but felt that a properly-permitted tiny home would not negatively impact a residential neighborhood any more than a larger ADU.

### **FOOD TRUCKS**

- Only be established on sites which have an active open business during the hours of the food trucks.
- Sites required to have full public improvements (curb, gutter, sidewalk, access drive, etc.).
- Locate on paved surfaces.
- Obtain written permission from the private property owner(s).
- 1 food truck is allowed per site, except for special events approved by the City.
- Impact no more than 4 parking stalls on private property.
- Tables and chairs permitted, shall be located on improved and/or paved surfaces, and shall not locate in required parking, landscape areas or drive aisles.
- Furniture shall not be retained on-site overnight.
- ADA parking stalls and pedestrian paths of travel shall not be permitted for food vending.

- Drive aisles, sidewalks, access to trash enclosures and similar areas may not be blocked by any vending activity.

Ms. Wells introduced the standards for “Food Trucks - Temporary and Permitted Uses,” explaining that the City was interested in allowing them in non-residential districts on a more regular basis as appropriate, and more broadly throughout the community.

Planner Papelbon pointed out that two different types of food truck allowances were being considered: first, as a temporary use for a specific event; and secondly, as a permanent use, such as a dedicated food truck park where the food trucks could set up on a regular basis.

Mayor Bukiewicz expressed his preference for a brick and mortar building as opposed to a food truck park. He asked how to deal with someone who owned a food truck and parked such at their place of residence.

Ms. Wells stated the next section of the Code update dealt with RV parking; however, the same language regulates the parking of commercial vehicles in residential areas.

Commissioner Hanna questioned what “obtain written permission from the private property owner” meant.

Ms. Wells provided an example of a special event held at a brewery where a food truck was present. The food truck would need written permission from the brewery owner to operate on the premises.

Commissioner Hanna expressed concern that the language did not limit residential homeowners from having a food truck on their property.

Planner Papelbon reiterated that food trucks were not permitted in residential districts unless it was for a special and temporary event, such as a block party.

Alderman Guzikowski stated that the Community Center had food trucks on Wednesday nights, and asked if that was allowed under the proposed Code.

Planner Papelbon stated it would be a permitted temporary use, but if it occurred more frequently, it would become a permanent use situation that would have to go through a Conditional Use Permit review.

Commissioner Hanna asked if there was a maximum number of food trucks allowed per event, saying she would like to see limits set based on the size of the lot.

Ms. Wells replied that the Code is currently written to allow one food truck per site unless it is for a special event, at which point there would be separate permitting process.

Commissioner Hanna questioned what “per site” meant, saying she would like to see the language in the Code changed from “per site” to “zoning lot” so it is not so ambiguous.

Commissioner Chandler asked for clarification that a food truck could take up a maximum of 4 parking spaces, but could have space for tables and chairs in addition to that.



Ms. Wells clarified that the 4 parking spaces were the overall area for the truck itself, including the tables and chairs.

Commissioner Chandler pointed out that the proposed text says tables and chairs shall not be located in required parking; however, they would actually be in a parking stall.

Ms. Wells suggested clarifying the language in the Code to state: “shall not locate in required parking except for the approved four parking stalls.”

Commissioner Chandler asked whether the Code would specify the allowed square footage a food truck could occupy.

Ms. Wells replied four parking stalls is approximately 650 square feet.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if those specifics should be included in the Code.

Ms. Wells responded that because some parking stalls are larger than others, it would be easiest to limit the number of allowed stalls, rather than measure square footage.

Commissioner Chandler questioned why the Code was so specific with regards to accessory dwellings, but not food trucks.

Ms. Wells replied that the difference was between a permanent structure and a temporary use, stating the long-term impact of a permanent dwelling located in an area where it should not be has greater repercussions than a food truck occupying slightly more square footage for a day.

Commissioner Chandler asked how one would determine “4 parking stalls” in areas where parking stalls do not exist.

Jackie answered the Ccode could be edited to reflect something such as “4 parking stalls” or “X number of square feet” for an area that is not a striped parking lot.

Planner Papelbon offered to share examples of permanent truck parks with the Commissioners.

## **RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARKING**

- No boat, boat trailer, mobile home, motor home, motor coaches, truck campers, camping trailers, travel trailers, fifth wheel trailers, large utility trailers, race cars and their trailers, sport aircraft and their trailer, canoes or kayaks and their trailers, all-terrain vehicles and their trailers, tent campers, folding campers, snow mobiles and their trailers, cases or boxes used to transport recreational vehicles or their equipment, yard maintenance equipment and similar equipment or vehicles shall be parked or stored outside on a residentially zones lot, except as provided herein:
  - They shall be located in the rear or side yard and not closer than 2 feet to a side or rear lot line.
  - Front yard location shall only be allowed on a driveway or turnaround, parked as close to the home as possible.
  - They shall be located outside of all ultimate rights-of-way, vision clearance triangles and drainage and utility easements.

- No recreational vehicles or equipment shall be stored in any open space outside a building unless such equipment is owned by the property owner or children of the property owner or resident at the property in question. If the property is rented, such storage shall be permitted for the tenant only provided that the equipment is owned by the tenant.
- All equipment shall be parked or stored as inconspicuously as possible on the property. The area around the equipment or vehicle must be kept weed-free and free of accumulation of other stored material.

Ms. Wells introduced the topic of “Recreational Vehicle Parking – Permitted and Conditional Uses” for single family residential districts and the duplex district. She stated staff would like feedback on the existing standards and the locations where recreational vehicles are allowed to be parked.

Planner Papelbon stated that the standards presented allow for a recreational vehicle to be parked in the side or rear yard within 2 feet of the lot line, whereas current Code states recreational vehicles must be parked on a paved surface not closer than 5 feet to a side or rear lot line. Staff would like to know if the Commission thinks 2 feet or 5 feet from the lot line is more acceptable. Staff would like Commission to consider the number and size of vehicles, paved surface requirements, appropriate setbacks and the specifics of front yard parking on paved areas.

Director Seymour explained this type of parking is a frequent concern throughout the City, and wondered if this is something that should be separated from the Zoning Code and put into some type of Property Maintenance Code. Director Seymour added that a broader discussion needed to take place with respect to the parking and storage of RV's, trailers, commercial vehicles and such.

Mayor Bukiewicz agreed that a much larger discussion was in order.

Planner Papelbon agreed with Director Seymour, but stressed she did not want to lose sight of the setback issue, as it was another permitting issue Planning frequently encounters. Planner Papelbon gave an example of an RV parked on decorative stone that was closer to the lot line than the 5 feet required by pavement.

Ms. Wells encouraged the Commissioners to take their time with the proposed updates, and explained this would not be their only chance to comment on changes to the Zoning Code.

Mayor Bukiewicz said that 2 feet was not much room to a neighbor's lot line, and felt 5 feet was more appropriate.

Planner Papelbon brought up the bigger discussion of recreational vehicle parking on a paved surface on the property, and the relation to an accessory structure allowance. Planner Papelbon expressed the need to find a balance.

Commissioner Chandler asked for clarification of whether parking should be allowed in the front yard only if infeasible in a side or rear yard.

Ms. Wells answered parking in the front is only allowed under certain circumstances where a driveway or turnaround is available. Otherwise, parking is required in the rear or side yard. The front yard is not the preferred location for RV parking, but is currently allowed if the above requirements are met.

Commissioner Carrillo commented that the subdivision she previously lived in had its own rules regarding the parking of recreational vehicles. In particular, parking in the front was only allowed for a certain number of days. If the vehicle could not be parked in the rear or side yard, then off-site parking was required. Commissioner Carrillo asked if the City could use similar language.

Planner Papelbon answered the City would definitely prefer such vehicles be parked in the rear or side yard, but that some residents may not have easy access to either, and are forced to park in their front yard.

Director Seymour stated that although the City tries to be accommodating, as the community transitions and standards change, he wondered whether residents should be looking for alternative choices for recreational vehicle parking so as not to negatively impact one's neighborhood.

Alderman Guzikowski agreed that most Home Owners Associations have the type of agreement Commissioner Carrillo was alluding to.

Ms. Wells added that as communities become more urbanized, it is not uncommon to prohibit the parking of recreational vehicles, either completely or in front and side yards in residential areas.

Planner Papelbon asked if the parking of recreational vehicles should be limited to larger lots where it may have less impact on the neighbors.

Commissioner Chandler questioned whether it was common to categorize yard maintenance material with recreational vehicles.

Planner Papelbon replied the wording was intended to describe riding lawnmowers and larger such equipment.

## **BUILDING MATERIALS STANDARDS**

- Exterior building materials shall be traditional, time-and weather-tested materials and techniques.
  - Exterior building materials utilized on the ground floor shall be limited to wood, masonry, stucco, fiber cement or stone veneer systems. Stone veneer systems untiled on the ground floor shall have a minimum thickness of 3 inches.
  - Exterior building materials utilized on upper floors may include all materials permitted on the ground floor as well as EIFS, stone veneer systems, or precast panels with inlaid or stamped brick texture. All materials utilized on upper floors shall have a minimum thickness of 1 inch and shall be structurally integrated into the façade of the building.

Ms. Wells explained the section "Building Material Standards" contained new language to be applied to multifamily developments, single-family attached developments, clubhouses, neighborhood retail and service uses and cafes. Staff relayed concerns about new building materials which don't have a proven track record of durability. Proposed standards were meant to balance the need for durable and tested materials on the ground floor, with the need to keep the cost of building down by allowing secondary building materials on the upper floors.

Commissioner Chandler noted the thickness of some of the materials had changed from 4 inches in the current Code, to 3 inches in the proposed Code.

Ms. Wells explained that technology improvements in 3-inch stone and brick veneer systems allow for greater durability with a thinner veneer.

Mayor Bukiewicz asked for staff's opinion on the 3-inch versus 4-inch stipulation.

Planner Papelbon explained her understanding is that the manner in which the veneer is attached to the building will ultimately determine its long-term durability. Thicker veneer systems are not adhered to the building, but are "tied in," where thinner materials are literally adhered to the wall. If the adhesive is not mixed or applied properly, it can lead to the failure of the veneer system. However, this is less common with new technology and installation improvements.

Mayor Bukiewicz asked whether Hardieboard or LP SmartSide should be listed as acceptable building materials.

Director Seymour answered he felt they should remain as discretionary items for Commission approval. If cheaper options were specifically listed as acceptable in the Code, Director Seymour felt that applicants would automatically default to them, and this was not necessarily a standard he felt the community should set for the durability and sustainability of the City's buildings.

Mayor Bukiewicz said he felt the Code was antiquated in that it did not address more modern building systems.

Director Seymour said the intent is to remain flexible with new technologies, but require more timeless material - especially on the ground level - as a community standard. The Commission should not be put in a position where they are forced to approve materials just because they are listed in the Code.

Commissioner Chandler asked about acceptable materials for trash enclosures.

Ms. Wells replied that screening requirements would be addressed in the next section of Code updates for Development Requirements, but screening material should be identical to or substantially similar to the materials used on the primary building.

Planner Papelbon added that tight language on screening requirements would need to be included in the update.

Ms. Wells asked if the Commission had any other questions or comments that had not been addressed in her presentation.

Mayor Bukiewicz asked if micro-distillery, micro-winery or microbrewery standards had been addressed in the allowable uses updates, and wondered if they would be acceptable in a B-4 district.

Ms. Wells answered that in other communities, the tasting room is often allowed outside of industrial zones as they are similar to a bar or restaurant. The actual production of spirits, wine or beer is more appropriate in industrial areas. Ms. Wells offered to gather information and work with staff on suggestions for microbreweries, micro-wineries and micro-distilleries.

Commissioner Siepert asked about the 50-foot building height allowed in Section 3, in relation to airport approach regulations.

Ms. Wells responded that any airport regulations would supersede the Zoning Code maximum allowances.

Commissioner Siepert asked how high the City's ladder trucks could reach

Assistant Fire Chief Mike Havey answered the aerial truck had a reach of 100 feet.

Ms. Wells thanked the Commission for their comments and suggestions.

Mayor Bukiewicz told the Commission that updating the Zoning Code was one of the most important things they would work on this year.

Planner Papelbon added that this was the most significant Zoning Code update since 1995, and it was crucial for the Commission to provide input. Planner Papelbon encouraged the Commissioners to ask questions and bring forth ideas, adding the Code could always be amended or updated at a later date if it was discovered something was omitted. Planner Papelbon stated the draft of the Zoning Code should be available to the Commission soon, with the goal to present to Council by the end of the year.

Commissioner Carrillo provided a brief Farmers Market update.

Mayor Bukiewicz reiterated the importance of following the State mask mandate.

Commissioner Carrillo moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Siepert seconded. On roll call: all voted aye. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas Seymour, Plan Commission Secretary

8-25-20  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date