

**MINUTES-REGULAR SESSION  
CITY OF GODDARD  
118 NORTH MAIN, GODDARD, KS  
May 10, 2021**

The Goddard Planning Commission met in a Joint Session with the City Council and the Mayor at Goddard City Hall on Monday May 10, 2021. Chair VanAmburg called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Mayor Larkin opened a Special Session at 7:06 PM. Chair VanAmburg led in the Pledge of Allegiance and Commissioner Cline led the Invocation.

**Commission members present were:**

Jamie Coyne, Doug VanAmburg, Doug Hall, Shane Grafing, Darrin Cline.

**Council members present were:**

Hunter Larkin, Larry Zimmerman, Brent Traylor, Michael Proctor

**Commissioners absent were:**

Jody Crow, Justin Parks

**Council members absent were:**

Sarah Leland

Also present were: Micah Scoggan City Planner; Thatcher Moddie Assistant to the City Administrator; Brian Silcott City Administrator

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Commissioner *Grafing* moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner *Hall* seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**5-0**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Commissioner *Coyne* moved to approve the minutes from April 12, 2021. Commissioner *Grafing* seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**5-0**

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

None

*Chair VanAmburg* [closed the portion of citizens comments]

**BOARD OF ZONING**

None

**OLD BUSINESS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

**H.1 Sign Regulations**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated that the sign regulations of the City of Goddard help regulate the types and number of signs existing in the City limits. These regulations can be changed with the approval of the Planning Commission and of the Governing Body. On March 21, 2016, the Governing Body approved changing the sign regulations to include a stipulation that mandates all signs be brought up to the code by December 31, 2021 (Ordinance #783). This new code does not classify pole signs and it would require all commercial signs to be converted to monument signs by the end of the 2021 year.

He further stated pole signs are prohibited for all existing and future signs by December 31, 2021 according to the code. Some businesses have raised concerns about needing to convert to monument signs and the prohibition of pole signs in the future. The city offered to pay a portion of the conversion process with the income from the 1% sales tax, but it was ultimately not accepted. *Scoggan* said the question arises should all new signs be required to be monument signs? Should all existing pole signs have an amortization period to convert to monument signs similar to the one that is in effect now?

*Chair VanAmburg* asked if the date 2021 was realistic or if they should require businesses to step up now.

*Commissioner Grafing* said he was not sure if most of the businesses could afford to change their signs to monument signs.

*Chair VanAmburg* said he agreed it was costly but how do they get to monument signs?

*Mayor Larkin* said the simplest way would be to grandfather the existing signs. He stated the Goddard Galleria was where most of the new development was happening and they required new

developments to have monument signs. He stated he did not think it would be right to force businesses to convert to monument signs it would be too expensive.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said a lot of the businesses have changed hands with no concept of what the rules have been. He stated the businesses have cried foul because they have not prepared for it.

**Chair VanAmburg** said the way the ordinance is written now it needs to be fulfilled by the end of the year 2021.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said if we are trying to appease them it needs to be in writing and it needs to be published in the paper what is required.

**Silcott** said whatever the consensus is to proceed city staff will need to revise the regulations. He stated that hearing that the City waited until the eleventh hour to act. There has been a lot of communication and miscommunication which could be derived from transient members or occupants of city hall by not communicating the fact that the city was willing to pay for the conversion with money collected by the 1% sales tax. He stated the city could give the commercial businesses an additional five years and in five years they could reassess whether the city was in a financial position to reintroduce a program similar to the one presented in the past to make it revenue neutral for the business owner. That way in five years it could be reassessed and decide whether it was something to move forward with.

**Silcott** stated that when the community vision plan was done in 2014 it was the resounding opinion of the participants for no pole signs and no more tin buildings. He stated that city staff had looked at improving façades and pole signs together, but it was not well received it was dropped altogether. He stated based on the comments he had heard it was too short of a window and with the mixed messaging that was given from previous members they could give businesses an additional 5 years and reassess to see if the City has enough funds to make it palatable for all the parties.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said what burns him the most is how many of these businesses are the same ones that were around 10 years ago. Most of those businesses have sold and new businesses have taken over and they should have told the new businesses that the monument signs were coming due.

**Chair VanAmburg** said another issue is the height of signs. A monument sign that is high enough to be seen from Kellogg versus a pole sign that has to be seen from Kellogg were the pole sign is not as big of a deal. What is the height of a sign?

**Scoggan** replied it was ten feet in a commercial district.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said it won't be high enough anyway once the flyover happens. The flyover will be over the height of those signs anyway.

**Mayor Larkin** said that he thinks the rationale behind it looks better for the neighborhood. Typically, with those massive monument signs there are many faces to represent the different businesses. If they gave them another 5 years it would be better that if the City plans on investing, if this is something they want to do, the City needs to plan for the five years and just pay for the signs.

**Mayor Larkin** stated if it is mandated, we should give them a guarantee on what we plan on doing. The City could budget for it and pay for the conversion of the signs.

**Councilmember Traylor** said if the businesses want it to be nicer, they have to pay the difference.

**Mayor Larkin** said however we want to structure the deal. Once we have it budgeted, we can start picking locations to start the improvements. If we start slapping it on people, they are not going to like it.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said we are not slapping it on people. They have had 5 years to know about it.

**Commissioner Coyne** said Kellogg drive looks like crap as well. So here we are asking them to put a lot of money in a sign to put out front of a crappy street. If we are going to require monument signs we need to put some stipulations on the lot and what the rest of it looks like as well.

**Hunter Larkin** mentioned that the welcome to Goddard sign is falling down.

**Chair VanAmburg** said and in the line of thinking what about the tin buildings. To have a nice sign in front of a tin building what does that say.

**Commissioner Grafing** asked how many signs they are talking about.

**Silcott** stated they have counted over fifty-eight (58)

**Silcott** further said that the visual clutter along Kellogg is loud.

**Commissioner Coyne** said it is limited to because there are not a lot of options.

**Silcott** said from staff's perspective it was how do you eat the elephant; it was a bite at a time. Staff knew when it was discussed back ten years ago signs were the low hanging fruit. After which façades could be handled and also get some buy in from the property owners. At the staff level they are looking for what the elected officials are looking for so something can be drafted that is not dead-on arrival.

**Silcott** further stated it was conveyed that folks do not want the free money that was collected from the 1% sales tax. He said the City has finite resources and the elected officials have finite time, and they want to make sure they are giving back to the community. He said he knows everyone wants to feel like they are moving the ball down the field and not going backwards.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said every time the ball is kicked down the road someone else is coming in asking for an exemption for their sign. How many exemptions have been granted because they have said look at that business, they have it why can't we have one.

**Chair VanAmburg** said they gave a variance to a business that wanted more than one wall sign. He said they gave it to them because they asked but perhaps, they shouldn't have. He asked the City Planner what the rule was.

**Scoggan** replied it is allowed for one wall sign per frontage abutting a street and they wanted 3-4 he could not remember how many.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said that holds the Planning Commissioner's feet to the fire because they can say you gave it to one business so you should give it to more.

**Silcott** said he understands the Planning Commission is in a difficult position. A business could threaten to not move into the City without certain provisions being granted to them. He said he understands because the same thing is asked of the City Staff.

**Commissioner Grafing** asked what the cost would be on replacing 58 poll signs.

**Silcott** replied he would have to go back and look but it would reduce the number of overall signs since a monument sign would have multiple faces for each business. In the past when they realized they were wasting a lot of time and effort they stopped.

**Mayor Larkin** said he understands that he would feel bad if Kellogg look bad indicating the City is not willing to invest in the road. He stated there needs to be a plan in place and they do have a plan for the road to fix it.

**Silcott** [had the elected officials write down some numbers to set the tone]

**Silcott** stated that it costs 3 million dollars for one lift station. If it is GO (General Obligation) it goes against the debt limit of the City. If it is not, it won't. 7.5 million is the current debt limit of the City. He stated you are looking at roughly 3 million dollars for a new subdivision. If they need a lift station that is another 3 million.

**Silcott** stated that if the debt limit is reached and the credit card gets maxed out the Planning Commission and the Governing Body have no reason to meet because they cannot add a new subdivision. It is all about being diligent and understanding when we jump and how we jump.

**Silcott** said the city has a lot of growth which is good but there is a lag factor when all those taxes come online. There is some time in between the temporary notes get converted into permanent financing and you could be looking at roughly 24 years of debt. He further said the City wants to be special not on specials and because of the promises by no one in this room that had been made to folks the city staff had to dance a dance. It will require another 5 years to reassess. He said the City can then begin to design the city for our neighbors and the community, but we don't want to get to in front of our skis. With that being said the elected officials and the staff need to get back to the pole signs and figure out are they happy to come back in five years. Would it be more in the interest of the elected body to do a moratorium or to look at grandfathering in the existing pole signs?

**Mayor Larkin** asked what the planning Commission felt on the subject.

**Commissioner Grafing** said the easiest thing would be to extend it five years and revisit it when the five years are up.

**Commissioner Coyne** said he would agree with that with the one caveat being that the business owner needs to be prepared to take action after five years. Since it has drawn on for so long we risk them closing their business or selling which is not what the elected officials want to see.

**Commissioner Cline** said there is also the matter of the height of the signs. If you are traveling 50 mph your sign needs to be so tall so it can be seen.

**Commissioner Grafing** said it might have been one business owner or it might have been the sign expert.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** when the flyover happens it will be like drying down downtown Wichita. You might be able to see the signs but how will you be able to get off to go there.

**Chair VanAmburg** said we can put a five-year limit on this, but we will have some of the same issues we have right now.

**Mayor Larkin** said it would just be prolonging the conversation. At the end of the day what do the elected officials want to do? Do they want to make a plan with the city finances and come up with a budget on what they want to do? Outlining how much it would cost the City. They probably won't be able to do it all at once but progressively you start attacking it.

**Councilmember Traylor** said the businesses can save up for it and pay for it themselves. The City does not need to give them money. If the City will give them five years, they can pay for it themselves.

**Commissioner Coyne** said he agreed, and the money could be spent somewhere else like on the roads encouraging them to participate.

**Councilmember Proctor** said with the RCUT going in the speed on US-54 will be reduced dramatically. So, the argument about speed will not apply shortly.

**Silcott** stated that the speed will be roughly 40-45.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said when you are looking for a business you don't look for the sign you use Siri or another app for locating the business.

**Scoggan** replied the RCUT design did not fall under the purview of the Planning Commission. It was at the discretion of the Governing Body and K-DOT who have the authority over US-54.

**Councilmember Traylor** said with the future RCUT and a future streetlight all that traffic will come to a halt.

**Silcott** said there is an MOU (Memorandum Of Understanding) to put in a stop light on Main Street.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said you find the monument sign and turn into that area.

**Mayor Larkin** said he guarantees if this is extended for five years, they will still be having the conversation. If they want to force the businesses to spend their money than it should be done now. He assures everyone this conversation will come back up in five years.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked if the frontage road will go one way.

**Silcott** said it has been a work in progress. They finished the field checks last week. As it currently stands the south side frontage will be one way. This is a requirement for KDOT's median requirements. Due to the volume of traffic the stacking would be too great so KDOT decided on an RCUT.

**Councilmember Traylor** asked if there was an RCUT at Junction city.

**Mayor Larkin** asked what does the elected body want to do? Do they want to prolong the conversation for another five years?

**Councilmember Proctor** asked is there a stop to new pole signs?

**Chair VanAmburg** said that is the issue to stop new pole signs and when a business changes hands it could require a new monument.

**Scoggan** replied the way the regulations read now no pole signs are allowed. The contention is what to do with all the existing pole signs.

**Councilmember Traylor** said one a renter moves out of a building the new renter would have to have a monument sign.

**Scoggan** said it would be difficult to track when a renter moves out and a new renter moves in.

**Commissioner Coyne** said if someone were to replace the sign would they be required to build a monument sign?

**Scoggan** replied yes and no if they removed the pole, they would need to build a monument sign. But if they are just replacing the face of the sign than no.

**Chair VanAmburg** said does not the elected officials have some control over that?

**Scoggan** replied yes and no non-conforming uses have different stipulations. It can be amended however the elected body wants.

**Mayor Larkin** said the elected body should grandfather the existing pole signs and once ownership changes; they would be required to put in a monument sign. He asked if that was what the elected body wants to do.

**Chair VanAmburg** said he thinks that makes more sense. This would all be part of the package for new ownership of the building.

*Councilmember Traylor* said there you go.

*Commissioner Cline* said are we talking sale of the building or just different use.

*Mayor Larkin* said you can't just do the change of the face.

*Commissioner Cline* said he means you only have to change to a monument sign if the building sells not if the uses changes inside.

*Mayor Larkin* said if Russ Lowen changes out the dance studio, he doesn't have to change to a monument sign.

*Commissioner Cline* said that was not what he asked. He wants it to know if it would be contingent upon the sale of the building.

*Mayor Larkin* said if there is going to be a sale of the building, a transaction of ownership, then it must be converted to a monument sign. He asked if that was what the other elected officials were thinking as well.

*Councilmember Proctor* said he thinks if there is going to be a transaction of ownership.

*Councilmember Traylor* said if there is a transaction of ownership, Goddard cuts the pole down.

*Commissioner Coyne* said if a new leaser were to come in that would not require a new monument sign.

*Councilmember Traylor* even leasers have to put those signs up.

*Councilmember Proctor* if it is someone who is leasing they wont foot the bill for a brand new monument sign. They are just filling an empty space.

*Mayor Larkin* said it has to be a transfer of ownership.

*Councilmember Zimmerman* said it would be up to the Planning Commission.

*Chair VanAmburg* said he thinks the ones who are leasing need to figure this into their lease cost too.

*Mayor Larkin* said I guarantee if you force a new tenant to pay for a monument sign rather than

pay the property owner would have difficulty filling that building.

**Scoggan** replied that a monument sign is one sign with multiple faces every time a tenant moves out it is just replacing one face on the monument sign. If they required, every tenant to have a monument sign there could be ten monument signs on one lot and the city wouldn't want that.

**Commissioner Grafing** said even Russ has multiple faces on his pole sign.

**Councilmember Traylor** said he thought you have to pay a tax for a pole sign.

**Mayor Larkin** said you have to pay a fee.

**Scoggan** replied there is a fee for pulling a permit even if you are changing the face. He mentioned that scribbles and giggles sold to launchpad learning center and they changed the face out and it cost \$25 dollars.

**Mayor Larkin** said that is correct it is not a tax.

**Scoggan** said in review city staff will require the sale of the building to new ownership be followed up with a monument sign. They would get rid of the amortization period.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said the only problem he sees is would the neighbors have to go in on that monument sign.

**Scoggan** replied that is a good point. Usually, you would have one monument sign per lot but it could be done by linear feet.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said usually you would look for a number on the monument sign and know it is for this development in strip center.

**Commissioner Hall** said he wants to bring up the main street sign. It has been brought to him it would be nice to have business names on the main street sign so people know where they are.

**Silcott** said **Scoggan** checked on this and even prior to **Scoggan** city staff checked with KDOT since it is their jurisdiction. City staff checked on decorative signs and it was not feasible and it is problematic and he realizes it does not make people happy when city staff says that.

**Silcott** said businesses buy the signs from KDOT for marketing on US-54. Staff can look into Businesses buying the sign from KDOT.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked if everyone was ready to move on.

*Scoggan* said it is at his discretion.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked *Mayor Larkin* if he was ready.

*Mayor Larkin* said he was ready for the next item.

**MOTION:** None: Receive and file

## **H.2 Design standards**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated as the City grows more businesses are being attracted to the residential boom that is being experienced as they see new potential clients in a burgeoning market.

All new commercial buildings typically require a site plan which outlines what the architectural style of the building is as well as the building material. As construction costs increase some property owners are desiring to build rolled metal buildings on commercial lots for the principal building or for an accessory building.

Design restrictions do not restrict these types of structures and some new buildings have been allowed to be built with rolled metal.

They do however require metal facing to be clad with something else like stucco, stone, brick ect.

*Scoggan* said that according to the subdivision regulations number 11.108.4.C Metal structures either for storage use or business usage of a square footage greater than 200 square feet shall not have sides faced with metal cladding. Facing materials for these structures shall be stone, brick, stucco or other approved materials. He said this however only really applies to principal buildings as outlined by part B

B. Applicability. All private and public principal land uses shall submit site plans and other required drawings (See PART THREE) for approval by the Planning Commission except single-family and duplexes, unless the latter are arranged in courtyard or grouped settings. He asked should rolled metal be allowed if the facing is different? Or should it be prohibited? Should this only apply to principal structures or to the accessory structures as well?

*Scoggan* said it as the leisure of the Governing Body and the Planning Commission if they think no residential property should have a rolled metal detached garage.

*Mayor Larkin* said this is required even in Industrial areas.

*Scoggan* replied yes it cover industrial as well, but it only applies to the principal building and

not an accessory building.

**Mayor Larkin** asked as an example Mayer Specialties wanted to add another storage unit would it be required to be something other than rolled metal?

**Scoggan** replied no as a storage unit would be considered accessory.

**Mayor Larkin** asked where else in the City would people be putting metal besides the industrial district.

**Scoggan** replied Main St was something that came up regularly. A certain property owner pulled a building permit for an accessory unit. If the accessory unit is over a certain square footage it is required to be a building permit, but no site plan is required so there was no dictate for something other than rolled metal. It began a sort of loophole situation that has generated some comments from citizens both in favor of and against.

**Chair VanAmburg** said he thinks it would make sense for it to apply to an accessory building if the accessory building will be visible to the public.

**Commissioner Cline** said that would mean somethings garage would need a brick front even if it is not going to be seen by anyone.

**Chair VanAmburg** if the building that you are building is visible to traffic it needs to be something other than rolled metal. If it is in someone's backyard where no one can see it than there is some wiggle room.

**Councilmember Traylor** if it was on the corner lot the side of it would have to be faced with something else.

**Chair VanAmburg** said they have 14 metal buildings on Kellogg. Orscheln was going to build east of town and Wichita told them they could not do rolled metal so they built in Goddard instead.

**Councilmember Traylor** asked if the Orscheln location was considered in town.

**Chair VanAmburg** said yes, it is and they were allowed to build the metal building with a brick façade. The property owner to the east of town said you can't put up a metal building it has to be brick or stucco.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** if it is visible to the public it needs to have a nice façade but if it is in someone's back yard and they are the only ones looking at it he doesn't see why they should have to brick it up.

**Commissioner Coyne** said most HOA covenants take care of that.

**Scoggan** replied yes and no some HOAs are more stringent than others.

**Commissioner Grafing** said the newer ones are more stringent.

**Mayor Larkin** said was it possible to add some sort of stipulation that required it to be reviewed by the City Planner.

**Scoggan** replied yes but it would be difficult with the residential ones. It would be easier with the commercial ones.

**Mayor Larkin** said the residential ones would be difficult because the HOA would take care of it.

**Scoggan** stated with using the property up the street as an example it is larger than the principle building so it is visible on all three sides to the public. Would that require facing on all three sides?

**Commissioner Grafing** said just facing the street would be required in his opinion. At least up to the soffit level.

**Chair VanAmburg** asked on which streets.

**Commissioner Grafing** said if it is on a corner lot it would be the sides facing those two streets. It doesn't matter if you are looking between buildings while you drive down the road if it is rolled metal.

**Scoggan** said if they continue to use the example up the street the accessory building is facing the east but it is mostly covered by the principle building would that be required to have facing on the east side?

**Commissioner Hall** said with that building the parking is on the south side, so it is wide open to the public. If you go to the peak, it is higher than the principle building but if you go to the soffit level it is not very much higher.

**Commissioner Coyne** said that parking is for the Library, but you see most of the south side of the building because of the parking.

**Chair VanAmburg** said there is nothing to be done about the current metal buildings.

**Commissioner Coyne** said there was something that could be done, and it would make the sign regulations easier.

**Councilmember Traylor** asked what the snow cone building was made of.

**Scoggan** replied stucco and wood.

**Councilmember Proctor** said there was some brick too.

**Councilmember Proctor** asked if there was a limitation on how big an accessory building can be.

**Scoggan** replied in residential districts it cannot be more than one story and taller than the principal building but there are no limitations really in commercial districts other than the bulk regulations. There is more flexibility in the commercial district.

**Chair VanAmburg** said it can be written in that the visible façades need to be up to a standard.

**Commissioner Grafing** said they could do that and accessory buildings that are set far enough away from the street could apply for a variance under and be judge under the discretion of the Planning Commission.

**Scoggan** agreed that could be written into the code.

**Commissioner Grafing** unfortunately if the elected body removes rolled metal completely out of the equation it blocks everyone except a large franchise to come into the City and build anything.

**Commissioner Proctor** said he also does not think it would make sense in the industrial park since it is highly commercialized.

**Mayor Larkin** asked if city staff had their marching orders.

**Scoggan** said very much so.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said he thinks industrial businesses should be able to apply for a

variance as well.

*Scoggan* mentioned excluding industrial businesses from the requirement.

*Chair VanAmburg* said he would rather they apply for a variance so it can be reviewed or else it is a done deal.

*Councilmember Zimmerman* said if it is industrial, they have to come before the Planning Commission for a variance.

*Scoggan* reiterated that industrial and commercial businesses could apply for a variance from the Planning Commission as the Planning Commission is the one that grants variances. He asked if that was acceptable?

*Councilmember Traylor* asked what would it be in the General Commercial District?

*Scoggan* replied they would have to ask for a variance as well. They would be required to do some thing other than rolled metal for the facing but they could ask for a variance as well. There is a business going in that district on a corner and they are being told they need to do some sort of facing other than rolled metal.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked if they were ready to move on to the next one.

*Scoggan* replied it was at their leisure.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked to move forward.

**MOTION:** None: Receive and file

### **H.3 Zoning- Commercial with residential (Mixed use)**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated commercial zoning with a residential component is typically referred to as mixed use. It is a structure that hosts both commercial and residential uses and is often seen as commercial on the first floor and residential above. This type of land use is becoming more prominent across the nation for development. It is a positive trend for development as it introduces more density for potential commercial customers in a smaller area as well as increasing commercial property value.

Currently the only zoning that will allow for this is the Central Business District (C-1) which is only a couple of blocks from Santa Fe to 3rd St. Amending the General Business District (C-2) to allow for residential and mixed-use types would open this zoning classification

up to host more residential rental properties on commercial lots. The current regulations are found in Article 4: Zoning Districts C-1 Central Business District 104.A.3 Dwelling units constructed in conjunction with and above the first floor of business establishments. C-2 General Business District 105.F.1 1.No building shall be used for residential purposes except an existing residence which is a legal, nonconforming use. Scoggan further reiterated that more development is looking at mixed use. The Central Business District (CBD) is the only zoning classification that allows for mixed use. He further stated the benefits of density and walkability in a smaller geography maximizing land use. Would allow for more residential units in commercial districts increasing potential for more online sales as well as in person sales at local businesses.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked if we were talking about having commercial offices spaces as an example on the first floor and condominiums or apartments above that on the second?

*Scoggan* said yes.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked isn't that common almost anywhere?

*Scoggan* said yes but currently the code of Goddard prohibits it unless it is in the Central Business District.

*Mayor Larkin* asked if you couldn't put an apartment complex in the Goddard Galleria?

*Scoggan* replied you could not.

*Mayor Larkin* replied that is no good, it needs to go.

*Chair VanAmburg* said we are regressing about 100 years when everyone who had a hardware store had their house above it.

*Scoggan* agreed and mentioned that comes up in planning Classes.

*Silcott* said it also comes up in city manager classes.

*Chair VanAmburg* said we have to open that up or we are shooting ourselves in the foot.

*Commissioner Coyne* said technically speaking Braums could put a unit on top.

*Scoggan* replied he didn't think they would want to, but they could generalize it. All commercial buildings are accompanied by a site plan and it would come before the Planning Commission

anyway. Technically they could and it would be at the discretion of the elected officials if they wanted to be more prohibitive or more inclusive in how they want it written.

**Commissioner Hall** said it would encourage vertical growth.

**Scoggan** agreed. He stated that it is also in the developers favor financially since it would be assessed as commercial on the bottom floor but residential on the top floor saving them money in taxes. It also encourages density which benefits the commercial districts that are near the developments.

**Commissioner Proctor** mentioned that if you go to Leawood where the AMC headquarters are. You have apartments and condos everywhere on top of Commercial.

**Scoggan** mentioned one of the concerns that had come up was could someone now live inside of a commercial structure and currently the way the code is written you cannot live in a commercial structure. If it was designed to have a residential structure or unit on top it would be allowed.

**Commissioner Proctor** mentioned the development behind the old lumber yard.

**Scoggan** replied it is being built on top and the garages are on the side.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said that if it was commercial on the bottom and residential on top wouldn't the façade have to run up the whole thing.

**Scoggan** said not necessarily. If it was rolled metal, it would but you don't usually see rolled metal on the residential side. If it was wood that is not considered a prohibited material.

**Mayor Larkin** said he thinks they should get rid of it, it is prohibiting our growth.

**Chair VanAmburg** asked to move forward.

**MOTION:** None: Receive and file

#### **H.4 Zoning-Rural Urban Intent (RUI)**

**Scoggan** introduced the subject. He stated as the City grows it opens up an opportunity for the boundaries of the city to be expanded and annexation to occur. When this happens certain properties that have existed as stock yards, horse stables, or other county related uses become non-conforming when they are annexed. These land uses have no definition under our current zoning and would be either non-conforming or would require a Conditional Use Permit for

certain properties as they are brought onboard. To prevent this, a less stringent and more county friendly zoning classification would be introduced to alleviate the necessity for wrestling with these land uses and code violations when the property owner agrees to annex. He stated that the new zoning classification would be called RUI “Rural Urban Intent” It recognizes the property is rural and cannot be immediately serviced by the city with water/sewer ect but the intent is to bring it online with City services in the future. This zoning classification would allow properties to exist “as is” with no code compliance or land use issues. The new zoning would allow city to define its growth area with annexation and grow efficiently without feeling the need to compete with other municipalities. Wichita/Sedgwick County currently have a “Rural Residential” zoning classification which could be emulated.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said he doesn’t mind the new zoning, but he would like to see it that if someone decides to get City Sewer and City Water they would have to have their zoning change classification.

**Scoggan** said that is something that can be drafted.

**Councilmember Traylor** said they would lose their horses.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** if they want water and sewer than yes.

**Commissioner Coyne** said why would they need to change?

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said if we are giving them water and sewer, we are giving them something and they need to give something back to fall in line. Why would we give them water and sewer on a big, huge acreage?

**Mayor Larkin** said typically the intent of this would be that at some point it would be developed. The city would not annex a farm or a ranch just to have it. The purpose is to bring the land into the city because it is soon to be developed.

**Scoggan** said yes what they would do is annex the land and zone it with the Rural Urban Intent zoning classification. In five years or so when the farmer sells the land to a developer the developer would turn around and rezone the property R-1 for single family detached housing which is typical.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said when the city moves north past Maple, farmers are not going to want to move into Goddard but they might if they have this loose zoning classification but when a developer comes in the rules change.

**Commissioner Coyne** said he understands that but with the example given of the property at 183<sup>rd</sup> and Maple if they wanted water and sewer do we need a second rural classification so they can keep their use? If we need to tax them a little more because they are getting water and sewer great. Would that be a new zoning classification?

**Mayor Larkin** said another issue that comes out of this is most of these properties are serviced by the Rural Water District (RWD). As a City we do not have the authority to bring water to these guys without permission from the RWD. He stated some developers have to pay upwards of a million dollars to get out of these franchise agreements.

**Scoggan** said this is true. As a city they could not bring water to a RWD customer without infringing on the rights of the RWD. The benefit would be when they are annexed in the city could let them keep their lagoons and water wells or RWD service while at the same time offering them City services like Police while giving them a more relaxed zoning classification like their boats and RVs in the driveway.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said if the city does not have this zoning classification, he is not sure the farmers to the north would want to come into the City and Wichita will go around the City.

**Commissioner Cline** asked what kind of services have to be offered if you annex them?

**Scoggan** replied unilateral annexation requires a service plan but if a property owner signs a petition to be annexed into the City it can be drafted into the petition to allow the property owner to keep certain services they currently have. It is only if it is forced upon them that a service plan must be shown that services are provided.

**Commissioner Coyne** said the city would just need a plan to do it.

**Scoggan** said yes and it can be contested if the city does not provide services to them within 5 years. The state could force the city to de-annex.

**Commissioner Grafing** said that if the City annexes them the city would be receiving property taxes.

**Scoggan** said yes and it could also be written that the City could reduce the amount they receive to make it more comparable to what they are paying now.

**Commissioner Grafing** said we would still be collecting property taxes.

**Scoggan** agreed saying we would be collecting more off that property than the zero-amount they are collecting now. It would be a way of trying to define the boundaries and keep ahead of Wichita.

**Commissioner Cline** said he wanted to know about the City water pressure.

**Scoggan** replied that falls under the purview of the Public Works department and the City Engineer. He said he can't speak on those matters and he disqualifies himself from answering those questions.

**Commissioner Cline** with all the new subdivision coming in the water pressure is going to keep going down and down.

**Doug VanAmburg** said with this classification it would allow people in the county to annex into the city while keeping their services and their taxes would be the same?

**Scoggan** said yes or the taxes could be lower to incentivize them.

**Scoggan** asked the Governing Body what they felt about the new zoning classification.

**Councilmember Proctor** said he thinks it makes sense. As the City grows it will be something they need to deal with at some point.

**Councilmember Proctor** asked is there any way for someone to abuse the zoning classification within the City limits?

**Scoggan** replied they could not because someone would have to go before the Planning Commission and ask for a rezoning and it would then go before the Governing Body for confirmation.

**Mayor Larkin** said the intention of this new zoning classification would help the city negotiate rural water district agreements more effectively than if the developer came and did it later. Rural Water District agreements are softer on farmers and if the city can take over for the RWD for a farmer the cost burden would be less on the developer later.

**Chair VanAmburg** asked to move forward.

**MOTION:** None: Receive and file

### **H.5 Zoning-High Density (R-4)**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated zoning classifications were adopted as a regulatory control over land development. As market trends change zoning classifications should change as well to maximize land value and property taxes without compromising health, safety and welfare. With residential housing considered a national issue and demand for rental properties increasing within the City limits of Goddard, this new zoning classification allows for a streamlined entitlement process with revised bulk regulations for creativity in design and density. These new zoning classifications need to be approved first by the Planning Commission and finally by the Governing Body. Once approved by the Governing Body they will become official 30 days after publication in the city newspaper.

*Scoggan* reiterated that it would create higher density and increase the allowable land use for single family and all types of residential structures. It would increase potential higher valuation properties to capture greater property taxes. It would streamline entitlement process for multi-family developments while maintaining oversight over the new developments. It would increase marketable land value for individual property owners.

*Councilmember Zimmerman* asked what was different between this zoning classification and the other multi-family classification.

*Scoggan* replied the current highest level zoning classification would be R-3 which restricts residential units to one unit per 5000 square feet. This new zoning classification would allow more units on smaller lots. It would also allow for zero lot line which means properties would be able to straddle the lot line. It would allow for more valuable properties to be built on those lots.

*Commissioner Cline* asked if you would lose the setbacks.

*Scoggan* said yes or you could simply reduce them to 10 feet instead of removing them altogether. He mentioned if it was closer to the Central Business District, the CBD has zero setbacks.

*Commissioner Cline* asked if it would affect the side property lines.

*Scoggan* replied it would. It would allow the property to be built right up to the side lot line. Currently the regulations stipulate it would require 6 feet on the side lot lines.

*Councilmember Traylor* asked if that included Saint Andrews.

**Scoggan** replied yes it included Saint Andrew, Spring Hill, the Seasons anything that was zoned R-1. The only one that was different was Arbor Creek because it was platted differently with 20' front setbacks.

**Mayor Larkin** said he has no objection to this. It would help bring more apartments into the City.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked if it would require a site plan.

**Scoggan** replied that would be the question. If they were building a single family detached structure it would not trigger a site plan. If they were building ten units it would.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked if it were built single family but had zero lot line would it be something the Planning Commission would want to see?

**Commissioner Grafing** said he could see it being an issue if it was single family.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked if there would ever be a time when they would want to see it if it was not triggered automatically.

**Commissioner Grafing** stated he couldn't see a property going up to the property line unless you had something you never had to do any work on.

**Scoggan** replied that one would see a zero-lot line if the land prices were more expensive, and it justified putting more property on the lot for the cost.

**Silcott** mentioned major cities where property values were high.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked if they would alter the setbacks.

**Scoggan** replied you could if the property development triggered a site plan review, and it was decided it would be unbecoming for that neighborhood.

**Commissioner Grafing** said they could just minimize the setbacks from 6 feet to 3 feet on the sides. He mentioned on some patio homes there was very little room between them.

**Chair VanAmburg** said with those patio homes they are not dealing with the side yards anyway.

**Commissioner Grafing** said it was part of the deal for those properties.

**Chair VanAmburg** said it was to their advantage anyway.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said would they have to designate the places that would be high density.

**Scoggan** said yes, they would. Just like the RUI zoning classification the R-4 would be a floating zoning classification that is not applied to any lots yet. It would require a change to the official zoning map or an individual rezoning.

**Scoggan** mentioned all the items presented today was receive and file only. They would have to be approved by the Planning Commission and finally the Governing Body to be formally adopted into the subdivision regulations.

**Chair VanAmburg** asked to move forward.

**MOTION:** None: Receive and file

## **H.6 Zoning Map**

**Scoggan** introduced the subject. He stated the official Zoning Map of the city of Goddard was adopted in 2014. In 2016 the Community Development Director, Kelly Bergeron, presented an ordinance changing the zoning map and it was adopted as Ordinance #782.

City staff would like to introduce a new zoning map that continues to reflect the ever-changing real estate market to better capitalize on land value and property taxes. This would require the approval of the Governing Body and would be presented as an ordinance similar to 2016.

City staff would like to get comments and feedback on the following revised zoning map.

**Scoggan** new zoning classification would apply to a portion of old Goddard where rentals are more prominent, properties are older and more likely to be requested to be rezoned. This would incentivize the private sector to put more capital into that portion of the city that is economically distressed. Future properties as they are annexed could be classified as the new Rural Urban Intent to allow for maximum flexibility. These properties could then be reclassified at the developer's request to a zoning classification of R-1 for single family for that type of development.

**Scoggan** mentioned that with R-4 it would allow all types of residential such that it wouldn't create non-conformity for all the existing properties.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** asked what the maximum units allowed for a development in R-4 would be.

**Scoggan** replied it would depend on the lot size. He mentioned the three plex going in up the street was on a third of an acre.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said he wouldn't want to see an apartment complex taking up a city block.

**Scoggan** replied it would have to have a lot of space and most of the lots are individual lots.

**Mayor Larkin** asked what this particular item accomplishes. Is it a what if situation?

**Scoggan** replied yes it shows what could be potentially changed in the zoning map which has to go before the Governing Body for approval.

**Commissioner Grafing** said he thinks the zoning is exactly where it should be. He thinks the R-4 classification should be in the older portion of Goddard where the houses are the oldest and there are several empty lots. If it was rezoned someone would be more inclined to buy it and build.

**Councilmember Traylor** agreed.

**Councilmember Proctor** agreed and said if they were going to build single family it would be out in one of the newer subdivisions.

**Commissioner Cline** said who would want to put a five plex on a dirt street in town?

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said it will make the property values cheaper because no one wants to build it.

**Commissioner Grafing** said it would make it more attractive once they go to sell that lot.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said once you get that five plex in there they may want that street paved and then you can say to them you have to pay for it with specials and we can do it.

**Commissioner Grafing** said this will have pitchforks.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said in the next twenty years there will be a lot of these pre-war homes that will need to be bulldozed and removed.

**Chair VanAmburg** said there are a lot of properties around town that could have a use for it. They received some push back on the rezoning of the three plex up the street.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked what would be the benefit of rezoning the properties on the south side of Linear park?

**Scoggan** replied the properties could overlook the park which would be considered an amenity and the ones on the other side of the street are zoned R-2 already.

**Commissioner Cline** asked if this would take into consideration the properties over by south Oak St Elementary?

**Scoggan** replied it would be at the discretion of the Governing Body. He pointed out the gridded pattern of a portion of Old Goddard and stated it was gridded from the earlier part of the 1900s. Since it was in a grid pattern it encouraged walkability since there was access to Main St and the StarBond. This would improve the commercial businesses in these districts.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said it would be beneficial because people would want to build next to the park and be in walking distance of a nice park and the pool.

**Scoggan** mentioned it is very common for Cities to have higher density in the center near their Central business District where you would see the skyscrapers and then it pitters out to low density on the outskirts.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said he thinks there will be some blowback from residents in the area eventually something will have to happen to those lots.

**Scoggan** mentioned there were quite a few blighted properties in old Goddard. He was hoping to turn them over to the private sector by incentivizing with up zoning versus the city having to go through with condemnation or something similar.

**Chair VanAmburg** said anything that is condemned is going to raise feathers.

**Scoggan** replied it depends on the lot. Some people wondering why it hasn't been bulldozed yet.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** asked if the city could zone the land south of industrial to be high density.

**Scoggan** replied they would have to wait for someone to buy it to be developed. After it was purchased, the developer would petition the city to be annexed and it could be rezoned at that point.

**Commissioner Hall** asked where the gas line runs through.

*Scoggan* showed on the map where the gas line runs through the property.

*Councilmember Zimmerman* asked if there was room in the area south of industrial for apartments and he asked if it was in the City limits.

*Scoggan* replied there was room, but it was not in the city limits.

*Scoggan* mentioned the zoning map on display shows a non-official outline for consideration.

*Councilmember Proctor* asked if this would benefit the city if RUI was in place for annexation.

*Commissioner Grafing* said it would help the city lock up land to prevent Wichita from going around them.

*Scoggan* replied that was correct it would help lock up land and the city wouldn't have to put down infrastructure immediately and they would generate value almost immediately.

*Chair VanAmburg* consented to move forward.

*Mayor Larkin* consented to move forward.

**MOTION:** None: Receive and file

## **H.7 Annexation**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated as the city grows there is an opportunity to annex land that is abutting the city limits of Goddard. Land can be either annexed through a unilateral process that comes with certain state stipulations or through a petition of the property owner. Unilateral annexation takes time and has more legal hurdles to jump over. A petition signed by the property owner only requires the Governing Body to approve the petition and to sign a resolution. Once signed it is published in the city newspaper and property is officially in the city 30 days later. He mentioned that the city is in a unique position to negotiate each annexation with the property owner. A municipality can reduce or waive a portion of the taxes collected to make annexation become more favorable to an individual. Once approved their property would be rezoned Rural Urban Intent (RUI) reducing the amount of city resources necessary to manage that property (water, sewer, code enforcement). He mentioned that this process is preferable over the unilateral annexation, but it would require some negotiating with property owners and individual petitions to be drafted and approved by the Governing Body.

*Scoggan* reiterated that signed petitions are preferable over unilateral annexations.

This would require the Governing Body to let the City Planner negotiate on behalf of the city to reduce the amount of taxes typically collected to an amount agreeable by both parties. Once the petition has been approved by the property owner the City would present it to the Governing Body for consideration.

*Silcott* mentioned that if the properties are platted, they could be considered all at once in a unilateral annexation. He mentioned it was the honey versus vinegar if people do not want to come into the city. Unilateral is undertaken sometimes because people simply don't want to come into the City.

*Silcott* mentioned that most people are paying a township tax and they will save money if they come into the City. He mentioned that part of this has to do with the gentlemen's agreement they had with Wichita not to go past 167<sup>th</sup> Now Wichita is intending to go north and west along Central cutting off the city.

*Silcott* mentioned that Wichita announced the Talia development at being at the intersection of Maple and 151<sup>st</sup> when in fact it is at 167<sup>th</sup> and Maple.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked if it goes the far east?

*Commissioner Grafing* said it does not.

*Silcott* said it was closer to 167<sup>th</sup> but in appearance it is less threatening to classify it as being closer to 151<sup>st</sup>. Historically with landowners they have done the approach of petitioning. With platted property owners they unilaterally annex but meet with them first.

*Scoggan* said that anytime there is a negotiation that is happening on behalf of the City it has to be brought before the Governing Body for consideration and acceptance.

*Councilmember Zimmerman* once a property has been unilaterally annexed you have to provide them services within a certain timeframe.

*Silcott* said yes, it is five years.

*Scoggan* said yes, it is required by state law if it is unilaterally annexed. If it is petitioned you do not have to provide it. If a property owner wanted to keep their water well and lagoon, they could sign a petition to be brought onboard. One issue they are running into is the state and the county require water wells and lagoons to be brought up to code before they sell their property if they are in the county. If it is not up to code property owners need to pay upwards of \$10,000 dollars to bring them up to code.

**Chair VanAmburg** said to run that by him again. If he was in the city the city does not require him to bring his lagoon and water well up to code before he sells it?

**Scoggan** said that is correct.

**Chair VanAmburg** said that would be worth \$15,000 dollars.

**Scoggan** showed a map outlining the city limits of Goddard and Wichita and the proposed growth for Goddard by 2035 and the proposed growth for Wichita by 2035.

**Silcott** mentioned that development to the north is problematic because of the dry creek basin to the north. It can be worked around. He mentioned that previous developments did want to be part of the city, but the city did not want to annex them at the time. Now that properties have had to pay that upfront cost it might be more difficult to bring them onboard.

**Mayor Larkin** said it is a pay to play. The city would need that land for growth.

**Silcott** said it is an orchestrated waltz. It did not make sense originally from an economic standpoint but now they have more urgency because the city will be end to round in the next twenty years. He mentioned Wichita is not going to care because they are just going to unilaterally annex because it makes sense for them. Wichita does not look at cost of services like Goddard does. He stated how does the city pay for it without blowing up the bank or tying the hands of people ten years down the road.

**Councilmember Proctor** asked how long the city would be underwater to finance those things?

**Silcott** said if it was something the elected body wants city staff would go into a parcel-by-parcel analysis for determining services and taxes acquired.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked what the western option is.

**Scoggan** replied the western option is wide open with no RWD on that side.

**Commissioner Coyne** it is discouraging but if the city wanted to go west, they could.

**Scoggan** said the RWD wraps the city on three sides and the west side if wide open.

**Silcott** said they can be in the city and still have rural water.

**Mayor Larkin** asked if that was true that people could have rural water while being in the City. The city does not have to bring them services.

**Silcott** said that was correct we just must show them there is a benefit for the services to be provided by the City.

**Scoggan** said the reason the city wouldn't mention PD as service benefit immediately is because the County already requests PD to assist them and so some unincorporated properties are receiving police services already.

**Silcott** mentioned anywhere from 30% and up of police service calls are outside city limits.

**Councilmember Proctor** said from that angle it makes sense to annex them.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked if the higher density areas still be RUI?

**Silcott** said most likely because that is the lifestyle, they are living now, and it would make it more desirable.

**Mayor Larkin** asked what is the probability that if the city annexed those areas, they would want to be on the city water and sewer.

**Silcott** probably sewer since sewer is a lot of the big cost. If it is not on GO bonds it could be more financially feasible.

**Councilmember Proctor** said okay so this is doable. What is a realistic timeline for this if they wanted to move forward with annexation?

**Silcott** said he would defer to the City Planner.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** once it has been discovered that we have annexed those larger properties what is the likelihood that someone would want to develop it once they find out the city has it?

**Commissioner Grafing** said he does not see anyone else wanting to put another development in right now. The city already has three developments going in right now.

**Scoggan** replied in terms of cost benefit analysis the city can run it through GIS software to make that type of determination.

**Commissioner Coyne** said so it could be determined which direction to headfirst depending on the information.

**Scoggan** said yes it could be segmented that way or it could be done by platting. It could also be done by service area since the city has a lift station in the south east of the city limits. He also mentioned that if they impacted rural water district, they would call the City and they have a right to by state law.

**Commissioner Cline** said if the city is annexing north to 13<sup>th</sup> it might as well continue that and head to 21<sup>st</sup> St.

**Scoggan** said that is a fair point the city could move that far north.

**Silcott** said the city would ideally like to go from 31<sup>st</sup> ST to 21<sup>st</sup> ST

**Scoggan** said this is all receive and file and if the elected body thinks the City Staff should be more aggressive in their annexation procedure.

**Councilmember Zimmerman** said the only good thing he can say about moving further north is that it is where the aquifer is for future water service. The water they would need for more wells would be further north.

**Silcott** mentioned that was being taken into account and should be brought before the Governing Body in the next 60 days.

**Mayor Larkin** asked where Baughman was on the drainage study that was approved.

**Silcott** said he spoke with Baughman last week and they are still working on it.

**Mayor Larkin** said the west stuff is what they are going to fight with Wichita over because the city wants homes and density. It is more beneficial for developers to be near 167<sup>th</sup> and Pawnee versus to the west of Goddard.

**Councilmember Proctor** said especially after there will be two more stop lights on US 54.

**Mayor Larkin** said the battle line will be along Pawnee and who will get the property taxes on that will it be Goddard or Wichita. That is what Baughman is figuring out.

**Scoggan** asked if they had a recommendation for the City to be pursuing annexation with

individuals or should it wait until the new year?

**Mayor Larkin** said he thinks they should hold off until the study from Baughman comes back.

**Commissioner Coyne** said he doesn't think it would hurt to ask.

**Chair VanAmburg** said is there any idea on when that study will come back?

**Silcott** said he would imagine it would be the next 60 days.

**Councilmember Proctor** asked how many people the city would have to meet with if they pursued the annexation outlined.

**Silcott** said they would meet with each person that wanted to meet with them. It is to establish a relationship. Where there would large tracts of agricultural land there would have to be a negotiation.

**Scoggan** replied state law prohibits unilateral annexation of 21 agricultural acres or more. It would have to be a petition.

**Councilmember Traylor** asked if a property was annexed would the city annex the roads next to them and manage the road maintenance.

**Silcott** replied yes, they would.

**Councilmember Traylor** said several individuals have mentioned to him the county does not take care of the roads.

**Silcott** replied that is the township and the township tax is supposed to cover street maintenance. If the City took them over, they could do a sand seal but the engineers would want to go all in but it would be more pragmatic and fiscally responsible to go slower.

**Commissioner Grafing** said his opinion is to start talking to them right now to see who is in and who is out.

**Mayor Larkin** said there is nothing wrong with that.

**Commissioner Coyne** said maybe it is the cities lucky day and most of the people would want to come into the City. They might all want to be RUI and not want sewer or water.

*Councilmember Proctor* what is the likelihood they would want to be Goddard residents versus Wichita residents.

*Scoggan* replied it just depends on what they consider to be beneficial.

*Mayor Larkin* said that Goddard has a lower tax rate.

*Councilmember Zimmerman* said that Goddard has a better School District.

*Scoggan* said some properties might be paying more but those tax collections could be negotiated.

*Silcott* mentioned if you dialed 911 who would show up and how fast?

*Scoggan* said each negotiation could be tailored to the property. The individual property owner could benefit from the reduced taxes and not be impeded in their current lifestyle. With the police department servicing these properties currently anyway it would benefit the city to collect a portion of the property taxes and with the compensating use tax the city would collect that as well from online sales.

*Councilmember Proctor* said he thinks the city should take a shot at it. It seems to make sense to him.

*Chair VanAmburg* said he was satisfied with item H.7.

**MOTION:** None: Receive and file

**CITY PLANNER REPORT**

*None*

**PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

*Commissioner Coyne* said he wanted to thank the Governing Body for coming. He knew it was not their week to be in City Hall so he wanted to thank them.

*Commissioner Hall* said he felt it was productive.

*Chair VanAmburg* said he also appreciated the Governing Body coming to the workshop and they are of course always welcome to the Planning Commission meetings.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked about the RV and Boat CUP status.

*Scoggan* said he believes it was still in protest period, but he could find out.

**ADJOURNMENT**

To adjourn the Special Session

**MOTION:** *Councilmember Proctor* motioned to adjourn the special session. *Councilmember Traylor* seconded the motion.

Motion carried **3-0**

To adjourn the Planning Commission

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Grafing* motioned to adjourn the meeting. *Commissioner Cline* seconded the motion.

Motion carried **5-0**

*Meeting adjourned at 9:20 pm.*

*Micah Scoggan, City Planner*