

CITY OF SPRINGDALE
JOINT SPECIAL MEETING
CITY COUNCIL, PLANNING COMMISSION,
& BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
SUMMARY MINUTES
JULY 8, 2026
6:00 PM

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Mayor Hawkins called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm

Mayor Hawkins stated that this is an opportunity for individuals to give input with regard to the zoning code before the committee meets one more time. This will go to the Planning Commission review and will then go on to City Council. This is not a meeting for public input as there will be opportunities for that before City Council and Planning Commission. This is something for those forums to review in advance to make sure that there aren't any major changes before the committee recommends it.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present

Jeff Anderson, David Okum, Tom Hall, Al Chang, Carolyn Ghanous, Michele Gilmore, David Gleaves, Evander Graham (arrived 6:06 pm), Dan Jacobs, Chris Mayborg, Michelle McFarland, Joe Ramirez, Amy Thompson, and Lavonne Webster

Members Absent

Steve Galster and Apryl Watkins

III. PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION

Mayor Hawkins stated that the matter will be handed over to Ms. Fields. He stated that she is going to go through the memo and that as she goes through it, all needs to stay on topic with the section that she is addressing for questions so that there is not too much jumping around.

Ms. Liz Fields introduced herself stating that she serves the City of Springdale as a contract planner for Planning Commission and is helping the city with the zoning code updates. She stated that she had helped with the last round of zoning code updates as well. She stated that in the memo in front of all the members, she has summarized everything under 5 different topics. Ms. Fields stated that if anyone has questions, to feel free to interrupt her and it can be talked through. She stated that this is only a draft version and the final version will look completely different. The committee drafted everything in section and this is the first time that it has been put together in one document. She stated that this is where inconsistencies are typically found. This meeting is to cover substantial changes.

Ms. Melissa Hays stated that she wanted to give thanks to specific members that are on the Zoning Code Committee. She stated that each one has spent a lot of time and painstaking effort to review the code. She appreciates Mr. Gleaves, Ms. Gilmore, and Mr. Okum for all of their time and energy throughout this process.

Ms. Fields stated that city staff have met weekly for the past 4 to 6 months and attacked it chapter by chapter. Some things took longer than others to get through. This project was all covered by a state grant. One of the keys things that the committee was trying to do is to implement some of the recommendations from the comprehensive plan. Ms. Fields stated that she had provided some recommendations in the land use plan around the Route 4 corridor and advised the city on how to be more flexible with the office and retail areas. One of the big changes that is being made is the removal of 2 existing districts and replacing them with 2 new districts. The OB (Office Building) district is proposed to be removed as it was not used much in the true office areas. She stated that Verdantas/CT

Consulting is working on a new zoning map that will be easier to read. The SS (Support Service) district is primarily along Northland Blvd. Where OB and SS currently exist, both will be replaced by the newly proposed SE (Service & Employment) district. This will allow more uses than is currently allowed in the OB and SS areas and make those areas more attractive.

There were no questions or comments at this time.

Ms. Fields stated that the new NB (Neighborhood Business) district is another big implementation to the zoning map. The Route 4 corridor overlay is proposed to be removed from the code and replaced with the NB district. Its intent is to promote the kind of development that the corridor overlay was originally trying to do, while modernizing it.

Mr. Jeff Anderson asked if architectural standards would be in the zoning code.

Ms. Fields replied yes and that the architectural standards are in the draft. She went on to say that all of this was to implement the comprehensive plan. One of the key things that the committee wanted to review was to have better regulations for a process for PUDs. The existing regulations are good, but the committee found some things that they could do to make them better and stronger. The committee added architectural requirements for residential if it is in a PUD but did not propose any residential design standards if it was not in a PUD. The proposal is to strengthen the city's residential PUD designs. It is also to make the PUD process better for both the major and minor modification processes. The original process for major and minor modifications was not doing what it was expected to do; therefore, the committee created a new process which is an administrative amendment option. It is proposed that both major and minor modifications to a PUD have the same process, which would be to publicly notify in either case to keep from stopping the process.

There were no questions or comments at this time.

Ms. Fields stated that throughout the zoning code, the committee has changed the names of various uses and terms to bring them into more modern terms. Many of them are editorial changes that do not substantially change the regulations in the zoning code. The committee is also looking at how to improve the organization and readability of the zoning code. Most of this is seen in the permitted use area. The zoning code currently has all residential regulations together. The committee has proposed to change it to one permitted use table that has all zoning districts so that there is no need to go back and forth between two different tables and have all the use standards in one place. A new chapter for dimensional standards was created that is separate from the use standards. These changes will make it easier for people to find. Some additional regulations were added that are typically found in zoning codes that will help the city in the long run. The committee has proposed to separate the accessory use and temporary structures use. This too will make it easier to find the information.

There were no questions or comments at this time.

Ms. Fields stated that changes have been either shown with track changes in red with cross outs or shown by text. In the first chapter, which is General Provisions, there are no changes.

The Administrative Roles and Authority §153.150 is the chapter where the review and approval boards are identified. This section shows which board is responsible for which process. The only changes to this section is the change for the minor modifications to PUDs and the removal of the corridor district. The T (Transition)

district has also been proposed to be removed. The T district is outdated and has hardly been used.

Mr. David Okum stated that the only properties that were transitional were the retail shops at Glensprings and it was duplicated with the corridor district.

Ms. Fields stated that with tools of that NB district and the PUD process, there is the intent of that transition built into the regulations moving forward. She stated that the code goes through each board and summarizes each board's duties related to the code. There is a city charter requirement that has been presented at Planning Commission a few times. It states that Planning Commission has to have a vote of 5 of the 7 members in order to approve an item. It was found in the charter and the committee wanted to ensure that this is also reflected in the zoning code to make sure that it is clear to the applicants and as a good reminder to the board and staff as well. Section 153.200 is the Development Review Procedures. This chapter is establishing different review processes such as development plans, conditional uses, rezoning, etc. It establishes the public hearing requirements and the processes for each of those chapters. Most of the changes are just bringing things up to date. This table appears messed up, but in the final version, it will look much cleaner and easier to read. The only change that the committee made is clarifying that the city made a determination at some point and instead of publishing the hearing notices in a local newspaper, it is being published on the city website. The updated code will match the current policy. In terms of processes, there were some small changes in the processes. There were no substantial changes to non-conformities and the enforcement penalty section; therefore, both of these sections are moving forward with some minor text edits. She stated that the zoning district is where we will get into more major changes from here on out. The zoning districts chapter just establishes all of the zoning districts. This is where the new proposed districts and the districts which we are proposing to be removed are found. The committee has added in new purpose statements for the new districts. She stated the next section is the Permitted Land Uses. The committee went through and made sure that each chapter had a purpose statement. If it did not have a purpose statement, then the committee added one in. With this table, all of the zoning districts are in there. The 3 yellow ones are residential. The orange one is multi-family. There is also public facilities, the new NB district, the same GB district, the new SE district, and the existing industrial district. In the table, if it is red, it is new. The committee has added a new townhome/attached single household dwelling. It is proposed to be either a conditional or a permitted in the zones that are shown. If there is a P in this table, then it is permitted by right. If there is a PS, then it is permitted subject to certain standards. If there is a C, then it is conditional. If the box is blank, then that means that zoning is prohibited in that zoning district. Some uses were added based on new regulations. The residential treatment facilities and residential facilities is based on fair housing laws and subject to Ohio regulations which is much more of a legal thing than anything. The committee talked about short term rental quite a bit. We all landed with not allowing short term rentals. She stated that we can talk about that and if anyone had thoughts, she would like to hear them.

Ms. Hays stated that the committee had defined short term rentals as 30 days; therefore, someone could rent a house for a month or more and would not fall under the definition of short term. She asked if anyone had any questions regarding the short term rentals.

Mr. Anderson asked if it could be talked about cases where it would make more sense that it would be just conditional use development so that there is more flexibility over time so that it does not have to come back through the process to be changed again.

Ms. Fields stated that the committee talked about all of the different options and where the committee landed was that the city does not have enough of them and will likely not have the demand for enough of them to create a whole process.

Mr. Anderson stated that the uses that he was concerned about are like the Extended Stays and asked if that use would fall under hotels since they have stays that are for weeks at a time and then asked if this was just for private residential areas.

Ms. Hays confirmed that that Extended Stays would still fall under hotels and that this is for residential homes.

Mr. Okum stated that it was for single family homes or condos. The committee looked it up and short term rentals/Air B&B's are very limited in Springdale.

Ms. Fields stated that if this is one of those things that the city starts regulating, it could end up going down a rabbit hole of yearly permits, is the city going to require things, and is it really worth the city's time to do.

Mr. Anderson speaking, but not audible.

Ms. Fields responded yes.

Mr. Okum stated that one of the things that the committee thought about is how does the city track it and manage it. He stated that it just becomes an enormous amount. He stated that the committee looked at other communities doing short term rentals. He stated that it is very consistent around the region that a lot of communities are saying no to the short term rentals.

Mr. Anderson stated that his next question was going to be how the surrounding communities have looked at it and do they have the same restrictions. He stated that Glendale has Air B&B's all over the place.

Ms. Fields stated that she looked up Fairfield's code and they have them conditional with some standards. She stated that West Chester banned them everywhere except in their commercial areas; therefore, they have a mixed use situation like an apartment over a commercial use, then someone can have an Air B&B. West Chester does not allow them in a residential subdivision. This could be something like the mall for instance comes in as a PUD, it could be written into a specific thing. The mall is a singular unique situation.

Mr. Anderson confirmed that the mall would be able to do whatever they want and that this is just talking about residential units.

Ms. Fields confirmed with a yes.

Ms. Hays stated that it would be straight zoning.

Ms. Fields stated that a lot of the HOA's already ban them; therefore, they are the ones who will be maintaining those regulations and we can let them. A lot of the new uses are just use terms or clarifying use names like alcohol production we changed it we previously has we just called out breweries and so we made that more general so a lot of those kind of things are not subsequent changes but they will help. We've added charging stations with auto fueling stations, coworking facilities things urgent care centers, clarifying that they fit in under hospital or medical office.

Mr. Anderson, speaking quickly and inaudibly, speaking about state legislation for alcohol and marijuana and that state legislation just calls it intoxicating substances.

Ms. Fields replied that it is not something that has been addressed in zoning yet. She stated that she would investigate it. She stated that this is the marijuana regulations that were approved by the city. She asked if this was something that

the city would like to relook at and address how the city would look at breweries vs. marijuana.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly about people using loop holes.

Ms. Fields stated that she would look into it.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly.

Mr. Gleaves stated that the Ohio legislature is trying to weed those things out. There are drinks and vapes and they are trying to separate these things. There are a lot of places like Michigan and North Carolina that have already done that.

Ms. Fields stated that she would check some of the other states that have already done that to see what they are doing in their codes. She feels that this is going to be one of those things that is ever evolving thing in the state legislature over the next couple of years.

Mr. Gleaves, starting out inaudibly due to multiple people speaking, speaking about Party Source and being able to buy drinks, but they will only allow medical marijuana.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly spoke on this going through the courts.

Mayor Hawkins stated that what we can do is delineate alcohol vs. other intoxicating substances. We could say alcohol and non-alcohol intoxicating substances to cover anything that may come up and then it would be taken care of.

Mr. Anderson stated that this is what he was looking for.

Mayor Hawkins stated that this general terminology should take care of it.

Mr. Anderson feels that it would make sense to keep alcohol and marijuana in there. People are going to want to search the code to see what is in Springdale's code.

Ms. Fields stated that for a lot of these you can do that sort of thing in definitions, but we can figure that out. She stated that the use table will be one of the more important parts of the code. It is a great place for someone to start when looking up things in the code because it is understandable. Permitted with Standard (PS) indicates that it is permitted with additional standards that apply to it. In the final version, it will have a section number in the blank box at the end. It will have cross references and hyperlinks as well in the final version.

Mayor Hawkins stated that it is important to call out, with all of the discussion, that data centers are not permitted anywhere.

Mr. Anderson stated that data centers can go in a PUD.

Mayor Hawkins stated that they could go in a PUD, but in general data centers are not permitted.

Ms. Fields stated that it is being shown but not allowing it anywhere. She stated that it could be in the definitions so that if someone searches for it, they could find it. In the final version, the city can decide if they want it in the table or just in the definition.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly regarding data centers.

Ms. Fields stated that we do not want to stop someone that needs a data center as part of their office or industrial usage if it is a part of their overall business. That is very different from a stand alone data center.

Mr. Anderson stated that we need to be careful with the terminology. There have been discussions that are happening in places where they are starting to do hyper data centers. Inaudible information about being office size. The tech companies are getting creative and trying to get around all the zoning codes.

Ms. Field stated that she would flag that definition to make sure that we are hitting all those points. There were no other big changes as far as controversial. There were more use terms added in for industrial use as they were very general before. Artisan manufacturing is something that is being seen a lot. A lot of those uses may be more appropriate in the commercial areas. By putting these uses in there and allowing them in more places in a more appropriate way. Artisan, light & high tech, and heavy manufacturing are being separated into three different categories. Also added are distribution & logistics and research & development. We already have food processing and laboratories. Use standards have also been added for multi-use dwellings. For the residential facilities and residential treatment facilities, these requirements come from the state. These are things that come out of the ORC.

Mr. Anderson asked if there is a reason that the city has to keep it in our code as well. When the state changes their code, then the city would have to change our code.

Ms. Fields stated that she feels it helps.

Ms. Hays stated that typically we reference the ORC section; therefore, if the state changes it, then we would hope that the state will still keep the same ORC numbering.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudible regarding being restrictive.

Ms. Hays stated correct, and that the city can't make ours more restrictive than the state.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly regarding being restrictive.

Ms. Hays stated that the city cannot be more restrictive on something like that due to fair housing laws.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly regarding being restrictive.

Ms. Hays commented yes and speaking inaudibly.

Mr. Okum asked Mr. Ramirez what the city charter says and if the city can be more restrictive.

Mr. Braun stated that we cannot be more restrictive on certain things because of the Fair Housing Act. He stated that he has this section marked off to review and would take a look at it. He stated that Mr. Anderson's point is correct that as the law evolves, the city wants to evolve as well. When changes occur, then we can put something in there that will catch that.

Ms. Fields stated that if it is more appropriate to reference having to do that too, then we can do whatever we need to do from a legal standpoint.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly regarding residential treatment and group housing units.

Mr. Braun, since Mr. Anderson brought up group housing, asked if those were zoned to certain areas.

Ms. Fields stated that the city has put them into different densities. If they are the size of a single family home, then they are permitted every that a single family home would be permitted. Then if they are group 1-5 occupants or 6-15 occupants it is regulated in a different way. She stated that if any of that needs to be changed due to legal things, let her know.

Mr. Anderson stated that this does not have to be solved tonight. Inaudibly speaking.

Ms. Fields moved on to public and institutional use standards. This is something that was specifically added for parks, playgrounds, playing fields, open spaces, and sports courts. A 100 foot setback requirement has been added due to noise and how it affects the surrounding property owners. If there is a park next to a residential property, then the playground or sports court would have to be set back by 100 feet no matter the sport so that it buffers that noise from the residential. Even though this is not something that is seen a lot, the city is trying to get ahead of some of the complaints that cities are hearing.

Mr. Okum stated that this does not include the City of Springdale's Community Center.

Ms. Fields stated that Mr. Okum is correct. Any existing ones will be fine, but if new ones are constructed, then they would have to have a 100 foot setback.

Mr. Anderson asked about repaving or resurfacing.

Ms. Fields stated that if they wanted to expand, then the 100 foot setback would have to be adhered to.

Mr. Anderson and Ms. Fields conversing inaudibly over different items that would have to adhere to the 100 foot setback.

Ms. Fields moved into the commercial use standards. She believes that the only thing changed was name change for brewery.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly.

Ms. Fields speaking regarding being under a certain number and the sizes of the breweries. We are still doing this as large and small scale. Another thing that the committee is trying to do is to create a distinction between automotive modifications and automotive repair. Modifications does not need the same kind of buffering as actual repairs. We are creating definitions to make them into two different categories/uses. She asked the group if there was a car wash standard. She doesn't feel as if these standards are new. Currently there is only retail sales in the code. With the NB district that is being proposed, we want to make sure that we are allowing smaller scale retail uses in the NB district; however, we do not want a Walmart or Target in that district. Walmart or Target type stores belong in the GB (General Business) district such as Kemper Rd. In the smaller areas that are closer to the residential zoning, the intent is for it to be a more walkable, more neighborhood scaled place. We want to put that divider between retail sales. That line is at 20,000 SF which is large. Ms. Fields believes that something like an Aldi or Trader Joe's would fall under that. It would be more of a medium size such as a Walgreen's, which would classify as small scale, but would keep out the larger big box stores. Some things were added for landscaping, rocks, and similar business requirements, so we can speak to outdoor storage and vehicle storage yards. There is a new accessory and temporary structure chapter.

Mr. Anderson asked why the ADU's (Accessory Dwelling Units) were crossed out.

Mr. Okum asked Mr. Anderson to speak up.

Mr. Anderson again asked why the ADU's were crossed out and asked if they were replaced by a different section.

Ms. Hays stated that it was not in the code. She stated that the committee thought about putting it in, but the committee went back and forth and decided not to put it in.

Mr. Anderson asked why the committee decided not to put it in the code.

Ms. Hays stated that the general consensus was that we already have an issue with overparking and overcrowded homes. The concern was that if ADUs were allowed, it would put more strain on the parking and overcrowding issues.

Mr. Anderson questioned them even being in the high and low density estates. He stated that he understands why we couldn't have them in the high density, but now what the committee is proposing is to not even have them in the low density.

Ms. Hays stated that we are not allowing them across the board. She stated that they may be built for the right intent but could become a rental property.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly about short term rentals.

Ms. Hays stated that it then becomes a long term rental. This was discussed as a group and the main concern was parking and then it becoming a rental.

Mr. Okum stated that most of the zoning codes based upon means and bounds and how much density there is. He stated that Mr. Anderson was correct about the high density and low density, and it may be something that we look at in the future, but it is going to take some work to get to that.

Ms. Hays stated that if you have a single family property now, then it will now become a 2-family home.

Mr. Anderson stated that there are restrictions for the number of houses or unit-like houses on a lot. He is now speaking more quickly and inaudible. He stated that he gets questions about it. He stated that we need to come back to this and that it is on a follow up list.

Mr. Okum stated that this is the purpose of the meeting.

Mr. Anderson stated to star it.

Ms. Webster stated that she has a questions about the removal of regulations for domesticated pets and animals.

Ms. Fields stated that this is something that she needed clarification on as well. She stated that she had it marked that they were removing the dogs and cats but was unsure about the chickens and bees.

Ms. Hays stated that dogs and cats are permitted and chickens are not permitted.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly regarding regulations.

Ms. Fields stated that the committee had talked about removing the maximum regulation for dogs and cats. It is something that is not seen in zoning codes. This is the only community that she has ever seen this regulation.

Mr. Anderson stated Ms. Fields better be careful because Council just added and modified that less than a year ago and he is just saying that more discussion needs to be had. Inaudible verbiage.

Ms. Hays inaudible verbiage regarding limitations.

Mr. Anderson clarifying the ordinance and limitations surrounding the dogs and cats.

Ms. Fields stated that based on this conversation that some things need to be added back in. She feels that we should have a bigger discussion on whether or not the dogs and cats get removed.

Mr. Anderson stated that this might be something that is looked at in the next round.

Ms. Fields stated that she could leave it in for now.

Mr. Anderson stated that because Council just recently affirmed it, it just feels weird to change it without a discussion.

Mr. Okum stated that we are the only community that has this section in our zoning code. It does not mean that this cannot be addressed by another means within our standards of the community. It is very odd and he is neutral on it.

Mr. Anderson clarifying if Mr. Okum is saying to just keep it in the ordinances.

Mr. Okum stated that he feels that the ordinances would be a better place for it, but we can speak to Mr. Braun about that. The committee talked about it in the meeting and it is just not appropriate for the zoning code revisions. By ordinance and regulations for the city, the standards can be enforced without it being part of the zoning code.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly regarding the regulations and standards.

Ms. Fields stated that we will ignore the dogs and cats' issue for right now. She stated that there is a new Accessory Structure table. The main changes were updated terms. There were also some substantial changes. Currently the code states that only one accessory structure is permitted. It is proposed that two be permitted, but the calculations of square footage vs. green space will remain the same. This will add more flexibility.

Ms. Hays stated that most of the time the building department runs into issues with individuals wanting a shed and a pergola vs. individuals wanting two sheds.

Ms. Fields stated that the dumpsters were moved to a different place in the code. She stated that a new regulation that was added to this section is EV charging regulations. The committee is proposing that EV charging stations be divided into different charging levels. This would allow smaller charging stations to be anywhere and the larger charging stations would go into places like parking lots. Definitions will be added and put into categories based on these levels.

Mr. Anderson asked if we needed to change the language. Now speaking more quickly and inaudibly.

Ms. Fields stated that there is nothing in the zoning code.

Ms. Webster stated that she knows some people that have a playhouse or dollhouse and asked if they could have a shed as well as the playhouse or dollhouse.

Ms. Fields stated that the committee is clarifying that a child's playhouse or play structure are exempt from the regulations; however, the play structure must be in the back yard. She stated that something can be added to the definition.

Mr. Anderson speaking quickly and inaudibly regarding the definitions for the play structures.

Ms. Fields stated that she could check into it. She moved on to the new dimensional standards chapter. A lot of the regulations have not changed and are being moved around from one place to another. She stated that she is aligning some terms for the residential requirements. Currently there is a very complicated calculation for the sizes of detached garages. It is proposed to leave in the minimum and maximum garage sizes but simplify it while keeping the same regulations.

Ms. Hays stated that staff appreciates that change.

Ms. Fields stated that in the table for the non-residential districts, there will be the new NB and the new SE districts. It is proposed that a B district be added which is similar to the OB district. The committee is proposing to lower the maximum height and the setback for the dimensional standards. She stated that if anyone had any thoughts on this to let her know. Some of these things are helpful for staff to be able to determine things like lot width and building height. There will be graphics in the code when the final version comes out.

Mr. Anderson stated that this was a big important change that was made.

Ms. Fields stated that the big thing in this section is the new architecture and building design standards. All of this is brand new to the code. These would apply to substantial expansions of existing commercial and industrial uses. It would also apply to new commercial and industrial uses. There are different standards for those different uses and there is more leniency for those uses, but we are establishing some minimums. Planning Commission would be the board that would be able to waive architectural standards; therefore, it would be necessary to loop that review and discussion in with the development plan. It would be reviewed with the site plan, landscape plan, and building elevations so that it is one discussion to make the process more streamlined.

Mr. Anderson asked if this would be just Planning Commission's word.

Ms. Fields stated that we have review processes everywhere else.

Mr. Anderson stated that it seems as if it should be just Planning Commission's word.

Ms. Hays asked if this would fall under plan review.

Ms. Fields stated that she believes so.

Mr. Anderson speaking on this case but was inaudible.

Ms. Hays stated that there is a development plan review that Planning Commission would do for any new development.

Multiple people were talking over each other.

Mr. Okum stated that if Planning Commission should waiver, then we would be the appeal process to a standard that is not being met.

Ms. Hays stated that the appeal process would be the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Anderson asked what if the applicant does not like the Planning Commission's decision.

Multiple people were talking over each other.

Ms. Hays stated that if the applicant does not like the Planning Commission's decision that it would go before the Board of Zoning Appeals if they chose to appeal it.

Ms. Fields stated that she would add it to the administrative table so that it is in there so that there would be no questioning it. In terms of other regulations, we have exterior building requirements. The requirements for commercial buildings are stricter and more intense; however, we are trying to be flexible with those requirements. The intent is to have higher quality building materials facing the public. For industrial use, we are adding in some additional requirements. If anyone has any questions or thoughts, let her know. Ms. Fields moved on to parking. The development standards for parking, landscaping, signage, etc. did not have many changes. There was an administrative waiver of parking spaces added. An explanation would allow staff to waive up to 25% of the required parking. The percentage of how much can be waived would be up to the city. There were not a lot of changes to the outdoor lighting requirements. The main thing here is that currently in the code, there are lighting requirements based on activity level. It is proposed that we have a maximum height and average illumination of fixtures based on use category. These categories are being established in the permitted use table.

Mr. Anderson speaking about BZA and people wanting to talk about things but was inaudible.

Ms. Fields stated that we are not changing how we measure it.

Mr. Okum stated that the standard for the distance from the residential is still the same as it was before.

Mr. Anderson stated that the residents were concerned about the height because they could see the light at the point of illumination.

Mr. Okum stated that one of the biggest problems is over lighting and/or spotlighting.

Mr. Anderson speaking, but inaudible.

Ms. Fields stated that we are changing it to be a little stricter at the property line.

Mr. Okum stated that residential to residential should be adjustable.

Ms. Fields stated that lighting codes can be very complicated. For landscaping and buffer yards, one thing that is being clarified is the applicability. We have broken it down into categories to make it a little more clear.

Mr. Okum stated that have to meet the original build landscaping approved plan.

Mr. Anderson speaking on compliance.

Mr. Okum stated that if the original is modified, then it would have to be brought back into compliance.

Ms. Fields stated that another non-substantial change is that the current code has a long tree list. Most communities are taking that out of their code and use standalone handouts. We are trying to be nimbler to be able to change a

landscaping requirement. Our code is currently grouped A, B, C, and D. The regulation is not changing, it is just being reworded. Pulling the plant list out of code, we are trying to make the code more user friendly. In relation to signs, it is proposed that the illumination change is that a wall sign be illuminated by only one light source.

Ms. Hays stated that Wing Stop is a great example.

Mr. Anderson stated that some are simply decorative.

Ms. Hays stated that right now we require internally illuminated which has been problematic.

Ms. Fields stated that a certain amount of wall signs are based on frontage. Some business have two sides to the building that show. It is proposed to allow additional wall signs on the sides of a building that faces an access drive, etc. This will allow us to be more flexible than we currently are. Window signs are currently separated as permanent and temporary. It is proposed to make this into one. Staff will be able to determine whether window signs are temporary or permanent. For electronic fuel price displays has come up that applicants want the price signs on the fascia of the fuel canopies. We are now proposing that they can have it subject to a certain percentage of the canopy. It is proposed to change temporary wall signs like for sale, for rent, under construction, etc. will be able to have up for up to 12 months instead of the current short term regulations.

Ms. Hays stated that the 12 months is more for advertisements such as for rent or lease. There is limited time for special event type signs.

Ms. Fields stated that it is proposed to remove the regulation for special event balloon such as cow balloons, fox balloons, duck balloons etc. We are saying no to those. The change proposed for the PUDs permitted uses will allow more flexibility on the uses.

Mr. Okum stated that Planning Commission could have considered something as a PUD. This will make it clearer.

Ms. Fields stated that there were not many changes to density and dimensional space. There was language added that clarifies what qualifies as open space or not. Also added was that residential PUDs must have a residential amenity. Adding a design and architectural requirements for residential. We are trying to raise the bar. For non-residential and mixed PUDs, we will use citywide standards which is similar to current.

Mr. Anderson asked about this being subjective.

Ms. Hays stated that it is our interpretation that it can be appealed at the Board of Zoning Appeals and appeal our interpretation.

Mr. Anderson inaudible.

Mr. Fields stated that a lot of these do have a specific number of requirements.

Mr. Anderson speaking on the appeal process. It needs to be consistent.

Ms. Fields stated that due to the previous language for major and minor modifications, we have added in new examples and standards as to what would qualify under either. We are not going through the definitions. We will do another shot in the definitions area. If there are questions or comments, please let the committee know.

Mr. Okum asked about smoke shops and if they are limited to a distance.

Ms. Hays stated that a minimum distance was set.

Mr. Anderson goes back to intoxicating product conversation. Inaudible.

Mr. Okum speaking on infused THC Delta 8 drinks.

Mr. Anderson stated that there has to be a better way to describe that type of business so that it is obvious.

Ms. Hays stated that maybe the definition of vapes, etc. needs to be looked at.

Ms. Fields stated that all of this is being discussed at Planning Commission next week and it is expected to be sent for adoption in August.

Mayor Hawkins asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Anderson and seconded by Ms. McFarland.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting by Mr. Jacobs and seconded by Ms. McFarland.

Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Retha Bullock, Clerk
Planning Commission/Board of Zoning Appeals

Minutes Approved:

_____, 2026 _____
Jeffrey Anderson, City Council

_____, 2026 _____
David Okum, Planning Commission

_____, 2026 _____
Tom Hall, Board of Zoning Appeals