

## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 9, 2017**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Nathan Rau at 7:30 PM

Roll call was taken: **Present: Gardner, Hicks, Vogt, Lutz, Childers and Rau.**

Chairman Rau asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the November 14, 2016 meeting. A motion was made by Lutz and seconded by Gardner to approve the minutes of the November 14, 2016 meeting as presented. Motion carried.

The Chairman asked if there were any citizens to address the Planning Commission. There were none.

The Chairman also asked if there were any corrections or deletions to the agenda. There were none.

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

The Chairman asked if there was any old business. There was none.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

The Chairman asked if there was any new business. There was none.

### **PETITIONS:**

#### **Z-17-01-01 Review and Comment on Possible Zoning Text Amendment to Section 40-3-2(B) regarding Commercial Accessory Building Roofing Materials.**

No one was present to speak on behalf of the petition; hence the Zoning Administrator spoke on behalf of this request. Mystic Oak Golf Course is building a pavilion to replace the log cabin that was destroyed by a fire. Under the current ordinance, the accessory building is required to match the building materials of the primary building. In this case, their accessory building (pavilion) would need to have an asphalt shingled roof. Due to the layout of the land, Mystic Oak believes that an asphalt roof would not be aesthetically pleasing, and they would like to install a green standing metal seam roof. In order to use a standing metal seam roof, a zoning text change would need to be made. The City Council met with Mystic Oak Golf Course and agreed to approve a change in the Zoning Text to allow standing metal seam roofs within golf courses and within the parks district due to the natural and open environment of these areas. The language presented in this petition was drafted by the City Attorney with the input from the City Council. Childers asked where this would stop..ie..would churches, schools etc...start asking for similar additions/changes to the amendment to meet their needs and with enough changes for allowances, would the zoning text eventually become useless, even though a standing metal seam room is superior in quality to an asphalt shingled roof. Lutz asked why the proposed amendment text was only for golf courses and parks, and why weren't all commercial accessory buildings included with the amendment change. Another suggestion was why not have all accessory roofing exceptions be granted on a case-by-case basis, similar to a special use permit. Rau questioned why conformity and color of the roof was not addressed, ie...pitch roof buildings on the property and then a new structure with a flat roof or someone installing a pink roof or some other non-conforming color.

**Motion was made by Childers and seconded by Hicks to recommend approval for the Proposed Zoning Text Amendment to Section 40-3-2(B) regarding Commercial Accessory Building Roofing Materials with the addition of the following language:**

**The accessory roof must complement the existing structure(s) and the roof color be submitted on the architecture plans.**

**Members voted as follows: YES – Gardner, Hicks, Vogt, Lutz, Childers and Rau.**

**Motion carried.**

**Z-17-01-02 Review and Comment on Possible Zoning Text Amendment to Section 40-2-3(B) regarding the addition of Gym/Training/Fitness Center to B-2 General Business District, Special Use Permits Required.**

The Zoning Administrator stated that this requested zoning text amendment is a result of the owner of Fast Fitness Boot Camp applying for a sign at 1301 Jamie Lane. During the process, it was discovered that gym, training and/or fitness centers were not allowed in a B-2 Business District. The site of the proposed Fast Fitness Boot Camp is located within a B-2 zoned area. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would add Gym/Training/Fitness Center as a Special Use permit in a B-2 zoned General Business District. Currently Gym/Training/Fitness Centers are only allowed in B-3, Central Business Districts under “personal service uses”. The request to have Gym/Training/Fitness Center listed as a Special Use Permit will allow for restrictions verses a permitted use. It was suggested to remove the language of “personal service uses” and replace it with Gym/Training/Fitness Center.

**Motion was made by Vogt and seconded by Gardner to recommend approval for the Proposed Zoning Text Amendment to Section 40-2-3(B) regarding the addition of Gym/Training/Fitness Center to B-2 General Business District, Special Use Permits Required. The Planning Commission also recommends adding the term “Gym/Training/Fitness Center” as a permitted use in the B-3, Central Business District.**

**Members voted as follows: YES – Gardner, Hicks, Vogt, Lutz, Childers and Rau.**

**Motion carried.**

**Z-17-01-03 Review and Comment on Possible Special Use Permit to allow for a Fitness Center to be located in a B-2 Zoning District at 1301 Jamie Lane as permitted by Section 40-2-3(B).**

Mr. Chad Skinner, owner of Fast Fitness Boot Camp, was present to speak on behalf of this petition. The fitness center is a group training environment where people exercise without tread mills, machines or heavy weights. The exercise program is body weight driven with some kick boxing. The program will aid in keeping people motivated and offers assistance in nutrition and weight loss.

**Motion was made by Hicks and seconded by Vogt to recommend approval for the Special Use Permit to allow for a Fitness Center to be located in a B-2 Zoning District at 1301 Jamie Lane as permitted by Section 40-2-3(B).**

**Members voted as follows: YES – Gardner, Hicks, Vogt, Lutz, Childers and Rau.**

**Motion carried.**

**Discussion on Comprehensive Plan with Todd Streiler of Streiler Planning**

Todd Streiler was present to provide an update on the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Streiler mentioned that the comprehensive plan is approximately half way complete. The Zoning Administrator added that

completion of the Comprehensive Plan is not date driven, but will be delivered when the product (plan) is completed. It was suggested that most of Chapter 2 – “Critical Issues”, could be moved into an Appendix since the majority of the chapter focused on the survey response. Comments were made that the flow from Chapter 1 and 2 into Chapter 3 was choppy and inconsistent. Mr. Streiler stated that after we have general consensus on Chapter Three – “Vision, Goals and Objectives”, then the next step will be the “Future Land Use Plan and Map” which will tie everything together. Discussion this evening focused on comments and feedback to Chapter Three – “Vision, Goals and Objectives”. Suggestions were made to revisit Section 3.1 – “Waterloo’s Vision”, and combine and refine the bullet points. Comments were made on the diversification of the housing stock on page five (5). It was believed this section should be amended with a focus on encouraging the purchase of existing housing stock versus encouraging the development of homes for first time home owners. The Committee also requested the development of ADA and other building grants to assist in the conversion of downtown buildings into affordable housing and business stock. There was general discussion on sidewalks and the maintenance of the sidewalks. It was decided this would be better addressed in Chapter Three. Taxes were again mentioned as an issue, however, data still needs to be compiled, and we still need to compare taxes and tax allocations to our surrounding cities and counties. Mr. Streiler again stated that he thought it was just a perception that taxes in Waterloo are high. It was recommended that there needs to be more emphasis on our schools and the level of education that they supply. The question also arose if the city had the capability to perform all the implementation strategies and performance measures as suggested by the plan. Mr. Streiler stated the performance measures would be a quantifiable check to see what had been done and implemented for a particular goal. Under Section 3.2 Section 7 – “Make Waterloo a Great Place to Start a Business”, it was questioned if we really want to publish business incentives such as waiving or discounting permit fees. It was also suggested that all acronyms be defined. Conversation eventually moved to the question of who the audience was for this plan. Mr. Streiler stated the audience was everyone. Regarding transportation objections, the question arose on how much did things change now that Illinois Route 3 is composed of five (5) lanes. Mr. Streiler also mentioned that some recommendations were given to him by the City itself, example...a signal light at the intersection of Gall Road and Illinois Route 3. There are several businesses interested in moving to Waterloo, but they require a signalized intersection. Another signalized intersection is at Rose Lane and Illinois Route 3.

**Motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:10 PM was made by Hicks and seconded by Vogt.  
Motion carried.**

Minutes respectfully submitted by Mechelle Childers.

