



**City of Jordan  
City Planning Commission  
January 11, 2011**

**Members Present:** Rolf Hafslund; Council Representative Pete Ewals; John Watkins; Guy Beck; John Levar.

**Staff Present:** Senior Planner Joe Janish; Planning Consultant, Joanne Foust, MDG Inc,

**Others Present:** Thom Boncher, Pastor Joseph Thunker, Al Weierke.

**1.0 Call to Order.**

*Chair Hafslund called the Planning Commission to order at 6:31 pm.*

**2.0 Adopt Agenda.**

Janish noted it may be appropriate to discuss the Design Review items prior to the CGO Discussion.

*Motion Levar seconded by Beck to approve agenda with amendment. Motion unanimously approved.*

**3.0 Approval of Minutes.**

**A. December 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

*Motion Watkins, with amendments, seconded by Levar to approve the December 14, 2010 minutes with revisions as noted. Motion approved 4-0-1 (Ewals abstain).*

**B. December 14, 2010 Workshop Meeting Minutes**

*Motion Beck, seconded by Watkins to approve the December 14, 2010. Motion approved 4-0-1 (Ewals abstained).*

**4.0 CGO Discussion.**

**A. Commercial/Industrial Zoning Districts and Performance Standards**

Planning Consultant Foust reviewed the proposed industrial Zoning District Amendments. The Planning Commission discussed the new language related to “grandfathering” of parcels under 1 acre and 150 feet in width. The language was related to lots of record. It was noted that the lots with a width below the 150 feet mark is also under the one acre minimum so the same language would apply related to the grandfathering.

It was noted that the architectural standards could be included as part of an EDA survey related to business retention and expansion survey.

Members reviewed a redlined copy of the Industrial Ordinance with changes from the December meeting incorporated, and a flyer and maps to be sent to owners of land currently zoned or guided to be zoned industrial.

Direction was also provided to look into indoor firearm ranges and if it would be permissible to have one in this type of zoning classification.

Members also indicated it may be appropriate to speak with the Railroad to determine what type of requirements exist to construct a spur off the tracks on the North side of Highway 169.

*Motion Levar, seconded Watkins to set a Public Hearing on February 8<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m. or there soon after. Motion passed unanimously.*

## **5.0 Public Hearings.**

None.

## **6.0 New Business.**

### **A. Organization Structure**

Janish noted that at the beginning of each year the Planning Commission is responsible to select a Chair and Vice-Chair position. Mr. Janish stated that Hafslund, Levar, and Watkins are potential individuals to serve as Chair for the Planning Commission in 2011.

*Motion Levar, seconded Beck to nominate Rolf Hafslund as Chair for 2011. Motion approved 4-0-1 (Hafslund abstain).*

*Motion Hafslund, seconded Watkins to nominate Levar as Vice-Chair for 2011. Motion approved 4-0-1 (Levar abstain).*

### **B. Design Review – 212 S. Broadway Street**

The Planning Commission reviewed the application submitted by Mr. Weierke and indicated changes to be made to the building. The Planning Commission noted the applicant should consider a new window to enlarge the current window and also a new door. The PC also noted the applicant could repaint the structure and would probably provide a better finished product.

The Planning Commission delayed action until the next item.

### **C. Design Review – 216 S. Broadway Street**

The Planning Commission reviewed the application submitted by Mr. Weierke. The PC provided some direction to the applicant on changes to the proposal which included: changes the stone to Indiana Limestone, selected one color for stucco and noted on the alley side a second darker color should be selected for the lower portion with banding separating the two. Members also asked for a revised drawing for both the front and alley side of the building. Mr. Weierke also discussed some other improvements that need to occur on the property as well, including a new roof.

*Motion Watkins, seconded Beck to hold a special meeting with a date to be determined to again review applications for 212 and 216 S. Broadway Street with revised drawings and if an application is received in time for the property at 106 First Street (the property where the awning collapsed). Motion approved unanimously.*

#### **D. Design Review – 312 Water Street**

Senior Planner Janish stated Pastor Joseph Thunker is seeking assistance as part of the façade improvement on 312 Water Street. The Planning Commission had reviewed this application late in 2010 and had requested some additional information. The EDA had reviewed the application in 2010 as well; however the applicant decided to seek funding in 2011 in order to seek a larger dollar contribution through the program.

Pastor Thunker’s project is providing a facelift to the building at 312 Water Street. The improvements include refurbishing the front of the building. The application notes the improvements are needed for two primary reasons. The first is to meet A.D.A. requirements, while the second is to provide an appearance of a church and ministry center rather than a warehouse with a garage door in its center.

*Motion Watkins, seconded Levar, to recommend a favorable response to the review of the application as it relates to the Design Standards of the Downtown area. Motion passed unanimously.*

#### **E. Annual CUP and IUP Review**

Senior Planner Janish provided a list of CUP and IUP permits that have been issued by the City of Jordan. Janish noted that the list is reviewed annually and only if complaints have occurred does the city look into the issues to determine if the applicant has become non-compliant.

Mayor Ewals noted that the City should go out and physically inspect the property to be certain they are still compliant. Janish noted he is not aware of many cities that have the resources to physically inspect all the properties to be certain they are still complaint with the conditions in the CUP. Janish noted it was his understanding that is why the City of Jordan has only looked into issues if a complaint is received to be certain that something is not out of alignment with the requirements.

Janish also noted in the past members of the Council and Planning Commission had questioned why an applicant column exists and it is because some of the CUP are filed under the applicants name and it correlates to the file folder.

Janish noted that a letter was sent to “Crittter Getter” indicating the IUP has expired and the owner had noted they intend to seek another extension and would be in front of the Planning Commission in February for an extension consideration.

Janish also noted that previously members have mentioned that Clancy’s has not provided the “greening” part of the CUP and would like to see that complete. However, due to the weather Janish indicated a timeline should be established to have the “greening” installed in the spring or summer.

*Motion Levar, seconded Watkins to approve the list of CUP and IUP’s with reviewing the CUP for 220 Traingle Lane in June of 2011 to be certain the “greening” requirement has been met; and also*

*delay consideration of the IUP until the February meeting at which time the applicant has indicated an extension would be sought. Motion approved unanimously.*

## **F. Tattoo Discussion**

Janish provided a handout for licensing requirements for Tattoo Establishments, along with some zoning information on how the City of Belle Plaine and New Prague handle this type of use. Janish noted he had hoped for more information for the meeting but would provide additional responses at the next meeting for commissioners to consider possible locations for a Tattoo Establishment. Janish noted that he is not aware of such a use wanting to enter the City of Jordan, but thought it would be better to have the discussion prior to a request.

## **7.0 Old Business.**

### **A. Appointments**

Janish noted that the Mayor had recommended appointment of one of the consensus candidates and staff is looking for direction for the commission. Janish noted a few options the Planning Commission could pursue, one would be to recommend to the Mayor appointment of the previous candidates, open the advertisement up again, or consider an option not yet thought of.

Mayor Ewals noted that staff should provide an overview on what has occurred since the recommendation. Janish noted that the City Council has held a first reading of an ordinance in which the City Council as a whole would vote on the recommendation from the commissions and the Mayor would no longer make a recommendation directly to the City Council.

Mayor Ewals also noted that the new process would reduce the applicants because individuals would be able to comment on the recommendations and open discussion would occur at the council about each of the candidates.

Commissioner Levar noted that he thought the Planning Commission may want to develop a list of “skill sets” for the applicants and then potentially consider either recommending from the existing pool or seeking additional applicants.

Staff was directed into looking if other communities provide a list of “skill sets” and if so what those entail.

## **8.0 Planners Report.**

Janish noted that legislation had been introduced to amend the variance language within State Statute. Janish also commented if the legislation continues to gain traction that the proposed bill would be shared with the Planning Commission at a future meeting.

## **9.0 Commissioner Report.**

None.

## **10.0 Adjournment.**

*Motion Watkins, seconded Levar to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:15 p.m. Motion unanimously approved.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Janish  
Senior Planner