

Village of Fall Creek
Minutes of Public Hearing and Plan Commission Meeting
August 3, 2022

1. **Call to Order:** 5:00 p.m., Village Hall Meeting Room, 122 E. Lincoln Ave., Fall Creek
2. **Roll Call:** Members Present: Village President Tim Raap, William Boettcher, John Kuehn, Evan Nyberg, Curt Van Auken. Members Arriving Later: Curt Strasburg. Members Absent: Chester Goodman. Staff Present: Village Administrator/Public Works Director Jared McKee, Clerk/Treasurer Renee Roemhild. Also Present: 2 citizens.
3. **Certify Open Meeting Law Requirements Have Been Met:** A notice of the meeting and the agenda was posted at the three public places and local newspapers were notified. A notice of the public hearing was published in the Leader Telegram.
4. **Adopt Agenda:**
 - MOTION (Kuehn/Van Auken) to adopt the agenda with moving agenda item #7 ahead of #5. Member Curt Strasburg arrived. PASSED, without negative vote.
7. **Comprehensive Plan Review/Research:** Chairperson Tim Raap explained the Village's Comprehensive Plan is a 20-year plan but it should be reviewed around the 10-year mark, so we're trying to get that accomplished now. At the last meeting, the Plan was broken into sections and designated for members to review, primarily looking at if there is anything that could use some updating or revisiting to see if our goals for the community are still in line. The members each stated their review and suggested updates for their respective chapters, with discussion taking place that the statistics are outdated, but until it's time to do a complete re-write in 2030, there isn't much purpose in redoing the statistics and surveys as it is very costly and doesn't buy us a lot at this point. William Boettcher clarified some State Statutes and technical terms, as well as reiterating that this is a planning document to give guidance for new development – it is specifying how you want to grow not critiquing what is already in existence, but a plan to give a vision for the future growth. Administrator Jared McKee will check the Statutes regarding any requirements such as public hearings for the review process and will check with West Central Regional Planning Commission for any grant availability updates they can give us for free.
5. **Public Hearing on Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments:** President Raap opened the public hearing and gave a quick walk-through of the main proposed amendments:
 - R1A (high density residential) lot width – currently 75 feet, proposed 70 feet to match with common development trends,
 - Basements – currently required, proposed eliminating the requirement as haven't found many other communities that require it,
 - Twin Homes – currently not in Code, proposed adding to get up-to-date with development trends,
 - Formatting changes,
 - Corrected broken references that pointed to incorrect or non-existent sections,
 - Some definitions added,
 - Permitted and conditional uses, as well as building requirements, setbacks, dimensional requirements, etc. are now in a table format to make it easier to read and decipher.

President Raap asked if there were any citizens who wished to comment.

- Vern Ming – Questioned how many public hearings there would be. Reply was that the topic has been on the agendas for several meetings, this is the official public hearing but there will be at least two more public meetings with the Board before any ordinance change would be passed.
- Vern Ming - Questioned the reduction in the lot width, concerned that people will not be able to park all their “toys”. Reply was that the reduced lot width is being considered for only one

residential district, as the reduced width relates more consistently with other communities' higher density districts. It is a way to make homes be more affordable. Not all residential districts would have smaller lot sizes. A developer would present their sketch plan, but it is the governing body that would decide the best use for that section of land. However, you must keep in mind that it is a trade-off. If you want development to come, you must keep up with current trends and set your requirements at a level that is comparable with other municipalities. We have a good market, people want to live here, and we don't have inventories for all the people that want to live here, but we will not have developers come if our restrictions are more than what is common in other communities making it too expensive for the developer and ultimately the home buyer.

- Karen Strasburg – Commented that when you are talking about reducing a lot size, it wouldn't be for the entire development. We are due for a development. It would be a shame to not move forward and make some changes to our ordinances so that can happen. We can still have the control over what the development is like.
- Vern Ming – Thinks there should be provisions for green space and thinks there should be a dog park in the Village.

With no other comments at 6:24 p.m., President Raap closed the public hearing.

- 6. Plan Commission Recommendation on Zoning Ordinance Amendments (Repealing Chapter 268; Amending and Recreating as Title 16):** Discussion took place on the lot width and lot sizes, with some concerns voiced regarding not wanting to get lots too narrow, but then also comments understanding it is the result of a price component due to the increased cost of road construction and that this is what the industry is going to. Many of the buyers for homes in a high-density residential district will be your first-time home buyers or your retirement buyers looking to down-size. Also discussed was the fact that when you have a developer come that is building the homes as well as selling the lots, the developer goes through extensive marketing studies to determine what is selling and they won't build something that they think they will have trouble selling. They are currently having no problems selling homes on smaller lots in other communities.

The commission continued to work through the points, item by item, discussing things like the definition of side yard vs. front yard as it relates to corner lots, basements, parking lots, warehouses, etc. Discussion again took place that if we want developers to come, we need to be competitive with what other communities are offering. Due to the significance of the issues, the Plan Commission decided they wanted to take more time to think about and review the proposed amendments.

- MOTION (Boettcher/Strasburg) to table until the next meeting. PASSED, without negative vote.

- 7. Adjournment @ 7:33 p.m.**

Renee Roemhild, Clerk-Treasurer