RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION

Held: Monday, October 27, 2025

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Schneider called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Chairperson Karen Walters	Absent
Greg Canda	Present
Council Rep. Doug Steidl	Present
Mayor Daniel Schneider, Jr.	Present
Kevin Royer	Present

OTHERS PRESENT: Village Planner Rita McMahon, Solicitor Brad Bryan, Administrative Assistant Faith Dorton

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES:
September 22, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting

Mr. Canda requested that the Minutes be amended to reflect that the 'wood store' is the River Light Gallery and clarify that Ms. Walters was in favor of clear evaluation criteria for parking requirement evaluations if the ordinance is amended to empower the Planning Commission to make such determinations. He then made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Steidl to approve the Minutes with Mr. Canda's requested amendments. Roll call vote: Mr. Royer, yes; Mr. Canda, yes; Mayor Schneider, yes; Mr. Steidl, yes. The Minutes were approved.

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION: None.

MAYOR'S REPORT: The Mayor announced that Trick-or-Treating is scheduled for Friday, October 31 from 6:00 p.m. until 8:00 p.m. Mr. Canda asked if there was any community gathering or party at the school or elsewhere. The Mayor said there was not this year.

COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: Mr. Steidl reported Council was advised the Downtown Master Plan was approved by the Commission as a stand-alone document from the Long-Range Plan. The Zoning Map amendment ordinance had a first reading at this month's meeting. Two more readings and a public hearing will take place. Mr. Canda noted that during Citizens Participation at this month's Council Meeting, Ms. Riggins raised concerns about whether additional parking variances were needed for the River Light Gallery and Coffee House parcels. Mr. Canda asked whether such approvals would fall to Council, the Planning Commission, the BZA, or be handled within the rezoning ordinance itself. Ms. McMahon responded that no new variances would be required. The setbacks for all the properties comply with the Code and an existing parking variance was already granted involving the Coffee Shop and River Light Gallery lots. If there are any issues, the properties and businesses are considered legal nonconforming uses that do not require variances unless the use of the property changes later.

BUSINESS:
Proposed Amendments to Village Parking Ord. and Pertinent Parts of Schedule of Regulations: Chapter 1125 & Section 1113.01

Ms. McMahon provided updated hard copies of the draft changes showing all proposed deletions (crossed out) and additions (underlined). Those indications did not come through in the online packet. She noted the draft contemplates a significant policy shift for the Commercial and Mixed-Use district requirements. Instead of fixed minimum parking requirements, applicants would propose the number of spaces they believe are appropriate, and the Commission would evaluate those proposals using clearly defined criteria as part of its site plan review. The changes also include revised off-street parking and loading rules, the removal of the detailed loading standards, and a reiteration that parking and loading arrangements would be approved through the Planning Commission review.

Ms. McMahon further explained the Code would expand the allowable distance for shared or off-site parking from 300 feet to 500 feet, noting that several existing lots fall within that radius. In response, Mr. Slocum suggested considering a quarter mile. Mr. Canda expressed concern about allowing that much flexibility, getting credited for parking spaces that far away, and the potential for that change to worsen the Village's already poor parking situation. Ms. McMahon cited the example of businesses and visitors using the Methodist Church parking lot. She also proposed clarifying language about when the Zoning Officer versus the Planning Commission approves parking plans. Accessory apartments above retail uses would be required to have at least one on-site parking space.

The group then discussed the existing parking requirements for multi-family dwellings, particularly the requirement that a three-bedroom unit effectively needs four spaces. Mr. Steidl stated he thought that was excessive. Mr. Canda asked how these rules intersect with short-term rental regulations. Ms. McMahon and Mr. Bryan clarified that short-term rentals are governed by a separate business ordinance with its own parking requirements that must still be met, regardless of the Zoning Code. Ms. McMahon also noted the draft contains a new maximum building footprint standard. In Commercial and Mixed-Use districts, the building itself should not cover more than 50% of the lot area, unless the Planning Commission approves otherwise. That addition is meant to control building size, recognize that parking demand is driven by building area, and avoid encouraging excessive coverage on already tight lots. Many of the existing buildings are already legally nonconforming with respect to parking and lot coverage.

Ms. McMahon described a new section that would formally set forth submittal and review criteria for parking in Commercial and Mixed-Use districts. Developers would be required to submit detailed information on proposed uses, peak parking demand, shared parking opportunities, nearby uses within 500 feet, on-street parking, public parking, and bike parking. She introduced a shared parking analysis tool developed by national planning organizations, explaining that it looks at peak hours and overlaps among different uses and helps determine whether a proposal's parking supply is reasonable. Mr. Canda supported attaching this tool as an official exhibit so that future Planning Commissions would have structured guidance. He voiced concern that a future Commission might be more favorable to intensive uses (e.g., many fast-food restaurants) and could over-approve projects. Ms. McMahon stated the Mayor and Council set policy through its appointments but agreed that embedding criteria in the Zoning Code helps.

With respect to decision-making, Ms. McMahon explained the Commission would evaluate whether there is a housing component and make sure on-site parking was provided for those units, whether expansions remove existing parking, whether the building footprint meets the new coverage standard, the nature and hours of operation, impacts on existing businesses and

current parking conditions, the presence of amenities such as bike parking and gathering spaces, and consistency with the Zoning Code, Downtown Master Plan, and Long-Range Plan. The Commission could approve, approve with conditions, deny proposals, or require revisions. Permits would be required. The Zoning Officer would enforce the approved requirements.

Ms. Padrutt noted that campers and RVs sometimes use the Village lot at the end of N. Locust like a campground, often staying multiple nights and publicizing the spot on social media. Mr. Bryan emphasized that the lot is Village property, and it can be regulated by the Village. Overnight parking should be prohibited, and campers should be ordered to leave. It was determined that 'No Overnight Parking' signs should be erected at the lot.

Mr. Steidl and Mr. Canda described the proposed amendments as conscientious, comprehensive, and substantial. Mr. Steidl requested that the Commission have at least a month to study the changes and return with questions and potential refinements.

Proposed Amendments to Zoning Code Relating to Supplemental Regulations for Commercial and/or Industrial Uses Adjacent to Residential Uses: Proposed New Section 1141.42 & Pertinent Amendments to Land Use Tables, Section 1109.03

Ms. McMahon described the proposed amendment creating supplemental regulations for commercial or industrial properties that directly abut residential uses, explaining the goal is to protect nearby homes by establishing additional standards in the few areas where these conditions occur. She clarified for Mr. Canda that "adjacent" means physically touching, not across the street, and advised Mr. Craig the rule applies to residential uses, even those located in Commercial districts. The requirements limit building height to match the neighboring residence; shift commercial activity away from the shared property line; place loading docks, overhead doors, trash areas, and parking on the opposite side of the residential structure; favor office areas closest to the home; and mandate substantial evergreen buffering or fencing. The Commission could waive standards when appropriate, and the most restrictive code section would apply if multiple rules overlapped. Mr. Craig asked how long a vacant residential structure still counts as a residential use, Ms. McMahon explained if it's in a commercial district where single-family homes are permitted, it remains residential regardless of vacancy. A nonconforming residential use elsewhere would lose its residential status after two years. Mr. Craig noted such flexibility means developers must appear before the Planning Commission to understand what is feasible. Mr. Bryan reminded the group that applicants may request an informal review before the Commission prior to submitting full plans. The members then reflected on the rarity of site plan applications in recent years. Mr. Steidl noted the Commission has not seen a true site plan in his two-year tenure. Ms. McMahon mentioned the MBA building at Mill and Locust will eventually require Commission site plan review once its owner proceeds. She encouraged the group to consider the areas of town these rules would affect. She estimated there are roughly nine sites. Mr. Steidl agreed the concept is worthwhile if it is not rushed. Mr. Canda confirmed there is no urgent deadline by which this amendment needs to be finalized.

Discussion of Possible Dark Skies Ordinance:

Mr. Bryan asked whether the Commission desired to discuss the dark skies ordinance concept or wanted to do so at a future meeting because Ms. Frank-Hensley, the biggest proponent of such an ordinance, was not present at this meeting. Mr. Slocum noted that he also asked about adopting such an ordinance. Mr. Bryan and Ms. McMahon noted the concept

was reviewed a few years ago, and the Commission did not want to go forward with it at that time. Ms. McMahon advised against pursuing a full dark skies ordinance due to its technical complexity and heavy enforcement needs. Instead, she suggested strengthening existing rules by enforcing current commercial lighting restrictions, requiring full cut-off fixtures, limiting pole heights, and preventing upward-shining lights. Mr. Slocum stated he would support such requirements, citing overly bright restaurant lighting that is visible from across the river. Problematic streetlights, which the Village does not control, were also discussed. Mr. Bryan added that after hours shut-off requirements must be balanced with security concerns.

Additional Potential Zoning Code Amendments to be Discussed at Future Meetings: Possible Mixed-Use Zone Provision Amendments

Ms. McMahon asked whether, alongside the proposed parking revisions and building footprint limits, the Commission wanted to add broader mixed-use standards, such as design, architectural, or landscape guidelines, to prevent inappropriate building scale or form. The Mayor questioned who would consistently and professionally review such standards. Mr. Steidl noted the challenge of protecting the Village's recognizable character without dictating specific architectural styles. Mr. Canda mentioned architectural review boards as a model. Mr. Craig pointed out that only properties within the existing Historic District have design protections, and areas outside it remain vulnerable.

Ms. McMahon emphasized the Mixed-Use district contains only about five developable acres once existing businesses are accounted for. She asked whether the Commission wanted to create a framework for ensuring that future development is cohesive and appropriately scaled. Members discussed simple, non-style-specific protections, such as discouraging front-facing garage doors, requiring parking behind buildings, and ensuring building placement and massing "feel like they belong." Mr. Bryan added that the Planning Commission currently lacks strong standards to meaningfully approve or deny plans. Mr. Steidl recalled a past proposal that met all the technical zoning rules but would have been visually incompatible with the Village. Mr. DeAngelo noted he previously submitted ideas for such guidelines.

Mr. Canda asked about speed-limit control after seeing small towns in New York with lower limits on state and county routes. The Mayor and Mr. Bryan explained the Village can set limits on County roads, but altering the limits on State Rt. 303 requires petitioning the State, action from the Ohio General Assembly, or a formal traffic study, none of which are easy to obtain. Mr. Royer and Mr. Slocum raised issues with obscured speed-limit signs due to vegetation or pole placement. Mr. Bryan and Mayor Schneider acknowledged that sign visibility problems persist despite the Village's repeated attempts to address them.

ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Schneider made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Steidl to adjourn the meeting. Roll call vote: Mr. Royer, yes; Mr. Canda, yes; Mayor Schneider, yes, Mr. Steidl, yes. The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:
Karen Walters, Chairperson

Karen Walters

Date

11/24/25