

**MINUTES**  
**Goshen Planning Commission**  
**April 1, 2025 at 5:30PM**  
**Goshen Community Building, 244 Clark Street**

**A meeting of the Goshen Board of Zoning and the Goshen Planning Commission was held on April 1, 2025 at 5:30pm at the Goshen Community Center.**

**Planning Commission**

**Call to Order:** Liz Mashie, Chair Person @ 5:30pm

**Roll Call:** PRESENT - Liz Mashie, James Gardner, Matt Dickhut, Loren Shackelford, Greg Langham, Marcie McClamroch, Scott Stokenbury

Brian Hogue, Attorney in attendance

**Approval of Agenda:** Liz Mashie asked for clarification from Brian Hogue and Mayor Stroud - Ordinance Review of Edits) is it intent to leave tonight's meeting with a set that will be recommended to City Council or Public Hearing? Brian Hogue prefers that Planning do what they want but not do anything until next month. Brian says that public hearing is not needed for these individual ordinances.

Loren Shackelford made a motion to approve and Scott Stokenbury seconded  
All in favor; none opposed

**Approval of Minutes from March 4, 2025** - Matt Dickhut made motion to approve; Greg Langham seconded.  
All in favor; None opposed

**Old Business**

**Driveway Regulations** - Mayor changes should have incorporated most recent changes (thru Planning), Lacie Lawson's (office) feedback from City Hall as well as the Mayor's feedback - the redline will be the most recent iteration where City Hall (Mayor and Lacie) went thru, which is what is presented this evening.

Mayor stated that with 13' minimum, there is no turning radius at all; he wants to prevent a swing-out to get into driveway which is why 5 degree radius is added and that translates with the commercial (ingress/egress); with commercial it will be a 15 degree radius. Loren Shackelford asked about on 1 entrance commercial property, the property at the end of the road shall be no less than 69' wide(??); Mayor clarified that for any commercial entrance, it has to provide a 15 degree radius for turn-in (creating that 69' width), and so this is to accommodate for trucks and trailers and even pick-up trucks with trailers behind them.

Loren Shackelford asked about a 200' wide lot, almost half of the lot will be driveway? Mayor: if it were a commercial property, that you have 3-lanes (1 entrance in/1 entrance out), yes. Loren Shackelford: But if it were a commercial property, regardless, it can be no less than 69', right? Mayor: Only if that's the only entrance and exit out of that business; they can have a single lane in and then they would just need the 15 degree radius on the 13' drive that goes through. The 69' comes from the 3 thirteen foot lane(s) added together plus 15' on each side, which makes the 69'.

Greg Langham asked if it is degree or feet on the radius. Mayor stated it's 15 degrees radius ends up being 15' outside of 13' edge of the lane. Greg also asked on residential diagram, it shows 10' on the driveway??? Mayor states it's 10' total/5' on each side. James Gardner requested that if the diagrams are intended to be on the final ordinance, the numbers/dimensions need to be changed correctly and Mayor said that will be done and the diagram will show a single lane.

Loren Shackelford - on culdesac and loop street(s) - lot and block subdivision challenges - "driveway shall be no less than 2' from the property line; driveway apron shall be no less than 20' from the property line" - Mayor responded that a variance would be considered for a subdivision; all have a variance process to appeal or apply for a variance. Confirmed from Loren Shackelford that both of the measurements are from the side property line(s). Further defined on Page 4D (if it slopes down or up, the length is treated differently). If downward sloping driveway, the first 15' of driveway has to be at least 20' from the side property line; and 25' on an up-sloping driveway. Liz Mashie suggested re-thinking the 20' number; maybe reducing the number? She also suggested leaving the 'property line' issue alone (not add the word 'side') but flip/re-order two other points so that as you read it you learn what your apron can do and then what your driveway can do. Committee proposes 10' from property line; (20' between driveways).

Greg Langham asked about a maximum upslope from the driveway to the city street from the standpoint of damaging the road as you leave or go in the driveway. Mayor does not disagree and that there may be a really good reason to add that (maximum upslope/elevation change). Mayor offered to look and see what other cities offer in terms of a slope and then bring that back to the commission to add to ordinance (approach and departure angle).

Max Poye asked about 'grand-fathering' in (driveway) - Liz Mashie pointed out that on Page 5 that the "enforcement revisions apply to all driveways, new and existing" and Liz also says she interprets that to the wash-out only, which can turn into enforcement action. Brian Hogue added that it's 'implied' that we can't force someone that has an existing driveway to come into compliance and incur those costs unless a public nuisance or safety hazard. Committee suggested clearer language that if it's a public nuisance or hazard, it can be applicable to new and existing driveways but it can't be applicable to the entire ordinance.

Greg Langham asked about circle driveway - does it mean we can have two cuts to the road (like a horseshoe?). Mayor confirmed, yes, it is an entrance and an exit on a circle drive. All on commission agree that it is very confusing when it comes to circle drive(s). Liz Mashie suggested verbiage of "Circle driveways with two road entrances are permitted as one driveway". Mayor confirmed it will be re-worded for clarity.

Culvert and gravel grate changes - Mayor stated that culvert tiles are out for bid (14 will need replacing on city streets that are metal and rusted through). It is City's recommendation that only concrete tiles culverts are allowed so that we don't have to replace again (if metal is used again). Replacement of concrete is 15-20 years, the weight bearing is a lot more stable, and having an extended foot out beyond paved surface (unless abutment). There was a question asked if concrete and metal are the only type of culvert - no, there is plastic but the issue (per Mayor) is that it flexes and often is not buried deep enough and it degrades over time. Mayor does not believe that they (plastic) will stand up to the test of time. Liz Mashie added that she does not believe we should mandate consumers to just 1 product; Loren Shackelford agrees - used COVID and the

challenges for getting product(s) as an example - what if the product is not available, what would be our other options? Mayor stated again that the 'other' options do not stand the test of time. Loren Shackelford added that at the County (Washington) the ordinance says that concrete culvert is preferred and metal or plastic is an option if approved by County Engineering. Mayor offered that we could consult with an outside engineer to accomplish the flexibility of option(s). Loren Shackelford offered the verbiage, "Concrete is preferred; other options are available on a variance request"; also ask them through the variance process to build them to manufacturer design standards or an engineering report/recommendations. Matt Dickhut asked who determines the diameter of pipe? All agreed that it should be an engineer; Mayor stated that ARDOT says nothing less than 14". Loren Shackelford added that County is 18" (minimum). Brian Hogue suggested adding language if the pipe is causing some problem on city road, then we can enforce that; it'll need to be torn out and put something else in.

**Gravel Grates** (end of the driveway that catches gravel) - Requirement vs. Recommended - Mayor states they are not required at all but to put them in after the driveway is installed, it is very challenging. Committee agreed that the whole section should be removed.

**Right of Way Standards** - Liz Mashie asked that Lacie Lawson checks the citation to make sure she is referring to what she intended to refer to. Mayor Stroud to follow up.

Discussion about landowners being responsible for any utility lines which are located in the right of way when work is being done at the landowner request. Committee agreed to strike the whole sentence.

Loren Shackelford asked about a 3 month limit on a permit for ditching and cutting - does that seem too short? Committee agreed that they'll just need to come back and re-apply.

Public Comment? None

**Sign Regulations** - Definitions - Marquee has been changed to Digital. Greg Langham suggested verbiage of "any illuminated display that uses electronic or digital display technology" in case something changes in the future or new technology comes available. Mayor will make change(s) congruent throughout.

**Temporary Signs** - Loren Shackelford asked for clarity on if temporary signs need city approval - Mayor says, no, they don't need approving. Mayor confirmed that Lacie Lawson (zoning official / appointed position by ordinance) and she would review and make sure it complies with all the ordinances that are in place; if it meets all the requirements from the ordinance, then she would approve it and permit would be issued. If it didn't, then it would come before the Planning Commission and City Council. Liz Mashie says that the ordinance is not clear in that verbiage. Suggested verbiage is to add 'permit to be issued by zoning official' - Zoning official will review and approve all temporary and permanent sign applications to ensure compliance with zoning and sign ordinances (NOT zoning, electrical, and building codes).

Loren Shackelford added the Planning Commission should be the decision maker on all variances and then either the applicant or an appellate could appeal it. Brian Hogue says there needs to be some notice requirement and if there's any opponents to the application, they can appeal that decision as well. Loren further added that on all variances, the Planning Commission should be the decision board and the City Council should be the appellate board (Brian Hogue agrees).

Permits only good for 6 months and one 30-day extension can be granted/utilized. Liz Mashie suggested that the extension should be able to come from the Planning Department or City Hall (or whomever issues the permit); they shouldn't have to come to a Planning Meeting, unless the extension is for more than 30 days.

Minor Alterations - Loren Shackelford asked if that needs Planning Commission approval and requested it be given back to the zoning official.

Extensions - Discussion about 10 business days with an additional 10-day extension permitted by zoning official.

Suggestion of non-compliant signage and merging from two sections into one - Liz Mashie suggested verbiage "any sign found to not comply with these ordinances, the permit will be revoked and the sign must be removed at the expense of the owner". Brian Hogue added that the City may not want to revoke the permit but would require that the sign be removed and then they'd still have the permit (because they've gone through the process) so they can erect a new one.

Light Intensity Fluctuation vs. Adjustable Intensity - Mayor Stroud - you can get signs now with different intensity setting and the city doesn't want the settings to be up and down during operation. For example, if it's set at 2700 lumens at night time it needs to be set there and stay there.

Greg Langham asked about animation - Mayor Stroud says it's animation/moving pictures - the majority of people don't want scrolling as people are driving by (distraction). Loren Shackelford added that if you have a digital sign you can change the verbiage any time you want and it can be up there for 5 minutes and then switch to something else - but not scrolling. All members agreed on 1x/hour. Mayor Stroud added about illumination and for signs to be seen during the day, they have been changed to 8000 lumens (from 2700) during the daytime.

Natural Resources - Liz Mashie asked about verbiage requiring contractor installation and inspection in commercial but not in residential. Why are we being so much more strict in the least developed area? Needs to be cleaned up.

Non Profit Announcements to be changed to Public Announcements.

Strike verbiage about Federal and State traffic signs (are permitted). All agreed; we (city) don't have jurisdiction over federal and state traffic signs.

Loren Shackelford says we should be monument sign only and everything else requires a variance; Scott Stokenbury and Mayor Stroud agree. Any pole sign, whether one or two poles, has to be approved through a variance. Clarity on light box signs and digital signs as long as they are within a monument setting - Mayor Stroud confirmed and stated that's why they are listed out in the ordinance.

Projecting Sign - A wall sign bolted to the building but not flush to the building. Loren Shackelford (location only on primary entry facade) is fairly restrictive (commercial) compared to other municipalities. If you have a corner lot with visibility from two different roads, you are typically allowed to do wall signs on both sides. In Fayetteville you can do three sides as long as it doesn't cover more than 30% of the exterior of the building. Mayor will have changed to match the 30% of the exterior building.

Greg Langham asked about temporary flags being covered under this ordinance (flutter flag)? Asked of Brian Hogue, if it's not in the ordinance it would not be a use by permit and wouldn't be allowed without a variance, correct? Brian confirmed that is correct. It's not allowed by our ordinance without a variance and if there's a complaint you go to the property owner and tell them to take it down or go through our variance process. Brian Hogue added that we need to 'define' signs if the City wants to govern that.

Public Comment: Curtis Vaughan asked if the city has a limit on the amount of time a digital sign turns. Loren Shackelford said the recommendation was 1x per hour. Curtis Vaughan feels a shorter timeframe would suit the community better - input from some committee members was to put it at 30 seconds. Loren Shackelford says this is more inline with a flashing digital sign but also says that's why there's a variance process in place. Loren would rather stay more restrictive and look at variances for public use that make sense; if you write the ordinance that everyone can do it, then you've lost that control. Preference to be written as an hour and allow a variance.

Lighting - Suggested to provide a variance process in this section as well. Brian and Loren suggested mirroring the same language - variances heard and approved by the city planning commission to be appealed to city council; further, any variance process we should have certified mail notification requirements to a certain distance of property at the expense of the applicant. What distance? Suggested a 300' radius (as provided by Loren Shackelford as he thinks that is the number that the County uses) - also beneficial to have the POA/HOA notified.

Public Comment: None

Mayor Stroud - Legislature has passed laws that will affect our regulations on 2 acre minimums and we are waiting for that to be finalized, approved, and adopted but will push back on some of the changes with zoning to make sure we are not violating or not allowing what the State is saying what we have to allow now.

Loren Shackelford made a motion to adjourn and Scott Stokenbury seconded.  
All in favor; none opposed

-

Adjournment: 7:45 pm



**Gina Swanson**  
Recorder/Treasurer



**Russell Stroud**  
Mayor