

MINUTES
Goshen Planning Commission
May 6, 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 May 6, 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 NOT in attendance

Approval of Agenda: Loren Shackelford made a motion to approve; Scott Stokenbury seconded
All in favor; none opposed

Approval of Minutes from April 1, 2025 - Matt Dickhut made motion to approve; Greg Langham seconded.
All in favor; None opposed

Old Business

Lighting Ordinance - Liz Mashie asked for clarification (from last month's notes) Brian Hogue (attorney) asked not to take any action until this month and the action is a recommendation that these changes to City Council for consideration for passing and that no public hearing is required; Mayor confirmed that is correct.

Mayor provided/presented edits that had already been made by the Planning Commission and Mayor is sent it off to Bruce (with Dark Sky) and Bruce has returned it with his edits/revisions. City trying to get it sent with ANSI standards and Dark Sky rules and regulations. Lisa Skiles has also received a copy and she offered the only recommendation that she would make was that if we wanted to include diagrams, that might be helpful; Mayor wants to leave it like it is because he believes 'lighting fixtures' will continue to change over time. Liz Mashie asked if there are external resources to provide if Planning receives questions/concerns? Mayor provided that there are sites (listed) that have pictures as examples.

If adopted, lighting ordinance is adopted, the City will purchase and have copies of the ANSI/IENSA at City Hall for reference. Mayor Stroud says that the only thing that remained the same, following Bruce's (Dark Sky) review of the document, was that in order to match the sign ordinance, the lumens were left at 2700 lumens (dusk to dawn) and 8000 lumens (daylight). They (Bruce) used a different scale, called NITS (another lighting scale) and for us to be able to get that into NITS it was burdensome and complicated (and hard to apply to our sign ordinance) so it was left it as Lumens. Equivalence of NIT vs Lumen is hard to determine. Loren Shackelford asked if there was a 'red-line or highlighted' edition of Bruce's changes as he (Loren) does not feel educated enough in this subject matter. Mayor pointed out that Planning Committee changes are made in Blue and Mayor changes are in Red. Bruce rewrote it to be more succinct ("we want 3000 kelvin except in circumstances where State standards provides or Ozark Electric provides; pole lights"). Mayor confirmed that all of the changes Bruce

made/added complies with everything that was in there initially; by putting it in succinct language, you don't have to put all the other sections in the document.

Liz Mashie asked if what we are recommending (inclusive of Loren Shackelford's question) is inline with what a Dark Sky Expert would recommend? No concern about exemptions from Liz Mashie but James Gardner does have some concerns. Loren asked that 'technically' we are adopting the standards that Bruce (Dark Sky) sent; Mayor offered the reason he changed the ordinance, based on Bruce's recommendation. Loren asked if Mayor has reviewed the agency guidelines and Mayor responded that they are a little more strict in the commercial standards, but as far as residential, we are already (mostly) doing (upward/downward lighting). Mayor says we have to have 3 copies of the standards at City Hall to clear up any confusion or for clarity on lighting. Mayor is ok to adopt the ordinance as Planning wrote it but if we are trying to be more closely aligned with Dark Sky, these are the recommendations. Loren Shackelford feels he is voting on something he does not understand well. Greg Langham asked does IES and ANSI have specific versions that we would reference or do we let it float and as they make changes, then we are, by definition, adopting those changes by the way the ordinance reads; Greg is concerned about the small guy trying to get something built and not sure what their guidance is.

Liz Mashie asked if we should present both versions to Council; one version is the one the Planning Commission worked on and then another version taking the wishes of that with Dark Sky - ultimately being up to City Council. Marcie McClamroch agreed. Mayor said he can certainly present both side-by-side to Council. Mayor also added that Lisa Skiles had referred this specialist (Bruce) to the City (for lighting) and Mayor met with im to take a look at the ordinance and that's how we got the recommendations that are being reviewed this evening.

Max Poye (Public) - Has the same concern of not knowing/understanding the 'verbiage' provided by the specialist (Bruce) and if we adopt by reference, unless you really know what's in there, we don't really know what we are adopting.

Loren Shackelford asked how large the documents are; Mayor advised approximately 50 pages of different lighting rules. Loren Shackelford has concerns about adopting references to a guideline that is prepared to be a lot more detail-oriented and a lot more restrictive than what we would typically write as a municipality (not necessarily a bad thing); feels if there's a complaint someone will pull that ANSI guideline and try to find grounds for litigation for violation of that.

Mayor offered to send it back to Bruce (Dark Sky) for various questions before we send it over to Council. This is for clarity about items presented as either reference or alternative (in speaking about Luxe). Loren Shackelford asked about how they define what is 'likely to offend ordinary sensibilities' - how much greater than 1 lux is that? Greg Langham indicated it becomes subjective. Loren further asked should we also have a conversation on the exemptions if we are going to present this to City Council (since one version has significantly more than the other)? Mayor likes the way Bruce (Dark Sky) worded the exemptions; some of the exemptions are things that were already listed out in a previous version. Compliance enforcement is the same for all ordinances. Mayor will do whatever the Planning Commission wants - submit both to Council? Go back to old version?

Greg Langham says relying on the standards is probably a good thing but, at the same time, not having something for the public to easily reference does not work to our advantage. Mayor doesn't want to purchase the document until he knows we are going to adopt it.

Scott Stokenbury asked what is the Council expecting of Planning? Mayor suggested to produce both versions to Council and verbalize to Council that there was concern raised about some of the standards that are in the one recommended by Dark Sky, because of the references, that we don't fully understand and they are very complicated (that is Mayor's understanding).

James Gardner is more comfortable with the original version that Planning worked on vs. the new version with expert input. Mayor offered to spend time melding the two versions together and taking out the verbiage of ANSI, IESNA, etc. Liz Mashie entertained/made a motion to recommend the old version of outdoor lighting with a couple of edits (exemptions listed below) presented to City Council; Scott Stokenbury seconded
All in favor; none opposed

Exemptions: Temporary lighting for special events; not longer than 30 days;
Holiday decorations, no longer than 60 days;
Motion Security Lighting, no longer than 10 minutes;
Navigation Lighting (Radio Towers)
Street Lighting (not owned by City-specifically State Owned; hwy 45)
Fossil Fuel Lighting

Driveway Ordinance - Loren Shackelford regarding the drainage culverts (tiles, length of tiles, etc) and is everyone good with the definitions provided in the document? Mayor confirmed that the length of culvert tiles (that come in 10' sections) you would need 30' because it needs to extend outside of the apron.

Gravel Grates - Liz Mashie would like this section cleaned up - "if installed, installation must be installed 25' before the driveway meets the public road".....

James Gardner - Asked about Right of Way width(s) - did they vary? - Mayor says our right of ways are difficult to find but says that the City right of ways are now in this regulation.

Loren Shackelford asked if 30 days (work must be completed and inspection letter turned in w/in 30 days of construction start) is the 30 days a viable timeline; Scott Stokenbury says maybe it should be 45 days; Mayor says if the delay is weather-related (or some other circumstance) then we can give them some grace. All agreed to change it to 45 days.

Mayor discussed the up- and down-angles of a driveway (very complicated); the extent of what is required (with all parameters) Mayor opted to not add it in the regulations; felt it might be more suitable as an addendum at a later date. If there's a concern, then we can get an engineer to take a look at the road/angle and then make their recommendations rather than opening Pandora's box. Mayor acknowledged that the Planning Commission had asked City Hall to go back and look at it but the ordinance was not changed.

Max Poye (Public): Will driveways be grand-fathered (from past discussions); Mayor advised that Brian Hogue (City Attorney) has indicated that the new rules/regulations/ordinance can not apply to 'past' unless it's a public nuisance or safety hazard; so, yes, properties are grand-fathered.

Loren Shackelford made recommendation for referral to City Council to approve driveway ordinance as started subject to the changes mentioned tonight; Scott Stokenbury seconded.

All in favor; none opposed

Mayor and Lacie Lawson (Staff) had discussion about interpretation and Mayor felt that Lacies' interpretation of Mayor's recommendation was not accurate, but maybe it is what needs to occur. Mayor says if you have a

driveway and your're going to build a shop, you don't have to get a permit or pave your driveway; it's your driveway and you've had it for 20 years. Lacie's understanding was/interpretation is that if you build anything new or anyone else is building anything off that driveway at all then that would require that driveway/apron to be paved. Liz Mashie says anything that requires a COO needs to also update the driveway to be in compliance; if a new building that requires new inspection and new consideration for 'is this a safe property that meets our standards today'..... Scott Stokenbury does not agree with Liz Mashie. Liz Mashie added that we've seen too many lot splits and tandems and we will increase traffic and it will become a slippery-slope. Greg Langham says it should only be if you put in a new driveway/apron - NOT if a COO is required. Loren Shackelford added that regardless of what you're doing to the property, if you are using your existing driveway, then you shouldn't need a permit; says a driveway ordinance addresses the installation and construction of new driveways only (his opinion only). Mayor will check with Brian Hogue (City Attorney) for legal input.

Sign Ordinance - Matt Dickhut made a motion to recommend sign regulations with the minor edits being sent to Council; Marcie McClamroch seconded
All in favor, none opposed


Variance Request Policy - Liz Mashie offered that there needs to be edits for consistency (100' vs. 200'). Mayor says it should be all at 200'. Loren Shackelford asked under the appeal process, "if the board of zoning adjustment denies the variance request, the applicant may appeal that decision" - do we have an avenue where an 'approval' can also be appealed (by other parties)? Mayor says, yes, that needs to be added in - Loren suggested verbiage such as "the actions of zoning board and adjustments can be appealed to City Council within 30 days (or whatever timeline)". Loren also added that in a scenario like this, the Zoning Board of Adjustments loses their authority but the other side of the argument is that we (Planning) are appointed or elected and so if there's a group that feels strongly enough that wants to take it to their elected officials, there should be an avenue that they can do that. Further suggestion to check with Brian Hogue (City Attorney).

Public Input: None

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

-

Adjournment: 7:08 pm



Gina Swanson
Recorder/Treasurer



Russell Stroud
Mayor