

CENTERVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Work Session
Tuesday, September 27, 2011

Mr. Clark called the meeting to order following the adjournment of the regular Planning Commission meeting.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Chair Paul Clark, Mr. Jeff Gammell, Mr. Jim Briggs, Mr. Jim Brunner, Mr. Jim Durham, Mrs. JoAnne Rau, and Mr. Bill Etson. Also present: Mr. Steve Feverston, City Planner; Mr. Scott Liberman, Municipal Attorney; and Mrs. Julie Weaver, Assistant Clerk.

Mr. Feverston stated that the purpose of the work session was to revise the draft of the alternative energy ordinance that will update Unified Development Regulations. He would hope to have recommended revisions completed by the October meeting of the Planning Commission so that the changes could go to Council in November to be set for Public Hearing in January. The moratorium on the issuance of permits for solar and wind systems expires in February. Mr. Feverston stated his preference to determine the regulations for wind and solar systems as soon as possible, leaving rules for other conditional uses related to alternative energy sources to be developed over time.

When Mr. Feverston asked for input for any changes to the draft, Mr. Brunner voiced a concern that the height of a wind power plant did not include the length of the blade of the turbine when height was discussed on page 2, Section 9.05, A. 10. b. 1. (a). Mr. Briggs agreed. Mr. Durham noted that A. 10. b. 1. (b) was related because of defining the required setback. He felt that the setback should include the length of the blade as well as the height of the support tower to cover the entire height of the structure. Mr. Feverston stated that he would address both parts (a) and (b) in the revisions.

Mr. Brunner directed the group to page 11, Section 9.57, D. 2. c. 5. He suggested simplifying the wording concerning solar shingles to delete "be painted to" and rather say, "shall match the roof color." Mr. Feverston agreed and pointed out that the same problem existed at the top of page 11, Section 9.57, D. 2. b. 8, for solar systems on a roof.

Mrs. Rau suggested that the name of the ordinance be changed to the *wind and solar* ordinance. The group concurred. Mr. Feverston stated that he would make the appropriate language revisions within the document.

Mr. Brunner pointed out that Section 9.57, F. 2. e. references the noise regulations of "Section 1157 of this Zoning Code" rather than the Unified Development Ordinance. He asked that the Section Number be checked so that the reference may be correctly cited.

When Mrs. Rau asked about wind mills in Centerville, Mr. Feverston responded that small applications were exempt as were wind devices in agricultural zones. As examples, he pointed out that some individuals and homeowners' associations have solar lights of varying sizes. As an example, he noted a solar light panel on Clubview in Yankee Trace.

Mr. Gammell asked for clarification of “small” and “large” wind systems. Mr. Liberman pointed out that the definitions section on page 14 limits “small” to systems producing less than 100 kilowatts of power. A brief discussion between Mr. Durham and Mr. Liberman resulted in the suggestion to define a “small” system as one producing 99 kilowatts or less, while a “large” system would produce 100 kilowatts or more. Mr. Gammell asked about approximate size for that output. Mr. Feverston said that specifics were not really an issue because any wind energy system, except in an agricultural zone, would be a conditional use with Council having the authority to grant or deny permission for the structure on a case by case basis. The maximum height of a small wind energy device is 40 feet from the ground to the center of the turbine.

Mr. Clark asked that the revisions be made and the ordinance be brought back to the Planning Commission at the October meeting. The expectation would be that, in November, Council could set the legislation for public hearing in January.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Paul Clark