

Minutes - Woodbury County Zoning Commission – January 27, 2025

The Zoning Commission (ZC) meeting convened on the 27th Day of January, 2025 at 5:00 PM in the Board of Supervisors' meeting room in the Basement of the Woodbury County Courthouse, 620 Douglas Street, Sioux City, IA. The meeting was also made available via teleconference.

MEETING AUDIO:

For specific content of this meeting, refer to the recorded video on the Woodbury County Zoning Commission "Committee Page" on the Woodbury County website:

- County Website Link:
 - o https://www.woodburycountyiowa.gov/committees/zoning_commission/
- YouTube Direct Link:
 - o <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PRQLWaCt2P0>

ATTENDANCE

ZC Members Present:	Chris Zellmer Zant, Tom Bride, Corey Meister, Jeff Hanson, Steve Corey
County Staff Present:	Dan Priestley, Michael Montino
Supervisor(s) Present:	Kent Carper
Public Present:	Jeannie Krueger, Ronnie Krueger

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Woodbury County Zoning Commission was called to order at 5:00 PM by Chris Zellmer Zant.

All commissioners were present, including new member Steve Corey, appointed by the Board of Supervisors for a five-year term beginning in 2025.

ELECTION OF CHAIR OF THE ZONING COMMISSION FOR 2025 (ACTION ITEM)

Bride nominated through motion Chris Zellmer Zant to be Chair. Second by Steve Corey. Carried 5-0.

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR OF THE ZONING COMMISSION FOR 2025 (ACTION ITEM)

Meister nominated through motion Tom Bride to be Vice-Chair. Second by Jeff Hanson. Carried 4-0. Bride Abstained.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA (INFORMATION ITEM)

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 8/26/24 & 11/25/24 (ACTION ITEM)

Bride motioned to approve the 8/26/24 minutes. Second by Corey. Carried 5-0. Hanson motioned to approve the 11/25/24 minutes. Second by Corey. Carried 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING (ACTION ITEM): FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF NUCLEAR ENERGY FACILITIES TO BE INCLUDED AS PART OF THE WOODBURY COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE

This public hearing was held to discuss adding nuclear energy facilities to its ordinance, continuing from previous sessions to assess public interest. Priestley offered comments on the potential inclusion of nuclear facilities in zoning, discussing aspects like generation, modular systems, and public engagement. Currently, nuclear plants can be permitted under industrial zoning with conditional use permits, but the debate is on clarifying or expanding this. Turnout was lower than for renewable energy discussions. The complexity of nuclear regulations was highlighted, involving federal, state, and local bodies, with safety, environmental impact, and emergency planning zones discussed. Commissioners and staff including Woodbury County Emergency Management Coordinator Michael Montino discussed the implications, safety, and community benefits of nuclear energy. Concerns about water use for cooling were referenced, noting advancements like helium-cooled reactors. Montino offered questions about local benefits versus grid support. The meeting touched on smaller, modular reactors potentially reducing traditional concerns. No public comments were received, but a letter from Chris Madson, City of Sioux City's Senior Planner, was entered into the record supporting conditional use permits for nuclear facilities in industrial zones. Hansen moved to accept the letter into record. Second by Bride. Carried 5-0 (Available in Appendix). No decisions were made; the issue remains open for further public input. Priestley suggested to continue this discussion in

subsequent public hearings due to lack of public turnout. Motion to close public hearing by Hanson. Second by Corey. Carried 4-0.

PUBLIC HEARING (ACTION ITEM) – PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (DIMENSIONAL SIZE FOR SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS)

A public hearing was conducted to consider potential changes to Section 4.11: Single-Family Detached Dwellings in the Woodbury County Zoning Ordinance. The hearing considered whether to amend or remove Section 4.11.1, which currently states: "The main body shall have a minimum dimension of not less than 23 feet." Potential revisions may involve eliminating, reducing, modifying, or adding to the minimum dimension requirement, as well as other changes to the contents of Section 4.11 and its subsections. Amendments could include the addition of new sections pertaining to single-family dwellings, definitions, the renumbering, and reorganization of content within the Woodbury County Zoning Ordinance.

Jeanie and Ronnie Krueger: They expressed their desire to install a single-wide mobile home on their property for their grandson, arguing that the current 23-foot dimension requirement prohibits this due to the narrower width of single-wides. They emphasized the need for affordable housing options in the area.

Existing Regulation: The 23-foot minimum was discussed as a standard set to maintain uniformity across different types of housing, including mobile homes, without discrimination, as per federal regulations from HUD.

Issues Raised:

Affordability vs. Standards: Commissioners discussed the issue between maintaining community standards and providing affordable housing options.

Structure Expansion:

The Krueger's discussed expansion. Given that there are no building codes specifically addressing this scenario, the Commission questioned whether a mobile home could be brought to a site, expanded on the same foundation, and still be considered as having a single, continuous main body with a complete perimeter foundation? Priestley offered concerns about the main structure being on a continuous perimeter.

Potential Solutions:

Meister discussed potential solutions including a conditional use for a relative. Priestley discussed both the conditional use and variance scenarios.

Variance: Discussed the possibility of a variance, but noted the challenges in proving a practical difficulty or hardship as required by law.

Conditional Use Permit: Suggested for scenarios where the mobile home could be on the same lot as another structure, but this still wouldn't bypass the size requirement.

Public Demand: There was a concern over the lack of significant public demand for changing the ordinance, suggesting that broader community support would be needed for any amendment.

Decision Making:

The commission did not make an immediate decision to change the ordinance but decided to keep the issue open for further public input. They acknowledged the need for more research, particularly on how adding to the structure might satisfy the current requirements.

Hanson suggested that legal interpretation on the addition to structures might be sought from the county attorney to clarify if such additions would comply with the ordinance.

The issue is to remain on the agenda for future meetings to gather more community feedback.

Motion by Bride to close the public hearing. Second by Corey. Carried 5-0.

REVIEW OF THE ZONING COMMISSION'S RULES OF PROCEDURES FOR ANY POTENTIAL CHANGES NOT LIMITED TO MEETING LOCATION (ACTION ITEM)

Priestley discuss the purpose of the Rules of Procedure and recommended that they be updated to reflect the basement meeting location that has been authorized by the Board of Supervisors Chair. Hanson made a motion to amend Section 2 of the Rules of Procedure for the Woodbury County Zoning Commission regarding the regular meeting location to state “in the Board of Supervisors meeting room in the basement.” Second by Bride. Carried 5-0

PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA (INFORMATION ITEM)

None

STAFF UPDATE (INFORMATION ITEM)

Priestley discussed upcoming training from Iowa State University Extension concerning planning and zoning. Staff will be in touch with more information in the weeks ahead as this is scheduled for April 22, 2025 at the Woodbury County Iowa State Extension location.

COMMISSIONER COMMENT OR INQUIRY (INFORMATION ITEM)

None

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:56 PM following a motion by Meister, seconded by Corey. The motion carried 5-0.

APPENDIX

Daniel Priestley

From: Christopher Madsen
Sent: Wednesday, January 22, 2025 9:25 AM
To: Daniel Priestley
Cc: Marty Dougherty; Mike Collett
Subject: RE: Comments Requested - Dwelling Minimum Dimension and Nuclear Energy

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good morning Dan,
City Zoning would support a County Zoning Ordinance amendment to allow/clarify that nuclear energy facilities are allowed in the GI zoning district. We would like to see the following, as the Gi zone is predominantly in close proximity to Sioux City:

1. A conditional use permit or similar process that would require a public hearing and review of the proposed location.
2. As noted in your background documents; submittal of a site plan, safety evaluation, and environmental impact statement.
3. Due to the location, FAA review of the proposal if the site is within the airport conical zone.

Thank you!

Chris R. Madsen, AICP, CFM
Senior Planner
City of Sioux City
Phone: 712.279.6341
Email: cmadsen@sioux-city.org
405 6th Street, Box 447
Sioux City IA 51102