

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Held: Monday, May 11, 2026

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Walters called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Chairperson Karen Walters	Present	Greg Canda	Present
Council Rep. Amy Frank-Hensley	Present	Mayor Daniel Schneider, Jr.	Absent
Kevin Royer	Present		

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES: April 27, 2026 Meeting

Ms. Walters made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Royer to amend the minutes to reflect that Mr. Royer abstained from voting to approve the March Minutes. Roll call vote (on motion to amend): Ms. Walters, yes; Mr. Royer, yes; Mr. Canda, yes; Ms. Frank-Hensley, yes. The motion was approved. Mr. Canda made a motion that was seconded by Ms. Frank-Hensley to approve the minutes as amended. Roll call vote: Ms. Walters, yes; Mr. Royer, yes; Mr. Canda, yes; Ms. Frank-Hensley, yes. The minutes were approved.

MAYOR'S REPORT: The Mayor was not present.

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION: Mo Riggins asked the Commission to put the Short-Term Rental Ordinance at the top of the priority list for the June Meeting if it is not discussed tonight.

Steve Craig noted the draft of the amended short-term rental ordinance on tonight's agenda reflects Council's request for legislation to ban new short-term rentals, while grandfathering existing ones. Mr. Craig raised concerns about how the Planning Commission would handle the proposed amended Ordinance and public input during what could become another lengthy discussion process. Ms. Walters and Mr. Canda stated the Commission would remain open to citizen participation and written comments on this issue.

COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: Ms. Frank-Hensley updated the Commission on several Council matters, including a possible second vote on the parking ordinance and continued discussion over the chicken ordinance, particularly concerns about roosters creating noise issues for nearby residents. She suggested the matter might be better addressed through enforcement of existing noise ordinances rather than banning roosters outright. Mr. Royer and Ms. Walters noted the current rooster restrictions were already the result of a lengthy process that resulted in a compromise that allows one rooster per property. Mr. Bryan explained the existing noise ordinance focuses more on repetitive loud noise and time restrictions rather than decibel levels. He stated he would review the ordinance to see if it could apply to roosters or needs to be improved. Mr. Canda asked whether there is a particular property that has multiple roosters. Ms. Frank-Hensley reported Council supports exploring a Mixed-Use District development moratorium. There will be legislation to enact the moratorium on the next Council Meeting agenda. Ms. Frank-Hensley also noted Councilperson Rosales volunteered to assist with work related to the proposed Village lighting and dark skies ordinance.

BUSINESS:

Proposed Amendments to Zoning Code and Business Regulation Code:

Mixed-Use Zone Development; New Chapter 1116

Ms. McMahon presented a proposed new chapter regulating development within the Mixed-Use District, explaining it would add design, landscaping, site layout, and character

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Held: Monday, May 11, 2026

standards on top of the existing zoning requirements. The new chapter would encourage, but not require, developments that combine commercial and residential uses, while giving developers and the Planning Commission clearer guidance than the current code provides.

She outlined proposed site criteria, including open space requirements, a front setback of no more than 20 feet, parking located to the rear or side of buildings, pedestrian connectivity, sidewalks, landscaping, and pedestrian amenities such as bike racks or benches. Mr. Canda questioned whether the 20-foot maximum would limit green space in front of buildings. Ms. McMahon explained the goal was to mimic the downtown pattern by keeping buildings closer to the street. Mr. Bryan noted the proposed ordinance permits the requirements to be waived or modified if the spirit of the regulations is maintained.

Ms. McMahon then reviewed proposed building design standards, including coordinated design, varied facades, identifiable entrances, complementary materials, window patterns, roof treatments, and no garage access facing the front of buildings. She emphasized the draft was not intended to mandate one architectural style, but to encourage buildings to take design cues from the Downtown Master Plan and support a cohesive Village character.

The Commission next discussed whether current Mixed-Use District uses should be revised, especially now that General Die Casters is gone and the Village has a major opportunity to shape future development. Mr. Bryan and Ms. McMahon raised concerns about allowing incompatible uses such as tow yards, gas stations, warehouses, heavy industrial activities, or large-scale storage facilities on prime downtown land, while noting that smaller-scale artisan or boutique uses might still be appropriate.

Further discussion took place regarding setbacks, sidewalks, curb cuts, private streets, parking lot buffering, road layouts, and whether a minimum front setback should be added. The group decided to add a five-foot minimum front setback, while keeping buildings close enough to support walkability and avoid large parking lots or hardscaped areas in front of buildings.

The discussion then shifted to architectural character. Ms. Frank-Hensley and Ms. Walters expressed concern that overly modern buildings, such as all-glass structures or stacked container-style designs, may not fit Peninsula's character. Steve Craig suggested looking at National Register or Department of Interior guidance if applicable. Ms. McMahon agreed to review the Master Plan and bring back clearer code language with stronger design regulations. The Commission next discussed permitted versus conditional uses, with the goal of maintaining appropriate procedural safeguards and avoiding inappropriate and undesired uses.

Amendments to Land Use Tables, Section 1109.03

Ms. Walters led the Commission through the uses listed as permitted in the Mixed-Use District, beginning with specialty retail uses such as antique shops, art galleries, florists, bookshops, and similar businesses, which the group agreed should remain permitted. The Commission then discussed auto-related uses. Mr. Royer and Ms. Walters favored removing auto parts stores and vehicle-related services from the district. Ms. Frank-Hensley questioned whether a possible niche antique auto parts store might be desirable.

The Commission then focused on size limits for retail and other uses in the Mixed-Use District. Ms. McMahon explained the current 10,000-square-foot threshold regulated size only, not the type of business. Ms. Frank-Hensley recommended reducing it to 7,500 square feet to better match the scale of existing Village buildings. The Commission questioned whether larger commercial uses up to 40,000 square feet were appropriate. Some members expressed concern that buildings that large could overwhelm the available downtown land. The discussion then

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Held: Monday, May 11, 2026

moved on to the desirability of a smaller upper range buildings (possibly around 15,000 to 20,000 square feet), with walk-up windows and curbside pickup remaining conditional.

Amendments to Chapter 1129; Landscaping, Screening, and Planting

Ms. Walters asked about the status of the General Die Casters property and whether the Commission should pause the Mixed-Use land-use review to allow time for a short-term rental discussion. Mr. Bryan said with respect to the Die Casters property, there is reportedly a signed letter of intent from a potential buyer. He noted that document did not bind the company to purchase the property and any environmental due diligence being conducted would likely take time. He noted that if Council passed the proposed six-month moratorium, the Village would have a limited window to move any desired zoning changes through Planning Commission and Council. Mr. Canda and Ms. Walters agreed this moment was a good breaking point, and the discussion on the remaining land-use items could continue at the next meeting.

Ms. McMahon asked whether she should update Chapter 1116 and the land-use changes discussed so far for the next meeting or whether the Commission wanted to wait until its review of use section was completed. The Commission agreed she should make those revisions prior to the June Meeting. Ms. McMahon then briefly introduced proposed revisions to the landscape screening and planting section, explaining she merged prior comments and proposed new standards into that chapter.

Amendments Short-Term Rental Ordinance, Chapter 741

Ms. Riggins presented research and data she gathered since the regulations were updated two years earlier. She stated since there are six fewer rentals at this point, revenue would be reduced moving forward. She explained most rentals averaged about three days per stay and were often used by groups or families meeting from different states. The greatest number of days that a property was rented was 140 and the least number of days was 61. Ms. Riggins stated since the rentals were often not utilized by families that already resided together, multiple vehicles travelling to individual rental properties were common. She conducted a review of the approved 2026 short-term rental files and identified numerous violations, including missing documentation, unverified reporting, and one alleged unregistered rental property that was investigated by Village officials.

The discussion focused on short-term rental regulations, enforcement concerns, and whether the Village should continue allowing non-owner-occupied rentals. Much of the conversation centered on parking requirements and occupancy limits. Ms. Riggins argued that the “plus three” occupancy allowance added to the two-people-per-bedroom rule undermined the parking restrictions. She stated additional guests usually meant additional cars. Ms. Walters and others explained that sometimes larger groups or families travel together and may simply want flexibility in sleeping arrangements, such as couches or bonus rooms. Mr. Canda noted that many homes contain finished basements or other spaces functionally used as bedrooms, even if they are not technically classified that way. Discussion continued around whether any parking problems reflect flaws in the Ordinance itself or failures in enforcement.

Ms. Riggins stressed that enforcement and the application process were the real problems. She argued that applications and inspection forms lacked proper checklists, supporting documents, and verification procedures. According to her review, many required materials, such as advertising listings, affidavits, proof of rental days, and parking documentation were either

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Held: Monday, May 11, 2026

missing or never submitted. She also criticized the inspections as superficial and inconsistent, saying one owner told her an inspection lasted only a few minutes.

In response to a question, Mr. Bryan and Ms. Dorton stated that applicants receive copies of the regulations and complaints can be submitted to the Village administration or Village Police Department. Commission Members debated whether the issues raised were primarily regulatory or enforcement related. Mr. Canda emphasized the Planning Commission's role was to focus on regulations rather than day-to-day enforcement. Mr. Bryan noted that many of the alleged parking complaints fall under ordinary enforcement mechanisms. Parking on the grass or blocking driveways is prohibited regardless of whether the property is a short-term rental. He emphasized the Police Department should be called to enforce those parking offenses. Ms. Riggins stated some approved parking diagrams did not match the space on the properties and certain rentals received renewed certificates despite recurring complaints or inconsistent documentation.

The conversation then moved into specific examples of parking conflicts. Ms. Riggins described one property where guests allegedly parked on nearby streets and walked across a neighboring yard because the approved parking spaces did not realistically accommodate the occupancy allowed. Ms. Walters questioned whether many vehicles parked in a driveway actually affect public property or neighboring parcels if all vehicles remain in a driveway on private land. Mr. Bryan clarified that current regulations allow reduced guest counts when a property cannot meet minimum parking requirements. Ms. Riggins argued the rules were being applied inconsistently.

The next topic involved whether the Village should continue allowing non-owner-occupied rentals at all. Ms. Riggins said many residents she spoke with preferred permanent neighbors rather than houses sitting vacant for most of the year. She argued the current minimum requirement of 60 rental days was too low and allowed homes to remain empty much of the time. Ms. Walters disagreed, explaining that some owners maintain their properties, use them personally, or keep them for visiting family members, rather than strictly as income-producing businesses. They only want to rent them on a limited basis. Mr. Bryan added that some owners rely on occasional rental income simply to offset the maintenance costs for these second homes.

The discussion also explored long-term rentals versus short-term rentals. Ms. Walters and Ms. Frank-Hensley questioned whether the Village should reconsider how rentals lasting 30 days or longer are treated, especially for remote workers or seasonal stays. Ms. McMahon explained that State Law distinguishes rentals of 30 days or longer as long-term rentals rather than short-term rentals, which complicates how local regulations can apply. It was clarified that short-term rental owners are already allowed to rent their properties for longer periods, but those longer stays do not count toward the required minimum number of short-term rental days.

Ms. Padrutt expressed concern about the overall financial value of short-term rentals to the Village, noting the Village only collected around \$6,600 in bed-tax revenue, while staff, zoning officials, and administrators spent significant time managing enforcement and inspections. Mr. Royer summarized the debate as involving two competing concerns: properties that may violate rules or create nuisance issues, versus homes that appear vacant for much of the year.

Steve Craig, a short-term rental owner, addressed the Commission. He said he favors maintaining a balanced number of overnight accommodations because they provide economic and tourism benefits to the Village. He strongly opposed raising the minimum rental requirement above 60 nights, explaining that Peninsula's tourism market is highly seasonal and he would not

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Held: Monday, May 11, 2026

be able to sustain his business at 120 nights. He also described how he uses rental income to rehabilitate formerly vacant properties and argued that short-term rentals can improve neglected homes and contribute positively to the community. He supports improving enforcement and inspections but cautioned against changing policies without considering the Village's broader long-range plan and housing goals.

The meeting concluded with discussion about next steps. Ms. Walters suggested forming a smaller working group or holding additional public discussions to review concerns in more detail. Ms. Frank-Hensley proposed a joint Planning Commission and Council meeting devoted entirely to short-term rentals and related enforcement and parking issues. The Commission also discussed broader parking-management ideas, including shuttle services, shared parking strategies, or transportation partnerships to ease congestion during peak tourism periods. The commission acknowledged that short-term rentals remain a complicated issue involving tourism, housing availability, enforcement capacity, neighborhood character, and economic impact.

ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Frank-Hensley made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Canda to adjourn the meeting. Roll call vote: Ms. Walters, yes; Mr. Royer, yes; Mr. Canda, yes; Ms. Frank-Hensley, yes. The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Walters, Chairperson

Date




