



Unified Government Clerk's Office

Monica L. Sparks, CMC
Unified Government Clerk

701 North 7th Street, Suite 323
Kansas City, Kansas 66101-3070

Phone: 913-573-5260
Fax: 913-573-5299
<http://www.wycokck.org>

NOTICE OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE MEETING

A meeting of the Business Development Task Force of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, will be conducted in person only on Monday, October 13, 2025, at 3:00 pm. in the Fifth-floor conference room of the Municipal Office Building, 701 N. 7th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

We invite you to view the meeting in person in the 5th-floor conference room, Suite 515, 701 N. 7th Street, Kansas City, Kansas,

Business Development Taskforce
October 13, 2025
3:00 pm- 4:00 pm
City Hall
5th Floor Conference Room
701 N 7th Street
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

AGENDA

Commissioner Tom	Burroughs	Chair
Commissioner Chuck	Stites	Co-Chair

Nate	Brungardt
Edgar	Galicia
Renee	Hadley
Lynn	Holcomb
Greg	Kindle
Gabe	Munoz
Richard	Napper
Mindy	Rocha
Jim	Schraeder
Dawn	Rattan

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call of members**
- 2. Review and/or approval of September 22, 2025, Meeting Minutes**
- 3. Review and Recap achievements of the Taskforce**
- 4. Suggestions for future topics with the Taskforce**
 - a. Changes to commercial zoning districts such as setbacks and height restrictions
- 5. Public Comment**
- 6. Adjourn**

Mayor's Business Development Taskforce

Monday, September 22, 2025

City Hall

701 N 7th Street KCK

5th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

Present: Chairs: Commissioner Tom Burroughs and Commissioner Chuck Stites **Members Present,** Renee Hadley, Gabe Munoz, Mindy Rocha, and Dawn Rattan. **Absent Members:** Edgar Galicia, Greg Kindle, Lynn Holcomb, Richard Napper and Jim Schraeder **UG staff and advisors present:** Wendy Green, Michael Farley, Alan Howze, Rodney Lucas, Jim Neath

1. Old Business

- a. **Sign Code Review:** Michael Farley indicated he is bringing a final review of the sign code that was sent out twice for review and will be going to the Planning Commission at their October 13th meeting:
 - All the details listed in the ordinance have been discussed in our past meetings.
 - There may not be any need for discussion but legal has never officially presented the final draft.
- **Commissioner Burroughs** asked for clarification. Where did we leave off a month ago. If he remembers correctly, the agenda today says review ordinance and sign changes. This is what this ordinance is here. **Michael Farley** indicates yes, it is. **Commissioner Burroughs** mentions this is going before planning commission Monday. **Michael Farley** clarifies, Second Monday in October, October 13th. **Commissioner Burroughs** states we need to get this approved so that it can go in as presented by our discussion to ensure if there's any changes, we still have time to get it done. **Michael Farley** indicates that it is correct, we would need a vote on the final draft and that's the language that we have here in the presentation. That's the language that was emailed out. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates it may be a benefit. He is used to reading ordinances, but some others may not be. He requested to go through the parts that have been changed and review recommended changes or additional language, so we don't go through every page.
- **Alan Howze** mentioned we should just think about a brief recap. This is the sign ordinance that we went through back in July and August, and all those changes that this committee voted on and approved, and that's now reflected in this ordinance that will go before planning commission on October the 13th, and any unfinished business today on the home occupation we have been discussing for the last three meetings could also go to the October 13th Planning Commission. We were talking about the gross vehicle weight and those kinds of things. The sign ordinance is pretty much done, cooked and ready. It is on the agenda for the October 13th Planning Commission. He is not sure if we want to spend time on this or if you want to focus on the home occupation conversation. Pick that conversation up and see if we can resolve a couple of items and then that can also go on the October 13th, planning commissions agenda as well. Should that be the desire of this taskforce?
- **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates yes, he is good with it but he is going off the agenda that reads review of ordinance of signed code changes, and that's what he was attempting to do. If we've already approved these, we can just move on and go right into the continued discussion on home occupancy, by rights, subsections, D, E and F. He asked the members if they all had a chance to review these ordinances as presented. **Mr. Farley** mentioned if there are any changes we have next month's meeting prior to the October 13th we can discuss. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked all to please call the chair or call the office to get additions to the legal department. **Mr. Farley** mentioned that is correct, because we would have a small window of opportunity at the October 6th meeting to address any additional changes that we need

to for home occupation, but I guess hope is by the end of the day we have at least all the changes maybe not the language being improved, so that they can complete on the sixth and that language then get over to planning by October 8th to be published, and then we can start the public hearing process on October 13th to then be sent to the Board of Commissioners. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates the biggest change in this ordinance would be the feathered inflatable signs on page 15 - 17, that's a start, but it also addressed the murals discussions that we had in here, a long discussion in reference to what the master signs were and all of that. If there are any questions, just bring them forward, otherwise, we'll just move on to the discussion of home occupancy.

b. **Home Occupancy D: Commissioner Burroughs** states if he remembers correctly, based off his notes we left off on D. **Mr. Farley** indicates that is his understanding as well.

- i. He indicates on D we have already moved to strike the term food trucks and just refer to commercial vehicles.
- ii. Additionally, there was a question about the GVWR (gross vehicle weight rating) for trucks. There was a question that came up about, trucks are getting heavier today and a private truck that's not used for any sort of commercial purpose might weigh more than a commercial pickup truck that would be used for a business purpose.
- iii. He was asked to check with the Public Works and see if they had any concerns or any insight into vehicle weight ratings and their effect on local roads.
- iv. He spoke with Chris Finger in the streets department. Essentially, he did not have any concerns. The way he phrased it was that "He did not think these trucks were exceeding 10,000 pounds.
- v. Mr. Farley did not know if that is reflected by the term gross vehicle weight ratings, but he thinks that refers to how much a truck can legally carry in terms of people, fuel and equipment.
- vi. The weight that he believes is the manufacturer, possibly some federal regulator would give that designation. He would suggest based on his conversation with public works is we need to keep or come up with a new gross vehicle weight rating.
- vii. We should go ahead and do that, and then remain in contact with Public Works Department and get their insight, maybe go right to Director Troy Shaw and get a more official recommendation from him and see if there's anything from the technical side related to streets and gross vehicle weight ratings that we're not aware of or don't know if there is policy about.

2. **GVWR Discussion: Commissioner Burroughs** asked if anyone knew where the 10,000 pound rating came from? Mr. Munoz mentioned it might be from KDOT as they require commercial vehicles to have DOT numbers at or over 10,000 lbs. **Commissioner Stites** is recommending we investigate it more because when you buy your tag, you buy a 12 M tag for a pickup truck, which is 12,000 pounds. The GVWR stands for the weight of the vehicle and what it can safely hold. If you're buying a 12 M tag, I think that's 12,000 pounds. We might just need to make sure that we're comparing apples to apples. **Ms. Green** indicates after our discussion last time, we Googled a new F350 truck, and it said that it's GVWR is 14,000 lbs. and that's just somebody's personal truck. **Commissioner Stites** indicates he has one and that is correct. **Ms. Rocha** indicates that it is before you put work boxes on it. **Commissioner Stites** indicates that it is all inclusive. Everything can only weigh up to 14500, which is what the manufacturer recommends not to exceed. If you're pulling a trailer, the trailer also has its GVWR, which could be on F350. He has one that's got a trailer that's 20,000 pounds. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates If he understands correctly, listening to this discussion, 10,000 pounds GVWR is a point of discussion and point of concern that if today's curb weight is what they referred to them as 14,000 lbs, they call it GVWR, but curb weight is with just fuel in the liquids in. **Commissioner Stites** replied, yes what it is driving down the road. **Mr. Howze** is wondering if there's another way to get at that, rather than the 10,000 gross vehicle weight, heavy equipment or heavy trucks or commercial trucks or double axel. Trucks are getting bigger and heavier. Pinning it to a number,

we probably would struggle enforcing anyway, because there's that is what it's really getting at is you don't want obvious commercial equipment being stored on the residential property. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates the operative word is commercial. **Ms. Rattan** indicated she used ChatGPT and looked up what is a medium duty truck and it's anywhere between 10 and 14,000 GVWR. Typical referenced here as 10,000 lbs., according to Chat GPT. **Commissioner Burroughs** requests some guidance as to what the taskforce wants to do with this paragraph. If his notes are correct, we were talking about trucks and vehicles and equipment in residential neighborhoods, illegally parked in unimproved surfaces, in driveways, out of the road, and the impact it has in our neighborhood. That's kind of where we left it. We had a long discussion about it, but I went back and read the minutes, but we were concerned about more about small businesses or businesses utilizing a home residence as a destination for equipment in a residential neighborhood or a number of vehicles that would park there, go there as an office, and leave their vehicles, grab the commercial vehicles out of the backyard, out of the driveway and leave. And that was a discussion that occurred a month ago. Whatever the committee's bidding is, if you don't want to do anything with this, we can just move on. The prior sentence was no machinery, equipment will be used that will interfere with radio television, and up to two non-resident employees. **Commissioner Burroughs** thinks Mr. Neath brought up the two nonresident employees. Legal did you indicate public works said 10,000? We've got trucks, bigger than that. Hummers that are around here, and some of the bigger vehicles today.

3. **Mr. Howze** recommends we go back and offer an approach to that, no heavy equipment or trucks that are not typically residential in character. **Ms. Rocha** asks where does that put a tow truck driver if he drives his tow truck home? That's on call 24 hours. **Commissioner Stites** states going back to his police department days, that's what was happening with these rollbacks, right? They're on call, they may get called out, two or three in the morning, and it's parked on their streets. How do you handle their job? I mean, that's their job to do it. Are you telling them that they've got to go to a lot and pick up their tow truck then come in. **Mr. Howze** responds that there is a little bit of flavor of the temporary signs for a limited basis. If it's parked there for more than.... **Commissioner Stites** adds who is policing it? That's going to be a thing. A half ton is rated the GVWR on a half-ton pickup truck at 6,100 to 7850, 3/4 tons, 8,500 to 10,000, and then a F350 is 10 to 14,000. He would think that if we changed the 10 to 14, that would cover up to one ton, which might work. We need to also have some conversation when you tag your truck over the 12, does that require to be commercial at that point? Then you've just kind of messed somebody up that's driving an F350 for their daily driver. I don't know the answer. The tow truck thing is one of those things that was happening, you get a call, a tow truck parked on your street, and it is there all the time. And then when you confront them or approach them about it, it's like, well, I am on call. Who am I to say you're not on call or are on cal, it's two in the morning? I'm not going to verify with anybody. I don't know how we do that either.
- **Michael Farley** states he wants to distinguish that parking certain vehicles in a residential district or in a public right way is covered in our traffic ordinances and he is less familiar with them, but trying to pull them up right now. What we're talking about here is only if this tow truck driver was using their address as their place of business, and that would already be another zoning issue. It is not if they are hired by a different company. He is not familiar with freelancing tow truck drivers, but if that is a situation, he thinks we already run into a bit of a zoning issue. **Commissioner Stites** mentioned if you apply for your business license, they will question that at that time. **Mr. Farley** indicates that he would ask that the Planning department answer that. There definitely might be a scenario, but I think that's already addressed. This is only if you were the business owner, essentially. **Commissioner Stites** suggests maybe the 10,000 doesn't need to be changed at all. **Ms. Rattan** states most cities have 10,000 as typical. **Mr. Farley** states an additional note to that is, for example, someone did have some sort of company where they had a larger commercial pickup truck that they were using. They could still apply for special use permits if the truck was

heavier, and so there would be review process and eventually would be brought to the Board of Commissioners. **Commissioner Stites** indicates if Chuck Stites owns a ditch digging business..... **Ms. Rocha** indicates her dad started his company in '94, in the basement of their home. He had a ¾ ton pickup truck. **Commissioner Stites** states that's clearly going to be above this right here, and we're saying they can't, right? We are saying that it would have to go through this special use permit process. **Ms. Rocha** mentioned what if you start that business and halfway through the first year, you buy three quarter pickup truck. Would you know you had to go get a special use permit? **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates he does not know that the truck is really the issue. He thinks it's the equipment, and it's hauling, that might be the issue. The backhoe sitting in the drive, the trailer, the equipment that is used. Most of these trucks are luxury vehicles compared to commercial use. The privately owned, even though they may be a business vehicle, they're usually used for a few things, haul the boat to the lake for the weekend, etc. **Ms. Rocha** asked, do you take out trucks? Or take out the gross weight of the truck and use heavy equipment? **Commissioner Burroughs** thinks that may be an option. **Mr. Farley** suggested if that is a recommendation we should create a new definition for heavy equipment that would go in the zoning code to clarify if that does include the cab of a semitrailer. Right now, that would not be allowed, my understanding is the taskforce is against this. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates 10,000 lbs. is common across the industry and within other communities. Is that really the issue. He thinks the real issue here is that we've struck other objects that are not typically residential character. We were maybe overreaching a little bit. It's one thing to put ordinances in place, but if we're not going to enforce them, what's the use of half of them? If the culture in a community is to allow small businesses to park their equipment in their driveway, let's their employees come to their house, and if we're not going to enforce that, then we must just let things ride the way they are. We can try to address it, but if we're going to address it, then we need an educational time frame to where you send out notices, you give warnings, you educate the public that this is going to happen. Mr. Smith, you can no longer have your over the road rig parked in your driveway all week long. You can no longer have your backhoe sitting on the trailer parked in your driveway all week long. **Commissioner Stites** asked if any of this change with zoning? If you're an AGR? **Mr. Farley** replied, yes, this would. These accessories use only apply to single family and two family residential districts. We're not talking about any agriculture or the rural residential. It's just part one, R1, R2 and R2B. **Mr. Howze** reminds us these are the gates you have to go through to get an occupancy home permit by right. Somebody can still go through a special use permit process if they wanted to park a vehicle or heavy equipment on their property, they just couldn't do it by right. These are just a by right criteria that if you meet all of these, you can by right, do your home occupation, but it still leaves open that lane for, special use permits in all that entails for more involved situations. There would be an avenue for them to get this. It's just not a hard no. The neighbors can weigh in. The neighbor can say we're okay with the guy who owns 10 acres and parks it behind his garage, we never see it.

- **Commissioner Burroughs** requested guidance asking If committee members wanted to strike the other objects that are not typical and residential character, or do you want to leave that in? We had it struck last time that if I'm listening now, it doesn't matter. If I'm hearing correctly, we're going to put four other objects that are not typically residential in character back in the paragraph. He would like legal to provide some guidance here. He asked Mr. Howze if he had any comments. He did not know why food trucks were singled out by themselves, but the other vehicles may be brought to the premises for loading and unloading only. He can see minivans or whatever. When you go to move, you park a heavy truck, in your driveway or out in the street. You usually don't store them overnight unless your people know you're moving and there's very little said about that. He does not want to create more problems if there's not a problem there. I think it would behoove us just to be mindful that it's not going to be a perfect piece of policy. There are going to be allowances made. **Mr. Farley** indicated that we will be adding that in the phrase or other objects that are not typically residential character. **Commissioner Stites** asked what's an

example? He is sorry but he doesn't even know what that means. **Mr. Farley** mentioned that would probably be on a case-by-case basis. Unfortunately, if anyone has experience with home businesses that have heavy equipment of some sort, he does not think we would be in the place right now to make a judgment unless we wanted to go through and actually define what those would be. As of now the way it works is that it would be up to planning in this case, because business license would send it over to them and review if they meet all the six of these or not? If they did, they go back to business license, probably make some notation and they'd get their permit. If there was anything the application that showed that there would be something that may not be typically residential character, then they apply for a special use permit and then go through that public process. Ms. Rocha states, if we can't define it, why leave it in there. **Commissioner Burroughs** says he is thinking of a motor home. It's not a business, but the gross weight of a large motor home sets on people's property a lot, trailers, huge boats. **Ms. Rocha** indicates those aren't a home business, so this is only pertaining to a home business. **Commissioner Burroughs** agrees but mentions this goes back to the weight thing and the obstruction within a community of vehicles, personally in his neighborhood. If anyone comes to my house or goes by my house, you're going to have to go by nine vehicles. Not from my house, but one of my neighbors has like seven vehicles, four of them on the street and two in the driveway. If he parks his car in front of my house, it gets a little challenging. You must slow down to come through his neighborhood. If you're living in some of the older neighborhoods that have narrower roads, it becomes a challenge with our big trucks that we have. Fire trucks can't go down the road. **Ms. Rocha** states again, this is only if you have a home business.

Commissioner Stites indicates that they have to go through those steps to say, what's the width of your road? Is this going to allow for fire trucks to get down on the road. He thinks there are already checks and balances that would be in place for that. **Commissioner Burroughs** mentioned we beat this horse to death, as about as far as we can go, and we need to come back to it. He mentions he is not sure we can give you any guidance about what needs to be done. We agreed to strike all other objects or not typically residential character, leave it as it is there. Let's go with what you have here. **Commissioner Stites** asked could an item like that be a trailer. Another object that is not typical residential. Your home business, you have a snow cone maker, and you have an enclosed 10 by 20 trailer. **Mr. Farley** thinks that could be possible. **Ms. Hadley** mentioned she is in Strawberry Hill. We've have had a lot of construction home business, including ladders and other equipment that they're just outside and walking sidewalks and things like that. She would say there's some equipment that wouldn't be heavy, but it's just not typically residential. Considering the zone and we're talking about single families, that this is more specific than someone who has five acres. **Commissioner Burroughs** would like to have a solid recommendation to go before Planning, so that they know we have a firm commitment. He tends to believe it could impact the entire work, so that's why he is really pushing to get guidance as to what we should do.

- **CitiesWork Recommendation:** **Commissioner Burroughs** asked if we have anything from CitiesWork regarding this? **Commissioner Stites** mentions we are not recreating the wheel here. We have a lot of other cities that have ordinances. He would like somebody to come back and say, this is what others are doing. This is how Bonner Springs and Edwardsville address it. Also, Johnson County or Leavenworth, let's see how they're working it and what they're thinking. I'm not saying that we can't figure out our own stuff, but, you know, we're sitting here trying to brainstorm stuff, they may have already passed and make some sense to us from other cities. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates the only thing from CitiesWork is in general, commercial and industrial special use permits should not be granted to residential areas. One of the things to be considered is it reads in general, commercial and industrial special use permits should not be granted adjacent to residential districts. **Mr. Farley** responded that the original changes to the code here did come from CitiesWork. The suggestions that CitiesWork provided. You have the packet there, they also provided. They had gone through our home occupation ordinance and made notations, striking things, adding to other things. It might have changed it a little bit because I know we've been working on

it, and I know it's not as updated, reflecting last meeting, but there is a possibility that more could change, but the basis of the amendments did come from CitiesWork recommendations.

- **Alan Howze** reminds us of the four other objects that we are striking because it's open to our interpretation. If you're trying to start a business, their whole thing was making it simple as possible. That's why a particular line; they focused legal on that one. If the desire to put it back in, then it's really that last one, which the committee struck was food trucks and others, and just saying commercial vehicles being brought to the premises for loading and unloading only and maybe calling that good. We can always come back and adjust it further, if there are issues that come up. It would at least clarify the intent of this taskforce. **Commissioner Burroughs** responds that the way he is reading this from CitiesWork, in April 2024 UG's Planning Department, asked CitieWorks to consult with them on updating their home occupancy rules. The drafted bill will, so that tells something's already been done and drafted with the CitiesWork recommendations. This addressed:
 - the up to two nonresident employees, if they are provided with off street parking,
 - allow food trucks, and commercial vehicles to be brought to the premises only for loading and unloading during the day, but overnight parking of such vehicles is prohibitive.
 - Allow customers and clients to be present on premises by appointment only, if there's not adequate off-street parking available, no more than two customers or clients,
 - we've had that in discussion and then allow inventory storage for commercial activity on the premises, if not visible, heard or otherwise detectable from the street. That's covered in no inventory storage, a commercial activity may be visible for registry.
- **Ms. Rocha** looked at the city of Shawnee: Vehicles used by the business owner and the employees are not allowed to be parked in the street during business hours. A commercial vehicle, no more than one, one ton is allowed to be parked in the driveway. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates It doesn't sound like there's much more that need to be done. Going off the document that has been drafted. If the ordinance has been drafted. **Ms. Green** responded that's what this is. They didn't draft a brand-new ordinance. They looked at our ordinance and made these recommended changes to us. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates If it's already done, then basically, we don't need to beat it to death and it's a recommendation and already been drafted. It tells me there's eye's already been on this. He just does not want to waste our time having this discussion and parsing at the language. If CitiesWork has already done this work, we don't even need to mess with D, E and F. It looks like it's following the exact language within CitiesWork. If that's the case, as your chair, I say, we just forward away what's been presented, up to our discussion today. If there's any other discussion, any other concerns regarding Home Occupation regulations. **Ms. Hadley** asked if we need a motion to accept the Home Occupation ordinance. **Commissioner Burroughs** states it says the next step was to return to the next business development task force to provide updated language reflecting changes made during the August 1st meeting. Submit changes to the echo and changes would go to the planning commission on the 13th. This was already brought to us. His understanding is this is just more of a review. **Mr. Farley** explained his understanding was the reason that this was being presented was CitiesWork did take the Unified Government's code. chapter 27-609 home occupations. They did not substantially change the language, and only went through made deletions and additions using our current code. That is what was reflected in the slides, barring maybe some slight tweaks or very small tweaks to make the language a little better. He understood the task force was to take that work of that foundation that's already been laid and make additional changes as the taskforce saw fit. I know already we've talked about removing the term food trucks and just keeping it as commercial vehicles. So that would be an example of a change different than CitiesWork who put food trucks in there. **Commissioner Stites** states he is not ok with just because Cityworks did this work, we're supposed to accept it. This is ours and not that I'm discounting any of the work because we may say we totally agree 100%. If that was the case, let's

vote for whatever CitiesWork said and let's all go home. We also had a very a big discussion about the definition of home occupation when we felt adamant about subjectivity, we employed only members of the immediate family residing on the premises, and we said strike that. That's why he is not okay with just saying, let's accept all of Cities Work recommendations. Otherwise, what are we doing here?

Commissioner Burroughs has kept the notes, if he remembers correctly:

- We struck the very last sentence on home occupancy. 27-340, we struck that last sentence.
 - Then on the next page in section 27-609, I have a star, by only members of the immediate family residing on the president premises. That was an issue that we got stuck on for a little bit, but
 - in the next section, we took members out and replaced them with persons residing on the premises. Rewrite and bring back 925. This was number B I'm sorry, I jumped ahead of you a little bit. On that one there, he had we will rewrite that. It was related to getting rid of members of the immediate family to only persons residing on the premises and up to two non-residents,
 - We took away only immediate family Everything else that was presented in that section was the red rewrite, that's what we're working on now, the premise. He is looking at the second page of the handout that we got two months ago, and that has all of these different B, C, D & E, all in the box.
 - The A was okay. No exterior advertising or signs.
 - We said that one was okay. B was the one that we were going to rewrite. That's the one we're talking about now. And we chose to go with again council, just so you know, it says, only persons residing on the premises. Mr. Farley agreed and found his paper copy.
 - C was ok that it was machinery and interference with television and all of that. I think we briefly touched on ham operators, but that's a hobby and not necessarily a business.
 - Now we're back to D again. Let's come back to D if we must.
 - Any questions on E? E is presented on the screen. Baby sitting was covered under a different regulation, if I remember the discussion. What about a salon? They have an appointment. This is maybe on premises, by appointment only. Is everyone good with this? As presented, striking, all the other stuff on the top, Customers, or only clients, may be present. That's where it starts off with the new ordinance. We good with that? Okay, I'm going to mark okay. no comments.
 - F, we talked about that early here, a special use permit for small businesses. Any questions about F?
- **We're back to D.** We'd like to get this one finished up so we can get something down and give council guidance. He has noted all over and will share with what he has. The very first sentence, right after the word "trucks. I've got to strike. If 10,000 pounds, if that was being uniform around the community, I say we just leave it alone. If other communities start changing, we should follow suit, just with the recommendation. **Commissioner Stites** indicates if there is a pathway, for special use, then you come in, and present, here's why I need and let people make that decision. Commissioner Burroughs mentions food trucks and the word other was stricken, so it now reads commercial vehicles, which may be brought to the premises for loading and unloading only. **Mr. Farley** mentioned he does remember that we were talking about using the term overnight and there were questions about that. He put in his notes that we could add at 7 p.m. to 7.am. We would be able to change those hours if they felt necessary. **Commissioner Stites** mentioned maybe it doesn't need to be said overnight at all, and they will not be stored in any 24 hour period, because it should not be ok to happen anytime. 6 o'clock? What's night? Overnight. Maybe it's 24 hour period. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates that most people think everybody works from 7:00 a.m. or 8:00 a.m. to 4 or 5. It doesn't get dark around here until 9 o'clock. If I have small business where I'm running commercial bars, my business is going to run until dark. I think we think there's an understanding

of an overnight means. But how do you enforce it overnight? If I get there at 7:15, and the order says 7 p.m. Yeah, because in the wintertime it's dark, 5:00. don't know, I'm not wanting to try to make a more difficult. **Ms. Rocha** mentioned we might be getting a little in the weeds. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked why we struck the word food trucks? **Mr. Farley** believes it is because we didn't want to single them out necessarily when they'd still be covered by another code. Commissioner Burroughs responded if we strike food trucks and other and just start with commercial vehicles may be brought to the premises, for loading unloading only. and will not be stored overnight.

- Mindy Rocha asked, didn't we already answer that then, if we say commercial vehicles may be brought to the premises for loading out and unloading. Didn't we answer at the first part of the sentence, are we contradicting ourselves? It is saying commercial vehicles may be brought to the premises for loading in and loading only and can't be stored overnight. We're seeing the same thing in two different ways. **Commissioner Burroughs** mentioned he understands what she is saying. **Mr. Howze** indicates we may be getting two different classes of vehicles, so the heavy equipment: backhoe and that kind of stuff, and then your commercial truck would be your box truck. **Ms. Rocha** replied right and in F, no inventory, storage, or commercial activity may be visible or otherwise detectable from the street, and it could be in your driveway anyways. **Mr. Farley** adds to clarify in the subsection F, in the past that has been interpreted to be more of the materials that are used in the business rather than maybe the vehicles themselves. **Ms. Rocha** states, do we then say, no inventory, equipment, or storage, or commercial activity, maybe? Instead of the word material. We add the word equipment, and you can't have equipment. then we're just already saying, commercial vehicles may be brought to the premises for loading and unloading only. She feels we are taking an extra step by saying it can't be stored overnight. If we say they can only come on the premises loading and unloading. We're just reiterating something that we're seeing in the next sentence. Right? **Commissioner Burroughs** states you're raising a lot of the same issues as we word smith this and work through it as we see. I'm trying not to let what I have dealt with in the community guide me on some of the issues we've dealt with. I mean, I see concrete guys with mixtures in their backyard, not one, but seven, huge cement mixers parked in their backyard. They are using their home as their business, because they bought an empty lot behind them, putting up an eight-foot fence, which isn't in code. He sees stuff like that and trying to get it addressed, and if we can't enforce that, what we are doing means nothing. **Ms. Rocha** indicates she just reads two sentences that mean the same thing. **Mr. Howze** asked if Ms. Rocha is suggesting in D to strike everything up till the last sentence and just say commercial vehicles may be brought to the premise for loading and unloading only period. **Ms. Rocha** states if they can't store it overnight, why do we need to say anything about loading and unloading? Who's going to enforce it?
- **Mr. Farley** indicates that language is probably less about the actual business reading it as the staff reading it and understanding, okay, did they intend that no commercial vehicles come onto the property and therefore we need to take it over to a special use process or in this case they gave us their business plan and said, I will need to swing by my residence couple times. Getting things from in and out of my garage. It's going to be closed, and it's not going to violate any of the other conditions, but I need to enter twice a day. **Ms. Rocha** asked, do we just leave no heavy equipment or whatever we've sat on the trucks will be stored overnight, but may be brought to the premises we're loading and unloading. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates cleaning up and making one sentence instead of two separate sentences will work. **Mr. Farley** asked Ms. Rocha to repeat the sentence again. **Ms. Rocha** states no heavy equipment any time, if we leave everything you have, and just say heavy equipment or trucks greater than 10,000 GVWR would not be stored on premises be may be brought to the premises for loading and unloading, only.
- **Rodney Lucas** mentioned that both chairs indicated that a lot of people have F 350s? You're saying that, so shouldn't it be changed to 14,000 pounds? **Commissioner Stites** indicates he does not want to create a problem if you go tag something or there's something tagged larger, now you just escalate yourself into a

commercial type vehicle. We can agree to change that to 14,000 pounds, but he does not know what the ramifications are for doing that. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked What if we say commercial trucks? **Ms. Rattan** indicates stating commercial does differentiate. **Mr. Lucas** states then you're possibly agreeing to semis when you used the word commercial. **Commissioner Burroughs** clarifies and states no heavy equipment or trucks greater than 10,000 pounds. **Mr. Lucas** explained you can change that to 14,000. **Ms. Green** states we should leave it alone because, as **Ms. Rattan** has already done the research, all the other cities in the area are leaving it at 10,000 anyway. And again, we're just talking about home businesses. We're not talking about anybody who has a big truck as their personal vehicle. **Commissioner Stites** mentions so anyone that has an F350 and they have a lawn mowing business, right? And at their house, they can't park in their driveway? **Ms. Rocha** mentioned in reviewing the website of city of Shawnee they state one ton should we just do the same? Is there much difference between a three-quarter ton or a half a ton and a one ton? Do we care? It's not going to hurt our streets, correct? **Ms. Green** indicates they are already driving out there anyway and have been for a while. **Commissioner Stites** replied we can just put a weight of one ton? **Ms. Rocha** states if you go tag it is 12,000 pounds and you're already over. **Commissioner Stites** mentioned anybody in here's that has tagged a pickup, go check and your tag says 12M. **Ms. Green** indicates typically, those are regulated by the state and based off of your VIN. **Mr. Howze** indicates indicating one ton will address that. **Mr. Farley** asked if that means adding one ton and keeping GVWR? The way it reads is no heavy equipment or trucks greater than one ton will not be stored on the premises. **Commissioner Stites** indicates that it will be confusing because people will think the weight of the truck. Because if it doesn't say GVWR, they're going to say, wait a minute, my truck weighs 7,000 pounds. Which is three and half tons. **Ms. Rocha** indicates Shawnee states one commercial vehicle; no more than one ton is allowed to be parked in the driveway. **Ms. Rattan** mentioned stating it that way also gets to Commissioner Burroughs' comment about seven vehicles in back yards. She clarified it mentions one, one ton vehicle where you mentioned seeing four concrete trucks in the back yards. A single vehicle. Commissioner Burroughs ask **MS Rocha** to please share Shawnees statement with legal? It would give staff a chance to look at that and combine it into a sentence as there might be a way for them to bring that back to us next month. We're pretty much done with the rest of this. **Commissioner Stites** ask if staff would not mind reaching out to Bonner and Edwardsville to see what they say. I would just like to know what they say. They are in the same county. **Mr. Farley** asked if he could have clarification, are we asking them what they have on the books. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked us to find out what they have on the books and clean up this paragraph. Can you bring two different D's in with the language of the other city, for us. Between the two, we come up with one of them. and I'm going to say as your chairman, the other stuff is already done. He appreciates your patience because we've dealt with a couple of things that are going to go in front of planning, and it's important we get through these, we give them something to chew on that shows this committee is truly vetted these. As painful as it has been at times. He does want to ensure that whatever we send them, that they have a solid understanding that, it has been vetted and discussed. The scenarios have been played out with legal in the room. He knows we are past our time, but we did hold it to an hour. The date of our next meeting is October 13, which is the date of the Planning Commission. **Mr. Howze** mentioned that will be the final language change for D. If the chairs are okay with it, we can email the two choices to the taskforce to vote and confirm it. **Mr. Farley** asked for confirmation on when the taskforce meets, is it twice a month or every two weeks? If it is every two weeks we would be meeting on October 6th. Calendar invites sent indicate it is October 13th as our meeting is scheduled for the second and the fourth Mondays of every month. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked for the two choices for D to be sent via email and members send their choice back to legal. The taskforce members will be given two options and must respond back individually to legal (no respond all). He appreciates the taskforce attentiveness. Thank you for your sticktoitiveness and concern. With no further business we are adjourned. Meeting Adjourned at 4:05 pm. Next meeting is October 13, 2025 at 3:00 pm