

**THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HELD ON JUNE 16, 2014, AT  
7:00 P.M., AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

\*\*\*\*\*

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Jack Edmonds. Members present were Jeff Reynolds, Eldon Johnson, Mitzi Mellott, Chad Heitschmidt, and Jim Kusler (Princeton Twsp. Rep). Staff present were Mike Nielson (City Engineer with WSB & Assoc.), Carie Fuhrman (Comm. Dev. Director), and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Assistant).

**APPROVAL ON MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ON MAY 19, 2014**

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 19, 2014. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

**AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETEDIONS:**

Fuhrman asked the Planning Commission Board if New Business items could be reviewed before the Old Business items, since there are people present for the New Business items.

HEITSCHMIDT MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE MOVING THE NEW BUSINESS ITEMS ON THE AGENDA TO BE REVIEWED PRIOR TO THE OLD BUSINESS. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**A. #14-03 Variance for Drive Thru & Site Plan Review for Caribou Coffee**

**Community Development Director Memo:**

United Properties Investment, LLC has submitted an application for a site plan review for the construction of a Caribou Coffee shop and variance for a drive-thru service lane at 703 Northland Drive. The property is legally described as Lot 3, Block 1, Princeton Crossing Second Addition, Sherburne County. An aerial map and survey have been provided to the Planning Commission to review. The property is owned by Ashland Inc., who has submitted written approval of the applications.

The property is zoned B-2 Neighborhood Commercial and designated as Highway Commercial on the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Plan.

The site is located west of Rum River Drive, south of McDonald's, and east of Shopko. The lot is triangular-shaped, 30,615 square feet or 0.7 acres in size, and is currently undeveloped. A portion of the lot contains paving from the adjacent Shopko parking lot. It contains a 30 foot drainage and utility easement along the east property line, a 24 foot wide driveway, drainage, and utility easement along the west property line, and a 5 foot easements along the north and south property lines. To the east of the site, in the Rum River Drive right-of-way, will be the future location of the city's trail.

The project includes the construction of a 1,750 square foot building, 20 feet in height, with a drive-thru lane on the north side of the building and outdoor patio with seating for 16 to the west of the building. The building meets all setback and height requirements.

**Access & Traffic Flow:** Access will be off of Northland Drive through an easement, which was established when the lot was platted back in the 1990's. Patrons will enter between Shopko and McDonald's through an existing curb cut and travel south to the site.

The drive-thru lane will be accessed via the southernmost entrance into the parking area off of the easement, indicated with a directional sign. This will allow vehicles to travel east, and then north to the menu board, located to the east of the building. The actual drive-thru window will be on the north side of the building, where drive-thru patrons will exit through the same access easement. The drive-thru has stacking room for five vehicles. Fuhrman prefers drive-thru patrons enter through this southernmost opening as the parking stalls closest to the building will likely be business with more vehicles entering and leaving, causing more traffic disruptions. The City Engineer is recommending additional signage to steer vehicles in this direction.

**Parking:** The site plan proposes 35 parking stalls, with one handicap stall, which meets the Ordinance requirement, one space per three patron seats, plus one space per employee on the largest shift. The coffee shop will have 48 interior seats and 16 outdoor patio seats, for a total of 64 seats. Maximum number of employees will be eight. The majority of the parking will be 90 degree stalls, with some 60 degree parking along the north property line.

The stall sizes and aisle widths meet Ordinance requirements as well. Parking is proposed within easement areas, which is allowed with the understanding it is the property owner's responsibility if access were to be required. Bicycle racks are required to accommodate bicycle parking.

**Landscaping:** The Landscaping Plan proposes landscaping within several of the parking lot islands, as well as surrounding the outdoor patio to the west, north of the building, and to the east of the building, which appears to meet Ordinance requirements.

**Signage:** The applicant is not seeking signage approval at this time. The applicant will likely utilize wall, awning, directional, and a pylon sign however;

Wall Signs: Up to 3 wall signs are allowed.

Pylon Sign: The applicant is tentatively considering a pylon sign in the northeast corner of the property. If it is less than 900 feet from the Highway 169 and Rum River Drive Interchange, the sign can be up to 150 square feet and 60 feet tall. However, Fuhrman has made the applicant aware of the multi-tenant business (MTB) sign provision of our Sign Ordinance, which is intended to allow commercial identification of businesses sites in a manner that coordinates traffic safely and to minimize individual pylon signs by clustering

two or more signs on a single MTB sign at major intersections. Pending Shopko's approval, the applicants may wish to advertise on the Shopko sign.

Awning Signs: The total awning sign area on any one side of a building may not exceed 5% of the building façade, or 40 square feet, whichever is greater.

Directional Signs: On-premise directional signs are allowed and may contain the name or logo of the establishment, but no advertising copy, and must be less than nine square feet in area.

Permits shall be pulled prior to signage installation. A new freestanding sign or MTB sign requires Planning Commission approval.

**Building Materials:** The building is proposed to be constructed on tan/light EIFS with concrete boulder accents along the bottom of the building, which are approved materials. The building will also contain canopies/awnings on three of the four building walls. The bottom of the awnings appear to be about 9.5 feet over the walking area, which meets the minimum eight foot clearance.

**Trash Enclosure:** The 138 square foot trash enclosure is proposed in the southeast corner of the lot. It shall match the exterior building materials, but cannot be of a permanent construction type, such as concrete block, as it is proposed within the drainage and utility easement area. It is allowed with the understanding it is the property owner's responsibility if access is ever required in that area.

The City Engineer has reviewed the application and submitted comments via a memo dated June 10, 2014 and June 16, 2014. He has requested additional information for the sanitary sewer and storm water prior to the Planning Commission meeting. The applicant has been working with city staff in regards to the sanitary sewer hook-up. Pending what is decided for sanitary sewer hook-up, if digging in the street is required, an escrow be required, as well as a two year warranty.

**City Engineer: Mike Nielson (WSB & Associates, Inc.) Memo dated June 10, 2014**  
Site plans were submitted by Alliant Engineering, dated 5/29/2014. The plans include Sheets C-0, Existing Topo and Sheets C1-C4, L-1, and L-2.

**General Comments:** The proposed development is a Caribou Coffee establishment with a drive through window. The site is currently vacant with a significant amount of bituminous paving that was apparently done by the former Pamida Store which is now owned by Shopko.

The site includes 0.70 acres with 4,509 square feet of pervious area for a total impervious percentage of 85%. The previous development that included the Pamida Store and McDonalds provided stormwater storage for the entire site. Additional storage will not be required for this site. Additional stormwater treatment will be required for sediment

control from the parking lot. The applicant is proposing sumped catch basins at the NE corner of the parking lot to trap sediment. This meets the intent of the Stormwater Management plan.

There is also an existing storm sewer system including a series of 5 catch basins that serve the pre-developed area and portions of the Pamida parking lot. This drainage needs to be maintained to meet the existing offsite runoff and additional runoff proposed by this development.

The applicant has removed a series of 3 catch basins and a 27" pipe that drains to the existing stormwater pond adjacent to Rum River Drive. This system has not been replaced with this plan submittal. A revised set of plans with stormwater calculations for all storm piping will be required prior to approval.

**Sheet – Alta Survey:** The limits of the existing conditions need to be expanded to show the sanitary sewer connection point and inverts of the existing sewer.

**Sheet C-1, Site Plan:** A recommendation to sign the drive through toward the south entrance was made to improve internal traffic flow was made at a previous design meeting. This has not adequately done. Additional signage should be added to mark the entrance clearly to the south to avoid congestion directly south of the store. Modifications may be required to the head in parking to allow a full access lane to the drive through and bypass lane as shown on the attached review drawings. The dual exit lanes may cause some confusion with 2 cars trying to make the same rt-turn. Channelization should be considered at this location.

**Sheet C-2 – Grading and Drainage Plan:**

1. Storm sewer was removed from under the building including 3 catch basins and a 24" storm sewer pipe. This drainage system has not been replaced and must be provided for in an equal or greater capacity.
2. The inlet protection shown must be around all existing and proposed catch basins.
3. Storm Sewer drainage maps and calculations must be provided for all existing, replacement and proposed piping systems.
4. The Site Data Block shows the disturbed area as 0.07 acres. This should be corrected to 0.70 acres.

**Sheet C-3 – Utility Plan:**

1. Replace the existing storm sewer system matching or exceeding the existing capacity.
2. Provide detailed design information including storm sewer design, pipe grades and invert elevations. Ponding in the parking lot should not exceed 1' in depth for the 100-year storm. This is a landlocked basin and you should assume a 50% clogging factor for all storm inlets.
3. Provide detailed information for sanitary sewer connection points including invert elevations, pipe size and grades. Details should be provided for connection to existing system and location should be shown on the drawings.

4. A bituminous replacement detail needs to be provided for the driveway repair adjacent to McDonalds.
5. All watermain materials must meet the Princeton Public Utility Specifications and a 48 hour notice must be made prior to connection to allow time for proper inspection by the PUC.

**Sheet C-4 Detail Sheet**

1. Details should be added for water and sewer construction.

**Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan**

1. Erosion Blanket must be provided for on all areas adjacent to Rum River Drive.

**Sheet L-2, Photometric Plan**

No photometric's have been included in the plan. Please submit.

**City Engineer: Mike Nielson (WSB & Associates, Inc.) Memo dated June 16, 2014**

Revised site plans were submitted by Alliant Engineering, dated 6/12/2014. The plans include Sheets C-0, Existing Topo and Sheets C1-C4, L-1 and L-2. Storm water calculations have also been submitted for the proposed storm sewer system.

**General Comments:**

The previous comments noted that the applicant has removed a series of 3 catch basins and a 24" pipe that drains to the existing stormwater pond adjacent to Rum River Drive that was not replaced in the original submission. The revised plans have replaced the existing pipe with an 18" pipe and 2 catch basins. It is my recommendation to maintain the 24" pipe size even though the 18" pipe with greater slope meets the 10 year design storm. This will alleviate any future argument that it floods more now than when the 24" pipe was in place. Also I am requiring that a 3<sup>rd</sup> catch basin be installed to replace the 3 that were removed.

**Sheet C-0 – Cover Sheet (NO COMMENTS)**

**Sheet – Alta Survey**

Comments Addressed.

**Sheet C-1, Site Plan**

A recommendation to sign the drive through toward the south entrance was made to improve internal traffic flow was made at a previous design meeting. This has not adequately done. Additional signage should be added to make the entrance clearly to the south to avoid congestion directly south of the store. Modifications may be required to the head in parking to allow a full access lane to the drive through and bypass lane as shown on the attached review drawings. The dual exit lanes may cause some confusion with 2 cars trying to make the same rt-turn. Channelization should be considered at this location.

**Sheet C-2 – Grading and Drainage Plan**

1. Storm sewer was removed from under the building including 3 catch basins and a 24" storm sewer pipe. This drainage system has not been replaced and must be provided for in an equal or greater capacity. The revisions are not adequate. The 24" pipe size should be maintained and the 3<sup>rd</sup> catch basin should be replaced.
2. My previous comments suggested that ponding in the parking lot should not exceed 1" in depth, however in this case it might be more appropriate to limit the maximum ponding depth to 0.5'. It is my recommendation that 0.5' maximum ponding depth. This can be accomplished by changing the north curb line to drain from the NW corner to the NE corner with the highpoint removed.

### **Sheet C-3 – Utility Plan**

1. Replace the existing storm sewer system matching or exceeding the existing capacity. Change the 18" storm sewer to a 24" as currently exists.
2. Add a 3<sup>rd</sup> catch basin as currently exists.

### **Sheet C-4 Detail Sheet**

1. Comments Addressed.

### **Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan**

Comments Addressed.

Sheet L-2, Photometric Plan – Plan submitted.

### **VARIANCE:**

**Variance Review Standards:** The Zoning Ordinance lists the following standards to review a variance application by:

1. Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance?

Comment: The general purpose and intent of the B-2 District is to offer basic, convenience-type goods and services to the immediately surrounding area in which it is located.

2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?

Comment: The Comprehensive Plan designates this area as Highway Commercial. A coffee shop with a drive-thru service lane is consistent with the Highway Commercial designation, which allows a large mix of retail, office, and other business uses with generally more stringent development standards. Integrated neighborhood design with pedestrian and automobile facilities should be encouraged.

3. Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance?

Comment: A drive-thru lane on a coffee shop is a reasonable use of a commercial property alongside a major highway.

4. Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?

Comment: The B-2 Zoning District is intended to serve those commercial areas in close proximity to residential areas, such as the commercial node just north of the roundabout and the areas south of downtown along Rum River Drive. The B-2 Zoning District currently lists coffee shops and with no drive-thru service as a permitted use. Although, the property is zoned B-2, Neighborhood Commercial, it is designated as Highway Commercial on the Future Land Use Plan. At the time the Comprehensive Plan was updated back in 2008, the zoning district should have been updated to match the land use designation, but it was not. This site, along with the adjacent commercial sites, should be zoned B-3, Highway Commercial, to match the Highway Commercial future land use designation.

Fuhrman has discussed this with the applicants and will be contacting the adjacent property owners to make them aware of this. The rezoning will be coming back in front of the Planning Commission to update this piece. The B-3 Zoning District does allow drive-thru service lanes as a permitted use. If the rezoning had already occurred, a variance would not be required. However, because the rezoning has not occurred yet, a variance is required from the B-2 standard.

5. Will issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?

Comment: Yes, the issuance of a variance to allow a drive-thru will maintain the essential character of the locality as it is within the middle of a highway commercial development. Shopko to the west and a McDonald's with a drive-thru service lane to the north. A drive-thru coffee shop will serve travelers along Highway 169.

6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?

Comment: Yes, the alleged practical difficulty that a coffee shop off a highway should provide safe and expeditious service to its customers is more than just an economic commode of doing business in a setting next to a highway.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

**Site Plan Review:** Based upon the above review standards, Fuhrman would recommend approval of the site plan review, subject to the following conditions:

1. Bicycle racks shall be placed near the entrance.
2. The signage shall be reviewed and permits obtained prior to installation. Planning Commission review is required for a new pylon sign or utilization of the MTB signage.
3. The trash enclosure shall match the exterior building materials in color. The trash enclosure shall not be of concrete block construction.
4. Additional information shall be provided for the City Engineer's review.
5. The conditions of the City Engineer memo dated June 10, 2014 shall be met prior to the issuance of the Building Permit or Certificate of Occupancy.
6. If digging in the street is required for the sanitary sewer hook-up, an escrow will be required, as well as a two- year warranty.
7. If access is required within any of the easements, the financial costs of removal and replacement shall be the responsibility of the property owner (parking, trash enclosure,

signage, etc). An agreement between the City and applicant may be required by the City Attorney.

8. All necessary permits shall be applied for and approved prior to construction, including, but not limited to: building, signage, Water Access Charge (WAC), and Sewer Access Charge (SAC).

9. Any consultant costs over and above the original escrow fee shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

**Variance:** Fuhrman would recommend approval of the variance for a drive-thru service lane, based on the following findings of fact:

1. The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance;
2. The variance is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;
3. The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance;
4. There are circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowners;
5. The issuance of the variance shall maintain the essential character of the locality, and;
6. The alleged practical difficulty involves more than economic considerations.

-----End of staff memos-----

Fuhrman introduced the application and went through highlights of the staff memo.

Mike Nielson, City Engineer, informed the Planning Commission Board that he did an updated memo after the applicants revised their plans. The current storm sewer serves Shopko parking lot area and access and easement area for this site. They were going to build over the storm sewer lines and they revised the plans so they will not be building over it. Nielson said the revised plans have the storm sewer removed from under the building including the three catch basins and 24" storm sewer pipe. He wants the 24' pipe size maintained and the three catch basins should be replaced. Provide the catch basins as a total of five. The storm sewer is designed for a ten year storm and Nielson would like the maximum ponding depth to 0.5'. It would be best for the operations of the parking lot.

Rick McKelvey, United Properties, was present to represent the project and said he is fine with the conditions from the City staff.

Edmonds opened the public hearing. There were no one present to address this item.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS TO APPROVE ITEM #14-03 VARIANCE TO ALLOW A DRIVE-THRU SERVICE LANE FOR A COFFEE SHOP (CARIBOU COFFEE) IN THE B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED IN LOT 3, BLOCK 1, PRINCETON

CROSSING SECOND ADDITION SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN REVIEW. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board Reviewed the Findings of Fact:

1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes.
3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes.
5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality? Yes.
6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations? Yes.

HEITSCHMIDT MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN FOR CARIBOU COFFEE IN THE B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT, LOCATED IN LOT 3, BLOCK 1, PRINCETON CROSSING SECOND ADDITION, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. BICYCLE RACKS SHALL BE PLACED NEAR THE ENTRANCE.
2. THE SIGNAGE SHALL BE REVIEWED AND PERMITS OBTAINED PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. THE PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW IS REQUIRED FOR A NEW PYLON SIGN OR UTILIZATION OF THE MTB SIGNAGE.
3. THE TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL MATCH THE EXTERIOR BUILDING MATERIALS IN COLOR. THE TRASH ENCLOSURE SHALL NOT BE OF CONCRETE BLOCK CONSTRUCTION.
4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR THE CITY ENGINEER'S REVIEW.
5. THE CONDITIONS OF THE CITY ENGINEER MEMO DATED JUNE 10, 2014 AND JUNE 16, 2014 SHALL BE MET PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE BUILDING PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.
6. IF DIGGING IN THE STREET IS REQUIRED FOR THE SANITARY SEWER HOOK-UP, AND ESCROW WILL BE REQUIRED, AS WELL AS A TWO YEAR WARRANTY.
7. IF ACCESS IS REQUIRED WITHIN ANY OF THE EASEMENTS, THE FINANCIAL COSTS OF REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROPERTY OWNER (PARKING, TRASH ENCLOSURE, SIGNAGE, ETC). AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND APPLICANT MAY BE REQUIRED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY.
8. ALL NECESSARY PERMITS SHALL BE APPLIED FOR AND APPROVED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO: BUILDING, SIGNAGE, WATER ACCESS CHARGE (WAC), AND SEWER ACCESS CHARGE (SAC).
9. ANY CONSULTANT COSTS OVER AND ABOVE THE ORIGINAL ESCROW FEE SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

**B. #14-04 Variance to Front Setback for Home Addition at 402 7<sup>th</sup> Street North  
Community Development Director Memo:**

Paul and Martina Snow have submitted an application for a variance to the 25 foot front yard setback requirement in the R-2 Zoning District in order to construct a 2,800 square foot addition on to their single family home at 402 7<sup>th</sup> Street North. The addition will be 15.8 feet from the front property line. The property is legally described as Lot 1, Block 44,

Princeton Original Townsite and the South ½ of Lot 2, Block 44 and West ½ of vacated 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North adjacent.

The addition will be 15.8 feet from the front property line. The property is zoned R-2, within the Wild and Scenic District, and designated as Traditional Residential on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Plan.

The subject parcel is located on the north side of 7<sup>th</sup> Street North where the improved street dead ends. To the east of the site is additional land owned by the applicants and the Rum River. The applicants own the vacant lot to the north of their house as well. Although the street dead ends, the right-of-way is still in existence in front of the home. The site contains a single family home with an attached garage. The house was constructed in the 1940's.

An approximately 2,800 square foot addition is planned to the west of the existing house, which is approximately 30 feet from the 7<sup>th</sup> Street ROW/front property line. The property owner has submitted a description of the proposed work, which is provided for the Planning Commission's review.

**Setback Standards:** The R-2 Zoning District requires a 25 foot front yard setback for the living area of a single family home, a front porch can be up to 20 feet from the front property line. However, there is a provision in the Ordinance that states if at the time this Ordinance becomes effective, 50% or more of the then existing dwellings having frontages on the same side of the street or road have a predominant front yard setback different from that specified therein, then all buildings thereafter erected, altered, or moved may conform to that predominant front yard depth as a minimum.

According to the applicant's survey, the house immediately to the west is 5.49 feet from the front property line. Using aerial GIS mapping, not certified surveys, the other homes on the north side of 7<sup>th</sup> Street North are approximately 10, 15, and 20 feet from the front property line/Right-of-Way of 7<sup>th</sup> Street North. Because there was not a predominant front yard setback to use, a variance is required.

**Wild & Scenic District Standards:** The property is located within the Wild and Scenic District. Single family dwellings are a permitted use within the District. There are no specific setback requirements for sewered non-riparian lots.

**Variance Review Standards:** Requests may be made for variances from the literal provisions of the Zoning Ordinance in instances when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the Zoning Ordinance.

A variance shall not be granted by the Planning Commission unless it conforms to the following standards:

1. Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance?

Comment: One of the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance is to establish regulations to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the residents of Princeton, which is accomplished through regulating the location of structures. The proposed addition is in close proximity to the front property line/right-of-way of 7<sup>th</sup> Street North. From a zoning Standpoint, this causes concerns in terms of safety, utility placement, and any possible future plans to widen the right-of-way of 7<sup>th</sup> Street North. However, due to the location of the home in its proximity to the Rm River, it is unlikely that the street may be extended in front of the home. The right-of-way, may however, be utilized for the public to access the river.

2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?

Comment: The act of renovating/adding on to an existing home is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan identifies on going residential activities within the Vision and Plan portion, including the improvement of neighborhoods and broadening housing styles and neighborhood design options within the City.

3. Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance?

Comment: The property owner proposes to use this specific portion of the property as a single family home addition, which is reasonable. It is the front yard setback that is not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Area there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?

Comment: Yes, the home was built in the 1940's, prior to the current setback requirements and was positioned at an angle on the lot. Adding on to the rear of the home is an option as the property owner's own the vacant lot to the north, but the lots would need to be combined.

5. Will the issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?

Comment: The issuance of the variance will maintain the essential character of the locality. Other structures located in the same block on the north side of 7<sup>th</sup> Street appear to be 5, 10, 15, and 20 feet from the front property line. A 15 foot front yard setback, as proposed by the applicants, would be in line with the character of the locality.

6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?

Comment: Yes, the alleged practical difficulty, the current home location of the home, involves more than economic considerations.

**CONCLUSION:**

To approve the variance request, the City must find that the proposed uses the property in a reasonable manner, and that the applicant has demonstrated that there are practical difficulties, unique to the property not created by the property owner, that interfere in

using the property in such a manner. The proposed use as a single family home addition is clearly using the property in a reasonable manner in a residential district in the City. The practical difficulty in this case, not caused by the property owner, is the current location of the home, which was constructed in the 1940's prior to the current zoning regulations. Although, there is room to add on to the home in the rear yard if the two lots were combined, the Ordinance provision was clearly intended to take into consideration situations such as this where the homes along one side of a street do not meet the required setback, to be more lenient with the front setback requirement.

Fuhrman would recommend approval of the variance to the front yard setback required, based on the findings:

1. The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The variance is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
3. The property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance.
4. There are circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner.
5. The issuance of the variance will maintain the essential character of the locality.
6. The alleged practical difficulty involves more than economic considerations. And subject to the condition that a building permit be submitted and approved prior to construction.

-----End Staff Memo-----

Fuhrman introduced the application and went through highlights of the staff memo.

The applicants, Paul and Martina Snow, were present and said they have nothing else to add to what staff reviewed.

Edmonds opened the public hearing. There were no residents present to address this item.

HEITSCHMIDT MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Edmonds asked the applicant what they are building the addition for.

Paul Snow said that a portion of the house will be removed and then the house added on to.

There was discussion regarding which portion of the house was going to be removed to accommodate the addition.

MELLOTT MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE ITEM #14-04 VARIANCE TO THE 25 FOOT FRONT YARD SETBACK REQUIREMENT FOR A HOME ADDITION TO BE 15.8 FEET FROM THE FRONT PROPERTY LINE IN THE R-2, RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT LOCATED AT 402 7<sup>TH</sup> STREET NORTH, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITION THAT A BUILDING PERMIT BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Findings of Fact:

1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes.
3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes.
5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality? Yes.
6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations? Yes.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Sign Review for Hibb's & Co.**

Timothy Hibbard, on behalf of Hibb's & Co., has submitted a permit application for the placement of two signs (one monument and one pylon) at 1606 10<sup>th</sup> Street South. This site is legally described as Lot 1, Block 4, Princeton Industrial Park. The property is zoned MN-1, Industrial District.

**Monument Sign (Sign #1):** The monument sign will be placed on the south side of the site in the grass island area between the two driveway accesses on to 10<sup>th</sup> Street South. Placement of the sign will be out of the right-of-way. Monument signs with a maximum sign area of 100 square feet and height of 8 feet are allowed. The proposed sign size is 36" x 48" (12 square feet), well under the 100 square feet maximum sign area allowed. The sign height will be 5 feet, which meets the maximum sign height allowed. The applicant is proposing to place two small solar lights on the top of each side, which is allowed via Ordinance.

**Pylon Sign:** The pylon sign will be placed in the northeast corner of the site. An existing pylon sign exists, but a recent survey revealed the existing sign is outside the property lines. The new sign would be located within the property lines.

The Zoning Ordinance allows pylon signs with a maximum sign area of 150 square feet and maximum sign height of 20 feet. The proposed sign size is 96" x 144" (96 square feet), under the 150 square feet maximum sign area allowed. The sign height will be 18 feet with ten feet of clearance between grade levels and the bottom of the sign, meeting the sign height and clearance requirement. Solar lighting at the top of the sign will be used to illuminate the sign.

Fuhrman would recommend approval of the proposed signs based on the finding that both signs meet the Ordinance requirements and subject to the following conditions:

1. Property line/pins shall be located and signs placed inside the property and outside the road right-of-way.
2. A Building Permit must be applied for and approved prior to sign placement.

JONSON MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO APPROVE THE MONUMENT SIGNAGE AND PYLON SIGNAGE AT HIBB'S & CO., LOCATED AT 1606 10<sup>TH</sup> STREET SOUTH. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

## **B. Site Plan Review for Fairview Northland Medical Office Building Addition**

### **Community Development Director Memo:**

Pope Architects, on behalf of Fairview Northland, has submitted a site plan review application for the construction of an addition to the existing Fairview Northland Medical Center at 911 Northland Drive.

The property is zoned HC-1, Health Care District, and designated as Medical Office on the Future Land Use Plan. Retail uses aligns with both the zoning and future land use designation. Fairview Northland owns four parcels with the building being located on 90-004-2106.

The project consists of a new two story medical office building (12,500 square feet on both levels, for a total addition of 25,000 square feet) connected to the existing 4-story Fairview Northland Medical Facility. The addition will be on the southeast corner of the existing hospital and will be connected in two locations. A courtyard will be established between the existing building and proposed addition. Some of the existing parking will be removed to accommodate the addition, and the new parking will be relocated to the east of the addition.

**Access:** There are currently three accesses into the site. The applicants are proposing an additional entrance onto Northland Drive to the northeast of the addition to accommodate delivery trucks. The City Engineer addresses this in his memo.

**Parking:** The entire parking area to the east of the current facility will be removed to accommodate the addition. It will be replaced to the east of the new addition. The site currently has 504 parking stalls and will have 520 stalls when the project is complete. According to the Ordinance, one parking space for each 200 square feet of useable floor area is required for medical office space. For a 25,000 square feet of medical office space, that would require 125 parking stalls. This is not knowing how much space is not useable, such as closets, entryways, etc. Staff is waiting for a detailed parking analysis from the applicants to determine the total number of spaces required. Additional parking spaces may be required, pending the results of the parking analysis; unless the applicant can prove that additional parking is not needed, which is required to be approved by the Planning Commission. For 90 degree parking, the aisles are required to be 26 feet wide.

**Landscaping:** The Landscaping Plan proposes landscaping along the south side of the new addition and landscaping "islands" and "peninsulas" within the parking lot area, which appears to meet the Ordinance requirements.

**Signage:** No signage has been applied for as a part of this application. Any new signs will require approval prior to installation. New freestanding signs require Planning Commission review.

**Building Materials:** The new addition will be of the same construction type as the existing facility. The addition will be comprised of masonry, brick and stone, glass, and metal panels, all of which are approved materials via the Ordinance.

**Trail:** Fairview Northland will be constructing a trail around their campus this summer. In 2017 – 2018, after receiving the federal grant, the City will be constructing the City trail, which will connect to Fairview's trail, and run along Northland Drive, to the east of the addition.

**City Engineer:** The City Engineer has reviewed the site plan application and submitted comments via a memo dated June 6, 2014 in regards to the new access, grading, drainage, and utilities.

**Fire Inspector:** The Fire Inspector has indicated that the new Fire Department Connection (FDC) needs to be shown on the plans.

Based upon the above review standards, City staff would recommend approval of the site plan review for the proposed Medical Office building addition to Fairview Northland, subject to the following conditions:

1. Additional parking spaces may be required, pending the results of the parking analysis; unless the applicant can prove that additional parking is not needed, which is required to be approved by the Planning Commission.
2. Parking aisles shall be increased to 26 feet wide.
3. Signs shall require separate review and approval.
4. The City Engineer recommendations shall be followed as indicated in the memo dated June 16, 2014 and updated plans submitted.
5. The Fire Department Connection (FDC) shall be indicated on the plans.
6. All necessary permits shall be applied for and approved prior to construction, including, but not limited to: building, Water Access Charge (WAC), and Sewer Access Charge (SAC).
7. Any consultant costs over and above the original escrow fee shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

**City Engineer: Mike Nielson, WSB & Assoc. memo dated June 6, 2014:**

WSB has received plans for the above project from Loucks Associates, dated 5-27-14 and signed by Vicki J. Van Dell, PE. The review plans include Sheets C1-C8. Also submitted for review was a Stormwater Management Plan dated 5-27-14 and signed by Vicki J. Van Dell, PE

The project includes the removal of an existing parking lot located on the east side of the hospital and constructing additional medical space along with a new parking lot. The proposed improvements will require a net increase of 0.55 acres of impervious surface. The applicant is proposing to treat additional runoff with an underground Stormwater System. The proposed drainage improvements will reduce the existing runoff for the 2, 10, and 100-year storm events, meeting or exceeding the city requirement for treatment and runoff rates.

**General Comments:**

**Sheet C1 – Existing Conditions** – No Comments

**Sheet C1-2 – Demo** – No Comments

**Sheet C3-1 – Site Plan**

The applicant is requesting an additional entrance onto Northland Drive to accommodate tractor/trailer delivery trucks. This issue has been discussed at previous development meetings. We do not encourage an additional access at the proposed location, however will recommend approval of the proposed service entrance if the following conditions are met.

1. The proposed exit is signed as RIGHT TURN ONLY.
2. EXIT ONLY or NO ENTRANCE signs be placed at the proposed entrance.
3. NO LEFT TURN signs are placed on Northland Drive prior to this entrance for approaching vehicles from east.
4. Proper sight distances are maintained at all times.
5. As traffic volumes or accidents increase, the hospital will take additional measures to reduce the use of this entrance by the general public. These measures may include gates between the parking lot and service entrance.

**Sheet C3-1 – Grading and Drainage**

1. The area to the west of the proposed addition is a depression with storm sewer draining the area. I have a concern about the drainage of this area. Due to a pipe blockage approximately 8-feet of water could pond in this depression before it would run out. Additional information is required for;
  - a. Back to Back 100-year storm and 10-day snow melt information should be provided.
  - b. Additional detail on wall type and footing details. It is unclear if there will be an exposed lower floor wall 13' tall.
  - c. The storm sewer under the building connection is not recommended. Further discussion on this design is needed.
2. Stormtech System – more detail is needed on this system.
  - a. Provide the standard Stormtech design sheet showing invert elevations and chamber construction.
  - b. Consider connecting the stormwater from CB 1 into the stormtech system.
3. Infiltration Garden. As shown the stormwater has direct path from inlet to outlet.
  - a. Provide an outlet structure to insure ponding in this area occurs. A reduced orifice and overflow structure will increase the infiltration.

**Sheet C3-2 SWPP**

1. A NPDES Permit will be required.

**Sheet C4-1 Utility Plan**

1. CB 9 should be relocated closer to the proposed curb to provide 10' of separation from the existing watermain.
2. The type of connection to watermain should be detailed and approved. Tapping Valves are preferred.
3. 48-hour notice to the PUC and Engineer shall be provided before making any connections. Inspection will be required by PUC or Engineering staff.
4. All fittings will require MEGA – LUGS or approved equal. Rodding on City water system is not allowed.

-----End of staff memos-----

Fuhrman introduced the application and highlighted the applicant memos. She reiterated that they are proposing 520 parking stalls and they currently have 504 parking stalls now. No signage has been applied for. The building materials will be the same as they have on the current building. The walking path will be going around their campus and connecting with the City walking path.

Raymond Pirainen, Director of Real Estate for Fairview, explained they will be expanding some services. The specialty services have grown. They would like the dirt work done in the summer. The intent is to get started as soon as possible.

David Moga, Pope Architects, said they will start the project in July or August. The Fire Department wanted the fire connection relocated for the temporary location and they have accommodated that in a single design. This addition is 90% to allow the existing services to grow and have more space. Currently the specialty services are at the clinic 2-3 times a week and this addition would make it where they can be here five days a week. There will just be a few new services added to the medical office building. They want to utilize the existing parking lot area instead of tearing up more green space.

Fuhrman said the Ordinance allows if there is adequate proof to not require more parking spaces, and the Planning Commission is okay with the amount the applicant is presenting, they can approve the reduced amount.

Nielson said the applicant is requesting an additional entrance onto Northland Drive to accommodate delivery trucks. This existing driveway and proposed driveway would connect to the primary. He does not want patients using this additional entrance and would like signage with right turn only, no left turn. He would like to reserve the right if there are accidents because of this added entrance, it would be gated off for deliveries only. For the green areas on the plans, he asked if the wall of the building is exposed?

Moga said yes, a finished product will be there.

Nielson said it is a big hole with a storm sewer under that area and could cause problems with the storm sewer. With a 13 foot hole, the leaves and other debris could collect in there and plug it up. A pipe breakage could lead into a footing failure. Nielson does not like this as part of the plans, but does not see any other alternative, so he requests they keep the area clean. He would like the concerns from staff satisfied with the Planning Commission approval.

Edmonds said patient parking is not over there.

Moga said they are creating a separation from patient, staff and service traffic. It is for the convenience for delivery services. They will route traffic back out to Northland Drive and not this area.

Pirainen said they understand Nielson's concerns. The court yard is to maximize the windows in that area and a reasonable place to look out for patients receiving treatments.

Johnson asked if the roads will be left open?

Pirainen said yes. They have dealt with a driveway entrance for service trucks by the emergency room and it has never been a problem. Patients and staff will not be using the additional entrance.

Moga showed a large board with a sample of the materials that will be used on the exterior of the building addition.

Edmonds said the site drawings look nice.

Heitschmidt asked Nielson if he is comfortable with the courtyard and access area.

Nielson said he would like an inspection of the pipes every three to four years in the courtyard.

Moga said the storm sewer and rerouting the Fire Department service connection is the first item they will do on the site when beginning the addition.

Johnson said for the approval of the site plan as presented, the Planning Commission should note the Engineer's conditions with the courtyard and the additional access for the service vehicles.

Nielson said it is their private building and there is a risk to the reward of what they want, but as long as they are aware of it, he is fine with the courtyard area. He does not need to sign off on those plans. The conditions for the access on Northland Drive should stay in place. He wants them to provide him with drainage information with the storm sewer and the rain guard also.

Fuhrman said the motion can be based on the conditions in Nielson's memo.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN FOR FAIRVIEW NORTHLAND MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING ADDITION AT 911 NORTHLAND DRIVE, #90-004-2106, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES MAY BE REQUIRED, PENDING THE RESULTS OF THE PARKING ANALYSIS; UNLESS THE APPLICANT CAN PROVE THAT ADDITIONAL PARKING IS NOT NEEDED, WHICH IS REQUIRED TO BE APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION.
2. PARKING AISLES SHALL BE INCREASED TO 26 FEET WIDE.
3. SIGNS SHALL REQUIRE SEPARATE REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
4. THE CITY ENGINEER RECOMMENDATIONS SHALL BE FOLLOWED AS INDICATED IN THE MEMO DATED JUNE 6, 2014 AND UPDATED PLANS SUBMITTED.
5. THE FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTION (FDC) SHALL BE INDICATED ON THE PLANS.
6. ALL NECESSARY PERMITS SHALL BE APPLIED FOR AND APPROVED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO: BUILDING, WATER ACCESS CHARGE (WAC), AND SEWER ACCESS CHARGE (SAC).
7. ANY CONSULTANT COSTS OVER AND ABOVE THE ORIGINAL ESCROW FEE SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

#### **A. Fence Ordinance Discussion**

Fuhrman informed the Planning Commission Board that she would like to discuss the Fence Ordinance. On her handout, she highlighted areas that need to be revised. She would like to make the language more clear. The Ordinance would still allow for property line fences if they have the property pins located or a survey. If they do not have either, they would need the signed agreement with the neighbor. Another area that needs clarification is the front yard fences. The front yard of a corner lot cannot have a fence higher than three feet in the clear zone area. A fence in the front yard cannot be in excess of three and one-half feet.

Nielson said the site distance is three and one-half feet when sitting in a car. Having a three foot fence height enables the driver to have clear view.

Fuhrman said she understands now the reasoning for the three feet in the clear view area and that will stay as is.

Edmonds commented on the fence language in the Commercial and Industrial Districts if they are within the required front yard setback, and not over six feet in height, they need to be of a chain link construction permitting maximum visibility. He believes that if the fence is meeting the required setback, they should not have to be a chain link fence.

Fuhrman said in the Commercial or Industrial District is where you see the chain link fencing.

Heitschmidt said it must have been put in there for a visibility purpose.

Fuhrman said some communities have a visibility requirement for all fences.

Reynolds said to allow the wood fence can be a maintenance issue.

Heitschmidt said it is for the visibility of the lot and not the maintenance of the fence.

Johnson commented a chain link fence is to see into the lot.

Heitschmidt said a percentage of view into the area could be in the Ordinance, like 50%.

Fuhrman will look up what other communities have for language with a percentage of visibility.

Fuhrman said the current ordinance states that a maintenance free fence may be erected upon the division line - Does the Planning Commission Board want the maintenance free fence material the only allowable material when a fence is placed on a property line or should that wordage be removed? Under the "Construction and Maintenance" section, it does specify what materials are allowed to be used. Finished wood is an allowed material. Would the Planning Commission want that as an approved material for property line fencing as well? If there was a fence that was not being maintained, staff could enforce the upkeep requirement.

Edmonds said that if a fence is going to be placed on the property line, you need a survey or property pins located. It does not matter if the neighbor approves of the placement or not.

Fuhrman said she is seeking clarification on what the Planning Commission wants in that regard. Sometimes property pins have been moved for whatever reason and are not in the right spot – the only true know to know property lines is through a licensed surveyor. We have a clause that we could ask for a survey.

Nielson said when a fence is on the property line, the owner of the adjoining property ends up maintaining it such as weed whipping along the fence. If the fence is two feet off the property line, the owner of the fence can maintain the other side of the fence.

Heitschmidt suggested that if they want the fence on the property line, they would either have to have the property pins located or a survey, otherwise have the adjoining neighbor agree on the placement.

Mellott said you need to know where the line is either by the property pins or a survey. Otherwise you need to have the neighbor's agreement on the property line. Mellott said it is adverse possession if you let someone put a fence on your property and sell it. As long as you let the new owner know this is your property, it is yours.

Fuhrman said to have it on the property line you need to have either a survey, property pins located, or neighboring property owner agrees in writing with the property line fence agreement.

Mellott said she believes if the neighbors agree that is where the property line is, and the property line fence agreement is signed, that is good enough.

Fuhrman said the City Attorney would like to see a simple disclaimer on the fence agreement between neighbors regarding the "practical location" language.

Johnson believes it should be surveyed.

Heitschmidt said if the fence is on the property line, they should either have the property pins located, or a survey, or the neighboring property owner signs the property line fence agreement.

Reynolds agrees.

Fuhrman will work on this language more and bring it back to the Planning Commission meeting in July.

Mellott said if two people are agreeing where they want the line, it should be fine. If a clause is in the agreement that you are not giving up the right to your land, it would be safe.

Johnson said if you do not know where your property line is, don't put a fence up.

Edmonds said for a fence to go on the property line, they need a survey or the location of the property pins. If they do not have either of those two, they should have the signed property line fence agreement with the neighboring property. Otherwise, the fence should be two feet from where they believe the property line is.

Heitschmidt said if two neighbors agree where the fence goes and they do not have a survey, they should be able to put the fence where they want. It would stay written as it is. We might want to take out the wording that a fence *may be located adjacent to, but not on, a property line*, if one of the three situations exist.

Mellott said it can be on the line with a property line fence agreement, otherwise it has to be two feet off the property line.

Heitschmidt said we would be removing the survey and location of the property pins then.

Mellott said if you do not know where your property line is, how do you know that the fence is going two feet off the property line?

Fuhrman said the Ordinance currently states if a property owner cannot get consent from the neighboring property owner, does not have a survey or property irons marked, then the fence has to be a minimum of two feet off the property line in order to provide ample space for maintenance. Is the Planning Commission saying to remove where they need to either find the property pins or have a survey from the Ordinance language?

Mellott does not want where they need to locate the property pins or have a survey. They can do the fencing two feet from where they believe the property line is.

Fuhrman said it gives the option to find the property pins or place the fence two feet off the property line.

Mellott said if there is no signed agreement between the neighbors, then they need to find the property pins or have a survey.

Reynolds said they should have any one of the three items or adjacent to the line.

Heitschmidt said a fence on the property line needs the two property owner's agreement and if adjacent to the line, it needs to be determined how far off the line.

Mellott said two feet would be the adjacent area; either on the line or two feet off.

Nielson said they need the neighbors okay if the fence is going on the property line and they should know where the property line is.

Fuhrman said it is the property owner's responsibility to find where the property line is. It has been working so far that the owner is looking for the property line. Fuhrman will put together some language and bring it back to the Planning Commission for review. She will take out the language that the fence needs to be maintenance free material for being on the property line.

#### **B. Sign Ordinance Discussion (Further Updates)**

Fuhrman said she is looking for the Planning Commission Boards direction on wall signage and went through the information in her staff memo:

##### **1) Wall, Projecting, Under-Canopy, and Fascia/Soffit Signs:**

With the new language, up to three wall signs are allowed on a single tenant building, the Planning Commission did not discuss if they want to allow those three signs only on one building wall or on any building wall.

Example: A business may be located along an alley and may want a sign facing the street and one sign facing the alley.

Fuhrman would interpret the language that was adopted to allow for the three wall signs to be allowed on any building wall, but would like to verify that was the intent of the Planning

Commission. The language allows buildings that abut two or more streets to have three signs oriented to each abutting street.

Fuhrman would also like to address if replacing existing freestanding permanent signs, does the Planning Commission want those to come in front of the Planning Commission.

2) Currently, the Zoning Ordinance states that billboards, pylon, monument, multi-tenant signs, and video display signs all require Planning Commission review. It does not differentiate between new or replacement of existing.

We oftentimes have pylon or monument signs that are being replaced. Fuhrman would recommend these be allowed without Planning Commission review, but the Ordinance should state that. Only those that are not video display or billboard.

Changes needed:

- Section 8 – Existing Signs and Section 9 – Non-Conforming Signs need to be updated to match State Statute requirements. Fuhrman is working with the City Attorney on this.
- Format for the number of Wall, Projecting, Under-Canopy, and Fascia/Soffit Signs.
- Update Definition Section.
- Add clarification that one pylon and one monument sign are allowed on the same property.

Johnson said if the business front is facing main street and they want to put the sign on another wall of the building, he is okay with that.

Fuhrman said the multi-tenant language will be coming back in regards to billboard, pylons signs, etc. Can staff okay the sign permit if it is just replacing the signage area? Non-conforming sign language will be brought back for updates with State Statute. On a multi-tenant building, the current Ordinance says one sign per tenant. Now that we allow three signs per business, does the Planning Commission Board want to allow up to three signs per business on a wall for a multi-tenant building?

Johnson said he is fine with them having up to three signs as long as the wall area is met.

Fuhrman will make that change for multi-tenant wall signage where they can have up to three type of wall signs, but need to meet the percentage of the wall area. She will draft language accordingly and bring it to the Planning Commission for review prior to the public hearing.

## **COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:**

### **A. Verbal Report**

#### **a. Planning Commission Meeting “Cheat Sheet”**

Fuhrman said she drafted a cheat sheet for public hearing procedures to help the public through the proceedings. If the Planning Commission is okay with it, she will have it on the front table when residents are signing in so they can review it.

The Planning Commission liked it.

**b. Sign Ordinance (Update pages in Zoning Ordinance Books)**

Fuhrman told the Planning Commission Board that they have updated Sign Ordinance pages to put in their zoning books.

**B. City Council Minutes for May, 2014**

The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

MELLOTT MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:04 P.M.

ATTEST:

---

Jack Edmonds, Chairperson

---

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant