

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HELD ON NOVEMBER 18, 2013, 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 Tim Siercks, Dick Dobson, Mitzi Mellott, and Chad Heitschmidt. Staff present was Carie Fuhrman, Mary Lou DeWitt, Mark Karnowski (City Administrator), and Kaci Nowick (Consultant Airport Planner.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ON OCTOBER 21, 2013

SIERCKS MOVED, SECOND BY HEITSCHMIDT, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 2013 WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTIONS: ON PAGE TWO, THE SECOND PARAGRAPH TO THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE SHOULD BE CHANGED TO READ," HEITSCHMIDT SAID THE RACES WERE DONE USUALLY BY 10:30 P.M. AND THAT SHOULD CONTINUE." ON PAGE THREE, FIFTH PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTON, THE WORD SHOULD BE "HEATS" INSTEAD OF "HEAPS". UPON THE MOTION, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Two items were added to the agenda prior to the meeting.

New Business: A. Princeton Today Newspaper- New Sign Review and;

Old Business: A. James Dougherty Kill Floor – Discussion

DOBSON MOVED, SECOND BY SIERCKS, TO APPROVE THE REVISED AGENDA. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Variance for the Public Safety Building

The following information is found in the staff memo: (Fuhrman summarized the information in her presentation): The City of Princeton is requesting a variance for the Public Safety Building to extend approximately 15 feet into the Crosswind Runway Safety Zone A; for the height of the building (the southern portion) to extend above the allowable height for the Approach and Transitional Surfaces in the Airport Zoning Ordinance; and the radio tower and antenna height to extend above the allowable height for the Approach and Transitional Surfaces in the Airport Zoning Ordinance.

ANALYSIS

Property Details: The building is located at 305 21st Avenue South; Legal description: Lot 8, Block 1, Aero Business Park First Addition, Mille Lacs County, which is the southernmost parcel in the development. The property is zoned B-3, General Business District. Public buildings and facilities are a permitted use within the zoning district. The property is guided for Highway Commercial on the Future Land Use Plan in the Comprehensive Plan.

A variance from three zoning restrictions in the Airport Zoning Ordinance are being requested:

- 1) The building extends into Safety Zone A by approximately 15 feet. An aerial map was provided and Fuhrman pointed out the red line indicates the current Safety Zone Locations.

As the map illustrates, a small portion of the southeast corner of the building extends into Safety Zone A.

2) The southern portion of the building exceeds the allowable height in the Approach and Transitional Surfaces area. As the map illustrates, the approximate allowable height in the southeastern corner of the building is 9 feet, while the proposed height is 15 ft-10 in. The approximate allowable height in the southwestern corner of the building is 15 feet, while the proposed height is 15 ft-10 in.

3) The proposed radio tower and antenna exceeds the allowable height. The radio tower itself is 65 feet high, and the antenna to be mounted on the tower adds another 15 feet, for a total height of 80 feet, which exceeds the allowable height.

Variance Review Standards: The Airport Zoning Ordinance states that “variances shall be allowed where it is duly found that a literal application or enforcement of the regulations would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship and relief granted would not be contrary to the public interest but do substantial justice and be in accordance with the spirit of this ordinance provided any variance so allowed may be subject to any reasonable conditions that the Board of Adjustment or Commissioner may deem necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance.”

Conclusion/Recommendation: The spirit of this ordinance regulation is to protect the operational safety of aircraft by limiting population and building density in the runway approach areas. The City Council has been in several discussions in regards to the future of the Crosswind Runway, especially in relationship to the extension of 21st Avenue. At this time, there has not been enough justification given for funding to be provided by the FAA for the construction of the Crosswind Runway, which led the City Council to vote to remove the crosswind runway from the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) this past fall. It is a lengthy process to amend the ALP, which the City Administrator has begun working on. Although the process to amend the ALP has begun, the zoning is still in place to protect it (red line), which is why the variances are required at this time.

Please note that the aerial map also illustrates where the crosswind runway safety zones would be located (dotted blue line on map) if the zoning matched the currently approved ALP (in that case, a variance would not be needed). It appears that when Aero Business Park was platted, it may have been the City’s intention to re-align the crosswind zoning to match the ALP crosswind because the south lot line of Lot 8 approximately follows the dotted blue line. The process to amend the crosswind runway safety zones to match the approved ALP had not occurred when the City Council voted to amend the ALP and remove the crosswind runway from the ALP all-together. Based on the above discussion, Fuhrman would recommend approval of the variance requests to the airport zoning requirements.

Kaci Nowicki, City’s Airport Planner, is here tonight to answer any specific questions the Planning Commission may have in regards to the airport zoning restrictions. Mark Karnowski, City Administrator, is also in attendance to answer any specific questions in regard to the public

safety building.

Edmonds opened the public hearing.

DOBSON MOVED, SECOND BY SIERCKS, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING SINCE THERE WERE NO QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Edmonds asked Karnowski if the runway was changed with the platting of Aero Business Park.

Karnowski said the zoning was put in place when the airport was designed. Later the current Airport Layout Plan by RSH re-aligned the crosswind runway and that is why there is a difference from the zoning on the ALP and what the zoning is right now. When Aero Business Park plat was done the City thought they were clear because what is on the ALP would not interrupt the Airport Zoning.

Siercks asked why this has come up now and not prior to building the Public Safety Building.

Karnowski said it was an oversight. Staff did not know that there was an issue and now asking Kaci Nowicki, it came to us it was an issue.

Heitschmidt asked if the crosswind runway is removed from the ALP, will the current airport zoning and the future airport zoning (that is on the ALP) no longer exist?

Karnowski said there was a small vocal group that did not want the crosswind runway removed at all. The Council's direction was to leave the zoning in place for the crosswind runway, but take the crosswind runway off the ALP. Those supporting the crosswind runway hope in the future that leaving the zoning there will help bring back the crosswind runway. It is his opinion that the crosswind runway will never get built even if there is funding. City Council left the zoning in place to pacify those people. It will stay in place until requested to be removed as it is not hurting anything leaving it right now.

Fuhrman said the red lines on the enclosed map show the crosswind runway zoning that was adopted June 29, 1978 and is still in place; it would have to go through airport planning change to remove it or to change it to the future Zoning that is shown on the current ALP (dotted blue lines).

Kaci Nowicki said that is correct. The Airport Zoning in red will remain on the plans until it goes through an Airport Planning change to have it removed. Even with the crosswind runway removed from the ALP, the zoning will not reflect the blue lines of the ALP until it goes through the Airport Planning process.

Fuhrman said the property that is for sale by the airport would need a variance to build on it or come back to the joint Airport Zoning Board to remove the zoning in the red area on the map to meet the State Statute. She does have to notify developers of this when asked on that land. HEITSCHMIDT MOVED, SECOND BY DOBSON, TO APPROVE THE VARIANCE FOR THE CITY OF PRINCETON PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING LOCATION TO EXTEND APPROXIMATELY 15 FEET INTO THE CROSSWIND RUNWAY SAFETY ZONE A, FOR THE HEIGHT OF THE BUILDING (THE SOUTHERN PORTION) TO EXTEND ABOVE THE ALLOWABLE HEIGHT FOR THE APPROACH AND TRANSITIONAL SURFACES IN THE AIRPORT ZONING ORDINANCE; AND ANTENNA HEIGHT TO EXTEND ABOVE THE ALLOWABLE HEIGHT FOR THE APPROACH AND TRANSITIONAL SURFACES IN THE AIRPORT ZONING ORDINANCE AT 305 21ST AVENUE SOUTH. 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?*

Siercks questioned that this was necessary to have the Public Safety building built on these lots. It was a screw up.

Karnowski said this does happen and was an oversight by staff. They did not know there was an issue with Airport Zoning.

Edmonds said the zoning was not clear and this is a unique situation.

Heitschmidt, Dobson, and Edmonds agree that this was a unique situation.

Mellott said in this situation it is not a unique situation to her.

Siercks agrees.

They decided to answer that question that it was unique circumstances that caused this. The answer for number one is 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. Princeton Today Newspaper – New Sign Review

Fuhrman said this sign request was received today. When she spoke with the business owner last week she thought there was more to this sign request than what is here tonight. Although the Zoning Ordinance lists wall mounted business signs under “Signs Permitted with a Building Permit”, it then states that they are only permitted by the Planning Commission. She will change that wording when she revises the Sign Ordinance that if it meets the requirements, it does not have to come to the Planning Commission for review.

The following is the information presented in the staff memo (Fuhrman summarized the information): Steve Conklin of “Princeton Today” has submitted a permit application for a sign at 123 Rum River Drive South. The location is in the B-1 Central Business District. This is a multi-tenant building, and Mr. Conklin will be renting the north side.

The Ordinance states that Multi-tenant buildings shall be allowed one wall sign for each tenant space and not occupy more than 10% of that building wall area. This sign will be illuminated by a drop down light from the eave. The sign will be constructed of a durable exterior material.

The sign size is 32” x 135” (~30.4 sq. ft.) and the building wall area is 36’ x 160’ (5,760 sq. ft.). The maximum size of the sign could be 576 sq. ft., so the proposal meets the size requirement. This sign request does meet the Zoning Ordinance and staff recommends approval.

DOBSON MOVED, SECOND BY SIERCKS, TO APPROVE THE WALL SIGN FOR PRINCETON TODAY NEWSPAPER, LOCATED AT 123 RUM RIVER DRIVE SOUTH. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Siercks asked Fuhrman if there needs to be anything done, like a motion, to clean up the wordage where the Planning Commission needs to review the signage.

Fuhrman said she will do it with the other changes when she makes the signage revisions, so it will go through the formal Ordinance amendment process.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. James Dougherty Kill Floor – Discussion

Fuhrman said that at their April 15, 2013 meeting, the Planning Commission discussed meeting if a slaughterhouse or kill floor should be allowed in a B-1 Central Business District. Meat Markets are allowed, but a slaughterhouse or kill floor are not addressed. In order for it to be allowed, an Ordinance Amendment is needed. The concern is potential nuisance issues that need to be addressed when allowing this type of use, such as noise, odor, wastewater, and so on. James Dougherty, owner of Princeton Meats asked to be on the agenda tonight to discuss with the Planning Commission their concerns.

James Dougherty introduced himself and said that he had read the article that was in the Princeton Union Eagle in regards to what the Planning Commission’s concerns were for a

slaughterhouse. Dougherty would like to answer their questions tonight in hopes they would consider amending the Ordinance to allow a slaughterhouse. He had read in the article that the unloading of animals and the chance of them escaping is a concern. Also, what would go down the drains.

Dobson said the discarded waste from the animal is an issue.

Dougherty said a sanitation company would come in and take the tubs that the waste goes into.

Dobson asked how the steer would be unloaded from the trailer.

Dougherty said John Oliver owns the small parking lot next to his building and a simple truck trailer would back up tight to the building and the animals would be unloaded inside the building. He would have automatic killing pens and the animal would be killed right away, no smell or noise. He would have Sundays from 1:00 P.M. - 5:00 P.M. as the kill day where the downtown is less busy. Dougherty had the Chief of Police looked at what he was thinking of doing and he was okay with the situation. The area where the animal would be brought in is the south side of the building off of First Street. There is a small service door there and that would be cut for doorways for the trailers. He has a mobile kill truck now. The trailer would open inside the building and that is the only place they could go is inside the building if the animal were to escape. The new automatic equipment is more preferred and no guns would be used. Some of the bigger farmers do not want the animal killed at the farm. They like the animals in a controlled environment. What he is intending to have would be a federal kill floor with an inspector from the USDA on-site. Having an inspector on site, the animals that are killed there can be sold to anyone or even a restaurant. With an inspector on site it is regulated by the federal government. Having it federal gives more options to sell to anyone. A custom kill floor is where he can give it back to the farmer. He has five full time meat cutters on staff. He will have to pay for the federal inspector to be there. They inspect the animal completely.

Edmonds said he is more impressed by the process of what he is speaking of tonight compared to before.

Dougherty said he has worked on a lot of kill floors and wants to do this right. The farmers that would come to him want him to have a federal kill floor.

Dobson wants his business to grow, and is fine with the kill floor only being on Sundays, but what happens five years down the road when he is busier, and needs to have added kill floor days.

Dougherty said if his business grows, he will build a new building in the Industrial Park. He would need the room. When he makes a trip to a farm, he has to get enough animals at one time to make the trip worth the expense. If he has a kill floor that would eliminate some time concerns.

Dobson said having a kill floor from 1:00 P.M. – 5:00 P.M. on Sundays would be okay.
Dougherty said yes.

Edmonds commented that this is a costly investment at this location.

Dougherty said he would keep the retail in this site.

Edmonds asked Fuhrman what she is looking at for direction on this.

Fuhrman said an Ordinance revision would need to be brought before them. It would likely require a conditional use permit, not just a permitted use.

Edmonds is looking at this differently after hearing him explain what he intends to do, and Heitschmidt agreed. It looks better than what they had assumed.

Mellott said her only concern is safety and if he can come up with a plan to not have that as an issue she would be okay with it.

Dougherty understands.

Dobson would like Dougherty to have a memo of what he spoke of tonight for his plans to bring to the Planning Commission for review.

Dougherty said he would do that.

Siercks said a drawing also of where this would be on the site.

Dougherty will have a drawing.

Fuhrman said she will put together a draft proposal of an Ordinance change, and then a public hearing would need to be held for the Ordinance amendment. The applicant would likely need to apply for a Conditional Use Permit, and a public hearing would need to be held for that.

Heitschmidt asked if only once a week for a kill floor and only on Sundays is enough for him.

Dougherty said yes. He mentioned that his customers were upset what the paper had written in regards to having this type of operation.

Heitschmidt told Fuhrman not to include the hours of operation in the Ordinance amendment. That could be decided on in the conditions of each individual Conditional Use Permit.

Fuhrman agreed, the hours on the killing time can be reviewed by the Planning Commission at the time of each Conditional Use Permit request.

Dobson commented that he did like Sunday afternoons as the time for a kill floor to be happening.

Dougherty said the public might hear some noise from a cow and thought Sundays would be the best. He will not need this till next summer, like in eight months.

B. Sign Discussion (Continued)

Fuhrman handed out additional information regarding signs and other community examples for the Planning Commission to review. She asked the Planning Commission Board if they wanted to have a workshop an hour before the next Planning Commission meeting or begin reviewing the signage tonight. The Planning Commission wanted the Chamber's input on signage and she only had two responses back. She will be sending out another message to get more feedback. The two that did respond were in favor of projecting signs.

Dobson commented that he would like some time to read through what they have gone through so far. He was unable to attend the November 5, 2013 workshop.

The Planning Commission decided to review some of the signage tonight.

A) Wall Mounted Business Signs: The Sign Ordinance only allows one wall sign for each principal building (except if the building fronts two or more streets, then more are allowed) – the gross surface of a wall sign cannot exceed 10% of the building wall, or 200 square feet, whichever is smaller. Multi-tenant buildings are allowed one wall sign per tenant, meeting the above size requirements.

The Planning Commission voted to allow up to three signs on one building wall, as long as all three signs were under the 10% or 200 square foot requirement, at a previous meeting. Fuhrman will incorporate this change when the rest of the signage changes are made to the Ordinance.

B) Roof Signs: The Sign Ordinance defines a roof sign as any sign erected over or on the roof of a building, but the Ordinance does not place any regulations on them (number, placement, height, etc.)

At the October meeting, the Planning Commission voted to continue not allowing roof signs and keep the Ordinance as is. However, at the subsequent November Special Meeting, further discussions ensued in regards to variations of roof signs. The Planning Commission discussed specifically defining which portions of a structure the signs were attached to and then allowing those signs (such as allowing signs that are secured to the fascia or soffit and are essentially parallel to the building walls). Another idea discussed was not allowing any "roof signs" that are located above the building wall. Clearance, size, and whether these are allowed with wall signs should be discussed, if allowed. Fuhrman's memo illustrated some diagrams which outline the soffit and fascia locations on a building that she handed out to the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission Board decided to review roof signs at a workshop session.

C) Projecting Signs (aka. Flag Mount Signs): The Sign Ordinance defines projecting signs as a sign, other than a flat wall sign, which is attached to and projects from a building wall or other structure not specifically designed to support the sign. The Ordinance does not regulate them in regards to location, number, size, etc. Permits have not been required for these types of signs in the past.

At the October meeting, the Planning Commission directed Fuhrman to do more research on projecting signs. As was mentioned prior, the local communities polled all require at least a 7 or 8 foot clearance for these types of signs. Examples of how other communities regulate these types of signs have been handed out to the Planning Commission Board. The number, clearance, and extension into the right-of-way should be discussed.

Siercks questioned building permits not required for signage in the past. If signage is not permitted it is not allowed, but there are some of these signs in the City.

Fuhrman said if it is not listed it is not allowed. The projecting signs are not listed in the Zoning Ordinance now, but could have been allowed in past Ordinances. There have been many Sign Ordinance changes throughout the years.

Heitschmidt said projecting signs and under the canopy signs could be done together.

Edmonds recalls Scott Berry from the Chamber mentioned that he does not mind projecting signs. Edmonds is concerned with safety. Wind can blow any sign down.

Fuhrman believes if the Planning Commission wanted to allow projecting signs or under-canopy signage, the wording needs to address the number of signs allowed, clearance, etc.

Dobson said it is easier to find a store when looking at projecting signs instead of wall signs.

Edmonds agrees.

Mellott said a uniform style would be nice.

Fuhrman said some cities have regulations on how the signs look, or some just have design guidelines. They cannot regulate what the sign says.

Mellott said for example North Branch in their mall area has under canopy signs that go out the same distance.

Heitschmidt questioned if uniformity for under-canopy signage would matter.

Siercks does not want electricity in them at all.

Fuhrman said it would be nice to have the Downtown Committee help with what they would like to see in the downtown area.

Siercks said if they have three wall signs could they add another sign. Would we allow an under-canopy sign if they already have three signs? This could exceed the 10% of the building wall, or 200 square feet wall regulation of the wall signs.

Heitschmidt said a wall sign and a projecting sign should have to all meet the wall sign square footage.

Siercks said projecting signs must meet the wall sign square footage and no more than three in a combination total, under canopy, projecting, or wall. What about window signage?

Fuhrman said the Ordinance reads signs or posters painted on or attached to the inside of a display window occupying less than 25 percent of the display window area. Window or door signs are not counted towards the wall signs. The business owner who had the sign review tonight is looking at putting TV screens inside the windows, but facing them outward and since they are inside, it is not considered signage. Fuhrman asked the City Attorney and he said we do not consider signs inside the building wall signage. Signs inside are not controlled.

Edmonds asked if we should do a Community Workshop to do a format design for projecting signs.

Heitschmidt said for projecting signs it is hard to put designs restrictions. Why would someone in the Industrial Park have to be confined to what is allowed downtown?

Fuhrman said design guidelines can be tailored for certain districts. She is willing to put something together on this. Having an architectural design would cost and someone would have to pay the cost.

Mellott said now is the time to make design standards where we have the regulations in force. What do we want the downtown to look like?

Fuhrman said this larger picture discussion has been happening with the Downtown Committee and especially after the Façade Improvement Study grants were denied. The Economic Development consultant from Sherburne County advised to do a market study before a façade improvement study, so there is direction of what the City should look like. There are some in the downtown that do not like some of the signage, but they have to understand it has to be regulated.

Siercks said if we have the height and clearance, and if it can be a circular sign or square sign, just have a basic sign regulation. They should be the same size of signs.

Fuhrman said this is a good time to look at the signage since some business buildings are empty and we are in the process of growth, and to have regulations in place before that happens.

Mellott said the look of signage is necessary to have balance of how much space and how it looks. We need the option for signage in place to make this happen. How do we want to develop our town? We need a procedure.

Fuhrman said business licensing has come up with the City Council.

Mellott believes there should be some type of Welcome Wagon in place. Resources in downtown need to work together.

Siercks said that should happen with the local realtors or Chamber to let us know what is coming into town.

Fuhrman agrees that signage does need to look nice.

Siercks said the signage should be 2 foot by 2 foot, no more than 2 foot out. That would be the maximum size.

Edmonds agreed with no electrical on the sign. They should be able to have a little spot light on the sign if they want.

Siercks will do an email with every question he has to the Planning Commission Board and they can use that in a work session. Some of the questions would be, how would the sign be fastened, and will it be a swinging sign?

Fuhrman said other questions are lighting, height/clearance, square footage, the distance to project out, and how it's mounted.

Siercks added if it should be two bolts mounting the sign or just say securely anchored.

Fuhrman said the specs would have to show how it would be securely anchored. Would the Planning Commission be in agreement of an 8 foot clearance, and 4 foot square footage maximum?

The Planning Commission Board is good with 4 square feet maximum, and clearance of 8 feet. The sign cannot project more than 4 feet. It must be thoroughly secured and anchored. No lighting.

Fuhrman said wall signs are allowed lighting.

Siercks said no lights.

Fuhrman asked not allowing internally lit either? Siercks does not want a heavy sign box on it.

Heitschmidt agreed, no illumination allowed to the sign.

The Planning Commission Board decided the projecting sign can be a total of 4 square feet and a clearance of 8 feet from bottom of sign to ground. It cannot project more than 4 feet out. It must be thoroughly secured and anchored and no illumination to the sign. A business that has projecting sign and wall signs must meet the wall sign square footage and no more than three in a total combination, under canopy, projecting, and/or wall signage.

D) Under-Canopy (aka. Suspended) Signs: The Sign Ordinance defines under-canopy signs as a sign suspended beneath a canopy, ceiling, roof, or marquee. The Ordinance does not regulate them in regards to location, number, size, etc. Permits have not been required for these types of signs in the past.

At the October meeting, particular discussion took place in regards to the clearance height. The Planning Commission directed staff to look into these signs further. With the projecting signs, the local communities polled required a 7 or 8 foot clearance requirement.

Siercks said the under-canopy signs could use the same regulations.

Fuhrman reiterated that the sign cannot extend beyond the roof or canopy with a 4 square foot maximum sign size and 8 feet clearance between the bottom of the sign to the ground, and must be securely anchored. The definition of "under-canopy" should include "overhang". A business with wall signage on the building and under-canopy signage must meet the wall sign square footage and no more than three in a total combination, under-canopy, projecting, and/or wall signage. Is the Planning Commission okay with the signage being parallel or perpendicular to the wall?

Dobson said he does not mind the signage being parallel or perpendicular to the wall.

Siercks said everything going up from the wall is not roof and from above the wall up is roof. That is what Attorney Schieffer said could be used as a defining point at the last meeting.

Heitschmidt wonders if we want to include eave and awning. Awning is the shell projected from a supporting frame work.

Fuhrman changed it to under canopy. The definition for under-canopy sign is a sign suspended beneath a canopy, ceiling, roof or marquee. She may include overhang in the definition.

Edmonds said at the next Planning Commission meeting we will clearly define what a roof is.

E) Temporary Signs: As you might recall, the City adopted regulations for temporary signs back in 2011. The regulations do not allow for-profit businesses to place temporary signs off-site, but do allow non-profit organizations and government units to do so. The Ordinance limits the number of permits that can be issued on any one property per calendar year and does not allow more than one temporary sign on any one property at one time. The Planning Commission voted to keep the regulations as is at their September meeting, but then at their October meeting, requested staff to get the opinion of the Chamber and how other communities regulate these signs. Fuhrman gave the previous memos presented to the Planning Commission when temporary signs were discussed back in September, October, and November of 2011, which highlight other communities' regulations. The results of the Chamber survey will be shared with the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission decided to wait on discussion of the temporary signs.

F) Electronic/Dynamic/Digital Signs: The Sign Ordinance does not regulate electronic signage. Several months ago, a subcommittee was formed to evaluate digital signs (ex: electronic reader board, video display boards, etc) as they are not addressed in the City's Sign Ordinance. The subcommittee's recommendation is to not allow these types of signs within the majority of the B-1 Central Business District and B-2 Neighborhood Business District, except the B-2 District south of 6th Street, and to allow them in the other Commercial and Industrial Districts. This is in an effort to protect the residential neighborhoods and historic nature of downtown.

The existing signs that do not meet this provision would be allowed to continue with limited maintenance allowed.

Some other points addressed by the subcommittee included:

- Requiring review by the Planning Commission of any digital sign
- Limiting the illumination; establishing brightness standards
- Limiting the number of times an electronic message can change (safety reasons)
- Backlit signs would not be affected

As was reported at the November meeting, 7 members of the downtown committee responded to the original survey:

- 4 did not want to see digital signs in downtown;
- 2 were unsure and wanted more discussion; and
- 1 wants the digital signs allowed in downtown.

The Planning Commission requested that the staff further poll the entire Chamber. Fuhrman has not received any feedback from the Chamber on this and will ask Michele from the Chamber to bring digital electronic signs back to the Chamber membership for their point of view. Fuhrman asked if the Planning Commission would like to ask the City Council to put a moratorium on the digital electronic signs so further study can be done.

Mellott said a moratorium would be a good idea.

Fuhrman believed a moratorium could go six months and then extend it for another six months, but she will verify this with Attorney Schieffer. It will be the City Council's decision.

DOBSON MOVED, SECOND BY MELLOTT, TO BRING THE REQUEST TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO PUT A MORATORIUM ON ELECTRONIC TEXT SIGNS, DYNAMIC SIGNS, AND DIGITAL SIGNS SO THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS TIME TO REVIEW ORDINANCE STANDARDS. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Fuhrman will put this on the City Council agenda. Fuhrman asked if the Planning Commission Board was okay with her bringing all the Ordinance changes back to the next meeting for review and they were okay with that.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:

A. Verbal Report

The Building Permit information for the month of October, 2013 has been handed out for the Planning Commission's review. Just a reminder to Dick Dobson and Tim Siercks that their term is up this year on the Planning Commission Board and they can reapply if they would like. Fuhrman said she is putting money in the budget for training for next year.

B. City Council Minutes for October, 2013

The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

SIERCKS MOVED, SECOND BY DOBSON, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:24 P.M.

ATTEST:

Jack Edmonds, Chairperson

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant