

**CITY OF COLUMBUS
JOINT MEETING
INTERACTIVE TECHNOLOGY MEETING FORMAT
STATUTES SECTION 13D.021
3.15.2023**

The 3-15-2023 Joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting for the City of Columbus was called to order at 6:01 PM by Mayor Jesse Preiner at the City Hall. Present were Mayor Jesse Preiner, City Council members Janet Hegland, Rob Busch, Ron Hanegraaf, and Sue Wagamon, Planning Commission members Barb Bobick, Lynn Carver-Quinn, Bethany Barrette, Frank Ramisch, and Judy Huntosh, City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko, City Planner Dean Johnson, and Associate Planner Frank Koenen.

In attendance via interactive technology were City Attorney Bill Griffith and an unidentified phone number.

The meeting was held in an interactive technology meeting format.

1. **CALL TO ORDER – CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING – 6:01 PM**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **INTRODUCTION – JUDY HUNTOSH**
Mayor Preiner introduces New Planning Commission member Judy Huntosh.
4. **MEETING AGENDA.** *Motion* Hegland to approve agenda, removing item five. Second Carver-Quinn. Carried with Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Busch, Ramisch, Barrette, Huntosh, Carver-Quinn, Bobick, and Preiner voting in favor.
5. ~~**MARCH 1, 2023 JOINT CITY COUNCIL & PLANNING COMMISSION MTG. MINUTES**~~
6. **PUBLIC OPEN FORUM.** Nothing at this time.
7. **PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRPERSON RECOMMENDATION.**
City Administrator Mursko briefly explains the nomination process of the Planning Commission Chairperson and Vice Chairperson. Mursko explains that the Planning Commission will vote for a Planning Commission Chairperson and Vice Chairperson, separate from the City Council. The City Council will then vote to accept or not accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission based on Chapter 3 of city ordinances. Mursko explained that it was decided it would be easier to do both votes at the same meeting, but that the Planning Commission and City Council will discuss and vote separately.

Motion Bobick to nominate Carver-Quinn for Planning Commission Chairperson. Second Barrette. Carried with Ramisch, Bobick, Huntosh, Carver-Quinn, Barrette, and Hanegraaf voting in favor.
8. **APPROVE RECOMMENDATION OF PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRPERSON**

Motion Hegland to approve the Planning Commission recommendation to appoint Carver-Quinn as Planning Commission Chairperson. Second Wagamon. Carried with Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Busch, and Preiner voting in favor.

9. PLANNING COMMISSION VICE CHAIRPERSON RECOMMENDATION.

Motion Lynn Carver-Quinn to nominate Bobick for Planning Commission Vice Chairperson. Second Barrette. Carried with Ramisch, Bobick, Huntosh, Carver-Quinn, and Hanegraaf voting in favor.

10. APPROVE RECOMMENDATION OF PLANNING COMMISSION VICE CHAIRPERSON

Motion Preiner to approve the Planning Commission recommendation to appoint Bobick as Planning Commission Vice Chairperson. Second Wagamon. Carried with Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Busch, and Preiner voting in favor.

11. ORDINANCE 23-01 - COMMERCIAL DESIGN STANDARDS

City Planner Johnson stated with four new planning commissioners, and the gap since the last meeting on the subject in November, it would be appropriate to take a step back and reevaluate the draft ordinance discussion.

Johnson outlined the discussion for the evening. Johnson explained design standards can be as simple as what is appealing to the Planning Commissioners. Johnson stated there are many new material products in the market and there is composite material for everything, and lists several types including By the Yard, Ultradeck, EIFS, LP, and Hardie Board. Johnson stated that colors will also be discussed, noting that the original discussion regarding colors centered on earth tones. However, since that time there has been additional discussion and modification and the Planning Commission and City Council may want to reconsider regulating color.

Johnson then discussed the desire to find an index of the valuation of materials. He noted that valuation is driven more by the market than material types. Johnson noted that some City Council members have had concerns about materials based on surrounding cities' projects based on workmanship rather than the materials. Johnson stated the city will continue to stress provisions in the ordinance that require good maintenance, repair, and upkeep. Johnson discussed the previously proposed minimum building size and drive-through businesses standards. He noted that sit down restaurants may have been the intention of the current ordinance, but that was not stated explicitly. Johnson discussed a 2008 retail study that itemized retail oriented acres which has declined to less than 80 because of the decrease in the demand in the retail market including the growth of online shopping.

Mayor Preiner clarified the study is only about the freeway corridor. Preiner stated the objective is make the freeway as beautiful as possible, but in a way that is realistic. Johnson stated the community must work around existing uses. Every city is unique, and has to grow with its business community.

BUILDING MATERIALS

Johnson spoke regarding building materials. First, Johnson discussed ribbed steel which he shared is one of the cheapest products available. Johnson stated the Planning Commission and City Council may find ribbed steel appealing or unappealing. Johnson suggested that the

Planning Commission and City Council could exclude ribbed steel if they find it aesthetically unappealing or to avoid a cheaper product. Johnson showed examples of metal panel building. Johnson stated it was an example to show metal can be worth more when compared to ribbed steel and that may be more appealing.

Johnson discussed differences that faux stone has from real stone to include that faux stone is installed by carpenters and regular masonry costs more than plastered stone. Johnson continued, saying that the city cannot rely on simply the cost differences to make a determination regarding allowable materials. Johnson described EIFS as a combination of vapor barriers, insulation, and finished surface. Johnson mentioned that EIFS panels can potentially carry wiring and plumbing. Councilmember Busch described how EIFS panels can be all concrete precast segments, then welded together to create a poured-in-place structure. Busch shared that many hospitals and high-rises are constructed in such a matter. Johnson clarified that without firm footings, precast panels would not be possible with a taller building.

Johnson discussed thin-set brick and stone, which are real brick materials that are less than two inches in thickness and stated that these lighter, simpler products are a function of what supports the product, and can allow multi-story buildings due to the lighter material. Johnson gave several examples to show the thin-set brick are difficult to distinguish the difference. Johnson asked if the bottom part of the structure in the Light Industrial district was products such as cultured stone, brick, etc. would it matter if the remainder of the building was metal panels?

There was then a short discussion on barndominiums due to an example on the screen. Busch mentioned the building style could result in poor insulation. Mursko mentioned that the building code made it difficult to build one. Johnson mentioned that each building material type would come with its own set of issues. An example is given that cedar lap siding can be susceptible to damage from woodpeckers. Busch asked if Running Aces is constructed from EIFS. Mursko stated that the hotel is wood framed with EIFS, while the original building was likely a type of stucco.

Preiner explained that the intention of the building material discussion was so the freeway corridor would not feature excessive pole barn buildings. Johnson stated that the difference in keeping ribbed steel in the district would likely be negligible to tax value, and that the focus should remain on the design standards in terms of curb appeal. Johnson mentioned that in some places on Lake Drive there is some wainscoting and the remainder of the building is ribbed steel. Johnson used Blake Drilling as an example, which had lap siding and LP Smart Side siding, which has aesthetically appealing look. Busch mentioned the building is not masonry, it is a screwed on product. Mursko mentioned the building had issues with windows due to height and weight.

EARTH TONES

Johnson presented several swatches of earth tone colors to show the wide variety of colors that could be considered earth tones. Johnson mentioned that many colors in the previous draft of the ordinance were already earth tone. Johnson then questioned if the city wanted to regulate colors. Councilmember Hegland stated that she does not want neon or brilliant colors, but everything else should be considered. Bobick asked about Blaine Brothers which was white and red. Bobick stated that looking at the Blaine Brothers site in Blaine and thought that building

used a bright white. Hegland mentioned that the final submittal of Blaine Brothers toned down the brightness of white compared to their Blaine site.

Johnson mentioned the bright blue on Caribou Cabin, and that the Planning Commission and City Council voted in favor of allowing it. Johnson stated the bright blue added were corporate colors.

Commissioner Barrette asked if there is a difference between the color of the siding and the accent of the siding. Johnson mentioned the closest the city comes to a difference between color of the siding and accent of the building is large buildings. Johnson gave an example of having 200-250 ft. wall breaks, which are necessary in a shoebox building to keep the building interesting.

Johnson mentioned Blaine Brothers put three different types of parapets and had other adjustments compared to original plans. Johnson mentioned it was approved because they went further in other architectural styles. Johnson stated the direction for the Planning Commission and City Council is if applicants want to get outside the box, they will need to offer more architectural features.

Johnson believed if the city is too restrictive, then the city may be in the position to constantly waive requirements, which would negate the purpose of creating the requirements. Johnson mentioned that applicants going through the Planned Unit Development procedure require trade-offs for the applicant with the city. Johnson mentioned that the trade-offs with Blaine Brothers included a great amount of landscaping. Johnson stated the parapets were originally very different and the building is architecturally oriented to the freeway, while the emphasis of the Planning Commission was to give greater appeal to the Hornsby side.

Johnson stated the city uses such the Planned Unit Development procedure to let applicants create alternative ways to have trade-offs with the city. Johnson gave the opinion that the city should avoid granting variances and instead require applicants to go through the PUD process. Johnson reasoned the PUD process makes applicants perform more. Commissioner Hanegraaf used the Blaine Brothers application as an example of the Planning Commission gaining concessions in exchange for waiving other requirements.

Johnson mentioned that the point of the process is not to eliminate businesses, but to ensure the quality of development is satisfactory and not overwhelm the community with certain business types. Johnson gave as an example the notion that Forest Lake has a large amount of car dealerships.

Hegland mentioned when the city developed the idea of requiring earth tones in the freeway district, the TH 97/Lake Drive bridge had just been completed. This motivated the coordination of the NE Quad. Hegland explained that a developer had proposed a coordinated plan for the area and had proposed a multi-unit development. Coordination is not as critical, and the city does not have a developer that plans to coordinate the NE Quad. Hegland stated the strategy of over regulating colors could create limitations in actions the city can take. Busch concurred with Hegland's overall point.

City Attorney Griffith responded to Bobick's earlier question about how a city can regulate color after allowing a version of white. Griffith pointed out a White Bear Lake case that determined a city can regulate aesthetics. Griffith stated that in the materials prepared by Johnson, the city should consider adopting one of the color wheels. Griffin stated that for the city to have flexibility for corporate colors, it can make certain colors excluded, but allow all other colors. This would help the city avoid complaints that the colors approved by the Planning Commission or City Council are arbitrary decisions. Griffith summarized that the city does have authority to regulate aesthetics, it must be done in a consistent manner.

Busch mentioned several existing businesses that utilize blue colors, and that it makes him unsure if blue should be an excluded color. Johnson described that some color wheels given as examples do have various shades of blue. Johnson described the existing ordinance regarding earth tones being simple. The existing ordinance is intended to avoid loud colors. Johnson stated the staff and consultants can draft something to articulate. Johnson continued, saying that using earth tones to describe the color requirements is a policy decision. Johnson asked the Commission and Council if they want to simplify the ordinance. Johnson continued, by saying that with direction staff can draft ordinance language to make the ordinance less complicated.

Preiner described new apartment complexes on West Seventh in Saint Paul that have new and different colors. Preiner gave the project as an example of a project done well in a manner that is aesthetically pleasing. Preiner stated that the city should not narrow color schemes down so much, but find the correct way to clarify requirements in the ordinance. Hegland stated hues will change over time, and that over several years it becomes difficult to find matching paint.

Wagamon stated that she likes the earth tones, but also likes any colors that are not bright and that corporate colors can work in the city. Wagamon asked how the city would actually put in the ordinance so developers and builders know what colors are allowed. Johnson stated that language could be drafted to clarify that obnoxious colors would be disallowed. Carver-Quinn mentioned that potentially picking one of the charts and showing them as example for what the city recommends.

Griffin commented that the discussion has been moving towards having flexibility, including corporate colors. The concerns are neon, bright and brilliant colors, and there are some definitions existing for those. Griffin stated that he believes that they can create ordinance language to exclude the more obnoxious color types.

Barrette commented that brighter colors can be used in a good way and would like some flexibility for someone who is creative and can incorporate them well. Griffin stated that is somewhat subjective but does understand there is a desire to not exclude something that would look good.

VALUATION

Johnson first clarified that the Planning Commission and City Council are comfortable with including metal siding. Busch stated the city should accept standing seam, but not ribbed metal. Johnson stated that if the desire is to exclude ribbed metal in the freeway district, then the ordinance should state it and staff will create ordinance language based on industry definitions to state the exclusion of ribbed metal. Johnson clarified that the masonry standards in the freeway district will not be modified unless the Planning Commission and City Council wants to

open discussion into the matter. Johnson explained that the current masonry percentages are the highest near the interchange of Interstate 35 and Highway 97, while lower with the districts increasing distance from the interchange.

MASONRY PERCENTAGES

Johnson showed the previous draft ordinance, which had the 80% masonry façade requirement like the existing ordinance. However, Johnson gave the opinion that the material division should be eliminated from the draft ordinance but retain the 80% requirement. The city would still have some flexibility with Conditional Use Permit for Planned Unit Development, which would allow the city to tradeoff less masonry if the applicant had a high-quality development. Johnson stated that it is rare tall buildings are built with all stone as they become too heavy. The buildings instead utilize metal products, such as EIFS, as the buildings can support the treated panels with insulation. Johnson stated that it is very common to have buildings constructed in such a manner.

Busch asked whether the facade requirements are to be highway facing or street facing. Johnson clarified that all sides require 80% masonry. Busch said he felt that requirement may be forcing potential applicants to build a precast building for cost effectiveness. Johnson believed Busch had a good point and it is difficult to construct some buildings with high-ceilings or two stories without premanufactured concrete panels.

Johnson stated that the city wanted to avoid bare flat panels. The city could continue having the 80% masonry requirement in the districts that have it, while allowing the rest to be other materials. However, there could be a provision that specifically prohibits ribbed steel.

Mursko asked Busch with the proposed masonry requirements whether builders could put a masonry veneer on the building. Busch affirmed. Busch stated when speaking to a large Twin Cities siding contractor, typically the requirements for masonry are usually a third of the building, while Minneapolis only expects half the building to be masonry materials.

Johnson mentioned that the apartment building in the NE Quad was originally proposed as nearly all masonry. However, when the apartment was approved the masonry had dropped to about half of the building. Johnson stated the city should adopt an ordinance that it will follow, because future applicants will bring complaints that the city approved projects like their own that did not meet the code requirements. Dean stated the Planning Commission and City Council can decide whether they believe 80% is practical. Johnson mentioned that much of the development in suburbs will be strip malls and have a backend with trash, deliveries, etc. Johnson asked if the city really wants to have the masonry requirement to the back or have the masonry requirement concentrated to the front. Johnson asked the Planning Commission and City Council what they believe the masonry percentages should be. Johnson stated the requirement can be for facades on all sides or just a certain side.

Griffin then asked to clarify if the discussion was leading to the city allowing metal panels, but would not allow ribbed metal or standing seam. Johnson confirmed but added that corrugated metal would also not be allowed. Busch asked whether standing seam would be allowed. Johnson stated that the proper terms will need to be developed for the draft ordinance.

As the presentation was scrolled through, Johnson explains that for each of the examples he gave progressively better examples for each siding type. Johnson mentioned on his five acre homesite, he would get a Lester building for an accessory structure, as it would be affordable. But he reiterates that the discussion is about the area where there is biggest exposure for this community.

Johnson agreed with Busch's point about masonry percentages by façade. The Planning Commission and City Council could consider lowering the total percentage of masonry on all facades, but retain a higher percentage on the front façade. He gave the apartment building in the NE Quad plat as an example of a building that had its freeway facing side have a greater amount of masonry than the remaining sides through the PUD procedure.

Hegland asked about the design on page 11 of the agenda packet whether the back is ribbed steel. Johnson confirmed and discussed that while an applicant could come in and argue through the Planned Unit Development process to build a similar design, they would have to make a case and trade off at the discretion of the Planning Commission and City Council. The idea is to not have materials that the city does not like, so ribbed steel would remain an item not allowed. Johnson stated that the type of material can be related to a low level of investment, while the Council and Commission are trying to have property owners progressively invest in their property in the city.

Councilmember Wagamon referenced the previous draft ordinance and discussions regarding the division of materials into classes and how they were based on other cities. Wagamon questioned why other communities divided their materials into different classes. Johnson guessed that the ordinance draft was based on communities that were different from Columbus, such as Woodbury. Koenen affirmed. Johnson stated that Columbus is a different type of community from a Woodbury type community. Johnson gave a scenario regarding asking community leaders in Woodbury about their needs and goals would be different than the needs of Columbus. Johnson mentioned different cities have different standards based on their necessities, such as setbacks. Johnson stated each community's history and context is important.

Bobick questioned how it is determined which applicants would need to do a Planned Unit Development. Johnson stated that the city changed the ordinance so that in all commercial districts those who do not meet design requirements would need to apply for a Planned Unit Development to be considered. That method allowed flexibility, but a Planned Unit Development would not set a precedent as would happen with a variance. The Planned Unit Development allows the city to have discretion regarding design requirements. Johnson gives the Blaine Brothers project as an example, where Blaine Brothers was made aware that the white design was going to be difficult to pursue. The Blaine Brothers asked how they could rectify that situation. Johnson discussed with them about enhancing design features and orienting it towards Interstate 35. Johnson stated his belief that it turned out well, and that it did not turn out as a white box building with red trim.

Johnson stated that regarding materials, the City Council seems to be open to all materials except ribbed steel. Johnson stated that with colors a variety will be accepted, however they will be softer and neutral. Johnson adds that brilliant or neon will not be allowed. Johnson then mentioned that there are no questions about valuations, so the group can move on from that

point. Instead, staff will look at ordinance language that references the maintenance and upkeep of buildings. Johnson then moved onto discussing restaurant seating and minimum building size.

SITDOWN REQUIREMENTS AND MINIMUM SQUARE FOOTAGE

Johnson asked whether the city wants a standard that a restaurant has to have seating. Johnson stated prohibiting a non-sit-down food restaurant (such as the existing Caribou Cabin in the city or Taco Bell in Brooklyn Park) is a policy decision. Johnson mentioned that the traditional thinking with restaurants is a sit-down facility with accessory drive-thru.

Johnson then referenced the other part of the draft ordinance revision was minimum building size. Johnson stated he does not have a strong opinion regarding building size. He stated there are already requirements for minimum building and apartment unit sizes in residential districts. He stated that the 3,000 square feet requirement in the draft ordinance would prevent another Caribou Cabin type business. Hegland clarifies it is 3,000 square feet per buildable acre. Johnson stated that the businesses are not going to be on large parcels. Part of the motivation is to avoid a small building on a 40-acre parcel.

Johnson mentioned as the city continues to grow the land prices will continue to rise. He estimated a 20-30 year timeframe where rising land prices will lead to older metal buildings being removed and underutilized properties being subdivided. Johnson mentioned that the market cannot be controlled, but it can be studied and researched. One such study led to a reduction in retail-oriented land. Johnson stated that he gave the examples as way to keep things in perspective when discussion sit-down vs. drive through restaurants.

Hegland asked about statistics about sit-down vs. takeout vs. drive through. Hegland stated she had heard about a reduction of seating in restaurants and a heavier reliance with takeout. Hegland wants to avoid standards that are blind to existing market trends and standards that result in no interest in development in the city.

Johnson responded there likely are not statistics regarding that subject that would be relevant to Columbus and the current ordinance work. Johnson noted that many restaurants have closed, with closings concentrated in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and inner ring suburbs. Johnson stated that with many office workers no longer being required to work in the office, it has impacted the restaurant industry. Hegland then asked if there are more statistics about restaurants. She acknowledged that many had closed but noted that many had opened in recent years with a hybrid sit down/takeout, popups, and other iterations. Hegland wanted to be more informed on trends.

Johnson stated the statistics could be very localized, and the issue is when looking at trends it can shift rapidly. Johnson gives the example of the excess in retail and office properties. Johnson gave the opinion that the apartment market is being overbuilt after years of low vacancy. He compared that to permits being down 50% in single family housing compared to two years ago, and investment in single family houses are down. He stated that people are buying cheap property on the fringe of the Twin Cities such as Corcoran and Medina. But those trends could change rapidly again. Johnson stated there is a crisis for an adequate supply of affordable housing despite overbuilt an apartment market. Johnson stated that it will take time for the vacant retail and office to be filled. Johnson stated that the city gaining new retail may be

difficult. A business such as drive-through-only might be motivated to come to Columbus due to the freeway traffic through the city. Johnson stated that Columbus is a traffic market, not a rooftop market.

Johnson stated that he believed City Staff had enough direction to begin a draft ordinance. The next discussion will involve minimum building size and sit-down vs. drive-through. The group could also revisit masonry percentages. Johnson questioned if the April 19 would be the next meeting for the discussion to continue. Mursko then clarified April 19 would be the first meeting.

12. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE REPORT

Hegland updated the Council about the Code Compliance Inspector position. The position had one person who came through the whole process of applying and interviewing. That person is scheduled for a follow up interview and after that interview a decision will be made regarding whether to move forward with a recommendation to hire.

Hegland then shared that at the previous meeting, the Council failed to accept the resignation of Planning and Zoning Permit Tech Ella Giefer.

Motion Hegland to accept the resignation of Planning and Zoning Permit Tech Ella Giefer. Second Busch. Carried with Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Busch, and Preiner voting in favor.

Hegland then explained that the city has a policy that employees can only carry forward less than 120 hours of vacation time per fiscal year. Circumstances from the previous year meant City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko could not use the vacation time. Wagamon asked whether this is just the exception is for Mursko one time or for all positions.

Motion Hegland to approve request for Mursko to carry forward more than 120 vacation hours from fiscal year 2022 to 2023. Second Preiner. Carried with Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Busch, and Preiner voting in favor.

Hegland then gave an update regarding the Sunrise River Watershed Management Organization (SRWMO) and trying to get the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) updated and approved. Hegland stated that there has been some difficulty with Ham Lake in granting approval and the current JPA require some aspects such as funding formula require a unanimous approval. After seemingly beginning to move forward with certain aspects, the Ham Lake City Council met and would not approve the funding formula or changes to the JPA. Hegland stated that the Attorney for the Board of Soil and Water Resources (BWSR) found a state statute that prohibits Watershed Management Organizations (WMO) to require unanimous votes, except in approving a Capital Improvement Projects. Hegland stated that several attorneys from different organizations (BWSR, Anoka County and the City) interpreted that the unanimous approval language was not allowed in the JPA because the unanimous approval requirement is not legal. Hegland stated that the WMO is moving forward with their work, and that the WMO needs more money for the attorney to finish that work. Hegland wanted to bring forward to the City Council a request for an additional \$1,000 so there is enough money for the attorney to finish the work.

Motion Hegland to authorize \$1,000 be provided to the Sunrise River Watershed Management Organization to finish the work on the Joint Powers Agreement for attorney fees. Second Wagamon. Carried with Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Busch, and Preiner voting in favor.

13. PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Hanegraaf stated that although the meeting would be his final as Planning Commission Chairperson, he would be in attendance on April 5 to help the new Planning Commission Chairperson Lynn Carver-Quinn.

14. ASSOCIATE PLANNER'S REPORT

Koenen reported back to the Planning Commission regarding billboards designs in the freeway district conforming to conditions placed. Koenen explained it had been brought to the attention of the Planning Commission that some of the oval pan signs on Clear Channel billboards did not follow the required standards and that a ladder was placed in front of the signs.

Koenen noted that after looking further at conditions, the color of the Columbus plaque should be sufficient to meet the conditions of the permit.

Koenen spoke to the company regarding the ladder in front of the Columbus plaque and suggested moving the ladder to the side, but the company noted the difficulty in moving the ladder given the positioning of the billboard. The company made several suggestions of potential options to remedy the situation.

Koenen stated the company could paint the ladder to match the stone. Koenen stated the company also suggested moving the sign to the front of the catwalk similar to Outfront's first sign on Interstate 35. Koenen stated the company did mention that a discussion with the company's engineer would be necessary regarding the feasibility and safety of that possibility. Koenen continued, saying an option would be to put it on the stone part near the base below the ladder.

Hegland asked if Koenen could come back to the Planning Commission with a solution to the sign issue. Mursko stated that the company needs to come back with a concept, because it is an aesthetic departure from what was presented. Mursko noted that they will be at the April 5th Planning Commission meeting for an Interim Use Permit application, and that could potentially be a sidebar discussion. Hanegraaf asked whether the Clear Channel had already begun altering the signs. Hanegraaf noted he did not notice the ladders when driving northbound. Busch noted that the ladders are on the north side of the side and would only be noticed going southbound.

15. ADJOURN

Motion Hegland to adjourn. Second Hanegraaf. Carried with Wagamon, Hanegraaf, Hegland, Busch, Ramisch, Barrette, Huntosh, Carver-Quinn, Bobick, and Preiner voting in favor.

Frank Koenen

Respectfully Submitted by Recording Secretary Frank Koenen