

**MINUTES OF
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
APRIL 28, 2008**

A public hearing and meeting of the Plan Commission was held at 7:30 p.m. in the Municipal building with the following persons present:

MEMBERS PRESENT

Michael Daugherty
Lori Shields
Louis Smith
Dennis Stubblefield
Roy Marcelin
Doyle Beesley
Jeff Schlueter

OTHERS PRESENT

Dan Culkin

Meeting was called to order by Mike Daugherty at 7:30 p.m. The first item on the Agenda was approval of the minutes from the February 25, 2008 meeting. Motion for correction of minutes by Dennis Stubblefield to show that he arrived late and left early; not Doyle Beesley. Correction is made. Motion by Dennis Stubblefield to approve the minutes as corrected with second by Roy Marcelin. Vote is taken and motion carries unanimously.

Prior to calling up the second item on the Agenda, Chairman Daugherty addresses an issue from the February 25, 2008 meeting with regards to obtaining another opinion on whether or not the Design Review Committee applied to the Open Meetings Act. Mr. Daugherty hands out a copy of a written opinion from Jason Bartel from the firm of Bartel and Barrickman to each of the members and informs the members that the opinion basically states that it doesn't matter whether or not there are members of the Plan Commission on the Design Review Committee but that the committee itself is subject to the Open Meetings Act because of its function. A copy of the written opinion is given to Dan for Ken Beth.

Review of attorney's draft of Community Design Standards

Chairman Daugherty calls up the second item on the Agenda which is a review of the draft of the Community Design Standards. First a discussion takes place as to when the Plan Commission should meet again on any changes that would be made tonight on this draft since the next regular meeting date would be Memorial Day. It is decided that the next meeting will be scheduled for May 19th.

A typographical correction is made on page 24, Section 9, beginning of third sentence: “appearance is design” should be “appearance in design”.

Discussion takes place as to page 26, #11 regarding the prohibiting of cinder block material on the exterior of buildings in the Central Business District. There is some confusion by Doyle Beesley as to why cinder block will not be allowed and Dan explains that concrete block will be allowed but that cinder block is a much lighter material and is different than concrete block. There was also a question by Doyle to Louis Smith regarding about what a split face block was to which Louis replied that it is a concrete block that has essentially been split in the middle by a chisel creating a rough texture on the face of the block. Lori Shields poses the question about pre-cast panels and why they wouldn't be allowed. It was clarified by Louis that it should probably be “plain” pre-cast panels as they do not look very nice. Dan made a note to add the word “plain”.

Doyle asks for some clarification on the current downtown immediate area zoning. Dan explains that the current C-2 zoning of the downtown and immediate areas has not been changed yet but that the re-zoning will be done in the near future.

Lori Shields poses a question as to Awnings and Canopies on page 26, #12a - f. She has some concern as to safety if awnings are not allowed to have light underneath them. It was explained that there can be lights underneath the awning just not within the awning. Much discussion takes place with regards to the types of awnings and canopies, how they must be erected and their coverage. Dan states that he will look into cleaning up some of the language with Ken on this matter to take into consideration, the lighting, material, projection and coverage of the awnings and canopies.

Members discuss parking lot screening in the Central Business District (page 29, Section 9B – Parking Lot Perimeter Landscaping). Dan makes a note to take a look at the language with Ken.

Louis Smith brings up the matter of similar houses on page 14, #6. He states his recollection that there were to be five to six houses of different floor plans in between similar houses, not three. A lot of discussion takes place concerning what a good number would be and what clarification can be done to avoid any conflict across the street and how to resolve the problem if there are only two lots. Dan points out to the members that they need to keep in mind that the language currently states “when any three of the following characteristics are present” then you can still may have the same floor print of three or four different designs but you can have different gables, hip roof, colors and even materials. Jeff Schlueter still would like to see an increase in the distance between the lots. The members request that a change be made to increase the distance from three lots to five lots.

Louis Smith asks a question with regards to percentage of first floor exterior walls for all front yards on page 32 if that means any yard that faces a street is a front yard? Dan's reply is that by definition that is correct. Doyle then asks that if in the second part (B) of page 32 where it says “and” all front yard it should be “for”? Dan made a note to make

the correction. Doyle also questioned the statement “For lots existing or platted prior to January 1, 2008” with regards to R-1A and R-2A classifications as they currently do not exist. Dan explained that it’s to cover anything after that date and that the members need to keep in mind when it’s an existing building you still want to make sure that there is something in place down the road as the zoning could be changed at a later date.

Doyle also asks with regards to page 32, A, under C-4 “other walls may be constructed of common brick or pre-cast concrete” if that meant that concrete blocks were not allowed in that zoning classification either? Members discuss this subject and it is decided to add concrete block just to C-4.

Dan makes a suggestion with regards to dollar figures under the Expedited Review Process on pages 10 & 11, Section 5 A for the CR districts (CR-1 through CR-4). He notes that the CR districts and the AG district were not included in this section and would like to see the CR districts be included in Section 5 A(1)(c) and the AG district be included in Section 5 A(1)(a). Members do not have any problems with this. It was suggested that the dollar figures listed should also include the words “plus the rate of CPI since its inception”. Members agree and Dan makes a note to have that included as part of the language.

With no further discussion by the members, Chairman Daugherty asks for a motion to adjourn. Motion is made by Doyle Beesley with a second by Roy Marcelin. Vote is taken and motion carries. Meeting is adjourned at 9:25 p.m.