

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 21, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 21, 2023, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall.

ROLL CALL

Present: W. Premeau, M. Rayner, S. Lawry, Chair S. Mittlefehldt, D. Fetter, A. Andres, and Vice-Chair N. Williams

Absent: K. Clegg and C. Gottlieb (excused).

AGENDA

It was moved by A. Andres, seconded by M. Rayner, and carried 7-0 to approve the agenda as presented.

MINUTES

The minutes of 03-07-23 were approved by consensus without amendments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

01-SUP-03-23 – 136 W. Baraga Ave. (PIN: 0110580)

Zoning Official A. Landers stated staff has reviewed the Special Land Use permit for a Hotel Use to be located at 136 W. Baraga Ave. She also stated this property is zoned Central Business District (CBD) and a Hotel use is a special land use in this zoning district. She referenced the staff report and attachments, and visuals of the attachments were shown. She stated the only piece of correspondence received was in the agenda packet.

S. Mittlefehldt asked if anyone had questions for staff. Hearing none, she invited the applicants to comment on the proposal.

Mr. Charles Holsworth stated that he and Josh Paquette are owners of the property, and that the team from RG Design, Brian Salvolin for civil engineering, and Jeff Goodney with Closner Construction are present to answer any questions.

S. Lawry stated - he had several questions and asked about the intent to use the neighbor business' dumpster and said that the Queen City Running store no longer has a dumpster enclosure and that they use rolling carts for trash now.

Mr. Holsworth stated - they will need to construct the dumpster enclosure which will meet zoning and they will have a legal easement with the neighboring property owner for this.

S. Lawry stated - there is a 2-inch water line, but that would not be adequate to fully sprinkle the building.

Mr. Dax Richer stated - they will need to meet the City Code by adding a line.

Mr. Brian Savolainen stated - they will be upgrading to a 6-inch line and that he will amend the utility plan to include that change.

S. Lawry stated - the Fire Department expressed concerns with the width of the alley and clear space in that area and asked if they would be removing any vents on the east side of the building to allow for the width of the driveway access.

Mr. Holsworth stated - yes, they will be removing that and cleaning all that up.

S. Lawry stated - that the analysis indicated that no new lighting was proposed, but the elevation drawings show six new lights on the south side of the building, and I presume there could be some more lighting around the ramp and stairs as well.

Mr. Holsworth stated - any entrance or exits that require lighting, downlighting, we'll meet the city zoning on downlighting. We know it's got to be downlight and not light up the sky so I think any of our sky lighting would be respectful of that. I think even on the side elevation, we might want to add a couple of downlights to light that driveway, but we would follow the city zoning requirements.

S. Lawry asked - if when spaces are rented from the DDA, what is the term of the rental, and could you lose the permits?

Mr. Paquette stated we pay for them quarterly and so we will continue to pay for them and then we'll be able to input the license plates based on guest arrival permits.

S. Lawry asked - so you have first option on them as long as you're current with your payments?

Mr. Paquette stated - yes, we plan to keep them. We currently own them now and we'll continue to pay them through the life of the operation.

Mr. Lawry asked - and those in the Spring Street lot, that is the total number of spaces that are available for rental?

Mr. Paquette stated - I'm not certain what the total number is available, but we have the requisite you inquired about.

S. Lawry stated - we did have correspondence from one of the other merchants indicating a concern over loss of spaces and I guess I'm just trying to find out - there was 13 spaces in that lot that they are proposing to lease, is that the total number of spaces that you commit to a long-term lease in that lot?

Ms. Lasse-McKinney stated - for the overnight, 24-hour parking permits that we have in that lot, they only have 13 of the 21 or 22 that we have available in that lot, so they don't have all of them and so there are several other businesses or residents in the area that have the rest of those. Otherwise, the permits that are parking there are just daytime permits.

S. Lawry asked - so this only reserves spaces for the hours from 7 p.m. until 7 a.m. or something of that nature?

Ms. Lasse-McKinney stated - for the 24-hour permits, it gives them access to that lot basically 24 hours per day and at night we prefer that they park only north into that lot. However, they are not required to, but for plowing purposes that is where we prefer they park. During the day they can park anywhere in that lot if for some reason there were not available spots. Sometimes people end up leaving their cars in the lot overnight and whatnot. As long as they are in that lot, they are permitted to be there.

S. Mittlefehldt stated to Ms. Lasse-McKinney - we spoke on the phone earlier, but I wonder just for the record if you could reiterate what we talked about, just your assessment, because I think you of all people really know the flow of parking in that area, just to address Ms. Wright-Getz's concerns about parking - so maybe you could just speak to that a little bit.

Ms. Lasse-McKinney stated - we do have those twenty or so permits that are 24-hours and those people come and go. Some stay there just for the night and are gone for the day and some are there all day long. So, I think there's 93 to 95 total spots in that lot, so there's still ample parking for other people, whether they be hourly parkers or daytime permit use. Additionally, in that general area, there is plenty of on-street parking on the area streets, including Baraga Avenue, Spring Street, Front Street, plus there's four or five other public parking lots in the area as well, so there's ample parking in the area within just two to three blocks - I would say several hundred spots.

D. Fetter asked Ms. Lasse-McKinney how the parking is controlled.

Ms. Lasse-McKinney stated - all of our permits are digital, based on license plates. Daytime we have a parking enforcement person who physically looks at those things and regularly checks both in the lots and on the streets to make sure that if there are permits, they're in the proper place, and if they're already paid that they're current on the payments for that time period. Otherwise, at night, the police department has access to those digital permits and they can check on those whenever they feel the need to do that.

Chair S. Mittlefehldt opened the Public Hearing, no one wished to comment, she closed the Public Hearing.

It was moved by M. Rayner, seconded by S. Lawry and carried 7-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.

The Planning Commission discussed each of the fourteen Special Land Use Standards in Section 54.1403.

S. Middlefehldt stated - number one, is Intent of the Zoning District, "the intent of the zoning district is met and the proposed use is in harmony with appropriate and orderly development of the district." What do you all think about that? I don't think we need to vote on each of these. We just have to get a general consensus. This is in the downtown commercial district so it seems pretty consistent with the district. All right, I don't see anyone disagreeing, so to number two - Use of Adjacent Land, "the current use of adjacent land and neighborhood are compatible with proposed use." It sounds like they've already talked with the neighbor, the Queen City Running company.

M. Rayner stated - I assume that's the small park area between that building and the museum.

S. Middlefehldt asked - is that owned by the History Center?

Mr. Holsworth stated yes.

S. Middlefehldt stated - I'm sure they would appreciate the flow of visitors coming from the hotel. Any thoughts on that one? All right, number three is Physical Appearance and Structure. Does the physical appearance of existing or proposed structures meet the standards in the ordinance?

N. Williams stated, yes, it looks like they're just adding onto the back a little bit but otherwise not really changing the look of the building, which I think fits in with the neighborhood.

M. Rayner stated - and they're restoring an existing structure.

S. Lawry stated - the preservation of what I presume is quarry sandstone is an excellent goal.

S. Middlefehldt stated, agreed, it could add a lot to that neighborhood.

Mr. Holsworth said - we are taking down a little bit of the two, the old structure on the back. It's an old cinder block extension added on - it's not attractive. It's going to be torn off and used for parking.

S. Middlefehldt asked, any thoughts on the physical appearance? Everybody seems good about that. Number four is Landscaping, "the suitability of proposed landscaping in providing ground cover, screening, and decorations on the site."

M. Rayner stated - there's not a lot of property for landscaping - two flower boxes in front.

S. Middlefehldt stated, okay - number five is Operations of Use, "the nature and intensity of operations involved in or conducted in connection with the proposed use is appropriate for the site and not in conflict with surrounding properties and uses."

S. Lawry stated - I think the switch to having private vehicles there instead of delivery vans coming in and out is actually an improvement. There might be a little higher numbers and trips counts but more compatible vehicles for the site.

D. Fetter stated - agreed.

S. Middlefehldt stated - number six is the Time of Use, "the proposed or estimated times of use and the physical and economic relationship of one type of use to another are not in conflict with each other or with surrounding properties and uses." Good there. Number seven - Number of persons or Employees, "the proposed or estimated assembly of persons or employees shall not be hazardous to the neighborhood or incongruous or in conflict with normal traffic or activity in the vicinity."

N. Williams asked - how many total units is it?

Mr. Holsworth stated sixteen.

N. Williams asked - okay, so 16 units and one employee doesn't seem like a grossly large number of people to be there.

Mr. Richer stated - it's a good one to learn about, though. Their business is very online and they do have other hotels in the area and so they are able to bring in that resource as needed. And their rooms are operated online, so they don't need a lot of staff there and they had to pay attention to follow those things because of the size of the building and the property so there's a lot of things that are going into that decision-making to lessen the impact on the city. There are no keys, there's one cleaning person, there's no concierges, and it's a virtual check-in.

S. Middlefehldt asked, any other comments? Okay, number eight is Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation – the "proposed or estimated vehicular and pedestrian traffic going into patterns, particularly children, as well as vehicular turning movements do not negatively impact traffic flows, intersections, site distances and safety."

M. Rayner stated I think that's applicable.

N. Williams stated I think by making that alley between the two buildings into a one-way, you're not going to have someone driving out from between those two buildings and hitting someone on the sidewalk.

M. Rayner stated - which is better than what it is now.

N. Williams stated - right, and then otherwise the public services and the fire department and the police department reviewed this and did not have concerns on those items listed.

S. Middlefehldt stated – okay, number nine is Physical Characteristics of the Site, any comments on the physical characteristics of the site?

S. Lawry stated just that it appears to be a very difficult site to work with, with the railroad right-of-way that's owned by the City is still taking off one corner of it, a big corner.

S. Middlefehldt stated okay, 10 is public services, the "proposed or estimated demands upon public services, such as electricity, sewer and water, police, fire protection, schools and refuse disposal shall not be overly burdensome based on our readily available information." We've covered that, but any comments? Okay, number 11, Environmental Factors, "the type and amount of litter, waste, noise, dust, traffic fumes and glare, vibration, which may be generated by such use shall be minimized or properly mitigated."

S. Lawry asked - do we know if there are any underground tanks on that property associated with the cleaning business?

Mr. Holsworth stated - we had a Phase 1 and a Phase 2 environmental done and they didn't turn anything up as far as underground tanks, but having that business out of there is a good thing. It has a lot of water in the basement, so they'll be cleaning all that up and capping it.

S. Middlefehldt stated – okay, number 12 is Site Area and Potential Future Expansion Areas, “that the planning commission determines that there is sufficient site area for the proposed use to prevent nuisances to neighboring uses, and if there is potential for reasonable anticipated expansion of use and about nuisances to neighboring use.”

N. Williams stated - it would definitely be hard for any expansion. However, it does not seem particularly burdensome on neighboring uses as it is right now, but I'm not sure how we tackle that or how we have in the past, but there's definitely not, unless they're expanding upwards, there's no real potential for expansion. Do you have any comment on that?

D. Stensaas stated I like what you said about that not being a burden. That isn't really problematic in this case.

A. Landers stated and then for the staff report, any future expansion would require additional public hearings, and we would go into these standards again.

S. Middlefehldt stated – okay, number 13 is Additional Neighborhood Factors, “other factors shall be considered as necessary to maintain property values in the neighborhood and guarantee safety, light, parent privacy to principle uses in the district.”

M. Rayner stated - I would think the Children's Museum and the History Center would find it beneficial to have people that close.

N. Williams stated - yeah, and I think all the businesses in this area are reliant on people coming to the area and staying in hotels, so it seems to be very appropriate to have a hotel of this type there.

M. Rayner stated too bad the bakery is closed.

S. Middlefehldt stated - all right number 14 is Master Plan, “conformance and harmony with the master plan.” Yes, good? Okay, great, so we went through that, and I believe we also need to go through section 54.1403 as well, right Dave?

D. Stensaas stated - this is a little less important to go through, as far as specifically addressing each one, because some of these are redundant and we covered a lot of these in the Staff Review, but if you feel like there's any of these you want to talk about, certainly talk about it.

S. Middlefehldt asked the members - do you want to go through that other section code?

N. Williams asked - what's the number of the other section?

S. Middlefehldt stated - I believe it's 54.1402.

City Planner and Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas stated - I don't think staff made any recommendations in here calling anything out, concerns, but we said the pedestrian sidewalk proposed to be built around new parking spaces will be needed and a welcome addition there, and better landscaping would be nice. Really, there are no major concerns.

S. Middlefehldt stated we've covered it all. All right, any other discussion on this project? Comments? Questions? All right would anyone like to make a motion?

It was moved by N. Williams, and seconded by D. Fetter and carried 7-0 that after holding a public hearing and review of the site plan set dated February 21, 2023, with supplemental documentation and the Staff Report/Analysis for 01-SUP-03-23, the Planning Commission finds that the request meets the intent and requirements of the Land Development Code Special Land Use Standards in

Section 54.1403 and the Site Plan Review Standards in Section 54.1402, and hereby approves 01-SUP-03-23 with the following conditions:

- 1. That an amended plan is submitted to meet staff comments*
- 2. That a license is obtained from the City Commission for the work in the right-of-way.*
- 3. That a use or access easement or agreement is obtained for the proposed use and construction on the City property.*

01-ZOA-03-23 - Land Development Code Amendments

A. Landers stated - the proposed amendments are the product of several months of effort by staff and the Planning Commission and have been developed, discussed, and refined during several work sessions from late 2022 into early 2023. She stated the draft amendments to the LDC document were attached in the agenda packet which is posted on the city website to be available to the public.

D. Stensaas stated - I guess I'd just say that we left the meeting with some items, the last meeting on the work session on this to address a couple of items and we've definitely addressed everything, and Commissioner Lawry also provided us with an extensive list of corrections that we needed to make. A lot of them were clerical corrections but very helpful because some of us don't have great attention to detail with writing and so if there's anything you want to go over again, let's do that. Otherwise, as you know, we could spend hours talking about these things, so we won't go through the list from top to bottom, but if there's anything you see that would need to be changed or that's still problematic in any way let's discuss it.

W. Premeau stated - I'm still confused on that, you've got one row on driveways that says you can have 18 feet if it's a 50-foot driveway, but you're interpreting the fact that down below it says that if you have a duplex, you can have a 24 foot driveway, but it doesn't say you could have that on a 50 foot lot. I mean, I know how you're going to interpret it, but how is the next guy going to interpret it?

S. Middlefehldt asked - what section is that in again?

D. Stensaas stated - Article 9, so we have Section E - maximum driveway and paved area - that explains for lots up to 60 feet in width, the driveway is allowed to be 18 feet, and 24 feet wide on a lot more than 60 feet in width. And then under Duplex in Item 2, it says the maximum width of the driveway is 24 feet.

A. Landers stated - so it's separated by uses, before you even get into that A and B language, so look at the use of it. If it's single family, we look at A and B. If it's duplex, we look at Number 2. So that's not an interpretation, it's just how you read the Code.

W. Premeau stated - well, it's in a single-family neighborhood.

A. Landers stated - it's the use, though.

D. Stensaas stated - the use, so if that single family home is legally converted to a duplex, they would be allowed to expand the driveway to 24 feet.

W. Premeau stated - but they could do that on a 39-foot lot, or 40-foot lot, also, correct?

D. Stensaas stated yep, that's what we're saying.

W. Premeau stated – okay, sorry I asked,

D. Stensaas stated - if there's actually room on a lot like that with a duplex.

M. Rayner stated - I don't know how you'd do that.

S. Lawry asked - just one more question on definitions under 35 and 36 of the daycare units, it talks about counting the children, except children related to an adult member of the family by blood, marriage or adoption. I'm wondering if it should state "an adult member of the resident family", because all kids are part of some family.

D. Stensaas stated - some of this language, for some of these things that we define in the code that are state requirements - and we do duplicate a lot of those with the childcare and the group homes, the foster care homes - we just take their language verbatim and use it in our definition, so that's my question, if that is derived from the state language.

A. Landers confirmed that the language was from the state of Michigan's definitions.

S. Mittlefehldt stated – we did go through this pretty extensively in at least a couple of meetings, so I'm good with what we have.

Chair S. Mittlefehldt opened the Public Hearing, no one wished to comment, she closed the Public Hearing.

S. Mittlefehldt stated – would people like to have any more discussion on this? There is sample language for a motion in the packet.

It was moved by D. Fetter, and seconded by A. Andres, and carried 7-0 that After review of the draft Land Development Code (LDC) amendments presented as case 01-ZOA-03-2023, and after conducting a public hearing and careful consideration of the contents of the draft LDC amendments, the Planning Commission finds that the draft LDC amendments are consistent with the recommendations, goals, and policy objectives of the Community Master Plan, comply with section 54.1405 of the Land Development Code and therefore are justified and appropriate and therefore should be approved by the City Commission as presented.

NEW BUSINESS

01-SKT-03-23 - Sketch Plan Review – 1502 W. Ridge St, 1303 and 1400 Grant Ave (PIN: 0513670, 0513810, 0513811)

A. Landers stated - Staff has reviewed the sketch plan for the construction of two apartment buildings, shed, parking lot, landscaping, site improvements, monument sign, and playground/picnic area with table located at 1502 W. Ridge St, 1303 and 1400 Grant Ave. She referenced the staff report and attachments, and visuals of the attachments were shown.

D. Stensaas stated - and this was something we just added to the LDC in the last three or four years, at the request of our local development community, to provide a step where they could come and get some kind of proof from the Planning Commission that as long as the layout and the uses that they're looking at putting on a site are consistent with the Community Master Plan and the Land Development Code. And they can take that to a bank – that's the main purpose - to help them when seeking financing.

D. Stensaas stated - and so anybody coming with a sketch plan is definitely coming back with a site plan that has all the civil engineering worked out on it, and goes through the full staff review.

S. Mittlefehldt stated – okay, that was going to be my question, because Scott Cambensy wanted more of the proposed utilities. Are there any questions or are there any thoughts about this project?

N. Williams asked - who is the PCI Design Group? Are they the developer?

Craig Patterson, representing the owner, stated I'm sorry, I probably should have said something earlier. He stated - I represent the owner, who's going to finance once they get bank approval. PCI Design is an architectural firm that's based in Columbus, Ohio, with a satellite office in Grand Rapids. They are the ones who design, and the development will be called Black Rock Crossing and will be owned by the principals of Woda Cooper Companies, and I am the Senior Vice-President for that company, and I can answer any other questions. We appreciate staff support, and we submitted the site plan you see. It wasn't perfect. We got input. We answered questions and you can see some of the responses. We plan to go for funding on April 3rd and then we'll know sometime in July whether we are funded, and then we would start construction about nine months after, but after we do the preliminary site plan review, deep engineering and everything that goes through that, and that staff would have a chance to look at all that. It's about a \$13.1 million investment and my hope it's not a solid rock site, if anybody had noticed that. We've got geos [geotechnical probing] and we're waiting on the engineering to come back.

S. Lawry stated – I have a question for staff - the owners or developers would have the opportunity to approach the city to request the vacation of Grant Ave. right-of-way through there if they so choose, is that correct?

D. Stensaas stated - well, from what I've seen, the part of Grant Ave. that does extend west of McClellan Avenue just dead-ends on that parcel that comes off of Grant Avenue in the subdivision, and then to the west of there, on this property, that's not platted property, so it seems like there's no concern with that. There's no record of it extending onto the un-platted property that this party owns.

Mr. Lawry stated - I was part of the City design team when the streets were put in, in 1978, and that the lots there were considered developable then and utilities were stubbed outside the main street to allow for that. I don't recall specifics on that portion shown as Grant Ave. beyond the three lots off of McClellan, but I do recall that the previous property owner requested the vacation of it back around the late '70s and at that time it was denied. I know the portion along those first three lots are still active right of way and the one on Hancock St. is routinely used by the City's Public Works department as a staging area for parking street equipment for street sweeping and things of that nature. The three lots in front of this are sort of in limbo, a special assessment was applied against them in 1978 or '79 and the owner at that time determined that the value of them didn't warrant paying the assessment, so instead he donated them to the City, but with the stipulation that they be used for park property, but the City has never felt the need to have a park there, so they just kind of sit fallow and restricted.

S. Mittlefehldt asked S. Lawry – just to clarify, are you talking about the area between McClellan and this property.

S. Lawry stated – yes, there's three platted lots north of Grant and three south of Grant that are part of the West End subdivision.

Mr. Patterson stated – it's our understanding that Grant Ave. was vacated.

D. Stensaas stated – whether it is vacated or not it won't be usable by anybody until the plat is amended, if it was vacated it can't be built on unless the plat has been vacated and we are not aware of any plats that had vacated streets that were subsequently amended, except for some of the property that NMU owns.

N. Williams asked – in the PCI Design Group letter there are questions and responses - whose questions and whose responses are they?

A. Landers stated – those were staff questions and responses by the PCI Group.

S. Mittlefehldt asked Mr. Patterson – you mentioned that the site might be rocky - are these conditions going to change your plans any? Are there things that are contingent on if it is solid bedrock under there or something?

Mr. Patterson stated - we did the geo work two weeks ago and they punched the holes, so we're waiting on the engineering and generally what happens is we look at where the trouble areas are...then we make an assessment as to whether or not the site work will still be affordable, and at this point in time we have no indication that they ran into trouble. Sometimes when they are on site they'll give you a call and say they're hitting it [rock] everywhere. We don't have any indication that we're in trouble, but we know back to the north there's a lot of rock, and so we're just waiting on that. We think we will have the results of by the end of next week, so that's how close we are.

S. Mittlefehldt stated – okay, thank you.

W. Premeau stated – I noticed that the topographical lines goes up and down like a yo-yo, it drops 13 feet, and asked where the utilities would be brought in.

Mr. Patterson stated – it is quite a hike up to the top, on the southeast corner. That's why the only access we are looking at is off Ridge St. because it's a gradual slope, even though Hancock and Grant could have been, because if you're coming off McClellan the slope is significant.

W. Premeau asked - so where the utilities would be brought in?

Mr. Patterson stated – off of Ridge St.

S. Lawry stated - there is a sanitary manhole north of the north curb line on Ridge St. and a 6-inch water main stubbed in there, probably with a fire hydrant on it, specifically to serve that property and that was assessed against that property as a tap.

Mr. Patterson stated – you know, it is a large site, 4.39 acres for 50 units. We'll maintain it, all that area. Our company has its own property management company, so we don't send that out to somebody else.

N. Williams asked Mr. Patterson – would the house on the site be demolished?

Mr. Patterson stated - we have no plans to maintain it, rent it or reuse it.

A. Andres asked - how many handicapped-accessible dwelling units there would be.

Mr. Patterson stated - that's a good question. First of all, we have 74 units and 74 parking spots. Six will be barrier-free. In the actual buildings, we'll have five barrier-free units. These are three story walk-ups, so your ground floors will be completely visible and even though we'll have more than six units on the ground floor, individuals who need accessibility can get into all of the units.

S. Mittlefehldt stated - I also want to point out, in section 54.1402(D3), these sketch plans are kind of just getting a general acceptability of the project and the Planning Commission isn't bound by statements or indications of acceptance of the plan, so I think when make the motion - there's a potential motion there in the packet – it's do we approve of the general goal of this project, and we'll be seeing it later, but does anybody want to discuss more or maybe make a motion?

S. Lawry stated – one more question - the dumpster enclosure would be within a front yard area. I'm wondering, from staff, is there an area there that would not be considered a front yard?

A. Landers stated - yes, so they are right on the line and my comment was to make sure they don't move it to the north any if and when they make their changes, because the front yard area is right here [showing location on-screen] because of the Hancock right-of-way.

S. Lawry stated - but that right-of-way doesn't extend back that far.

A. Landers stated - so that's their front yard right here and the rest of it turns into a side yard. It's the 50 ft. adjacent to the lot line.

D. Stensaas stated – so once they're out of that right-of-way area they're no longer in the front yard area.

Mr. Patterson stated – I'm glad you pointed that out, I'll remove it.

D. Stensaas stated – that's something your design team will have to accommodate.

S. Lawry stated – the Fire Department sounded like they were asking for an even bigger turn there and rather than use that to push the dumpsters further north you'll probably have to go further south, if the rock will allow it.

S. Middlefehldt stated – would anyone like to make a motion.

It was moved by W. Premeau, and seconded by S. Lawry, and carried 7-0 that after review of the sketch plan 01-SKT-03-23, the Planning Commission finds that it is an acceptable Sketch Plan for preliminary planning work, and that the existing character of the property, the proposed use of the property, the mass and location of structures, the general site circulation, and the other required elements shown in Figure 52 of Article 14 of the Land Development Code (LDC) for Sketch Plans are generally in compliance with the LDC.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

A. Andres welcomed S. Lawry back to the Planning Commission.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that it was good to have Mr. Lawry and his rich historical knowledge on the Planning Commission.

N. Williams asked questions about the Special Meeting on Thursday 3/23 that were answered by staff.

S. Lawry stated that the two projects presented tonight are promising and that he hopes the Ridge St. site works out for the applicant.

D. Stensaas stated that there is no business for the 4/04/23 scheduled meeting and that it could be cancelled to give the members a bit of a break.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair S. Mittlefehldt at 7:05 p.m.

David Stensaas

Prepared by: iMedat

Edited by: David Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator, Planning Commission Staff Liaison