

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
July 18, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 18, 2023, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission (PC) members present: W. Premeau, M. Rayner, S. Lawry, K. Clegg, Chair S. Mittlefehldt, Vice-Chair N. Williams, D. Fetter, C. Gottlieb, A. Andres

PC members absent: none

Staff present: Zoning Official A. Landers, City Planner & Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas

AGENDA

It was moved by C. Gottlieb, seconded by A. Andres, and carried 9-0 to approve the agenda as presented.

MINUTES

The minutes of 06-20-23 were approved as presented, by consensus.

CONFLICT of INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were confirmed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 03-SUP-07-23 - 424 N. Third St. & 143 W. Michigan St. (PIN: 0181310 & 0181380)

Zoning Official A. Landers stated: The Planning Commission is being asked to review an application for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval. The Planning Commission qualified the project for a PUD on May 17, 2022. The Planning Commission will need to conduct a public hearing for a Preliminary Site Plan Review and draft recommendations to the City Commission, who will issue final approval or denial of the PUD. She described and showed on the monitors in the room the Staff File Report and attachments, the Site Plan Review application, the variance letter from the applicant, the staff and applicants' comments, a proof of the granting of an easement, the area map, the block map, the zoning map, photos of the site, and the Site Plan set. She also stated that there was no correspondence submitted.

Mr. Andy Langlois stated that he and Mr. Dave Manson (also present) are the applicants. He also stated: This project, we kind of need to do it. The last 10 years we've been brewing on a 3-barrel system and three barrels isn't really that much and what happens is we run out of it quite quickly, so we're able to put in a 7 to maybe 10-barrel system in the front for the building, and that will get us through summers much better. So, our footprint is pretty small. We've always kind of just grown from the very beginning and then one step at a time as we can do it, and so this is the next step, and I hate to say the last step, but it might be the last step. We're kind of land-locked at this point. But it does make sense on a few different areas, though. It's going to allow us to have the space we need to put in a bigger system and produce more beer there. We do lose the lower patio that's out front but at the same time we're going to gain that seating up on top, much like our existing rooftop deck. I think it's also going to create a pretty clean line going across, with windows across the front so you can see the tanks, and I was looking through the master plan from three years ago, you hired the experts to come it. I just want to see if we're in line with that and it seems like it's pretty much what we're going for. The Master Plan [Third St. Corridor Plan]

vision is to extend fencing around the corner of Blackrocks. We're basically bringing it out to Michigan Street, and increasing seating, so while we're not putting a fence there, we're putting a building there. Also, there was mention [in the Plan] of street walls and how "a vertical element in front of each lot creates a street wall, which like the walls of a room, street walls is what makes the street comfortable, safe, interesting to walk along, so high walls with windows or other openings and street trees recommended." So, that's essentially what we're trying to do is just kind of build a clean line with an existing brick building, bring it across and put some tanks in it. I think that's it.

C. Gottlieb stated:

I have some questions for the applicants. What would be the change in the amount of seating provided?

Mr. Langlois stated:

Currently there's already seating in this section [pointing to image on-screen] so we'd add a little bit, I mean, we're going bring up the same amount of seating as down below and bring it up. And then the only other section is here. This isn't seating right here. This is going to be like currently a new addition we did. He put some mechanical stuff that we needed up there and we fenced it in so this is all going to be fenced in, just to keep people out, keep the noise in, that sort of thing.

C. Gottlieb asked if there had been any noise complaints since the last addition was completed.

Mr. Langlois stated:

It's been quite a few years since we've had one. That was a whole other story, the history and learning and growing of the business and finding that if you're going to have music outside to be respectful and get it done by 9 o'clock.

C. Gottlieb asked if there would be any change in operating hours.

Mr. Langlois said no.

C. Gottlieb asked: Do you anticipate increasing or decreasing sound outside the building and area?

Mr. Langlois stated:

It should be similar. I know our neighbors have expressed some concern with the current set-up, saying that because people are on the roof they can hear them more clearly, so we're going to be putting some more people on the roof, but then again I don't know what to say. We're part of the downtown district and we're trying to run a business and I can totally empathize with their situation, too, and I'm not sure how bad that is.

K. Clegg asked how the increase in spent grain would be handled by the applicants.

Mr. Langlois stated:

Currently, we're raking it out into bins and then we load them up, bring them over to the production center and then it goes to the cows. So, it's going to be very similar in that way. We have some different ideas of how we're going to handle that. Maybe some sort of nurse trailer or maybe just being a truck.

Mr. Manson stated (to Mr. Langlois): That is what the new truck will be used for.

Mr. Langlois stated:

They will truck the spent grain to the farm.

K. Clegg stated:

And you say that the curb cut is absolutely necessary for that? My concern is that...right now you've got the Burger Bus and all of your food trucks parking in that spot where the curb cut is going to be, which will make it no longer legal space.

Mr. Langlois stated:

I think it's going to be the spot before the curb cut and two spots after the curb cut.

K. Clegg asked: Is that long enough for the bus?

Mr. Langlois stated: I think so, yeah.

Mr. Manson stated:

I wonder out loud if while it's not a legal parking spot, the only people that would complain of a violation of that parking spot would be people who need to have egress, right?

A. Landers stated:

Once you put a curb cut in, you won't be able to use that as an on-street parking spot. You'd lose it.

Mr. Langlois stated:

Going to back to your question – "is it necessary" – when we're handling tons of grain, its coming in and going out, if you back a truck up it becomes much more efficient to load and stock, as opposed to – especially during winter - going out to the street to get it.

K. Clegg asked about mechanical handling of the spent grain.

Mr. Langlois said that they would be using hand trucks or just grabbing the sacks.

S. Mittlefehldt asked where the bike parking would be relocated from the from the front area.

Mr. Langlois pointed out the proposed bike parking location on the site plan, shown on the monitors.

S. Lawry asked the applicants if the barrier-free requirements would be met with the proposed changes.

Mr. Langlois stated:

Yes, and people from SAIL came through. We have access in the front of 3rd Street, and we have the ramp in the back, handicapped accessible bathrooms throughout.

S. Lawry stated:

By having multiple serving areas are you covered for that?

Mr. Langlois said: yes, absolutely.

S. Lawry stated:

From the plan sheets I noticed that there is a gas meter on the west face of the building and it doesn't show what is happening with that on the new construction sheets, and we wouldn't want to see it encroaching into the public sidewalk.

Mr. Langlois said that we'd like to get creative with that, but obviously it won't protrude over City property with it and we'll find another spot for it.

D. Stensaas said that he had a comment related to S. Mittlefehldt's question about bike parking. He stated: I was looking at the site plan and wanted to point out for the applicant's consideration that the area set aside for the drainage swale or rain garden on the east side of the parking lot could be a good place to provide more bike parking. You could cantilever a pervious deck to park bikes out over the concave drainage swale and sort of double your use of that space, and you could even put a covered shelter there with the roof draining into the swale.

A. Andres stated:

I just have one suggestion. The one glaring issue I see is if a handicapped person walks up to the building by themselves, they cannot enter the building. So, there's automatic doors that can be placed, push-button automatic doors would be lovely.

Mr. Langlois stated:

Okay, thank you, off the ramp?

A. Andes said: yes.

Chair Mittlefehldt opened the public hearing.

Dawn Gallo, of 135 W. Ohio St., stated:

I don't have a problem with the brewery getting larger on the bottom. I hear the balcony as it is right now. Is there a way that maybe you could put up a buffer (speaking to Mr. Langlois and Mr. Manson), fencing or something, so it's not hitting towards my house?

Mr. Langlois stated:

I think this might help, that we're going to be adding this right here [pointing to the rear monitor]. If you look on that far wall side, you see how that's a little different? So that's going to be a fencing that we have with our current one...so now see right there on the left? That will be open, but everything bouncing around in the corner will be probably be bounced off [inaudible].

Ms. Gallo stated:

I'm still a little concerned with the noise that's going to be coming from that area when people are sitting there on the railing there, because I already hear them at the other one. I love what you do with the music. You make great beer. I just have a problem with that. So, maybe if you'd put up some sort of buffering fence that could curb that noise down a little bit?

Mr. Langlois stated (to Ms. Gallo):

I'll see what we can do. I mean, obviously we don't want to block too much of the site coming down here, but I'm thinking you're living over here, so even something coming down that can collect that sound could make a big difference.

Dawn Gallo said: right, you can see my house from there, and there's a parking lot [inaudible]. It's like we love the idea they do shut down the music at 9, which is awesome.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

That's something we could easily put in a motion as, like if this does get passed we can put it in the motion that they would look into and investigate sound buffering.

Dawn Gallo said: great, thank you.

Matt Gallo, of 135 W. Ohio St., asked:

Can we go back to the previous picture that you had up there? He's talking about a wall right here. This is still open right here so we're talking about this area right here, which faces north, and we live like across the Schwalbach's parking lot, okay, so we hear all the noise. We hear the generators from the food trucks running all the time. We hear the music all the time, and it's not the music, like my wife said. I commend them because they shut down at 9 o'clock at night-time, it's wonderful. We had to deal with 10 o'clock Charlie's when it was over on the other side of the street and Chad didn't care about anybody. But, if something can be done to maybe put a flat wall up there, or something up there, I hate to sound selfish, but I don't care where the sound goes as long as it doesn't come in our direction. I have music in my garage, which is across Schwalbach's parking lot and when the music starts at Blackrocks, I shut my music off in my garage because I can hear the music at Blackrocks better than I can hear my music in my garage. And it's not a complaint. Don't get me wrong, we love the bands that they select. We love the time, it's 6 'til 9 o'clock...so that's not - the music is always fantastic. If you've never been there, you've got to check it out. But anyway, it's the sound that we're concerned with, okay? The generator's off and different things. They used to be able to plug in there and then somebody came along and said you can't do that because of OSHA or something to that effect. So consequently all of the food trucks that are there nowadays are running a generator, and we hear the generators at our house, too. Okay? It's with us, it's more of a noise thing. We've been battling noises on Third Street for a long time and honestly, we have confidence that Andy and his partner are going to take care of the needs that we have. They've always been really cooperative, but we just wanted to make sure that we let everybody know what's going on. The noise amplified by going from the 1st floor to the 2nd floor - now you've opened up a whole different realm here. You're no longer on the ground level with all the blockage. The sound is going to project even more so we're concerned about that, adding the new area up top for sitting. How many do you seat right now in the open area?

Mr. Langlios stated:

You can get quite a few in there. Our goal, our seating plan up there is not to cram as many people in, it was more like a let's make this comfortable and if they can find a seat, then find a seat, but we're not trying to slam people in.

Matt Gallo stated:

We totally understand that. The other problem that we had, that we noticed immediately, is when they built the new band shell there, it put the wall up as on the south end of the open area at the back. That immediately acts as a bounce, so music that's coming out of there, any noise that's coming out of there as far as people conversing and stuff like that gets bounced across the parking lot and over to our house and stuff like that. It's not terribly bad, but I did notice the other day, believe it or not, this is something that amazed me - we were there on Friday evening and the band was playing and there were a lot of people there, as there always are on stuff like that and you can talk among each other without having to yell in each other's ears, but you couldn't hear the band as well there as you could hear it in my driveway.

Mr. Manson stated:

I remember that night. I live across the street over on Hewitt and that wind, if that wind is south, everything carries I've noticed.

Matt Gallo stated:

So basically, and that's the problem that we have with the whole thing as far as the sound, and what's it going to do as far as the sound goes if more people are talking and stuff like that. I've covered the generators, the upstairs and the sound bounce. So, that's pretty much all I've got, just the noise is our concern and so long as they keep it 9 o'clock, the music anyways, we'll see what happens as far as the sound going up. You may get that buffer wall in there would be something for us. I feel sorry for the people who live across the street on the west side of it, but it is what it is.

Pete Dohrenwend, of 131 W. Ohio St., stated:

I think when I looked at the site plan, too, I was just - that one wall, maybe you need to go back to the plan down below on the side view. Yeah, where the hanging lights are, and the fence...if it's hog panel or it's just permeable, maybe make sure that that's not open, maybe if it's something solid. I don't know, but that's something to think about. Coming around this corner (pointing to site plan on screen), is the

brewing equipment going to be between the house, on the bottom level, between the house and the sidewalk as well?

Mr. Langlois said: there's an entry there.

Pete Dohrenwend asked: this area inside, is that where the tanks are going to be too?

Mr. Langlois said: there will be brewing stuff in there.

Pete Dohrenwend stated:

Again, I frequent your establishment a lot. Just the one concern, just the noise and ways that they can mitigate that, knowing that they're going to elevate people. Again, it's mostly in the summertime. People aren't going to be there in December.

Mr. Langlois stated:

It is a fencing that we use. It's like lattice almost, and so obviously we did that so people can look down, wave by to your friend walking up 3rd Street. It's a smaller run. We could look at solid glass. There's also trees which provide options, hop plants are really thick and they grow fast and maybe that's something we could cover that with a whole string of hops.

Mr. Manson stated:

I'd like to have greenery and even having some big flower boxes on that side, like on the south side, would also kind of help buffer that.

Mr. Langlois said: we'll figure it out.

It was moved by S. Lawry, seconded by K. Clegg, and carried 9-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.

S. Lawry stated:

The Community Master Plan pushes business use on the ground floor and residential on the 2nd or 3rd floors, and both with this proposal here and the one we dealt with a couple of weeks ago next door, pronouncing commercial or manufacturing or whatever move up to the 2nd floor. I don't know if we should be considering that consistent with the Master Plan or not, or if it's something we should be looking at changing the Master Plan in the future, but it kind of sets a new pattern in where we were discouraging residents of the first floor and not actually was the source of a sore spot with the neighbors to this facility in the past, the ground level level residents straight off their patio, and I guess I'd hate to see the same problem develop one layer higher. I think it's a very efficient use of space and that it can be buffered, but I guess it's something that I think we need to look at with regard to the Master Plan and whether this is something we want to encourage or discourage or adapt the plan to.

A. Andres stated:

Restating the need for accessibility "buttons" on the outside of the building. Great job on accessibility, love your beer, it's great.

D. Stensaas said, concerning the issue with the electrical power for food trucks and the noise generated by generators, I'm wondering if with this next expansion, if this might be a good time to run power out under the sidewalk and place a disconnect between the sidewalk and the street to cut down the need for the food trucks to run generators.

Some discussion of the electrical power provision for food trucks in the right of way ensued between the applicants, staff, and the Planning Commission members.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

Is anybody prepared to make a motion and maybe consider some language about the applicants investigating some type of buffer along that north wall on Michigan St.?

*It was moved by M. Rayner, seconded by S. Lawry, and carried 9-0 that after holding a public hearing and review of the site plan set dated June 16, 2023, with supplemental documentation and the Staff Report/Analysis for 03-SUP-07-23, the Planning Commission finds that the request meets the intent and requirements of the Land Development Code Sections 54.1403, 54.1402, 54.627, and 54.637, and hereby approves 03-SUP-07-23 with the following conditions - .
1) that buffering options be examined for the rooftop patio expansion, and 2) that an amended plan is submitted to meet all of staff comments.*

CORRESPONDENCE, REPORTS, MINUTES OF OTHER BOARDS/COMMITTEES

A. Discussion of correspondence RE complaints about Superior Culture late shutdowns

D. Stensaas stated:

There's a couple of new members on the board since we had to have the hearings with Superior Culture, but we got a complaint from one of the neighbors. She documented two instances where they were not shut down on time and the one at 10:08 PM, she said it looked like it was still going strong with just people sitting out in the back, and the outdoor operations are supposed to be ended at 10.

A. Andres asked: are we really complaining about 8 minutes?

D. Stensaas stated:

Yes, but according to her, things were still going strong 8 or 10 minutes after 10 PM, and like a dimensional requirement - it doesn't matter if it's an inch too big or a yard too big, it's an exceedance of the limit. So, there was that one and then she documented another one, what did she say?

A. Landers stated:

While he's looking for that, its 717 N. 3rd St. - Superior Culture.

D. Stensaas stated:

Across from the Third Base and Main Street, Frosty Treats, not the quietest part of 3rd Street to start with, but they have a limit of having to shut down at 10 outdoors in the back.

A. Landers stated:

Sunday to Friday at 9, and 10 on Saturday.

D. Stensaas stated:

The other one was a little more niggling, noise outside at 9:03 and music is supposed to end at 9:00 PM, and then I think she said it was actually inside, the music was coming from inside the house. I just responded to this, directly to the property owner, and let him know that we got complaints, we're documenting this and they have to maintain these hours or you're going to be back in front of the Planning Commission.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

For those people who are new, maybe a little bit of history on this site, because they have been before us a few times and it's the same - their neighbor is an acoustical engineer so he comes with quite compelling evidence of acoustical violations of the noise level on the outside patio in the back space. So, they had a conditional permit for like a year and they came back and the Planning Commission at that time gave the young business owner a second chance, and so this is the third time around now that we've heard these kind of complaints.

A. Landers stated:

The second chance was with conditions including soundproofing stuff.

D. Stensaas said they spent a lot of money on soundproofing. And this neighbor has said that they have been doing a really good job for the most part. She herself said they have been doing a really good job of keeping it under control, but she did want us to know that there's these instances so I'm just letting you know that we are keeping track of these things and if we get further complaints like this we're going to have to bring it to you and if it continues we're going to be back to another public hearing again, with their special use permit potentially being revoked or suspended.

D. Fetter asked: is the requirement only for outdoor music or also indoor?

D. Stensaas said: just outside, the outdoor music.

A. Landers said: two days a week, we put some really clear specifications on it so it was like two days a week.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

I think Fridays has a stop at 9, which is what she was saying, and then the outdoor music on Saturday...had a stop at 10 and the outdoor use had a stop at 10 as well.

D. Stensaas stated: Lights out.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

Lights out, that's what is in motion because I think the question from the residents, they wanted to make sure that there's no people are out there after 10, because the noise carries. This is a little bit different where this property, this is all residential in the back, so that back area is all residents living there. They hear it and...we were packed at the hearings.

S. Lawry stated:

Before it gets to the point where it comes back here, can staff maybe suggest that they install an automatic alarm that tells them, their patrons, that they need to vacate the space?

D. Stensaas stated:

Another issue that I think we need to talk about at the staff level is if we should be issuing fines...that is something we could do as a next step is just to tell the property owner that if there's a violation that we would be potentially issuing fines, and we could talk to the City Attorney about that and make sure she's comfortable with it and maybe that's the next step we should have as- take that step.

M. Rayner stated:

Legally I think we really have to have validation. Her clock could be off by 3 minutes. I mean, we're talking 3 minutes here.

D. Stensaas stated

Well, one of them. The other one was more like 10 minutes and still going strong is what she said.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

Even the threat of a fine might be enough, if they realize there's going to be a real consequence, because that's the problem I think at this point. We've kind of given them the benefit of the doubt a couple of times.

D. Stensaas stated:

Well, the Planning Commission, you guys did take away a lot of their opportunity they had previously. When they were given their first Conditional Use permit for this, there were almost no restrictions on it. I mean, it was way too loosey-goosey as we found out, and then had to really reign it in and say like you can only have music two nights a week outside, during a six month period.

M. Rayner asked: Now there's no noise complaint David?

A. Landers stated:

For noise complaints they want to call the cops, but the cops can't do anything until 11 o'clock. They don't follow our code, so that's what this gal was saying, what is her recourse on this? That's why she's emailed this to us, stating this is what happened but I couldn't call the cops because it wasn't 11 o'clock yet. The cops follow City code. They don't work with our code.

D. Stensaas stated:

Maybe what we can do - there's several neighbors there that are very familiar with each other and if the group of them can document the time and send us photos like they've done in the past then we have more evidence, and that's how we brought them in before was evidence from multiple neighbors that was conclusive that this was a problem.

D. Fetter asked: would there be potential for a biased opinion of it? Do we need a third party that's neutral?

D. Stensaas stated and that's where we'd have a problem with the fines thing is if we don't have evidence from a city official that this is occurring it might be a little more problematic to fine, but actually getting them back to the planning commission and revoking their permit, that's the big threat to them is that they don't get to do any outside music. And so that's kind of what's hanging over their head is if this continues, the planning commission can completely revoke this permit for outside music.

M. Rayner asked: have we notified them that there have been additional complaints then, or do we need to make a motion to have you notify them?

D. Stensaas state:

No, I contacted the owner by email, but I have not gotten a response in over 5 days.

M. Rayner said: but you did make an effort to contact him.

D. Stensaas stated:

So I think maybe after this meeting, I'll try to call him, see if we can get in touch and say this is something you've got to take seriously because the Planning Commission can revoke your permit.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

And maybe even before you call the business owner, talk to the City Attorney to see what the options might be, just so we know.

S. Lawry stated:

Do we know is this owner occupying the property or is it leased property?

A. Landres stated:

He owns it. The residence is no longer upstairs, that got changed to his business, so he no longer lives there anymore.

S. Lawry stated:

I just wonder, if he lost his permit on that site whether he would have the flexibility to just move to a different site.

D. Stensaas stated:

I've got to think that he's going to double down on making sure the noise is under control, after spending what he said was at least \$50,000 on all the noise abatement stuff they installed.

A. Landers stated:

It could be maybe he has new staff that they weren't told, there could have been things that weren't made clear to them or something like that.

S. Lawry stated:

That's why I thought maybe some type of automated alarm system that could also page his staff and if it actually was audible to the patrons as well...it could even be a recorded message.

C. Gottlieb asked: question, is there enforcement of conditional use permits, violations, that may fall back to this commission?

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

I think typically we hear about them when neighbors complain and it's mostly Dave and Andrea hear about it.

C. Gottlieb asked: that falls back to this group to enforce?

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

Well, that's why we're discussing it. I think we're discussing the options. There's no motion. We don't really have any authority to decide this is what the City is going to do, but we can help Dave and Andrea decide what the options might be.

D. Stensaas stated:

Well, the planning commission already took a lot of action with Superior Culture in the past. It is still the Planning Commission's discretion and the LDC allows the Planning Commission to revoke a conditional use permit for violations of conditions of approval. Like I said before, at first they didn't have much in the way of restrictions for outdoor music and the Planning Commission placed a lot of restriction on their outdoor music including what kind of instruments that they can have outside.

S. Mittlefehldt stated: that's right, no drums, right?

D. Stensaas stated:

Yeah, so the next step would really be to revoke the permit or suspend it for a period of time.

K. Clegg stated:

We talked about fines. Is that within our ability, is that an appropriate next step?

D. Stensaas stated:

That's authorized. Violations of site plan standards or conditions of approval are subject to fines and...to give you context, we're working on documenting landscaping on several site plans. We sent out letters to the property owners, letting them know if their landscaping is incomplete. This is typically the last thing that gets done on site plans, so this summer, the early part of the summer, we made a sweep of these sites where they're supposed to have their landscaping done by now and we're issuing those letters and that authority to issue fines comes from the Code. If your site plan is in violation because things weren't completed, conditions of approval weren't met, you can be fined for that and so that's a stick that the city has to try to entice the completion of site plan requirements. In this case, as you said, it's probably a lot harder because we don't have staff that can go out there at 10 o'clock and document whether there's a noise violation or not. That's something I would need to talk to our attorney about, you know, can hearsay or evidence – I'm not sure that evidence supplied by a resident can be used to issue a fine.

K. Clegg stated:

As far as the next step, if you can explore the possibility in what we do in terms of fining. The fine is going to be a lower penalty for them than revocation, but the revocation of the permit is also essentially a fine because they're going to reduce their business ability and not take in as much money, so if we're willing to have another step in between before that.

D. Fetter asked: was the business owner informed of the most recent complaint?

D. Stensaas stated: I did, by email, but I haven't received a response.

A. Andres stated:

For the record, there were people on the Commission, when they did give the permit approval, that we're against the location because of the neighbor complaints from the area, just for background.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

Any thoughts on this? Dave, does that sound good, it sounds you have a path forward. Great.

Training

A. Article – Traffic and Transportation Studies (Michigan Planner, May-June 2023)

The Planning Commission and staff discussed the article. D. Stensaas said that staff will speak with the City Engineer and see if there are ways to provide more specificity to the traffic study requirement language in the Land Development Code, but that the vague language in the Code does allow for a range of options to be required, although no specific options are stated.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

W. Premeau said that there were a lot of "To Be Determined" by the Planning Commission items in the Staff Report for the case tonight and they were not discussed.

S. Mittlefehldt stated the meeting is officially adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair S. Mittlefehldt at 7:45 p.m.

David Stensaas

Prepared by: kw/iMedat

Edited by D.Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator, Planning Commission Staff Liaison