

EAST BETHEL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
May 23, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Tanner Balfany, Glenn Terry, Sharon Johnson, Gabriel Hanschen, Joe Reiter,
and Randy Plaisance

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sherry Allenspach

ALSO PRESENT: Jack Davis, City Administrator
Aaron Berg, Zoning Administrator/City Planner
Kevin Lewis, City Council Liaison
Jim Smith, City Council

1.0 Call to Order

Chair Balfany called the Planning Commission regular meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2.0 Adopt Agenda

Commissioner Johnson moved and Commissioner Terry seconded to adopt the agenda as presented. Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

3.0 Approve April 25, 2023 and May 9, 2023 meeting minutes

Balfany asked any discussion?

Johnson requested on page 8, line 41 to change the word actualization to fractionalization. Page 12, Line 29, she requested it to say Ms. Paulson presented pictures and stated she looked at this every day.

Terry requested on page 3, Line 12, should read: He stated he did not want to make the Council liable to some claims of misogyny or that strong, independent women are not welcomed after Planning and Zoning had unanimously approved two of them.

Terry requested on page 2, line 4, should read: Terry stated to Berg that he would comment after the staff report.

Terry requested on page 4, line 3, need to pluralize perception of other instead of other.

Hanschen stated he liked to nitpick things and this is great. On page 5, line 35, it should say another chance. Page 6, line 36, as opposed to major rollblock, it is meant to be roadblock.

By general consensus, without a formal motion, to adopt the April 25, 2023 and May 9, 2023 meeting minutes as amended. All in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? The minutes are adopted as amended. **Amended minutes adopted unanimously.**

4.0 Concept Plan Review: Designing Earth Contracting – 187th Ln NE & Ulysses St NE

Berg reviewed staff's report stating Designing Earth Contracting, Inc., an existing East Bethel contractor, has submitted a concept plan application for the construction of a new, 19,000 square foot, office, and shop space near the intersection of 187th Ln NE and Ulysses Street NE. The new building will consist of 7,500 square foot office, an 11,500 square foot shop, and over 80,000 square feet of rear and side yard storage area.

Berg stated the proposal includes the use of a combination of precast concrete panels, glass, and brick.

Berg noted the property is zoned (I) – Light Industrial and Appendix A, Sec. 48 (4) permits Construction Service through Conditional Use. Additionally, Exterior Storage in the Light Industrial Zone is also regulated by Conditional Use Permit.

Berg indicated City staff will provide all informal comments to the applicant in preparation for their submission of Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Approval Applications.

Berg recommended the Planning Commission provide comments in addition to an approval of the concept plan.

Balfany asked for a motion to start the discussion. Berg responded this was just a feedback session and not formal action was needed.

Reiter asked if the back lot would be paved. Berg responded it would be gravel and he did not know if the applicant would want to pave it in the future. He pointed out the applicant was in attendance if they had any questions for him.

Balfany asked the applicant to approach the podium.

Justin Hillman, 18651 Buchanan Street, stated they have been in the industrial park for 18 years and as they've continued to expand and grow the company, they have outgrown their current location. He believed they were going above and beyond what the requirements were. He noted their goal was to create some energy to have all of their development follow with them and possibly be the anchor to that development to encourage others to follow or bring in new architecture and more modern design to that area.

Mr. Hillman stated their goal was to build and retain their company there. He indicated they were going to have more staffing and to accommodate that demand, they need to expand and relocate. He noted the location they chose was a good fit for their team and their clients.

Mr. Hillman indicated with respect to the exterior paving, right now it will most likely be gravel for the larger area with concrete aprons coming in and pavement areas for the parking. They do not see paving at this time due to the damage from equipment. He indicated the equipment they used had steel tracks on them which would damage any blacktop. Mr. Hillman stated with gravel they could replenish and maintain it as necessary to keep the yard presentable.

Mr. Hillman noted with respect to the outdoor storage, that was not really true. He indicated there would be on average 10 to 20 employee vehicles parked back there and they needed to have enough room for traffic flow for the machinery and trucks. He stated it was outdoor storage, but it was not outdoor storage; there was a floor; there was traffic; there was parking; and this was a combination of all of that.

Berg stated the screening requirements in the light industrial zone would still be applicable to the storage area, so they would still be required to screen it from the right-of-way on both sides of the road.

Johnson asked what kind of fencing or screening would they have. Mr. Hillman responded it would most likely be fully screened with a CMY style wall where you would not be able to see in there. He noted where they were currently located, a lot of their neighbors had vinyl fencing and they were going to try to "dial it up a bit more," especially since they would be on the corner with a new gas station coming in. He indicated they wanted a "fancier" design and they were still working on the details on how to achieve that. He felt confident they would exceed the minimum requirements.

Balfany asked how they would handle dust control with the gravel and the fencing with the machines coming in and out. He asked if Mr. Hillman believed the dust would stay fairly contained in the yard. Mr. Hillman responded they never had a complaint in the past and he didn't anticipate there would be any complaints in the future.

Berg stated the proposed storage would be to the south and west of the building, so from the right-of-way they were going to see mostly building and the rest would be screened. He noted during the daytime if the gate was open, someone might see something though.

Balfany asked Mr. Hillman if they would be able to maintain their lot. Mr. Hillman responded he was confident they would have a better-looking building.

Terry asked if they would have anything other than the vehicles that would be stored there. Mr. Hillman responded they might have a little overflow with some pipe, but it would be minimal. He indicated they might also have a little surplus of concrete bags at times also. He stated what was stored in the yard was more for service use and they would not be bringing in extra sand, rock, or concrete piles. He indicated they did not have materials on site.

Johnson asked if they would be using the entire building or would they be subletting. Mr. Hillman responded they would not be subletting and would be using the entire building themselves.

Hanschen asked if their employees were local, or did they come from out of town. Mr. Hillman responded he lived a couple of miles away and employees lived from 5 miles to 65 miles away.

Hanschen asked how many employees did they currently have. Mr. Hillman responded they currently have a little over 30 employees.

Hanschen asked how many employees did they think they would be hiring with this expansion. Mr. Hillman responded it would depend on the market. He noted they were a seasonal business, so during the high season, they could have between 50-60 employees. He believed the gas station would also benefit from their staff coming in and shopping. He stated at the current time though he could not give Hanschen a projection on the number of future employees they might hire.

Hanschen stated he understood they would not be storing a lot of materials, but there was a possibility of the Ordinance changing with respect to the height of storage. He asked if Mr. Hillman anticipated that a 12-foot-high height restriction would be a hindrance for them. Mr. Hillman responded he did not believe so. He indicated maybe if an excavator parked with the arm up it might go above 12 feet, but they are not really storing materials and they were storing more equipment and hardware items.

Berg clarified that the Zoning Code for construction yards were exempt from exterior storage requirements as outlined in Section 24.4(a) as the maximum amount of exterior storage could not exceed the square footage of the building and 12 feet in height, provided they are all located in the rear yard of the principal building. He stated that was where there was a dilemma in that the Code says it cannot be in the side yard, but under a conditional use it could be allowed.

Johnson wished Mr. Hillman luck. Mr. Hillman stated they are very excited about this and it had been years in the making. He noted this allows them to stay in the area and continue to grow.

Terry thanked Mr. Hillman for their architectural approach by trying to up the same and set a standard. Mr. Hillman stated that was a goal of theirs and they wanted to raise the bar a little bit.

Reiter stated this was a beautiful building. He noted one of the items the Commission would be hearing on tonight was changing an Ordinance with two concrete panels. He asked Mr. Hillman if that type of a building was less expensive than what he was doing. Mr. Hillman responded they had explored all kinds of options and by going precast it was more expensive for them on this particular building given the footprint. He indicated it was their goal to utilize the panels for energy values, so they would get better ratings and be more energy efficient. He noted another reason was because they were allowed to go higher and have higher ceiling clearances inside. He stated they were also able to incorporate more materials and if they went with the traditional rock face block, they were hostage to only that material.

He believed they added more character to the building and they had taken this to the next level. He stated they took the most expensive option and they are proud of that and the finished product.

Balfany stated this was a very beautiful building and was well put together. He asked the Commissioners if they were comfortable with what has been proposed and could they let Mr. Hillman move forward with the CUP application and Site Plan review.

Terry stated this looked good to him.

It was the Planning Commission's consensus to move forward with the CUP application and Site Plan review.

5.0 Ordinance Amendments

Appendix A – Zoning

Section 24 – Exterior storage standards in the B2, B3, and Light Industrial Zoning Districts

Section 28 – Architectural standards in the B2, B3, and Light Industrial Zoning Districts

Berg reviewed staff's report stating at the April 3, 2023 City Council meeting, Council Members Jim Smith and Tim Miller recommended amendments to various City Codes which are contained in the Zoning code. Council directed staff to route the amendments to the Planning Commission for a Public Hearing and recommendation. At the April 25, 2023 meeting the Planning Commission discussed these after holding a public hearing.

Berg indicated due to the mixed levels of support and limited amount of time for discussion of the proposed revisions staff thought it was in the best interest to bring two of the Zoning Codes amendments back for further discussion and formal recommendation.

Berg noted the East Bethel Economic Development Authority (EDA) also reviewed the proposed amendments and have provided a review, which he outlined for the Commissioners.

Berg recommended the Planning Commission conduct further review and discussion of the proposed amendments and make a formal recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Reiter moved and Commissioner Johnson seconded to start a discussion on the Ordinance Amendments. Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Hanschen stated if they went with the painted steel siding as an exterior finish for the new construction and then they looked at the EDA's concern. It appeared the EDA wanted this more defined. He believed this seemed too broad.

Reiter stated from what he understood, the worry was that pole barns would get built in the commercial district. He indicated it also appeared that Councilmember Miller had other ideas around what type of post frame buildings that he wanted to allow.

Terry asked if those were definable in a standard so that it is not misinterpreted by somebody that wanted to do the inappropriate version.

Berg proposed if they wanted to maintain an architectural standard, a quarter mile from the centerline of Highway 65 and then allow for an amendment to, or a change to the architectural standards. Outside of the quarter of a mile, they would still maintain a higher standard in the Highway 65 corridor for at least a quarter mile on each side of the center line. He noted that would allow for a lighter standard outside of a quarter mile. He indicated that way if someone wanted to start a business, there was little impact. He stated they someone wants to start up a

business outside of a quarter mile and work their way into the commercial industrial park and set up their architectural standard after they generate some employees and want to move to the Highway 65 side, they've upped their game and they have got more revenue coming in and can afford something with a little higher standard.

Berg stated that would be easily definable in the Code without making a lot of changes. He noted by putting that back in and by simply stating that these architectural standards were a requirement of anything with certain feet from the centerline of Highway 65, then they could lighten up the architectural standards for anything outside of that distance and allow for post frame construction stand-up concrete panels. They could make all kinds of changes that they want outside of that quarter mile that would simplify all of this.

Berg stated another potential simplification would be, as the EDA recommended, that anything served by sewer and water would be held to one standard and anything not serviced by sewer and water would be held to a different standard. He indicated that would then isolate where they had sewer and water. He noted the commercial park was the most desirable properties at this point for anyone coming in from out of town that could probably afford a higher value lot. He indicated a start-up business that did not have a lot of employees might not be able to afford the lot south of the movie theater, but they might be able to afford something a half a mile off where it was more reasonable.

Reiter asked would the City have to create a new zone. Berg responded they would have to rezone everything that was a quarter of a mile outside of Highway 65 as mixed use. He believed they wanted to avoid opening up the zoning map for a rezoning as well as the comprehensive plan changes, he believed that would get "real muddy." He indicated if they could just change the text in the Zoning Code saying the standards does not apply to anything outside of 1,320 feet of the centerline of Highway 65, either east or west, then can then add an amendment to the Zoning Code which included lighter standards for anything outside of that quarter of a mile.

Berg stated they could name whatever they want for construction materials, glass, siding, etc. without having to change the entire Zoning Code to accomplish something that they could accomplish in a couple of lines.

Balfany asked by changing everything in the Zoning Code, what else could be changed.

Terry believed Berg's second example was a better fit in that not everything on Highway 65 needed to be to that standard, and there were some properties where it would not apply, but the City sewer and water one zeroes in on those.

Berg stated his proposal was just two ideas. He indicated he would like to simplify this as much as possible to not only do the least amount of work for himself, but also so it makes sense and accomplish what the Council had in mind as far as changing things to open the door to more business.

Balfany stated he was going to defer to Berg's judgment a little bit on that since he was the one who sat down with the Councilmembers and he had a better idea of what those Councilmembers' intents were based on those conversations.

Berg noted that change wouldn't be limited to the commercial zone, the light industrial zone, or the mixed-use zone – it would be anything within a quarter mile.

Reiter stated a rural business would have to go outside that quarter mile (i.e. behind the Dollar General, a small gas engine shop could go in). Berg responded that would be close. He

indicated maybe the first two blocks off of Highway 65 would be a quarter mile.

Terry stated to him that makes more sense on the west side, but less sense on the east side where the standard was lower architecturally right now. He indicated that would limit the opportunity for a business to come in that would be compatible with what was there on that side and only allow the ones that wanted the higher architectural standard to be able to develop on that side.

Berg noted Terry was talking about a mixed-use zone, which has completely different standards than the industrial and commercial zones. He indicated there was a lot of flexibility there.

Terry pointed out where he was talking about and noted he did not see a business going in there that would meet the same standards as across the road. Berg stated the beauty of it right now was that it did not have to meet the standard because it existed in a non-conforming fashion. He noted they would be able to repair or potentially upgrade a little bit. He stated they would not be able to demolish and then rebuild to the current standards. He indicated he did not see an empty lot where Terry was indicating to be built on anyway. He stated something would have to be torn down to be rebuilt to whatever standard there was at that time.

Terry stated if a business wanted to reconfigure something to a different business, they were stuck or it was not a good option for them if they were held to that high of a standard which would not be fitting in with everything else.

Berg stated one oversight was they could not permit post frame construction, but they could also limit to what the exterior finish of post frame construction was to make it a higher standard. He indicated if they wanted to see cement stucco or concrete block on the front of something that was post frame, that could be accomplished; and then the back three sides of it could be steel siding or vertical panels. He indicated they could technically create a post frame building, finish the outside, and they would never know that it was a post frame building.

Berg stated a business was going to spend a lot more money trying to make it look like it was not a post frame building to try and meet some standards, but if money was not a limiting factor, they could make a post frame building look like a stick frame or steel girder building by how the outside was finished.

Reiter asked if it would have to be a quarter mile all the way up and not just in the water district. Berg responded they could define it with whatever recommendations they wanted, but it was easy to make text changes in the Zoning Code to allow for anything outside the 1,320 feet to be a different standard. He indicated they could limit it, but asked what would happen if a new sewer and water area came in and they have limited it to only the sewer and water district. Then things would need to be changed because the sewer and water had expanded. He did not think this was a good option.

Balfany noted they would lose for uniformity also.

Berg stated 1,320 feet did not change and they are either in or out. He stated they needed to look beyond the 1,320 feet also to determine what allowable features would they want.

Balfany stated if the intent was to give some greater flexibility, he was not opposed to that, but he believed there should be some architectural standards, which went a long way as opposed to radical differences from building to building next to each other. He thought it was more of a professionalism piece to it. He stated it helped with property values, with the look, and with the feel. He thought it was more inviting to consumers and customers.

Johnson agreed it would be a good idea to keep those standards tight with a quarter mile and to

not allow the pole buildings in that area.

Reiter asked her if she meant steel sided pole buildings or all pole buildings. Johnson responded pole buildings that were cited.

Reiter stated he had seen apartment buildings with laminated post frames, so they are pole buildings.

Balfany expressed concern about setting precedent and what this would open up. He stated they had to be careful about what was allowed. He indicated someone might have good intentions, but without clear rules and guidelines they could abide by, they might say once they met the minimums that the City could not stop them and they can do what they want to do.

Balfany stated he was grateful the EDA looked at this and shared their thoughts. He stated they needed to be careful and respectful to the City and the residents about what they are doing. He indicated as they were changing things again, they do not want the repercussions at the end, even going into this with the best intent.

Hanschen stated he was in favor at least if it is not the 1,320-foot standard that it is something very basic and simple versus splitting it between City sewer and water. He stated they were trying to paint a nice picture of East Bethel and he was in favor of having standards, but "let go of the reins a little bit" outside of that.

Balfany asked Plaisance if he had any opinions on this. Plaisance responded they were talking about reducing the corridor from half a mile down to a quarter mile for the standards, but he was thinking about all of the places in the City that are right on that half mile or just beyond the half mile where someone could potentially put up a pole building. He indicated they might or might not want that to be an option.

Plaisance gave an example of where the Senior Center was located in the water district and someone could buy the property across the street from the center, which was next to a church and put up a pole building. He did not believe the church would want this to happen. He stated if they drop the standards, then they could put up a pole building, which would be an eyesore. He gave other examples in the City where a pole barn could be put up next to existing businesses. He indicated he would be frustrated if he was one of those businesses and somebody was able to put up a pole building. He stated he was leery of making it a quarter mile.

Plaisance understood the idea that they are trying to get businesses that were just started and get them into a new building, but he believed they had to be careful about how they did that, particularly when they talk about the east side. He stated he wanted to leave this at the current corridor limits.

Berg stated that would be a mile and with some minor exceptions, no business or industrial zones could be outside of that area. He indicated after the mile, it all turned into multi-family residential, single-family residential, and then agricultural.

Terry asked what was the prime motivating factor to changing the standards. Berg pointed the Commissioners to page 72 of their packet and explained the first purpose was to increase the security of commercial industrial building in rural areas by eliminating the requirement for windows on the side and back of new construction which would give business owners greater flexibility to design their buildings to meet specific needs and enhanced security measures. The second reason, he stated, was to create a new section for the B.2.B.3 district which would allow the City to be more responsive to the needs of its diverse businesses by tailoring the building

design requirements to suit a unique characteristic and requirements of these districts. He noted this change would enable businesses to develop their properties in a way that was more in line with their needs while maintaining high architectural standards. He stated that was provided by Councilmember Miller as the reason for the proposed changes.

Balfany asked if any developers had asked for things to this extent. Berg responded developers would come in and ask what the City's standards were and they make a proposal that was close to the standards. He stated once in a while, he would get a call from a contractor who wanted to know what the zoning restrictions were for a particular parcel of property, but more often than not he received the response that that was okay and they could not do something.

Berg indicated most of the time though it did not have anything to do with the architectural standards, but rather it had to do with the intent or the nature of the business that they want to put in that location to make sure it matched the Zoning Code. He stated nobody has said to him that they could not come to the City because of a design standard.

Reiter stated he believed keeping some standards was important in some of the districts but keeping them too tight where a small business might be prevented from coming in might have some risk to that. He indicated if they keep small businesses out of the City what might happen was only large developments or businesses would come and then the City could not foster small businesses. He stated he did not want to see a bunch of corporations coming into the City and building parking lots. He noted changing the standards would be more attainable for small businesses and this was something they should think about.

Terry stated they also had businesses that were home occupations that they were trying to encourage to leave the home occupation because the business was getting too big for it and this might restrict their opportunity to find a place if it was too much to invest in a property that would work for them.

Johnson stated it seemed to her that the property along the highway was expensive anyway, and that the additional amount to build a non-pole building to her was insignificant. She felt that the pole buildings were not appropriate in that quarter or half mile. She indicated Plaisance had made a good point on the half mile.

Hanschen stated they want to encourage small businesses or even home occupations to move into this district and if they keep that standard as the highest standard they have, then there was a place for it if they kept it to that half mile. He indicated, however, if they did allow a margin such as a quarter mile that seemed reasonable, fair, and practical to him citing the curb appeal of Highway 65. He noted that would allow smaller businesses who could not afford the Highway 65 frontage to be there.

Balfany pointed out they needed to be respectful of all current property owner's businesses or residential when they are talking about doing this because it could potentially devalue some of the surrounding properties. He indicated they had done a lot of work and a lot of research over the past two Comprehensive Plans and this was what they felt at that time was an appropriate direction for the City.

Hanschen asked how vast was the difference between the architectural standards that were currently in place versus what they want to lessen them to. He asked for small businesses and home occupations trying to move up, was that going to hinder them.

Balfany believed there was more than one way to solve the problem. He indicated not every contractor needed to be on highways, so there might be a lesser valued property somewhere in one of the commercial properties along Viking. He stated there were other properties that had

located off the highway and had still been able to cater to small businesses.

Reiter asked if it would be appropriate to ask Miller about what his intentions were on the post frame buildings. Balfany stated they were going off the information they had to try and give a recommendation they were being asked for. He noted in the end it was their opinion and that was all they were offering.

Balfany did not see that bringing this to the quarter mile was going to move the needle much for what they are discussing. He did not see it accomplishing much.

Johnson asked if they had enough information to craft a recommendation.

Reiter asked if they should look at the rest of the changes, such as architectural enhanced precast. Johnson believed what they saw tonight was very beautiful.

Berg stated there was a difference between just cast concrete and concrete that was adorned or had some features to it. He indicated what they saw tonight met the current standard because they had not designed the concrete yet; it was not a straight up poured panel and they were trying to get the right features into it. He pointed out there were ways to make a concrete panel a bit more than a concrete panel.

Terry stated he did not know about the painted steel as that seemed vague to him. Hanschen asked if they needed more information on that, what was that going to look like, and could they set a standard on that.

Johnson stated it was very, very vague. She noted when they were doing their building, they could not do just flat siding and she believed it was up to interpretation of the person sitting in Berg's position right now.

Berg acknowledged there were differences in interpretation of the Code from his predecessors to him and how it was read was sometimes gray.

Balfany stated he would be okay with removing painted steel. Terry suggested that before they gave up on the painted steel (because it could be done well), to add some kind of language for implied design concerns when referring to painted steel. Then it might be up to interpretation, but the presenter would have to address that they are looking for something beyond just the bottom-line way of doing it.

Hanschen stated if he was interpreting it correctly, he believed that was what the EDA was saying also.

Balfany noted he did not see what they could do with steel beyond what had already been done and they see on a regular basis. He asked what would happen when somebody tried to sue the City when they could not build their building because the City defined this too much or they did not meet the Code.

Terry stated he could bring in a lot of examples of beautiful steel in construction, that was even higher end than anything they have seen, but it is how they allow it in there with language that implied thought had been put into it. He stated that would give more flexibility to a desire or builder to at least have an idea that they had not thought of.

Hanschen stated this was not designed architecture; it was just cheap metal and he believed the fence was up high enough to filter out weeds.

Johnson believed the verbiage in the first paragraph catches that.

Plaisance believed the building design should exhibit architectural control, which sought to be

creative, and utilized building line shapes and angles to maximize architectural integrity was just a statement of purpose and not an actual piece of standards that were to make the actual change. Johnson agreed and indicated to her this was not enforceable.

Terry indicated that was all the more reason to give painted steel a broader or more architectural definition because that was a control.

Hanschen suggested adding a section F to add more specific elaboration where they could expand on the steel siding.

Balfany asked what did that mean. Terry responded it meant was that for flat, plain steel or concrete they would not work, but something that has some creativity to it would be acceptable.

Balfany believed that left it too vague and he did not know what language they could use to make it definable enough. He indicated they needed to do this very carefully with respect to vagueness, but they also do not want it to be so defined that an owner could not do anything.

Hanschen asked if Balfany was open to receiving more verbiage to look at this. Balfany responded to him if they wanted to make these changes, removing the painted steel would solve it for now and if someone wanted to come and try to make an argument with it down the road, they had that option.

Reiter asked if Balfany was proposing to remove painted steel siding because he did not want that to be the primary feature. Balfany responded that was correct because that went back to the design standard less than fifty percent.

Reiter asked if they were all in agreement that the cast in panels look good. Johnson responded yes.

Balfany asked if they had a consensus on a recommendation.

Berg noted that was the difficulty when they started to pick this apart line by line. He indicated someone had an opinion about one and then there was a different opinion and he had not received a formal recommendation.

Section 28, Architectural Standards were discussed by the Commissioners, and the following consensus was reached:

Page 1, Section A.2 add to the beginning of section e) to read, “Architecturally enhanced pre-cast and cast-in-place panel, architectural concrete in combination with other permitted materials,...”

Page 1, Section A.2.4 “A minimum of 30 percent of the façade facing the public right-of-way shall be glass.”

Page 1, Section A.2.5 “All exterior sides shall be surfaced equivalent to the front of the building and shall be exempt from the requirements of windows on the sides or back facades.

Page 1, Add Section B to read:

“Building design requirements for Central Business (B-2) and Highway Business (B-3) districts shall exhibit architectural control which seeks to be creative and which best utilizes building lines, shapes, and angles to maximize architectural integrity.

1. **Unadorned pre-stressed upright concrete panels, unfinished concrete block, galvanized or unfinished steel, galvalume, or unfinished aluminum buildings (wall or roofs) are not permitted as primary exterior building materials.**
2. **At least 50 percent of all exterior wall finishes shall be comprised of any combination of at least two of the following materials:**
 - a) **Brick.**

Page 2, Section c.) 3) add to the beginning of section e) to read: “Architecturally enhanced pre-cast and cast-in-place panel, architectural concrete in combination with other permitted materials, painted steel siding,...”

Page 3, Section 6) c) add to the end: “and shall be exempt from the requirement of windows on the side or back facades.”

6.0 Updates

Council Liaison Lewis updated the Commission on recent Council actions.

7.0 Adjournment

Commissioner Reiter moved and Commissioner Balfany seconded to adjourn at 10:24 pm. Balfany asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Balfany asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Submitted by:

Kathy Altman

TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.