

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**PLANNING COMMISSION/
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
December 19, 2006**

Commissioners Present: Cowman, McLean, Gage, L. Smith, Wrischnik

Others Present: Justin Givens, Amy Barenklau, Ross VanderHamm, Brian McCauley

Item 1: Consider the minutes for the November 21, 2006 meeting.

Chair Cowman called the meeting to order with the first order of business the consideration of the minutes from the November 21, 2006 meeting.

Commissioners Gage and McLean made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted with all Commissioners voting in favor.

Item 2: Sign Requirement Deviation – Zarco 66: Consider an application for a deviation from Article 7 of the Paola Land Development Ordinance – Sign Regulations.

Planner Givens stated that Scott Zaremba was in attendance and then presented the staff brief. The city received a formal complaint about the Zarco 66 “Welcome to Paola” sign located at 1005 N. Pearl. It is the understanding of staff that Mr. Zaremba did approach staff about the placement of the sign in theory, but never submitted a plan nor was a sign permit ever issued. An on site meeting took place with Mr. Zaremba, Brain Faust, and other Public Works employees prior to the sign placement.

After a site visit, the sign does appear to be in violation of the Sign Regulations of the L.D.O.:
Section 07.103 Signage Plan Required – Plan and Permit shall be submitted – No Sign Plan or Permit was received for the property

Section 07.104 Signs Prohibited In All Districts – B. Off-premise/Advertising Signs – In addition to the Welcome to Paola, the sign does include the Zarco 66 logo. The sign most likely is located in the R-O-W and not on the owner’s property.

Analysis: Mr. Zaremba has asked for a deviation from the sign requirements of the LDO. The following criteria (abbreviated) are used when considering a sign deviation. Staff’s comments are in *italics*.

- A. Purpose and Intent of Code:** Is granting of the deviation in compliance with the general purpose and intent of the City's signage regulations? *The intent of the sign regulations is to "preserve the desired community character and avoid confusing and cluttered streetscapes" (Article 7 - 07.000 "Purpose"). 1005 N. Pearl is in the Thoroughfare Access district, which does allow for any encourages ground signs such as this, especially on entrance streets.*
- B. Impacts on Adjacent Properties:** Will granting of the deviation adversely affect neighboring property owners or residents? Is the sign consistent or compatible with that in the area as a whole? *Staff does not believe that the sign as placed will and has had an adverse impact on neighboring properties.*
- C. Safety:** Will granting of the deviation adversely affect safety? *The sign as placed has not raised any safety issues and the Public Works Director has issued a Right of Way permit after inspecting the placement of the sign.*
- D. Visual Clutter:** Will granting of the proposed deviation significantly clutter the visual landscape of the area? *The sign, as placed, has not increased any visual clutter and in staff's opinion enhances the visual appeal of the property and city entrance.*
- E. Site Constraints:** Are there site constraints (topography, landscaping, existing buildings, or unusual building design) that substantially block visibility of the applicant's proposed signs? *Due to the nature of the sign and location of buildings and traffic patterns on the property, the current location is the best for visual impact.*
- F. Lighting:** Will the proposed sign disturb nearby residential land uses or adversely affect traffic on adjacent streets? *The sign is lighted but that light is directed onto the sign and does not interfere with traffic or neighboring properties.*
- G. Promotion of High Quality - Unique Design:** Is the proposed sign of high quality and compatible with color, lighting, and signs of the development and adjacent buildings? *The sign is of high quality – large limestone with minimal writing and graphics. The color actually would be encourage in the TA district and blends in nicely with the neighborhood other landscaping and doe provide a unique appearance for an entrance to the city.*

Additionally, the initial complaint is the only one that city staff has received and since the time of placement, no other complaints have been lodged as far as I am aware.

Recommendation/Actions: The Planning Commission may:

1. Approve the Deviation as requested.
2. Approve the Deviation with conditions.
3. Deny the Deviation

It is staffs recommendation that the Commission approve the sign deviation as requested.

Commissioner Cowman stated that the LDO is pretty cut and dry when addressing signs. He stated that requests in the past have been turned down, but personally felt this sign was a nice addition.

Commissioners Gage and McLean both stated that an approval would create potential future problems, but felt the sign was a nice addition to the area. Both stated they were not against the sign and would be willing to take a chance and approve the variance.

Commissioner Smith asked to hear from the applicant. Mr. Zaremba gave some background information. Commissioner Smith then asked why he had not obtained a permit and Mr. Zaremba stated there had been no specific discussions about exactly would be placed in the Right-Of-Way.

Commissioners Cowman inquired if the logo is what had triggered the complaints and Planner Givens stated it had been, but indicated there probably would have been complaints even without the logo.

Commissioner Wrischnik inquired if permits had been obtained after the fact and staff indicated that he did submit a permit application after the sign installation. Commissioner Gage stated it is always a problem when things are done in reverse order.

Commissioners Gage and Cowman made a motion to approve the sign deviation with all Commissioners voting in favor.

Item 3: Façade Finish Approval – 5 West Wea – Consider owners request for approval of façade finish in the Downtown District.

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. Before issuing a Final Certificate of Occupancy for the occupant of 5 West Wea, the Building Inspection Department has asked for the Planning Commission to comment on and either approve the final façade look or deny the certificate until further work is required or completed. When Steve and Doris Karney took control of the building, they began renovations on the structure. They and their contractor Terry Ballou received building permits for various projects including a bathroom renovation and the removal of the tin siding. Upon removing the tin, the contractor relayed the brick and completed work to secure the remaining brick and the stucco.

Analysis: Nothing in the Building Code would prevent the issuance of a final certificate because of the façade, but some objections to the appearance of the structure were made and because the building is in the Historic Downtown Area, staff felt that the Planning Commission should

review the façade. The appropriate section of the Land Development Ordinance is below with commentary from staff.

SECTION 15.210 DOWNTOWN DISTRICT STANDARDS

The Downtown District contains the City Square, Court House Square, City Hall, and Library. The standards of this district are to maintain the historic image and character of the downtown area and to ensure that new buildings fit into that character. All buildings shall be reviewed during site plan approval by the planning commission for adherence to the following:

- A. **Building Material.** Red brick masonry is the preferred building fascia. Stone and other brick masonry may be approved, provided the building fits into the context of its neighbors and is not a sharp contrast to existing buildings. *The Buildings characteristics remain unchanged, and the red brick that is exposed is the preferred fascia and the stucco is common among many of the downtown buildings including those adjacent to this property.*

- B. **Building Height.** All buildings shall be at least two stories in height. If the use proposed is such that two stories are impractical, then the architecture and street facade(s) should be such that the two-story character of the streets is maintained. *Not applicable to this situation.*

- C. **Architectural Style.** There is no single style that is mandated for the downtown area. However, building elevations should be sensitive to the scale and style of neighboring buildings. Overall window placement, window size, decorative trim or material, and colors should be consistent with the general street face. *Do the renovations blend into the existing area with respect to the façade? One could argue that the exposed brick is used a decorative trim highlighting the windows and general lines of the building.*

- D. **General.** In looking at neighboring structures it should be understood that some older buildings have been degraded with applications of more modern materials over the original building facade. In these cases, the Planning Commission may insist on a facade that more closely resembles the original styles, or is in keeping with buildings further down the same street that have preserved their historic character. *Does this finish preserve the Downtown character and enhance the building as well as the surrounding buildings?*

The building owner's did not do a site plan as the renovations did not trigger an actual site plan but the Building Department did do a consultation with the owners that required several of the renovations and upgrades. The owners made no mention about the front façade.

The issue at hand is whether the front façade in its existing state complies with the LDO and Downtown District Standards.

Recommendation/Actions: Depending on information presented at the time of the meeting, the Planning Commission may;

Find that the façade is compliant with the Downtown District Standards, allowing the Building Department to issue the Final Certificate of Occupancy or;

Find that the façade is not compliant with the Downtown District Standards, requiring either a variance application from the owner, or one element, either stucco or brick, used as a theme for the entire front façade.

Commissioner Smith inquired if this was holding up the occupancy of this building. Planner Givens explained that they are currently on a temporary which allows them to occupy the building.

The Commissioners all felt that it was unique, but looked nice, and several voiced concerns about the maintenance of the building. Planner Givens explained that the owner had it sealed, so maintenance should not be an issue.

Commissioners Cowman and Gage made a motion to approve the front faced at 5 West Wea. All Commissioners voted in favor.

Item 4: Paola Crossing– Review of site plan and possible approval of plan.

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. Paola Crossing is the newest shopping center proposed for Paola. The center will be retail-shopping space located adjacent to the new hotel. Four Points Development, LLC. has provided a preliminary site plan and concept drawings for the building.

Analysis: The design calls for roughly 9600 sq. ft. of Retail Shopping space to be finished by the tenant. I am including a comment sheet that I provided to the engineering and architectural firms. I have also had a follow up meeting with Clint Stewart of Taylor Design to go over additions and questions for the final site plan pending approval of the preliminary plan. Following are Design Review Standards from the LDO. Staff commentary is provided in italics.

SECTION 15.410 DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS

In conducting the design review, the Planning Commission shall evaluate the plan against the following criteria. Approval requires that the criteria have been met or are inapplicable to the specific project, and that the development is significantly superior to one that simply met the Ordinance requirements.

1. The project is compatible with surrounding uses in terms of scale and adherence to the traditional character of Paola. *Agreed, the area is zoned for commercial use, while the original site plan called for a restaurant in the area, it seems that the commercial space will fit nicely onto this piece of property.*
2. The architecture, project layout, landscaping, and signs contribute to a harmonious and diverse character that has a strong sense of unity. *Agreed, the plan calls for the use of sandstone stucco and red brick that is predominantly used throughout the City Entrance Area.*

3. Monotony is avoided and the plan provides an environment that has interest and diversity without becoming chaotic or discordant. *Agreed, the plan calls for several offsets in the roof line to provide a break and uses a color scheme that matches the current standards but is not repetitive with other buildings in the area.*
4. The buildings are designed to be part of Paola, rather than a plan or character that can be applied to similar uses across the nation. Formula buildings and color schemes are undesirable. *Agreed, while this look is common in retail centers, it is not a formula building and does not use a color scheme that serves as an advertisement in and amongst its self.*
5. The streetscape protects or enhances the entrances to Paola, making them distinct from similar land uses in other communities. *Agreed, with Paola's landscape requirements and design review the entrance area is strengthen with the design and location of this building.*
6. The combination of architecture, signs, and landscaping creates a sense of place for those developments having many buildings, or which contribute to an overall sense of unity if the development is a single building. *Agreed, while no formal sign or landscape plans have been submitted the overall concept is apparent on the development plan and the elevation drawings submitted to the commission.*
7. The streetscape and building design reduces apparent building mass of large buildings to match the City's small town character. *Agreed, the location of the building on the property, the use of landscaping to shield the building from the street and encourage an older more mature area are essential to creating the small town character feel while encouraging growth and modernization. In addition, the varied façade lines and height will give the appearance of older areas.*

Recommendation/Actions: The Planning Commission may:

1. Approve the site plan without comment or condition
2. Approve the site plan with conditions to be attached during the meeting
3. Not approve or table the approval of the site plan until that time in which the Commission feels that all aspects of the Land Development Ordinance have been met or satisfied.

Clint Stewart with Taylor Design Group, as well as the owner, architect and designer were in attendance.

Commissioners Gage asked Mr. Stewart if he felt they would be able to resolve the parking issues. Clint stated that the handicap parking was on the plan, just not marked and he felt all other issues could be resolved in time to present the final plan at the January meeting.

Commissioners Gage and Smith made a motion to approve the preliminary plan with all Commissioners voting in favor.

Item 5: USD 368 Administrative Building Site Plan – Review of site plan and possible approval of plan.

Planner Givens stated that Rod Allen, Superintendent and Jay Hastert, Business Manager were in attendance and then presented the staff brief. USD 368 has submitted elevation drawings for a proposed new Administration/Central Business building to be located on the school districts campus located on the northeast side of town. They have asked the Planning Commission for a review of the design so that they can proceed.

Analysis: The elevation designs are submitted for approval. The only issue that I see with the design is the use of metal. This will be a steel building that will be wrapped in brick and stone but the do want to leave portions of the steel exposed. As you can see from the drawings that have chosen a neutral color that is consistent with design standards in the district. They have also proposed that additional landscaping could be used as a compromise to help screen the steel parts of the building.

From the LDO

DIVISION 15.100 PROHIBITED MATERIALS

Because they are out of character with the historic character of Paola, metal-sided or concrete-slab buildings are permitted only as indicated below:

- A. **Metal-Sided Buildings.** Permitted in the I District. Permitted in the BP and TA Districts provided that the street facades shall be constructed of decorative masonry materials, except when an overlay district has higher standards (e.g. the City Entrance Area Standards). The façade of any building in the BP and TA district, which is located within 200' of any street right-of-way, including any highway right-of-way, shall be considered a street façade and constructed of decorative masonry materials (Ordinance 2799, 06/11/02). Metal buildings existing at the time of adoption of this ordinance may be expanded up to 15% of the original building footprint (Ordinance 2772, 03/21/01).
- B. **Concrete-Slab Buildings.** These buildings are permitted only in the I District. Permitted in the BP district provided that the street facades shall be constructed of decorative masonry materials. Prohibited in all other districts.

- C. **Design Review.** In all other locations, these materials shall be permitted only where the development submits architectural, landscaping, and sign reviews and receives Planning Commission approval.
- D. **Exception.** One (1) pre-designed storage building containing less than one hundred fifty (150) square feet is permitted per lot.

SECTION 15.410 DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS

In conducting the design review, the Planning Commission shall evaluate the plan against the following criteria. Approval requires that the criteria have been met or are inapplicable to the specific project, and that the development is significantly superior to one that simply met the Ordinance requirements.

1. The project is compatible with surrounding uses in terms of scale and adherence to the traditional character of Paola. *Agreed, the project will fit nicely among the other structures on the site and the traditional character of Paola.*
2. The architecture, project layout, landscaping, and signs contribute to a harmonious and diverse character that has a strong sense of unity. *With the use of the brick and stone that is existing on current buildings on the USD campus, the new Administration Center will not harm the character of the area. The placement of landscaping is critical to the screening of those areas that may be seen as objectionable to the public.*
3. Monotony is avoided and the plan provides an environment that has interest and diversity without becoming chaotic or discordant. *Agreed, the plan calls for a building that is unique enough to stand alone but blends nicely with existing structures.*
4. The buildings are designed to be part of Paola, rather than a plan or character that can be applied to similar uses across the nation. Formula buildings and color schemes are undesirable. *Agreed, the City of Paolo used these buildings as design standards and the new building will only increase the overall "Paola Feel"*
5. The streetscape protects or enhances the entrances to Paola, making them distinct from similar land uses in other communities. *This is not necessarily applicable but with the use of landscaping, brick and stucco as well as natural color, metal the building is reflective of the overall design criteria of Paola.*
6. The combination of architecture, signs, and landscaping creates a sense of place for those developments having many buildings, or which contribute to an overall sense of unity if the development is a single building. *Agreed, each building on the Campus is unique but blends nicely with the surrounding environment and compliments each other building.*
8. The streetscape and building design reduces apparent building mass of large buildings to match the City's small town character. *Agreed, by requiring landscaping and general color combinations this building will fit nicely into the overall small town character.*

Recommendation/Actions: The Planning Commission may:

1. Approve the Design Plan as submitted.
2. Approve the Design Plan with conditions attached.
3. Deny the Design Plan.
4. Table the issue for further discussion or request more information.

Commissioner Smith inquired if the existing metal building would be torn down prior to the new building being erected. Dr. Allen and Mr. Hastert indicated that it would be removed.

Commissioners Cowman, McLean and Smith all stated they felt the building looked nice and it would not be noticeable from the road.

Commissioners Cowman and Gage made a motion to approve the site plan for USD 368. All Commissioners voted in favor.

Item 6: Rural House Drive Requirement – Don Bogard 28369 N. Hospital Drive – request to remain gravel until such time as the road becomes paved.

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. The property owner, Don Bogard, recently purchased a tract of land on Hospital Drive north of 287th Street and south of K-68. He has also, purchased a home that will be moved onto the site from Louisburg. The Building Department has inspected the house and provided Mr. Bogard with the necessary information on any updates or modifications that will have to be made in order to bring the house into compliance with current building codes. Mr. Bogard is concerned that the city's requirement to hard surface his drive will be cost prohibitive, and could be damaged by routine maintenance by the county. He has requested that he be allowed to keep his drive as gravel until that time which Hospital Drive becomes paved.

Analysis: The house is located .2 miles north of 287th Street on Hospital Drive. Hospital Drive is mostly gravel with a very small portion north of the house location being paved but in very bad condition. Of the 18 drives on this portion of Hospital Drive, none have been or are hard surfaced. In speaking with Penny Evans, Miami County Engineer, there currently are no plans to pave any of this section of Hospital Drive.

The LDO states that:

SECTION 15.525 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS

Driveways. Driveways with access on public streets shall be hard surfaced.

Deviations. The Planning Commission may approve deviations from one or more of the design standards on the basis of a finding that the architectural style proposed provides compensating design features and that the proposed dwelling will be compatible and harmonious with existing structures in the vicinity.
(Ordinance #2772, 03/13/01)

Mr. Bogard has agreed to hard surface the drive, if the road becomes paved, and has additionally agreed to attach a rider to the property in the event that a new owner is in control of the property at that time when Hospital Drive is paved.

Recommendation/Actions: The Planning Commission may:

1. Approve the deviation with the condition that when Hospital Drive becomes paved, that the drive is hard surfaced within 6 months.
2. Approve the deviation with no conditions.
3. Not Approve the deviation and require Mr. Bogard to hard surface his drive.
4. Not Approve the deviation and require Mr. Bogard to hard surface a portion of his drive to the minimum setback line, as the Commission has done in the past.

It is staff's recommendation that the Commission approve Mr. Bogard's deviation with the condition that the drive be hard surfaced within 6 months of Hospital Drive becoming paved.

Commissioner Gage said this has been an issue with previous homes. Commissioner Smith said he felt it was a good solution.

Commissioners Cowman and Smith made a motion to issue the deviation on the hard surface drive requirement to allow it to be installed within six (6) months of the section of road in front of said property becoming paved. All Commissioners voted in favor.

Item 7: Reece & Nichols Realty Office – Design and color review of building remodel.

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. Ernie Pratt of Pratt Development has been selected to remodel the existing Reece Nichols building located at 609 Baptiste Drive. Mr. Pratt has present the following design and color scheme for review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Analysis: The LDO provides the Planning Commission the authority to review and approve design and color schemes in certain locations that are essential to the community. Staff commentary is provided in *italics*.

SECTION 15.220 CITY ENTRANCE AREA STANDARDS

City entrances are shown on the Zoning Map. All buildings in these areas regardless of the zoning shall be subject to design review by the Planning Commission. Only one of the three entrances has important existing buildings; Baptiste Drive has the hospital and high school. Other entrances will develop in the future. The following building standards shall be applied to the design review of non-residential uses:

- A. **Materials.** Masonry materials including integrally colored textured block, brick and stone with unpainted finishes are required on all street exposures. The use of stucco or exterior insulated finish system may also be permitted. Metal is not a permitted exterior finish material. On Baptiste Drive, the materials should be selected to complement and blend with the high school and hospital. (Ordinance 2799, 06/11/02) *The design renovation calls for stucco and stone to be used to accentuate the buildings design.*
- B. **Colors.** The basic colors shall be earth tones or brick colors. The Baptiste Drive area shall use tones that are consistent with the hospital and high school. No important buildings existed as of the date of adoption of this Ordinance at the other two City entrances. The Planning Commission should review the first buildings in these areas and select a range of colors that can be extended to the rest of the corridor. *The majority of the exterior will be Cubicle Gray with accent colors being London Mist and Black Tie. Mr. Pratt has submitted color swatches as well that will be available at the meeting.*
- C. **Style.** There is no single style that is mandated for the entrance area. However, building elevations should be sensitive to the scale and style of neighboring buildings. Design themes that reflect the city square band shell should be strongly considered. If a business park is the proposed use, an overall design guideline should be approved. *The remodel calls for extending the existing roofline 2' and removing the sloped edge and creating a flat wall surface. This will give the building a more modern look.*

Recommendation/Actions: The following are Design Review Standards from the LDO that are provided to help guide the commission in their review. Staff comment is provided in *italics*.

SECTION 15.410 DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS

In conducting the design review, the Planning Commission shall evaluate the plan against the following criteria. Approval requires that the criteria have been met or are inapplicable to the specific project, and that the development is significantly superior to one that simply met the Ordinance requirements.

- 1. The project is compatible with surrounding uses in terms of scale and adherence to the traditional character of Paola. *Agreed, staff feels that this remodel will bring the building into closer conformity to the character of Paola.*
- 2. The architecture, project layout, landscaping, and signs contribute to a harmonious and diverse character that has a strong sense of unity. *Agreed, the plans design will blend*

better with the neighboring brick and stucco structures in the vicinity and the district in general.

3. Monotony is avoided and the plan provides an environment that has interest and diversity without becoming chaotic or discordant. *Agreed, the building will be different in actual color but uses the encouraged materials.*
4. The buildings are designed to be part of Paola, rather than a plan or character that can be applied to similar uses across the nation. Formula buildings and color schemes are undesirable. *Agreed, the building as it stands looks more dated and formulaic than it will once completed.*
5. The streetscape protects or enhances the entrances to Paola, making them distinct from similar land uses in other communities. *Agreed, the buildings remodel calls for materials and color schemes that are encouraged in this area.*
6. The combination of architecture, signs, and landscaping creates a sense of place for those developments having many buildings, or which contribute to an overall sense of unity if the development is a single building. *Agreed, the building once completed will fit better into the Entrance Zone than as built.*

The streetscape and building design reduces apparent building mass of large buildings to match the City's small town character. *Agreed, the current look with the shake shingles is a very dated look and once complete the remodel will promote the characteristics that the City has chosen.*

Commissioners Cowman, Smith, Gage and McLean all stated that other buildings in the area had brick or earth tones and the gray/black would deviate quite a bit from surrounding buildings. They all felt they would like to see colors more in line with surrounding buildings.

Commissioners Cowman and Smith made a motion to table the decision until the January meeting. All Commissioners voted in favor.

Item 11: Baptiste Commons Sign Review

Planner Givens presented the staff brief. Acme Sign had originally submitted a sign application for the Baptiste Commons Shopping Center, which included a LED message center designed for community information. The application also included lettering "Baptiste Commons" on top of the building line.

Analysis: Staff is asking for assistance in determining if the lettering is allowable under the LDO or if a deviation should be given for the location. The applicant has proposed 15' blue letters that will street approximately 22 feet on the center peak of the shopping center. The LED

message center was initially submitted at a larger than allowed size but has since been re-designed to conform to Paola regulations.

The question though, is does the lettering or naming constitute a sign? If so, is this sign allowable under the LDO? Additionally, does or will this sign count in future sign designs?

SECTION 07.215 MULTIPLE BUILDING/TENTANT DEVELOPMENT SIGNS

In the case of a unified development consisting of multiple buildings (attached or freestanding) or multiple tenants in a single building, one detached ground sign may be permitted identifying the entire center. The sign shall not exceed 20 feet in height and the sign face shall not exceed 100 square feet in area.

One wall sign shall be allowed for each business or commercial establishment in a unified development and shall be located on the facade of the tenant space. Each tenant sign may not exceed 10% of the front façade of the space the tenant occupies. In cases where one or more tenants do not have a front façade, a comprehensive sign plan must be submitted for the entire development. (Ordinance #2772, 03/13/01)

Types of Signs Permitted in TA District

Ground	Pole	Projecting	Wall	Awning	Bulletin	Roof
Y	Y	Y	Y	O	O	N

Allowable Size and Height for Signs in TA District

TABLE 07.210 PERMITTED SIGNS AND STANDARDS (continued)					
Zoning District	Signs Per Lot*	Maximum Gross Area	Maximum Height	Minimum Setback	Illumination*
Thoroughfare Access (TA)	3	-- Ground - 100 sf at minimum setback - 125 sf at 2 times the minimum setback -- Pole - 50 sf -- Wall - 10% of the sf of the front façade; all other facades 5%. -- See Section 07.215 for multiple	Ground: 20' at minimum setback; 25' at 2 times the minimum setback	Minimum Parking Setback (See Section 04.110)	Permitted

Recommendation/Action: The Planning Commission may;

1. Approve the Sign Plan as Submitted
2. Approve the Sign Plan as Modified
3. Deny the Sign Plan.
4. Defer action for further review.

Commissioner Wrischnik asked if there were similar signs in town and Planner Givens stated that he had not been able to locate any. Commissioner Gage asked to clarify if this sign would take place of a monument and Planner Givens agreed.

Commissioners Smith asked about the height of the sign and any potential problems to residents in the area. Givens stated it should not affect the residents as it will not be lit and would only be seen from the southern side of the building.

Commissioner Gage inquired if the property owner was aware that the LED sign could not advertise businesses? Planner Givens stated that he had informed them it was a public information center only and time/temperature type information is all that could be displayed.

Commissioner Wrischnik asked for clarification on color of the center sign, Planner Givens agreed that it would be bronze as indicated in the submitted drawings.

Commissioners Gage and Cowman made a motion to approve the signage plan with all Commissioners voting in favor.

Item 8: 2007 Planning Commission Calendar

Planner Givens presented the 2007 calendar to the Commissioners. Since the submission and filing dates are critical to the planning process especially for variances, the city submits a calendar of required dates each year.

Commissioner Cowman stated that in the past years it had been given for review and planning, not adoption.

Item 9: Items From Staff

a. Comprehensive Plan Meeting Location

Planner Givens asked for input on the location for the Public Hearing for the revised Comprehensive Plan.

Several Commissioners commented on the problems with everyone in the meetings have good visibility to view maps, documents, speakers. Commissioner Cowman asked staff to look at options and make a decision on the location best suited for the public hearing; the other Commissioners agreed.

b. Planning Commission Meeting Location

Planner Givens informed the Commissioners that the City Council has

moved their meeting location to the Public Works building and explained that employees have been working to make it work for public meetings. He asked the Commissioners if they would be interested in moving future meetings to that location.

Commissioner Cowman stated he would like to find somewhere that works better for the public. Commissioner Gage reminded staff that KCPL has a meeting room, as well.

The Commissioners agreed to try the Public Works building and plan to meet there for the meeting in February.

c. Work Session

Planner Givens stated that some items had been pulled from the meeting, as staff was concerned about time. He suggested a work session to discuss Right-Of-Way reduction and snout houses.

The Commissioners all agreed that they did not want to have a third meeting in January and asked that staff propose February dates at the January meeting.

d. Snout Houses

Planner Givens explained that staff was researching background information and the Commissioners suggested that staff contact former planner Molly Saunders for additional information.

Item 10: Items from Commissioners

Commissioner Cowman inquired about the temporary trailer for the dry cleaners in Baptiste Commons. Staff indicated they would verify if the occupants were in the new building and send a letter if necessary.

Commissioner Gage inquired about the goats in town.

Commissioner McLean inquired about a property in the growth area and asked if staff would initiate a nuisance complaint. He also mentioned the trailer at Wilkes Motors that is on the adjoining property and had been previously told to relocate it on their property. He also mentioned two storage trailers behind the Rent-to-Own on Baptiste Drive.

Item 12: Adjourn

Commissioners Cowman and McLean made a motion to adjourn with all Commissioners voting in favor.