

WEST ST. PAUL PLANNING COMMISSION

The regular meeting of the West St. Paul Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Samantha Green, on Tuesday, August 18, 2020 at 6:34 pm in the Municipal Center Council Chambers, 1616 Humboldt Avenue, West St. Paul, Minnesota 55118.

ROLL CALL: Samantha Green, Morgan Kavanaugh, Peter Strohmeier, Dan McPhillips, Lisa Stevens, Tori Elsmore

Excused Absence: Maria Franzmeier

Also Present: Melissa Sonnek, City Planner; Sharon Hatfield, Administrative Specialist; Amanda Johnson, Attorney; John Justen, Council Liaison

Adopt Minutes: **Minutes from the July 20, 2020 Planning Commission City Attorney Work Session were approved.**

Minutes from the July 21, 2020 meeting were approved. .

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

PC Case #20-08 - Platting Application for a Property Line Adjustment between 1019 Smith Avenue and 1010 Dodd Road - Michael Buttgereit

Sonnek reviewed the platting application for the property line adjust between 1019 Smith Avenue and 1010 Dodd Road. The site is one of her favorite triangles in town. Sonnek related that applicants, Sara and Michael Buttgereit, purchased their house in 2019. There was an existing retaining wall and a fence along the northeastern part of the property. In February, the Buttgereits applied for a permit to extend the fence around the rest of the property. They discovered that the existing fence was not on their property. It is on the 1010 Dodd Road property which is owned by the West St. Paul EDA. The proposal is to extend their property out 10 feet north from their existing property line. This would put the existing fence within their property. The current property is one-tenth of an acre, below the 10,000 square foot minimum. The extension of the lot would bring the property into compliance. The Engineering Department reviewed the submitted plans. The only request they had was an additional easement. For drainage and utility, Engineering requested a 10-foot easement on the eastern property line and 5-foot easement along the other property lines. Sonnek summarized the recommendation from staff saying that staff recommended the approval of the property line adjustment subject, to the Engineering recommendations and the EDA sale of the 10 feet of property.

Sonnek asked if there were any questions for her or for the applicant. Kavanaugh asked what the 5-foot easement along the rest of the property lines was for. Sonnek answered that the easement was typical for drainage and for utility. The present lot size is very tight. McPhillips asked about the 10-foot and 5-foot easements; Sonnek said that by subdivision ordinance, the City requests that the easement adjoining the street is 10 feet; for the internal property line, the easement is 5 feet. McPhillips asked about the development of the Smith Avenue area. Green said that the Environmental Committee is working on the lot and providing tables and benches for nearby restaurants to use. With the Corona virus precautions, the park project has been put on hold. Kavanaugh said that the redevelopment of the Smith Avenue area was a good point. He asked if the realignment plans were taken into account for the recommendation. Sonnek said it is a fair question. It is something for the Commission to consider. Kavanaugh does not want to have to move the fence or to pay for the property a second time if the realignment requires it. Justen confirmed that the park would be temporary. He predicts that there will be no attempt to make any permanent development whatsoever. The area will remain vacant until the reconstruction. With no further questions for Sonnek or the applicant, Green opened the Public Hearing at 6:41 pm. With no

comments, Green brought the application back to Commission discussion. Kavanaugh said that the Commission should try to accommodate the wishes of the property owner. However, he does not know if the Commission should be looking at the request yet. The EDA has not sold the property yet. Secondly, if the realignment requires the 10 feet of property, the City may have to buy back the property or put it into condemnation. Kavanaugh is not in favor of the application. He would rather help out the homeowner with an easement. McPhillips asked if the property was up for sale or was it just the 10-foot strip. Sonnek said that the property is not up for sale. The proposal for tonight would just be for the 10 feet. To answer Justen's comments before, Sonnek said that the property was bought by the EDA for the eventuality of being used in the realignment of both roads. Green asked if there were any time frame for the realignment. Sonnek said that nothing has been proposed yet; it is a question of funding. Green does not want to deny the applicant if the realignment may be 15, 20 or 30 years away. Kavanaugh said that an easement could be used instead and the realignment can terminate the easement without the City paying for it. Justen added that there is extreme fluidity to when the alignment would occur; it is crucial that the City do it. That is the reason the park was temporary. The realignment could happen in 6 months or 5 years. No one has suggested it would cross the 10-year threshold. It is a prioritized project. The pedestrian safety issues there are significant. It will not be 20-30 years down the road. The realignment will be done as soon as the City can. Elsmore the 10 feet are currently owned by the City and the City is the one who would be selling the property, the Commission would be pretty safe in [approving the request.] She does not see any harm in the request because it is contingent on many other pieces. Stevens says we do not have the information on the realignment. Justen said the City does not know how the realignment will be constructed; there are multiple plans. None of the plans have been locked in. Kavanaugh said that the small area plan had Dodd Road "T" off at Smith Avenue. This could change with the redevelopment of the Oxendale market space. McPhillips agrees that these property owners need a fence. He asked the City Attorney to weigh in. Johnson said the City can look at an easement. The fence and the retaining wall are already in place. The tricky thing is that they are not on the applicant's property. The idea is to get things that already exist onto his property. Staff's recommendation is to move the property line; it is a little bit cleaner. The City would not own the property and would not be liable for the fence. Johnson asked about how long the fence had been in existence. Sonnek said that the extended area is recent; the northeast corner was there with the previous owner. It was there before the City purchased the property. Johnson said that this is another issue because technically it is City property. Maintenance could be addressed in an easement. Green said it may be helpful for this request to go before Council to see what their flavor is on how to move forward.

Kavanaugh made a motion to deny the application. Discussion followed. McPhillips added the reasoning for the denial is that the Commission needs more clarity for potential scenarios. Green asked if it would be better to continue this item until next meeting [after Council input]. Elsmore asked if the Green wanted to know if the EDA was willing to sell the property. Green wants to know if the EDA is willing to sell the property. If they are willing, the application is fine as it is. If not, the Commission needs to reevaluate the application. Elsmore asked if Staff knew. Sonnek said that she cannot speak for the EDA per open meeting law. Justen said that Council has not seen [this request] until tonight. He does not think Council has any type of leaning right now.

The motion died, for lack of a second.

A motion was made by Stevens to continue the discussion on the application. The motion was seconded by McPhillips.

Vote-5 ayes/1 nay (Kavanaugh). The motion carried.

Sonnek asked what points of clarification the Commission needed. Green said the Commission would like to know if the EDA is willing to sell the property. Stevens further clarified saying she would like to know if the EDA would prefer the sale or the easement based on the realignment. Kavanaugh said if the EDA preferred an

easement, this item would not come before the Commission. Sonnek said this was correct. The EDA would be able to execute the easement without the Commission's input.

PC Case #20-09 - Multiple Applications for the Redevelopment of 1571 Robert Street South and the Construction of a Five Story Mixed Use Building Offering Market Rate Apartments and Retail- Roers Companies

Sonnek said that the Commission would be reviewing multiple applications for the redevelopment of the northwest corner of Robert Street and Wentworth Avenue, also referred to as Town Centre I. ESG Architects, on behalf of Roers Companies, is proposing to tear down the existing Maaco, Aamco and Batteries Plus buildings to build the new apartment complex. Granny's Donuts is not included in the proposal. The proposal has changed as of last night's EDA meeting. Instead of 187 units, there will be 192 units and there will be a decrease of retail space to a total of 1,700 square feet. There will be underground parking, a mix of studio, one-bedroom, one bedroom plus den, a few two-bedroom units as well as some bicycle storage on each floor. There will be a dog park, storage for residents on each floor and a bike repair area as well. The site will be just south of the regional River to River Trail. In summation, Sonnek said the Commission would review, the Conditional Use Permit which allowed for the mix of uses, the commercial and the residential and allowing for a structure that has more than 16 units, the Site Plan, the Rezoning request from B6 to a PRD with underlying B6, and the Preliminary and Final Plat. Sonnek added that the current plat is from 1887 and is listed the City of South St. Paul. The City does not want to have that "floating out there".

It is mostly commercial and some office zoning that currently surround the site. There is some retail to the east. Mostly B6 with the northwest having B3 with the office building. This project would be the "last piece" of the 2040 Comp Plan. It was identified as an area likely to be redeveloped by 2030. The Met Council 2040 Housing Plan indicates a demand for additional housing, (affordable and other types). The Met Council guided the area to have 20-40 units per acre; this proposal has 60 units per acre. The site will allow the opportunity for residents for "filtering." For example, residents can downsize within the community to this building allowing other residents to purchase their first homes. It creates a healthy housing market. Sonnek reviewed the setbacks for the building and asked the commissioners to keep in mind that the PMD does allow for some deviation from the code. Ideally, the City wants both sides of the building to be attractive. Deciding what is the front of the building can be tricky. The code dictates that the shorter property line (Wentworth Avenue) be the true front of the site. The side setback is only 5 feet; (code is 10-30 feet). The City is comfortable with this because the adjacent properties at their corners have the same setback. This was the intent of the Town Center I and Robert Street Redevelopment plan. The rear property line deviates from code; the proposed landscaping will help with visual relief in this area and that there is a change in grade. Commissioners should note that it is a side yard for Granny's. For this reason, the 9.4 foot setback would not be unusual. (A 0-foot setback would be allowed.) The parking setbacks requirements exceed code. The parking code requires 2 stall per 1 unit which would amount to 384 stalls. The retail space would require 9 stalls. The applicant is proposing 265 stalls, (101 surface stalls and 164 underground stalls.) The ratio would be 1.38 to one. It is a little bit lower than what the City has seen in the past. There will be a dog park on the site; it could be a site for additional parking if need be. The applicant had a third party create a travel demand management program for the increased traffic at the proposed building. It covered both parking and traffic around the site. There is an increase of 206 daily trips for the adjacent roads. With this [small] increase the surrounding roads are expected to be able to operate at their existing level of service. The drive aisles and parking stall widths meet and sometimes exceed code. Most of the stalls are 18 feet in depth; the code requires 20 feet. Some of the City's parking codes are out of date. The City has recently approved the 18-foot stall depth in other plans. All of the curbed islands will have the required landscaping except for the islands near the underground parking. The Dakota County Planning Commission did review the access plans on Wentworth Avenue, (a County

road) The County was willing to allow the continuation of the western access. The County requires that the eastern access be closed. The County is requiring 40 feet of right of way and a 10-foot trail easement. MNDot has requested that the most southern two access points be closed on Robert Street. The northern access (where Block Buster used to be) would be preserved. The third access point would be on Livingston Avenue; it would offer full access. The other access points would be right in, right out only. The submitted plans did not include lighting and signage details. Regarding the landscaping, the submitted plans would remove 80 caliber inches of trees. The City requires that the applicant replace 30 percent of the quality trees. The applicant is exceeding code with their landscaping plan. The applicant however had not submitted any irrigation plans. Staff is recommending that an irrigation plan be submitted as a condition of approval with the building permit. The Environmental Committee did review the landscape plans at their August meeting. They liked the dog park and that the full tree replacement requirement was being met. They recommended approval of the plan with the added recommendations of pollinator-friendly plants not treated with neonicotinoids and to incorporate a better mix of Minnesota native plant species. Staff recommends that the applicant consider as a condition of approval the recommendations from the Environmental Committee's August 7, 2020 memo. Code does require that 60 percent of building materials be primary materials, brick, stone, stucco, glass or comparable materials. No more than 40 percent can be secondary materials. The applicant meets these code requirements. Because the proposal disturbs more than one acre of land, City code requires that a stormwater management plan be included as part of the application. WSB is recommending a number of approvals requiring proper permitting, drainage calculations, etc. City Staff is recommending as a condition of approval that the applicant follow all items in the WSB memo dated August 12, 2020.

Regarding the Rezoning application, the plan requests rezoning from B6 (Town Center Mixed-Use) to PMD (Planned Mixed-Use Development) while still retaining the B6 underlying zoning. The rezoning does adhere to the 2040 Comp Plan.

Regarding the Platting, the existing platting is from the 1880's. The replatting will consolidate several lots, clean up the legal description and formally dedicate the right of way, easements, etc. Staff is recommending as a condition of approval that the plat be recorded at the County within one year of approval and prior to the submittal of the building permit. The Dakota County Plat Commission reviewed the plat at their August 5, 2020 meeting. As a condition of approval, City staff is recommending that the applicant adhere to the items outlined in the Dakota County Plan Commission memo of August 7, 2020. MnDot also reviewed the plat. Similarly, City Staff is recommending as a condition of approval that that applicant adhere to the items outlined in the MnDot memo dated August 11, 2020.

Sonnek summarized the staff recommendations that she outlined during her presentation. Sonnek asked if there were any questions for her. Green asked how different the building renderings would be with such a reduction of retail space. Sonnek said that staff met with the applicant earlier today; the applicant expects to retain the majority of the renderings. A big piece of the corner of the front of the building is glass; there will be some shifting. The applicant could speak to the result of the changes. Kavanaugh asked about the integrated bus stop. Sonnek said that was her first question and she said that Metro Transit has requested that the bus stop shift a little south based on the buses wanting to cue fully in the right lane. It works well with the change in the retail space. Kavanaugh asked about the parking study; he asked if the plan really does call for 217 parking stalls. Sonnek said that this is correct. It is based on the peak parking with the 5,000 square foot of retail. Green asked the parking numbers would change with the Brew Pub/restaurant requirements. Sonnek answered that restaurant are very restrictive when it comes to parking. Retail requires less parking. The traffic demand study was based on the 5,000 square feet of retail. Reduction would likely decrease the parking demand. Kavanaugh confirmed that, in theory, the parking study could be even less than 217. The proposed parking stall numbers (265) do not include the dog park area which could be converted into parking stalls. Kavanaugh asked if there were walkout units on Wentworth.

Sonnek deferred to the applicant for more clarification. She said there were a few walkouts planned on Wentworth Avenue, but with the trail easement; they were not able to fit in the walkouts. They thought about shifting the building north to accommodate the walkouts. It would be a nice amenity to have an outdoor seating area [for those apartments.]

Jeff Koch from Roers Companies came before the Commission. He is an owner. Roers is based in Minnetonka and has built over 5,000 apartment units. They have buildings in MN, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa and Wisconsin. They invest in the community and own and operate within the community. They will own and manage this investment for the long haul. MetCouncil has suggested less parking for the project and encourages more mass transit usage. From Roers' perspective, the project is an overparked in terms of parking need. The underground and external parking is underutilized. Stevens asked about the underground parking; are renters choosing not to pay for underground parking. Koch said that Minnesotans think of underground heated parking as a convenience. It is not a matter of paying for parking. Some two-bedroom units may have only one car. Some residents choose not to have a car. With Uber and mass transit, they are able to live without a car. This building has great walkability to all the existing retail and appointment base within the community. He does not foresee an issue with unit dwellers parking on the street. Kavanaugh asked where Roers would take away parking if the site plan were to make more green space. Koch said he would reduce parking closer to the trail where the dog park area is; it would open up more green space potentially. Roers is comfortable with the plan ratio; they will not push for less. He would rather have renters and visitors park on the site instead of parking on the street. Kavanaugh asked how the dog park would be maintained. Roers said that the management company would handle it. There are cleanliness issues with cleaning up after the dogs. He said in his communities, the residents do a doggie DNA; and test excrement for DNA. If it is matched to the resident, they pay a fee. Green asked if this would be the first public dog park. Roers said yes. McPhillips asked if Carbone's would keep their entrance. Sonnek said yes; there is a natural buffer between the sites.

Robert Loken from ESG Architects came before the Commission to speak. Like Roers, ESG works all over the metro area and have developed a lot of multi-family housing. He said that the integrated bus shelter will remain on the plan. It works better for the design of the building to retain the bus shelter; (there is not enough right of way to place the shelter elsewhere.) MetroTransit is typically happy with this; it pushes maintenance on to the property owner. They are still negotiating the size and the location of the shelter with MetroTransit. Regarding the walkout units on Wentworth, they were part of the original design. However, after the plat review they learned that the 10-foot easement requirement would infringe on the proposed design. ESG pivoted and the building plan was shrunk down on the south side to add back in the walk out units. ESG has experience with public dog parks; they built a successful dog park on a private development on municipal land in the city of Minneapolis. Regarding the grade change on the trail, Loken said where the trail goes into the tunnel, there are retaining walls on both sides. There is quite a bit of grade change. Green asked how the renderings would change with the change in retail space. Loken replied that they would shift the original (glass enclosed) residential space south, about two-thirds of the way on the façade of the building. The upper third north will be filled with residential spaces. These units would replace the 3,300 square feet of retail that has been reduced from the plan. Loken confirmed that they would be walkout units to Robert Street. They will be similar to the units they have now, with private patios, exterior doors and sidewalks out to the sidewalks on Robert Street. They would have a small transparent fence. Depending on the grade, they would like to have the [patio] elevated a bit. They will all have a step up and a short guard rail around them. There will be a rooftop amenity for the top floor residents: an exterior terrace and some resident amenities immediately adjacent to the elevator lobby. There will be a dedicated bike storage room at street level. There will be some bicycle stalls at the head of the parking stalls. There will be quite a few exterior bike stalls depending on how much retail there is and there will be stalls for visitors as well. Stevens asked about the green/efficiency features of the building. Loken said there is a rather large stormwater management plan. Nearly all of the stormwater will run to an underground tank. The water will be treated.

Sediment will be filtered out before the water goes into the City system. The number one way for energy efficiency, which they use is a proper window to wall ratio. For the [Minnesota] climate, using a 30-35 percent ratio helps. It uses the sun in the winter to heat and limits heat gain in the winter. Sometimes when you see very glassy buildings, they are usually stunning but they are energy hogs. ESG will use R30 insulation on the roof; it goes beyond code. There will be LED lighting throughout. Most lighting will be on sensors, including the underground parking lot lighting.

Green opened the public hearing at 7:47 pm. Steve Cook, a West St. Paul resident, came before the Commission. He asked if this was going to be the first five story building in the City. He also voiced a concern regarding the reduction of commercial space in the building. He is concerned that the City is giving up a prime location for a commercial property. He is also concerned with the setback from Robert Street; the building would be very close to the street and he is concerned about the snow removal. Sonnek said that it would be the first five-story building in West St. Paul. She did look at the LA Fitness, thinking it would exceed the building but it would not. As far as the snow removal, the City has a private contractor that does the removal up to Butler Avenue. Wentworth Avenue is a County Road; they would manage the snow removal for that road. The only snow removal that the applicant would be responsible for is the interior, the parking lot and the dog park. Julie Eastman of Ward I came before the Commission. She shared some square footage retail space comparisons with the Commission. She said that Council Chambers is about 2,000 square feet. The Verizon/Jimmy Johns is a little over 4,000 square feet. Taco Bell is about 3,100 square feet. The Starbucks is about 1,700 square feet. Judy Rangel called into the meeting. She asked about solar panel in the proposed building and she said that it would be great if there were more retail in the building. Carol Keyes-Ferrer of Ward II called into the meeting. Her concern is that this is a five-story proposal and all of the buildings around it are only one story. The LA Fitness is two stories high; the senior living building at DARTS is four stories. The building is going to be especially large on that corner. She is also concerned about the increased traffic on this corner especially because it is a major through fare for emergency services. There is a lot of traffic from the Dome, the LA Fitness and the banks along Livingston The corner on Livingston and Wentworth Avenue is already hazardous; it is too close to Robert Street to be able to put in any kind of traffic control. She is very concerned about the increased traffic. She talked about the situational rezoning and conditional use permits. She is concerned about the potential for soil pollution. There were three automotive repair facilities at the proposed site. She would like to know if this is being dealt with. The public hearing was closed at 7:56 pm. Green resumed discussion with the Commission. Kavanaugh asked about the five-story building. Sonnek replied that the B6 District outlines 35 feet, between 3-4 stories. The PMD however, allows for some flexibility. The Dominion project required a CUP for anything about 35 feet. This project did not. Green asked the applicant to speak about the change in retail. Koch said that they share in the concern in the reduction of retail space. There is a symbiotic relationship with building residents and the retail space. Anything retail-wise is an amenity for their residents. The reality is that retail is underperforming and it has been an underperforming asset for a number of years. It is driven by the "Amazon effect," Recently COVID-19 has taken a drastic hit specifically on the restaurant industry. Roers reached out to a local brewery distillery to fill the retail space. It is not out of a lack of effort that Roers is requesting the revision to the plan. Koch looked at what is available on Robert Street and the greater West St. Paul area. There is 30,000 square feet in one building at Signal Hills. A more prominent recent example is the 252 Rooftop building that was completed in early 2019. They proactively built 5,300 square feet of retail. It has been on the market since 2018. They have only filled one out of five spaces. To add more retail would also affect other existing retail. Green asked if they have anyone to fill the retail space. Koch said that they do not have anyone yet.

Kavanaugh remarked that there are many amenities and retail within a quarter mile walk. He is surprised that the applicant is keeping any retail space. When it comes to real estate and lending, [retail] is not happening now. Even places like the Galeria are limping along; some of their businesses are going on line. This was unheard of even a year ago. Green said that she knew Kavanaugh wanted to talk about parking. Kavanaugh continued

saying that he would like the dog park taken off the table for parking; he would like to put in a condition that the dog park stays in forever. Kavanaugh suggested to reducing parking along Robert Street and putting in more green space as a buffer. The City usually does not allow parking lots on Robert Street. He referred to the parking lot that leads to the dog park. Kavanaugh said a project like this coming forth so soon after having the 2040 Plan in place is very exciting and a great opportunity. The corner is currently blighted and embarrassing; the proposed building is new and nice looking. He is in favor of the staff recommendations with the two changes in parking. Stevens asked about soil pollution testing. Sonnek said there was a Phase I (on all sites) and Phase II, there was minimal pollution. It will be mitigated by the construction. Stevens asked if there were a limit to how many stories would be allowed in the current rezoning. Sonnek said the Commission must decide this. Kavanaugh said that he does not have a problem with the five-story building. The City must start somewhere when it implements the density that the Comp Plan calls for. Over time it will integrate and start to look better. Green said that she would have a problem with it if it butted up to any residential areas. It would be a different conversation. Green asked with City Hall being off Wentworth, are there any concerns from the Police or Fire Department. Sonnek said, surprisingly, there was not a lot of concern from either department. Primarily because the full access off Livingston Avenue, does allow emergency services the access they need. Also a building of this size, per building code, would need a sprinkler system. Green asked if there were any concerns with the added traffic. Sonnek said that there were very minimal concerns with increased traffic. Kavanaugh remarked that the Wentworth Avenue trails are very beautiful and the plan will tie into the trails there. Green said that she understood the reduction of retail but she is excited that the applicant is keeping some retail space, especially on the Wentworth Robert corner.

Green said the Commission has four items to vote on. The first was the Conditional Use Permit, the mix of commercial/residential uses and a structure with 16+ units.

A motion was made by Elsmore to accept the conditional use permit as stated in the report with the listed conditions. Kavanaugh seconded the motion.

Vote-6 ayes/0 nays. The motion carried.

A motion was made by McPhillips with the conditions mentioned by Kavanaugh earlier, (eliminating the dog park as proof of parking and eliminating the parking lot along Robert Street) to approve the site plan.

Vote-6 ayes/0 nays. The motion carried.

A motion was made by Kavanaugh to approve the rezoning of 1571 Robert Street from B6 Mixed Use to PMD. Elsmore seconded the motion.

Vote-6 ayes/0 nays. The motion carried.

Commissioner McPhillips made a motion to approve the preliminary and final plat subject to the four listed conditions.

Commissioner Stevens seconded the motion.

Vote: 6 ayes/ 0 nays. The motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS - NA

OLD BUSINESS - NA

OTHER BUSINESS –

Planning List - Sonnek reported that staff had prepared a list of items that would be needed to be updated in the code. She wanted any additions or recommendations or priorities from the Commission. Green would like the pollinator ordinance language to be put before the Environmental Committee for review and updating. She would also like the Landscape numbers to be reviewed by that committee. Kavanaugh said parking was his priority. Sonnek said that he would like Commission members to choose their top five. Their priorities would go before Council in an Open Council Work Session. Three priorities would be a good number for the Commission to start work. Justen remarked that he does not see anything on the list that is glaringly controversial. Sonnek foresees one Planning work session after Council sees the list. Stevens would like to see the requirements regarding green buildings. Sonnek said this could be added. Green would like to have Dave Schletty in that conversation. Stevens also added building height to the list. Justen remarked that before the list comes before Council, that the code requirements be very specific. He said that the second item on the list is very specific; the first one on parking numbers is not. Green said that she would like to see the statistics on parking variances that were approved by the commission. Kavanaugh would like to see what a comparable city like Richfield is doing. Green said that it may be helpful to have another work session before the list is brought before Council. For clarification, Sonnek listed the priorities as parking numbers, units per acre, construction materials, (as it reads in the list.) McPhillips asked about seeing samples of building materials during plan review. It is hard to imagine what the building would look like in the renderings. He would like the best materials used in the new buildings. Green said the Commission will cover this during the conversation regarding code.

ADJOURN

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 8:29 pm.

The motion carried. All ayes.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon G. Hatfield