

MINUTES OF THE
RAPID CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
December 8, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Erik Braun, John Brewer, Karen Bulman, Mike Gollhofer, Galen Hoogestraat, Curt Huus, Mike Quasney, Kimberly Schmidt and Gerald Sullivan.

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Herr and Steve Rolinger. Darla Drew, Council Liaison was also absent.

STAFF PRESENT: Vicki Fisher, Fletcher Lacock, Robert Laroco, Carla Cushman and Andrea Wolff.

Braun called the meeting to order at 7:00 a.m.

Braun reviewed the Consent Agenda and asked if any member of the Planning Commission, staff or audience would like any item removed from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration.

Motion by Brewer seconded by Bulman and unanimously carried to recommend approval of the Consent Agenda Items 1 thru 5 in accordance with the staff recommendations. (9 to 0 with Braun, Brewer, Bulman, Gollhofer, Hoogestraat, Huus, Quasney, Schmidt and Sullivan voting yes and none voting no)

---CONSENT CALENDAR---

1. Approval of the November 23, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

*2. No. 16PD046 - Orchard Meadows

A request by KTM Design Solutions, Inc for Yasmeen Dream LLC to consider an application for an **Initial Planned Development Overlay to allow an apartment complex** for Section 9, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more fully described as follows: Commencing at the southwesterly corner of Tract H of Orchard Meadows, and the point of beginning. Thence first course: N83°21'59"E, a distance of 544.47 feet; Thence second course: N74°46'00"E, a distance of 65.61 feet; Thence third course: S00°06'17"W, a distance of 146.81 feet; Thence fourth course: S45°06'12"W, a distance of 14.14 feet; Thence fifth course: N89°53'48"W, a distance of 14.67 feet; Thence sixth course: S00°06'12"W, a distance of 52.00 feet; Thence seventh course: S89°53'48"E, a distance of 14.67 feet; Thence eighth course: S44°53'48"E, a distance of 14.14 feet; Thence ninth course: S00°06'12"W, a distance of 604.68 feet; Thence tenth course: N89°54'10"W, a distance of 625.75 feet; Thence eleventh course: N00°00'35"E, a distance of 739.61 feet; Thence twelfth course: N83°22'14"E, a distance of 23.12 feet, to the point of beginning, more generally described as being located south of SD Highway 44 East and east of Elk Vale Road.

Staff continued the Initial Planned Development Overlay to the January 5, 2017 Planning Commission meeting at the applicant's request.

The Rapid City Planning Commission's action on this item is final unless any party appeals that decision to the Rapid City Council. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Department of Community Planning & Development Services by close of business on the seventh full calendar day following action by the Planning Commission.

*3. No. 16PD047 - Section 28, T2N, R8E

A request by KTM Design Solutions, Inc for Rapid Center, LLC to consider an application for an **Initial Planned Development Overlay to allow General Commercial and Light Industrial Development** for Section 28, T2N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more fully described as follows: Commencing at the northwesterly corner of Lot 1 less Lot H-13 of Forefather Flats, and the point of beginning Thence first course: S89°58'03"W, a distance of 1,919.18 feet; Thence second course: S00°08'30"E, a distance of 678.69 feet; Thence third course: S67°14'25"E, a distance of 333.47 feet; Thence fourth course: S67°14'20"E, a distance of 280.68 feet; Thence fifth course: S89°50'05"E, a distance of 298.83 feet; Thence sixth course: S89°50'04"E, a distance of 1,187.54 feet; Thence seventh course: N00°00'00"W, a distance of 457.63 feet; Thence eighth course: N90°00'00"W, a distance of 10.01 feet; Thence ninth course: N00°00'05"E, a distance of 282.04 feet; Thence tenth course: N90°00'00"W, a distance of 125.18 feet; Thence eleventh course: N00°00'00"E, a distance of 182.00 feet, to the point of beginning, more generally described as being located southeast of the intersection of East Mall Drive and Dyess Avenue.

Planning Commission acknowledged the applicant's withdrawal of the Initial Planned Development Overlay to allow General Commercial and Light Industrial development.

The Rapid City Planning Commission's action on this item is final unless any party appeals that decision to the Rapid City Council. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Department of Community Planning & Development Services by close of business on the seventh full calendar day following action by the Planning Commission.

4. No. 16PL103 - Highpointe Ranch Subdivision

A request by Wyss Associates, Inc for Watershed Development, LLC to consider an application for a **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** for Proposed Tract A, B, C and D; Lots 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B, 7A and 7B of Block 1; Lots 1, 2, 3A, 3B and 4 through 7 of Block 2, Lots 1A, 1B and 2 through 15 of Block 3, Lots 1, 2, 3A, 3B and Lots 4 through 21 of Block 4, Lots 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B and 5 through 26 of Block 5, Highpointe Ranch Subdivision, located in Section 20, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, legally described as the SE1/4 of the SE1/4 and the E1/2 of the NE1/4 of the SW1/4 of the SE1/4 of Section 20, T1N, R7E, located in the SE1/4 of the SE1/4 and the E1/2 of the NE1/4 of the SW1/4 of the SE1/4 OF Section 20, T1N, R7E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located northwest of the intersection of Poppy Trail and Dunsmore Road.

Planning Commission recommended that the Preliminary Subdivision Plan be approved with the following stipulations:

- 1. The proposed plat shall be allowed as a phased development with all subdivision improvements needed to support a particular phase included in the construction plans for that phase;**
- 2. Prior to approval of the Development Engineering Plan application, submitted engineering reports required for construction approval shall be accepted and agreements required for construction approval shall be executed if subdivision improvements are required. In addition, permits required for construction shall be approved and issued and construction plans shall be accepted in accordance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual. All final engineering reports shall be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and contain a Certification Statement of Conformance with City Standards as required by the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual;**
- 3. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Poppy Trail shall be submitted for review and approval showing the street located in a minimum 68 foot wide right-of-way and constructed with a minimum 34 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, water and sewer in compliance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual and the Rapid City Municipal Code or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained a copy of the approved document shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;**
- 4. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Road A, B and C shall be submitted for review and approval showing the street located in a minimum 52 foot wide right-of-way and constructed with a minimum 26 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, water and sewer in compliance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual and the Rapid City Municipal Code or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained a copy of the approved document shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;**
- 5. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Cul-de-sac A and Cul-de-sac B shall be submitted for review and approval showing the street located in a minimum 52 foot wide right-of-way and constructed with a minimum 26 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, water and sewer. In addition, the cul-de-sac bulb shall be located in a minimum 104 foot diameter right-of-way and constructed with a minimum 84 foot diameter paved surface. in compliance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual and the Rapid City Municipal Code or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained a copy of the approved document shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;**
- 6. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for the section line highway located along the**

south lot line shall be submitted for review and approval showing the section line highway constructed with a minimum 26 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, water and sewer in compliance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual and the Rapid City Municipal Code or an Exception shall be obtained or the section line highway shall be vacated. If an Exception is obtained a copy of the approved document shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;

7. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for the section line located along the east lot line shall be submitted for review and approval showing the section line highway constructed with a minimum 26 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, water and sewer in compliance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual and the Rapid City Municipal Code or an Exception shall be obtained or the section line highway shall be vacated. The eastern half of the section line highway shall be vacated by Pennington County since it is located outside of the City limits of Rapid City. If an Exception is obtained a copy of the approved document shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
8. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, water plans and analysis prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer shall be submitted for review and approval in accordance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual. The design report shall demonstrate that the water service is adequate to meet estimated domestic flows and required fire flows to support the proposed development;
9. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a sewer design report prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer as per the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual shall be submitted for review and approval. The design report shall demonstrate that the sanitary sewer capacity is adequate to meet estimated flows and provide sufficient system capacity in conformance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual;
10. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a drainage plan and report prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer as per the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual and the Rapid City Municipal Code shall be submitted for review and approval for the proposed subdivision improvements. The drainage report shall address storm water quantity control and storm water quality treatment. In addition, easements shall be provided as needed;
11. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, street names shall be submitted for review and approval. In addition, the approved street names shall be shown on the Final Plat document;
12. Prior to submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application for Phase Two, a second point of access shall be constructed or the construction plans for Phase Two shall include a second point of

- access to ensure that no more than 40 lots take access with one point of access;
13. Prior to submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, the applicant shall coordinate with the Fire Department to ensure that the proposed landscape islands allow for fire apparatus turnaround or the plat document and construction plans shall be revised as needed;
 14. Prior to approval of the Development Engineering Plan application, a Development Agreement shall be entered into with the City for all public improvements, if applicable;
 15. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a cost estimate of the required subdivision improvements shall be submitted for review and approval;
 16. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, the Master Plan shall be revised to further clarify the phases of development within the area identified as “Future Phases”;
 17. Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, an agreement shall be submitted for recording securing ownership and maintenance of the proposed open space and storm detention areas;
 18. Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, an agreement shall be submitted for recording securing maintenance of the landscape islands;
 19. Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, surety for any required subdivision improvements that have not been completed shall be posted and the subdivision inspection fees shall be paid; and,
 20. Prior to the City’s acceptance of the public improvements, a warranty surety shall be submitted for review and approval as required. In addition, any utilities and drainage proposed outside of the dedicated right-of-way shall be secured within easement(s).

5. No. 16PL120 - Stoney Creek South No. 2 Subdivision

A request by Fisk Land Surveying and Consulting Engineers, Inc for Bank West to consider an application for a **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** for proposed Lot 2 of Stoney Creek South No. 2 Subdivision, legally described as the unplatted balance of the SE1/4 of the SW1/4 and an unplatted portion of the SW1/4 of the SW1/4 all located in Section 22, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located in the southeast corner of the Overview Lane and Nugget Gulch Road intersection.

Planning Commission recommended that the Preliminary Subdivision Plan be approved with the following stipulations:

1. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans shall be submitted for a termination manhole in Nugget Gulch Drive to replace the existing cleanout located in the right-of-way or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved document shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
2. Prior to approval of the Development Engineering Plan application, a Development Agreement shall be entered into with the City for all

- public improvements, if applicable;
3. Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, all necessary easements, including drainage easements, and utility easements shall be dedicated;
 4. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a cost estimate of the required subdivision improvements shall be submitted for review and approval;
 5. Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, surety for any required subdivision improvements that have not been completed shall be posted and the subdivision inspection fees shall be paid; and,
 6. Prior to the City's acceptance of the public improvements, a warranty surety shall be submitted for review and approval as required.

---END OF CONSENT CALENDAR---

---BEGINNING OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS---

- *6. No. 16PD051 - Original Town of Rapid City
A request by Kim Schmidt, Upper Deck Architects for Mike Kuhl Construction Project Manager, Pennington County to consider an application for a **Major Amendment to a Planned Development to expand the boundaries to allow a medical facility and a detox facility** for Lots 1 thru 16, Lots 25 thru 28 and the W1/2 of vacated 3rd Street, Lot 17 thru 18 and the W1/2 of Lot 19, the E1/2 of Lot 19 and all of Lot 20, Lots 21 thru 22, Lots 29 thru 30, the north 60 feet of Lots 31 and 32 and the south 80 feet of Lots 31 and 32, all located in Block 107 of Original Town of Rapid City, Section 1, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 321 Kansas City Street.

Schmidt stepped down from the dais and will be abstaining from this item as she has a conflict of interest.

Laroco presented the application and reviewed the associated slides. Laroco reviewed the requested Exceptions including the request to reduce the required parking from the 241 parking spaces to 67 parking spaces noting that they are proposing to provide additional parking in future phases but at this time they need the Exception to allow the project to move forward. They are also requesting Exceptions to reduce the required front yard setback along Kansas City Street from 25 feet to 4 feet and the required rear yard setback from 25 feet to 0 feet as they currently exist to be allowed to remain as it and an Exception to reduce the required setback from commercial parking to a residential use from 12 feet to 0 feet, provided that a 6-foot-tall white vinyl screening fence is provided adjacent to the residential use. The applicant is also requesting an Exception reduce the required amount of landscaping islands for the site from 4 to 0 which will enable them to maximum the parking on the property. Laroco noted that this is a phased plan with additional phasing requiring review and approval as a Major Amendment to the Planned Development as the come forward.

Laroco noted that this project will help to centralize a number of the County services and facilities creating a campus for County offices and services. Laroco stated that staff recommends that the Exceptions be granted and the Major Amendment to a Planned Development to expand the boundaries to allow a medical facility and a detox facility be approved with stipulations outlined in the Project Plan.

In response to a question from Bulman, Kim Schmidt of Upper Deck Architects reviewed the location of the proposed detox facility and the proposed ADA access into the building to service this facility. Schmidt confirmed that this facility will eventually replace the existing one but that there will be a transition period.

In response to questions from Brewer, Fisher confirmed that additional parking identified as part of a future phase of this project. She indicated that the proposed parking for Phase I will meet anticipated parking need for all proposed uses in Phase I, noting that many of these uses will not have clientele that require parking or will be those that already use the parking for the other existing services in the surrounding campus buildings. Brewer discussed his concerns regarding parking and the concern that the future parking will not be completed prior to occupancy of the building. Schmidt noted that the unique use of the building helped to arrive at the requested parking reduction for Phase I and that Phase II will include the additional parking.

Hoogestraat stated that he believes that the parking should be sufficient, but did ask about the residential property located in the center of the project.

Mike Kuhl, Project Manager for Pennington County stated that it is the County's intent to obtain this property in the future and that they continue to work to that goal, but that in the meantime the screening fence is being provided to buffer the parking from the residential property. Kuhl confirmed that parking identified in the second phase should not be built until such time as the County owns the property in question.

Discussion followed regarding the parking concerns.

In response to Braun's suggestion that any additional use require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development be included in the stipulations, Fisher clarified that this stipulation was already part of existing stipulations.

Brewer moved to approve with additional stipulation that way-finding signs be posted as needed to identify public parking, Bulman seconded.

In response to the query from Fisher to the applicant regarding this additional stipulation, Mike Kuhl stated that way finding signs have been discussed, but more in association with department and location, but that he would be fine with way-finding signs for parking.

In response to a question from Bulman, Fisher clarified that upon submittal of a building permit the location of these way-finding signs will be identified on the

site plan.

Brewer motioned, Bulman seconded and carried to approve the requested Major Amendment to the Planned Development with the following stipulations:

- 1. The requested Exception to reduce the required amount of parking on the property from 241 spaces to 67 is hereby granted. Changes to the uses or operation of the site which result in an increase in the required amount of parking will require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development. All parking shall be installed and maintained in compliance with the requirements of the Rapid City Municipal Code.**
- 2. The requested Exception to reduce the required front yard setback along Kansas City Street from 25 feet to 4 feet is hereby granted.**
- 3. The requested Exception to reduce the required rear yard setback from 25 feet to 0 feet is hereby granted.**
- 4. The requested Exception to reduce the required setback from commercial parking to a residential use from 12 feet to 0 feet is hereby granted, provided that a 6-foot-tall white vinyl screening fence is provided adjacent to the residential use as indicated on submitted plans.**
- 5. The requested Exception to reduce the required amount of landscaping islands for the site from 4 to 0 is hereby granted.**
- 6. Prior to issuance of a building permit, plans shall be revised to show the location and design of way-finding signage which indicates the availability and location of additional public parking located in the County's parking structures.**
- 7. All signage shall comply with the requirements of the Rapid City Municipal Code. No Light Emitting Diode (LED) message centers are being approved as a part of this Final Planned Development. The future addition of any LED message centers shall require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development. A sign permit shall be obtained for each sign.**
- 8. This Major Amendment to the Planned Development shall allow a medical facility and detox facility with additional parking on the property. All requirements of the Public District shall be maintained unless specifically authorized as a stipulation of this Major Amendment to the Planned Development or a subsequent Major Amendment to the Planned Development. All uses permitted in the Public District which do not increase parking requirements shall be permitted contingent upon an approved building permit. All conditional uses in the General Commercial District or uses which increase the required amount of parking on the site shall require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development. (8 to 0 to 1 with Braun, Brewer, Bulman, Gollhofer, Hoogestraat, Huus, Quasney, and Sullivan voting yes and none voting no and Schmidt abstaining)**

The Rapid City Planning Commission's action on this item is final unless any party appeals that decision to the Rapid City Council. All appeals

must be submitted in writing to the Department of Community Planning & Development Services by close of business on the seventh full calendar day following action by the Planning Commission.

*7. No. 16PD057 - Eastbrooke Subdivision

A request by Williams and Associate Architecture, Inc for Wellfully to consider an application for a **Final Planned Development Overlay to allow a group home facility with accessory offices** for Lot 1R of Eastbrooke Subdivision, located in Section 31, T2N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located in the northwest corner of the intersection of Racine Street and Waterloo Street.

Schmidt returned to the dais at this time.

Laroco presented the application and reviewed the associated slides. Laroco reviewed the applicant's Exception request to waive the required screening fence to adjacent residential uses, stating that based on the row of large coniferous trees the applicant is proposing to plant along the northern property line that should provide a visual and noise buffer to those adjacent uses staff requests that the Exception be granted. Laroco noted that the applicant is proposing to place a 6-foot-tall screening fence around all of the outdoor recreation areas and courtyards which provides additional buffering. Laroco presented staff's recommendation that the **Final Planned Development Overlay to allow a group home facility with accessory offices** be approved with stipulations as outlined in the staff report.

In response to a question from Quasney, Laroco confirmed that no part of the structure is located in the Flood Plain. Fisher further clarified that the applicant has to provided a Flood Plain Development Plan that meets the Federal Standards.

In response to a question from Bulman, Jess Olson, Executive Director of Wellsprings, doing business as Wellfully, stated that they will retain the current facility, but that they would not be offering the same services in that facility.

Hoogestraat moved, Quasney seconded and unanimously carried to approve the requested Final Planned Development with the following stipulations:

- 1. The requested Exception to waive the required screening fence adjacent to a residential use is hereby granted, provided that a row of large coniferous trees be installed and maintained along the northern property line so as to provide a visual and noise buffer to adjacent residential uses;**
- 2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, an executed and recorded copy of a drainage easement on Lot 3 for the proposed private storm sewer shall be provided;**
- 3. All signage shall comply with the requirements of the Rapid City Sign Code. No Light Emitting Diode (LED) message centers are being approved as a part of this request. The addition of LED message**

centers shall require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development. A sign permit shall be obtained for each sign, and;

4. This Final Planned Development shall allow for a group home and accessory office to be constructed on the property. All requirements of the General Commercial District shall be maintained unless specifically authorized as a stipulation of this Final Planned Development or a subsequent Major Amendment to the Planned Development. All uses permitted in the General Commercial District shall be permitted contingent upon provision of sufficient parking and an approved building permit. All conditional uses in the General Commercial District shall require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development. (9 to 0 with Braun, Brewer, Bulman, Golliher, Hoogestraat, Huus, Quasney, Schmidt and Sullivan voting yes and none voting no)

The Rapid City Planning Commission's action on this item is final unless any party appeals that decision to the Rapid City Council. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Department of Community Planning & Development Services by close of business on the seventh full calendar day following action by the Planning Commission.

*8. No. 16PD059 - Pine Hills Subdivision

A request by Pius and Doris Anne Werlinger to consider an application for a **Planned Development Overlay to allow an oversized garage** for Lot 11 of Pine Hills Subdivision, located in Section 28, T2N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 4295 Sturgis Road.

Lacock presented the application and reviewed the associated slides. Lacock reviewed the requested Exception to allow an oversized garage of 1,807 square feet in lieu of the maximum 1,500 square feet noting that staff supports the request be granted and the Exception to reduce the minimum required setback from a Section Line Highway from 58 feet to 36 feet noting that doing so rather than vacating the Section Line Highway would retain the future right-of-way should it be needed. Lacock stated that the Exception to allow an accessory structure with a height not to exceed 18 feet in lieu of the maximum allowed height of 15 feet would be mitigated as the proposed structure will be sufficiently setback and buffered from Sturgis Road. Lacock presented staff's recommendation that the Exceptions be granted and the **Planned Development Overlay to allow an oversized garage** with the stipulations as outlined in the Project Report.

Hoogestraat moved, Brewer seconded and unanimously carried to approve the Final Planned Development Overlay to allow an oversized garage with the following stipulations:

1. An Exception is hereby granted to allow an oversized garage of 1,807 square feet in lieu of the maximum 1,500 square feet;
2. An Exception is hereby granted to reduce the minimum required

setback from a section line highway from 58 feet to 36 feet;
An Exception is hereby granted to allow an accessory structure with a height not to exceed 18 feet in lieu of the maximum allowed height of 15 feet;

3. Prior to submittal of a Building Permit, the applicant shall coordinate with the Rapid City Fire Department to arrange a site review for wildland fuels mitigation;
4. Upon submittal of a Building Permit, a surveyed site plan of the existing and proposed structures shall be submitted identifying the location of the well and septic system; and,
5. The Final Planned Development Overlay shall allow an oversized garage. The proposed structure shall not be used for commercial purposes or as a second residence. In addition, the garage shall not be used as a rental unit. Any change in use that is a permitted use in the Low Density Residential District shall require a building permit. Any change in use that is a Conditional Use in the Low Density Residential District shall require the review and approval of a Major Amendment to the Planned Development. (9 to 0 with Braun, Brewer, Bulman, Gollhofer, Hoogestraat, Huus, Quasney, Schmidt and Sullivan voting yes and none voting no)

The Rapid City Planning Commission's action on this item is final unless any party appeals that decision to the Rapid City Council. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Department of Community Planning & Development Services by close of business on the seventh full calendar day following action by the Planning Commission.

9. Discussion Items

10. Staff Items

Fisher thanked the Commission for their hard work during the year.

11. Planning Commission Items

12. Committee Reports

- A. City Council Report (November 21, 2016)
The City Council concurred with the recommendations of the Planning Commission
- B. Building Board of Appeals
- C. Capital Improvements Subcommittee
- D. Tax Increment Financing Committee

There being no further business, Hoogestraat moved, Bulman seconded and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 a.m. (9 to 0 with Braun, Brewer, Bulman, Gollhofer, Hoogestraat, Huus, Quasney, Schmidt and Sullivan voting yes and none voting no)