

MINUTES OF THE
RAPID CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 23, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Erik Braun, Karen Bulman, Galen Hoogestraat, Linda Marchand, John Pinkard, Dennis Popp, Kay Rippentrop, Steve Rolinger and Jan Swank. Amanda Scott, Council Liaison was also present.

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Brewer, Andrew Scull.

STAFF PRESENT: Brett Limbaugh, Vicki Fisher, Fletcher Lacock, Robert Laroco, Sandy Smith, Dale Tech Ted Johnson, Carla Cushman and Andrea Wolff.

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

Marchand 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 Rolinger seconded by Bulman and unanimously carried to recommend approval of the Consent Agenda Items 1 thru 3 in accordance with the staff recommendations. (9 to 0 with Braun, Bulman, Hoogestraat, Marchand, Pinkard, Popp, Rippentrop, Rolinger, and Swank voting yes and none voting no)

---CONSENT CALENDAR---

1. Approval of the April 9, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

2. No. 15PL025 - Red Rock Village Subdivision

A request by Renner and Associates, LLC for DKEA, LLC to consider an application for a **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** for Lots 6 thru 10 of Block 1, Lots 6 thru 11 of Block 2 and Lots 1 thru 6 of Block 3 of Red Rock Village Subdivision, legally described as in the NE1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located west of the intersection of Dunsmore Road and Tehama Street and Dunsmore Road.

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

1. **Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Lahinch Street shall be submitted for review and approval showing the street located within a minimum 52 foot wide right 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 within a minimum 118 foot diameter right-of-way and constructed with a minimum 96 foot diameter paved surface or Exception(s) shall be obtained. If Exception(s) are obtained, a copy of the approved Exception(s) shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;**
2. **Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application,**

- construction plans for Tehema Street shall be submitted for review and approval showing the street located within a minimum 52 foot wide right and constructed with a minimum 26 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, water and sewer or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved Exception shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
3. 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. In addition, a water master plan shall be submitted for review and approval to address water main looping to meet requirements of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual. Utility easements shall be secured as needed;
 4. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, sewer plans prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer as per the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual shall be submitted for review and approval. The sewer plan and analysis shall confirm that the Red Rock Meadows Lift Station is sized to accommodate flows from the proposed development. In addition, a sewer master plan shall be submitted for review and approval to ensure that the proposed sewer can serve future development. Utility easements shall be secured as needed;
 5. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a drainage plan prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer and in compliance with the City's Drainage Basin Plan shall be submitted for review and approval. The drainage plan shall address storm water quantity control and storm water quality treatment. The Design report shall be in conformance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual and shall be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer. In addition, the plat document shall be revised to provide drainage easements as necessary;
 6. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan in compliance with the adopted Stormwater Quality Manual and the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual shall be submitted for review and approval;
 7. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a geotechnical analysis including soil corrosivity analysis shall be submitted for review and approval;
 8. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a revised Master Plan shall be submitted for review and approval identifying access to the unplatted balance located west of Phase Two and south of Phase Three;
 9. Prior to Development Engineering Plan approval, engineering reports

- required for construction approval shall be accepted and agreements required for construction approval shall be executed. 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 Registered Professional Engineer;
10. 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;
 11. Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, ownership and maintenance of the proposed detention and storm water quality pond shall be secured and a copy of the recorded document submitted with the Final Plat application;
 12. Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, all necessary drainage easements, utility easements and temporary turn around easements shall be dedicated. The proposed sanitary sewer easement on proposed Lots 10 and 11 shall be provided on one lot per Section 3.5.2.5.c of the Infrastructure Design the Infrastructure and the sanitary sewer easement shall be a minimum 20 foot side. A separate private water main easement shall be dedicated for the existing water line from the well to the golf course that parallels the sewer main. The storm sewer easement from Lahinch Street to the detention pond shall be a minimum 20 foot wide easement centered on the storm sewer pipe;
 13. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a cost estimate of the required subdivision improvements shall be submitted for review and approval if subdivision improvements are required;
 14. 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,
 15. 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).
3. 15TP012 - Acknowledge the 2012-2014 Socio—Economic Report

Planning Commission recommended that the 2012-2015 Socio-Economic Report be acknowledged.

---END OF CONSENT CALENDAR---

---BEGINNING OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS---

- *4. No. 15PD009 - Kashmir
A request by Michael Derby to consider an application for a **Major Amendment to a Planned Development to allow a rental reunion cabin** for Lot D through

G less Lot H1 of Lot G of Kashmire (Revised), located in Section 8, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 2720 Chapel Lane.

Lacock presented the application and reviewed the associated slides. Lacock noted that the application proposes to change the use of the existing structure and does not call for additional buildings or construction.

Lacock reviewed the history on the property stating that in 1994 the property was rezoned from Flood Hazard District to General Commercial District and noted that following the 1972 Flood when the City was purchasing greenway property that this property was found to be relatively safe and was not acquired by the City as part of the greenway tracts. In 1981 FEMA Flood Plain maps and a review done by the Corps of Engineers confirmed that this property is located in the 500-year flood plain and not the 100-year flood plain or floodway. Lacock stated that in 1994 a Final Planned Development to allow a restaurant was approved, and that in 1997 a Major Amendment to allow the existing structure was approved. In 2008 an Initial Planned Development to construct a full service resort around the existing restaurant was denied by both Planning Commission and City Council. Additionally, Lacock reviewed the access and alignment study that was done by the City, which advised that a second access be provided for the Chapel Valley area. However, this advisement was voted down based on neighborhood input, and the Chapel Valley Emergency Management Task force was formed.

Lacock reviewed some of the issues of concern addressed during the review of this application such as flood hazard, emergency evacuation, the number of dwelling units with one access point and the increase of overnight stays. Lacock stated that the property is in the 500-year flood plain not the 100-year flood plain and was relatively safe from flood hazard, that traffic and parking calculations showed that the reunion cabin use would affect a reduction from the current calculated use as a restaurant and reviewed how those numbers were obtained. Lacock stated that the applicant has presented an emergency site evacuation process plan and a letter of support from Rapid City-Pennington County Emergency Management. Regarding the 40 unit limit for a single access, Lacock stated that the use is not considered a single-family structure and therefore the limit does not apply to this this facility. Lacock stated that based on the limited number of occupants and the applicants preparedness plans staff recommends approval of the **Major Amendment to a Planned Development to allow a rental reunion cabin** with stipulations.

Rolinger moved, Swank seconded to approve the Major Amendment to a Planned Development to allow a rental reunion cabin with stipulations.

Dick Tupper, 4917 Steamboat Circle, spoke to his concerns regarding how this will impact the safety of the single access stating that the area is already at risk and he feels that adding this use will only increase the risk.

Peg McIntire, 4520 Steamboat Circle, spoke to her concerns regarding issues

with access referencing the confusion created during past emergencies. She stated that the Chapel Valley Neighborhood Emergency Group has worked to address the issues and feels that the City needs to take this into consideration and asked that the Planning Commission deny this application.

Zbignew Hladysz, 4801 Powderhorn Drive, stated that as an engineer he sees the dangers associated with this application, stating that adding 22 beds is adding 22 beds and urged the Planning Commission to vote against this item.

Linda Sandvig, 4810 Powderhorn Drive, spoke to her concerns stating that safety is the highest priority. Sandvig asked that if the application is approved that it be restricted to the current size and to not allow expanding the use in the future and to limit signage.

Braun commended the Chapel Valley group for their dedication to the emergency plans and stated that he believes that this will be a reduction of use from the current use.

In response to a question from Bulman regarding the plan for the use of the property, Carmon Derby, 4035 Oakmont Court, stated that their operation plan is based on reunion cabins located in other hills communities, stating that this is not a service available in the city. Carmen stated that the kitchens are no longer commercial and that the liquor license had been sold and only a beer and wine license remains on the premises.

Bulman moved, Braun seconded to add revised stipulation that the reunion cabin shall operate in compliance with the approved “Emergency Site Evacuation Procedures” plan.

Fisher addressed the 40 unit rule noting that as a commercial property the structure is fire sprinkled which provides an additional level of protection and that is why the requirement only refers to single-family residences. Fisher also noted that this use reduces the overall use and that any future changes to this property would require an additional review before the Planning Commission.

In response to a question from Popp, Lacock stated that any expansion to the use this property would require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development and would entail a review by the Planning Commission. Fisher clarified that the current structure is at limit, but should they decide to build additional buildings it might be possible, based on the size of the property and the size of the proposed building. Fisher noted it would still trigger a Major Amendment to a Planned Development and would therefore require the review and approval of the Planning Commission.

Swank stated that he believes that the Derby’s have every expectation to use their property and although he did have some concerns regarding the safety of the neighborhood in that regard, he does not believe that is a reason to deny the application.

Discussion regarding the ingress and egress to the area followed.

Rolinger moved, Swank seconded and unanimously carried to approve the Major Amendment to a Planned Development to allow a rental reunion cabin with the following stipulations:

- 1. A Building Permit shall be obtained prior to any construction and a Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained prior to occupancy;**
- 2. Upon submittal of a Building Permit, a utility plan shall be submitted for review and approval showing domestic water service and fire service lines constructed in compliance with the design requirements of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual;**
- 3. A minimum of 22 parking spaces shall be provided. In addition, one of the parking spaces shall be van handicap accessible. All provisions of the Off-Street Parking Ordinance shall be continually met;**
- 4. A minimum of 39,452 landscaping points shall continually be provided. All provisions of Section 17.50.300, the Landscaping Regulations of the Rapid City Municipal Code shall be continually met. All landscaping shall be continually maintained in a live vegetative state and replaced as necessary;**
- 5. All outdoor lighting shall be reflected within the property boundaries so as to not shine onto adjoining properties and rights-of-way and to not be a hazard to the passing motorist or constitute a nuisance of any kind;**
- 6. All provisions of the General Commercial District shall be met unless otherwise specifically authorized as a stipulation of this Major Amendment to the Planned Development or a subsequent Major Amendment;**
- 7. All signage shall continually comply with the submitted sign package and the Rapid City Municipal Code. Changes to the signage which comply with the Rapid City Sign Code shall be permitted. No electronic or Light Emitting Diode (LED) signage is being approved as a part of this Major Amendment to the Planned Development. The addition of electronic or LED signage shall require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development. A sign permit is required for any new signs;**
- 8. All applicable provisions of the adopted International Fire Code shall continually be met; and,**
- 9. The Major Amendment to a Planned Development shall allow for a nine bedroom "reunion" cabin with a maximum of 22 beds and a maximum occupancy of 47 people as per the building code. Any expansion to the "reunion" cabin or any change in use shall require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development;**
- 10 The "reunion" cabin shall operate in compliance with the approved "Emergency Site Evacuation Procedures" plan. (9 to 0 with Braun, Bulman, Hoogestraat, Marchand, Pinkard, Popp, Rippentrop, Rolinger, and Swank 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.

*5. No. 15PD010 - Atlantis Subdivision

A request by Fisk Land Surveying and Consulting Engineers, Inc. for Northcott Company - Daniel Vogel to consider an application for a **Major Amendment to a Planned Development to allow a restaurant** for Lot 1 revised of Atlantis Subdivision, located in Section 27, T2N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 1300 North Elk Vale Road.

Laroco presented the application and reviewed the slides. Laroco noted that the property straddles the City of Rapid City and Box Elder city limits. Laroco commented that the on-sale liquor permit will not be expanded in association with this application. Laroco stated that the applicant is requesting an Exception for a 60 foot tall pole sign as a part of this application, noting that the elevation variance would place the elevation of the sign at the same height of other 40 feet signs and reviewed slides showing the signs in the area. Laroco presented staff's recommendation that the application for a **Major Amendment to a Planned Development to allow a restaurant** be approved with stipulations.

Rolinger moved, Swank seconded to approve the Major Amendment to a Planned Development to allow a rental reunion cabin with stipulations

In response to a question from Bulman regarding the height of the sign in reference to the billboard located in the vicinity, Laroco stated that the maximum permitted height of a billboard is 30 feet. Janelle Fisk stated that the sign meets separation requirements and that lowering the sign would drop it below the elevation of other signs in the area and that she does not believe that the sign will create a conflict in line of sight. Fisk noted that the size of the sign is based on the consideration that the major viewing traffic focus being that driving on I-90.

Dan Vogel, with Northcott/Perkins the applicant, thanked everyone for their work on this application and said they looked forward to extending their relationship with Rapid City.

Rolinger moved, Swank seconded and unanimously carried to approve the Major Amendment to a Planned Development to allow a rental reunion cabin with the following stipulations:

- 1. If the Planning Commission should determine that the proposed 60 foot tall on-premise sign is appropriate for the location, then the Exception to increase the permitted height of the proposed on-premise sign from 45 feet to 60 feet is hereby approved. All additional signage shall comply with the requirements of the Rapid City Sign Code. No electronic or Light Emitting Diode (LED) signage is being**

approved as a part of this Major Amendment to the Planned Development. The addition of LED signage shall require a Major Amendment to the Planned Development. A sign permit shall be obtained for each sign;

2. A building permit shall be obtained prior to construction. A Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained prior to operation of the restaurant;
3. Prior to issuance of a building permit, plans shall be revised to address all Public Works design change comments;
4. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the property owner must enter into an agreement with the City for access to the water shutoff valve to be located on private property;
5. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the property owner must enter into an agreement with the City for the maintenance of the proposed storm water sumps and flexstorm filters for storm water quality treatment;
6. Prior to issuance of a building permit, final plans signed and sealed by registered professional pursuant to SDCL 36-18A shall be submitted;
7. Handicap accessibility shall be provided throughout the structure as necessary;
8. Erosion and sediment control measures shall be installed throughout the project and maintained as necessary;
9. All proposed parking shall be constructed as shown in the approved parking plan and in compliance with the requirements of the Rapid City Parking Ordinance. Changes to the parking in compliance with the Rapid City Parking Ordinance may be permitted as a Minimal Amendment to the Planned Development;
10. All landscaping shall be constructed as shown in the approved landscaping plan and in compliance with the requirements of the Rapid City Landscaping Ordinance. Changes to the landscaping plan in compliance with the Rapid City Landscaping Ordinance may be permitted as a Minimal Amendment to the Planned Development;
11. All lighting shall be designed to preclude shining on adjacent properties or rights-of-way so as to become a nuisance to neighbors or passing pedestrian or vehicular traffic;
12. All requirements of the International Fire Code shall be continually maintained;
13. All requirements of the General Commercial District shall be maintained unless specifically authorized as a part of this Major Amendment or a subsequent Major Amendment to the Planned Development, and;
14. This Major Amendment to the Planned Development shall allow for a restaurant and parking to be located on the property. Any use permitted in the General Commercial District may be permitted contingent upon an approved building permit and provision of sufficient parking. Any conditional uses shall require a Major

Amendment to the Planned Development. (9 to 0 with Braun, Bulman, Hoogestraat, Marchand, Pinkard, Popp, Rippentrop, Rolinger, and Swank 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.

*6. No. 15UR008 - Wises Addition

A request by Kennedy Design Group Inc., for Wal-East Development Inc. to consider an application for a **Major Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit to expand an on-sale liquor establishment in conjunction with a casino** for Lots 1 thru 4 of Block 20 of Wises Addition, located in Section 31, T2N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 685 LaCrosse Street.

Lacock presented the application and reviewed the associated slides. Lacock stated that the application is to increase the square footage of the existing casino to accommodate 10 new machines noting that there will be no new construction, additional signage or expansion of the bar area. Lacock noted that a request had been received regarding the screening fence and as such an additional stipulation has been added that requires that the screening fence be extended along the west side of the property to the alley and that the dumpster be fenced and gated. Lacock also noted the stipulations that address the need for landscaping and parking to be brought into compliance prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and that staff recommends approval of the application for a **Major Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit to expand an on-sale liquor establishment in conjunction with a casino** be approved with stipulations.

Rolinger moved, Bulman seconded to approve the Major Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit to expand an on-sale liquor establishment in conjunction with a casino with stipulations.

Bulman stated her support of this application.

Rolinger moved, Bulman seconded and unanimously carried to approve the Major Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit to expand an on-sale liquor establishment in conjunction with a casino with the following stipulations:

- 1. A Building Permit shall be obtained prior to any structural construction and a Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained prior to occupancy;**
- 2. Upon submittal of a Building Permit, a revised site plan shall be submitted showing the screening fence located along the west property line extending south to the alley. In addition, the dumpster location in the southwest corner of the property shall be screened and**

- gated;
3. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, two handicap accessible parking spaces shall be provided and the accessible route to the building shall be striped as shown on the site plan. A minimum of 27 parking spaces shall be provided. In addition, two of the parking spaces shall be handicap accessible. One of the handicap spaces shall be “van accessible.” All provisions of the Off-Street Parking Ordinance shall be continually met;
 4. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the landscaping shall be installed as per the approved landscape plan. A minimum of 14,342 landscaping points shall be provided. All provisions of Section 17.50.300, the Landscaping Regulations of the Rapid City Municipal Code shall be continually met. All landscaping shall be continually maintained in a live vegetative state and replaced as necessary;
 5. All outdoor lighting shall be reflected within the property boundaries so as to not shine onto adjoining properties and rights-of-way and to not be a hazard to the passing motorist or constitute a nuisance of any kind;
 6. All provisions of the General Commercial District shall be met;
 7. All signage shall comply with the submitted sign package and the Rapid City Municipal Code. Changes to the signage which comply with the Rapid City Sign Code shall be permitted. No electronic or Light Emitting Diode (LED) signage is being approved as a part of this Major Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit. The addition of electronic or LED signage shall require a Major Amendment. A sign permit is required for any new signs;
 8. All applicable provisions of the adopted International Fire Code shall continually be met; and,
 9. The Major Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit shall allow for the expansion of an on-sale liquor establishment in conjunction with a casino from 1,886 square feet to 3,136 square feet. Any expansion to the on-sale liquor use shall require a Major Amendment to the Conditional Use Permit. Any change in use that is a permitted use in the General Commercial District and in compliance with the Parking Ordinance shall require the review and approval of a Minimal Amendment. All conditional uses in the General Commercial District shall require the review and approval of a Major Amendment to the Conditional Use Permit. (9 to 0 with Braun, Bulman, Hoogestraat, Marchand, Pinkard, Popp, Rippentrop, Rolinger, and Swank 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.

7. Discussion Items

A. Zoning Board of Adjustment Training

Cushman reviewed the rules governing the Zoning Board of Adjustment and reviewed that the Zoning Board of Adjustment is authorized from State law. Cushman reviewed the Ordinance that enables the operation of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Cushman noted that the vast majority of variances will be for exceptions to Chapter 17 of the Zoning Code such as setbacks, paving, sign height and location, lot coverage or density and parking. Cushman reviewed purposes of the variances and some of the reasons for granting.

Cushman reviewed the process to file a variance noting that the burden of proof is on the applicant and reviewed some of the criteria that the Zoning Board of Adjustment can use to justify action. Cushman noted that requirement that a variance may be granted to ensure the reasonable use of the property allows the Board to offer compromise in some instances, but noted that land use is not a reason to request or to grant a variance.

Rolinger left the meeting at this time.

Cushman reviewed the requirement for consensus on actions by the Zoning Board of Adjustment and how to appeal the decision of the Zoning Board of Adjustment, noting that this is what makes the board a quasi-judicial body is that any appeal of the decision of the Zoning Board of Adjustment has to be appealed to the Circuit Court.

Fisher reviewed the difference between a Variance and a Planned Development stating that they are separate actions for different uses.

Fisher presented the Project Report form that will be used for variances and the new procedures for variances.

In response to question from Braun regarding the “Relevant Case Section” on the report, Fisher clarified how this section would be used stating that it would be specific to the application. Cushman included that each application needs to be considered as its own merit and not on related or like applications.

In response to a question from Bulman on how they would receive the variance applications for review, Fisher stated that they would be prepared, presented and published in the same manner as the current Planning Commission Agenda.

B. Project Report Review

Fisher reviewed the new Project Report that will be used in place of the current Staff Report. Fisher stated that this new form is designed to provide more information in a simpler, streamlined form and to provide visual support to the application in one form making it easier to review the

application. Fisher noted that the new form presents information in a table format rather than the previous narrative paragraph format, which should make it easier to identify issues such as uses, Comprehensive Plan applicability, and neighborhood area policies, excreta.

Fisher further stated that the new form will separate the stipulations from what will now be called out as advisories, explaining that advisories are those items that are required by either the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or the Zoning Code. Fisher noted that Advisories will be included with each Project Report, but as a separate page.

Brett said that the Project Report is set up to place certain information on certain pages allowing for easier location of information and he feels this will make the decision making process more precise with respect to approvals or denials of applications.

8. Staff Items
9. Planning Commission Items
10. Committee Reports
 - A. City Council Report (April 6, 2015)
The City Council concurred with the recommendations of the Planning Commission
 - B. Building Board of Appeals
 - C. Zoning Board of Adjustment
 - D. Capital Improvements Subcommittee
 - E. Tax Increment Financing Committee

There being no further business, Popp moved, Braun seconded and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:49 a.m. (9 to 0 with Braun, Bulman, Hoogestraat, Marchand, Pinkard, Popp, Rippentrop, Rolinger and Swank voting yes and none voting no)