

MEMBERS	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Bob Beda, Chair	X		
Dusty Szymanski	X		
Erich Ferchau	X		
Stu Ferguson	X		
Carolyn Riggs	X		
Greg Larson	X		
Councilor Ed Seymour	X		

OTHERS PRESENT: Community Development Director Steve Westbay, Planner Andie Ruggera, Planning Technician Pam Cunningham, Mike Grosse, Peg Yale, Bob Maurer, Warren Wilcox, Chris Madison, Wayne Castka, Vicky Castka, Paula Swenson, Navid Navidi, Ken Coleman, Debbie Stewart, Rick Miller, John Solanik, Vicki Johnson, Kirsten Dickey.

**I. CALL TO ORDER AT 7:00 PM BY CHAIR BOB BEDA**

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

**III. PUBLIC HEARING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Conditional Use Application CU 12-1, SUBMITTED BY MICHAEL GROSSE FOR A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE IN THE COMERCIAL (C) DISTRICT.**

**Open Public Hearing.** Chair Bob Beda opened the public hearing at approximately 7:01pm.

**Proof of publication was shown for the record.**

**Review of Process.** Planner Ruggera gave an overview of the process of a Conditional Use application. The applicant is Mike Grosse, who is requesting a single-family residence at 614 West New York Avenue which is located in the Commercial district. The legal description of the property is the south 60 feet of lots 10 through 12, Block 25, West Gunnison Addition, City and County of Gunnison, Colorado.

**Applicant Presentation.** Michael Grosse addressed the Commission and stated he would like to put a single-family unit in the property.

**Public Input.** Chair Beda asked if any members of the public wished to speak. There were none. Planner Ruggera stated that on March 22, 2012, she received phone call from Kevin Donovan, who owns the property at 605 West New York. He stated he fully supports the proposed use. This was entered into the public record.

**Staff Presentation.** Planner Ruggera reviewed the Staff Observations and Review Standards as outlined in the staff report. The lot and existing structures are nonconforming to the LDC in regard to the minimum lot size, maximum lot coverage, and setbacks. The application meets all of the review standards, but Planner Ruggera pointed out than in regard to "Nuisances," the applicant should be aware that nuisances from single-family dwellings are minimal, but surrounding Commercial uses may generate impacts and the applicant should be aware that these non-residential uses will continue.

Mr. Grosse stated in regard to the nonconforming lot, he is in discussions with Mark Sniffen (owner of the adjacent parcel at 110 S. 12<sup>th</sup>) about buying back the land that was previously sold to him, which should bring the property back into conformance.

#### **Commission Questions**

- Commissioner Ferchau asked Mr. Grosse if he owns property. Mr. Grosse responded that he is waiting for clear title from the Odd Fellows because all of the members who are on the title are deceased. He has put together a lease [with IOOF Grand Lodge in Pueblo] with a right to act on their behalf.
- Chair Beda asked how long the building has been unoccupied. Commissioner Ferguson stated it had been over 15 years.

**Commission Discussion.** None of the Commissioners had any issues with the proposal and Director Westbay stated that is staff's opinion as well.

Chair Beda closed the public hearing at 8:08 p.m.

#### **ACTION**

During the regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held on April 11, 2012, Commissioner Larson moved, Commissioner Riggs seconded, and the Commission voted to APPROVE Conditional Use application CU 12-1, submitted by Michael Grosse for a single-family residence at 614 West Virginia Avenue, located in the Commercial zone district, based on the following Findings of Fact:

Findings of Fact:

1. The Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the record of this action includes the application contents on file with the City of Gunnison; all comments entered into the Public Hearing record; and provisions of the *City of Gunnison Land Development Code* and the *City of Gunnison Master Plan 2007*.
2. The Planning Commission finds that this Conditional Use application is for a single-family residential use in the Commercial zone district.
3. The Planning and Zoning Commission finds that a single-family residence is compatible with the neighborhood uses. The Planning and Zoning Commission further finds that surrounding non-residential uses, noise, dust, traffic and adjacent uses will continue.
4. The Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the lot and the structure are nonconforming to the *Land Development Code* in regard to the minimum lot size, maximum lot coverage of structures and building setbacks.
5. The Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the two off-street parking spaces required for this Conditional Use are present on the parcel.
6. The Planning and Zoning Commission finds that a building permit will be required for the interior remodeling of the structure to a single-family residence.

7. The Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the single-family residence will not be a detriment to the community's health, safety and welfare.

Roll Call Yes: Dusty, Erich, Stu, Bob, Carolyn, Greg, Ed

Roll Call No:

Roll Call Abstain:

Motion carried

#### **IV. CONSIDERATION OF THE MARCH 14, 2012 MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioner Riggs moved to approve the March 14, 2012 meeting minutes as presented.

Commissioner Larson seconded the motion.

Roll Call Yes: Dusty, Erich, Stu, Bob, Carolyn, Greg, Ed

Roll Call No:

Roll Call Abstain:

Motion carried

#### **V. UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS.** There were none.

#### **VI. COUNCIL UPDATE.** Councilor Seymour updated the Commission on recent Council business:

- On March 27<sup>th</sup> Council
  - took action on the Farmers Market events permit;
  - approved Gunnison Partners' request to waive fees and for a Challenge Grant for the 8<sup>th</sup> Street school house renovation project;
  - approved the purchase of a new truck for the Electric Department (which was in 2012 budget);
  - received an update from Mary Vader on the Gunnison County Housing Authority and Ken Coleman also gave an update on meetings he had attended. Subsequent to that meeting, Councilors Drexel, Harriman and Seymour and City Manager Coleman took a tour with Ms. Vader to visit the senior housing and proposed Habitat for Humanity housing;
- On April 3<sup>rd</sup> Council had a work session
- On April 10<sup>th</sup> Council:
  - heard an update from Randy Phelps on the hospital;
  - took action on the sewer slip line bid which stayed the same as what was budgeted;
  - took action on the Firemen's pension death benefit, raising it from \$100 to \$500 for retired firefighters;
  - passed a resolution recognizing and commending Rod Landwehr;

#### **VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

- Commissioner Riggs stated that Restaurant Week is April 20-29<sup>th</sup>. There are 20 participating restaurants in Gunnison who will be offering specials from 18.80% off to \$18.80 (1880 was the year of Gunnison's founding).

#### **VIII. PLANNING STAFF UPDATE.** Director Westbay updated the Commission on recent department activity:

- there will be a Conditional Use and Three Mile Review on the agenda for April 25<sup>th</sup>;

- discussions have begun with Gunnison Rising for a boundary line adjustment and Highway Access Control Plan;
- staff has been working with WSC applicants on the City's internship program;
- the Creamery building is being remodeled and will house a vision center;
- there have been several wildfires in the last few days; and,
- Director Westbay noted that Rod Landwehr served the City with a lot of wisdom and advise, which was given humbly and graciously, and he will be missed.

Commissioner Ferchau asked if there is a fire ban. Director Westbay responded that the Western Regional committee is meeting in Montrose tomorrow and they will communicate with media after the meeting. The Wildfire Board, federal and local agencies that make that determination.

**IX. Because the Public Hearing for ZA 12-1 was published for 7:30, Chair Beda recessed the meeting at 7:17 until 7:30.**

**X. THE MEETING WAS CALLED BACK TO ORDER AT 7:30 PM BY CHAIR BOB BEDA**

**XI. PUBLIC HEARING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: TEXT AMENDMENT APPLICATION ZA 12-1, PROPOSING THE ADOPTON OF A MODIFIED CHAPTER 15.100 SIGN STANDARDS, OF THE CITY OF GUNNISON LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE.**

**Open Public Hearing.** Chair Bob Beda opened the public hearing at approximately 7:30 pm.

Commissioner Ferguson recused himself.  
Commissioner Larson recused himself.

**Proof of publication was shown for the record.**

**Review of Process.** Director Westbay gave an overview of the process of a Text Amendment application. He advised the Commission that they may take action at a later date, and have the option to continue the public hearing as long as it is not closed.

**Applicant Presentation.** As the Applicant, Director Westbay explained the application. He said that the application was made based on directives from Council and the Commission. The Planning and Zoning Commission has been working on the *Sign Code* for quite some time. He stated that a detailed focus on *Sign Code* regulations is warranted at this time because the existing *Code* lacks necessary specificity, directives are confusing, and it does not address modern sign technologies.

Director Westbay provided a history of review and development of the proposed *Sign Code*. He said there has been considerable public outreach, including an article in the newspaper and personal visits to 125 businesses to explain the proposed *Code*.

The proposed amendment will repeal the existing *Sign Standards* and replace them with the new *Sign Code*. He provided an overview of the 11 sections of the proposed *Sign Code*.

Director Westbay explained that one of the underlying currents of this discussion is Electronic Sign Standards. He said that staff looked at 20 different municipal codes that integrate modern sign technology. Example standards from the United States Sign Council (USSC) were also used in development of the new *Sign Code*. He said the USSC presents standards from the business and industry side, rather than government. The proposed *Sign Code* contains performance-based standards about how to regulate the size, copy change rate, and illumination.

Another important element of the proposed *Sign Code* is Sandwich Board signs. Director Westbay explained that Sandwich Board signs are unique situations. On private property, they would be Freestanding signs and are permitted. However, in the public right-of-way, it is different. The issue isn't the desire to limit and regulate the signs; it is the function of the street and sidewalk in the CBD and the liability issue. Any structure in the right-of-way presents potential liability to the City. The new *Sign Code* allows Sandwich Board signs with performance standards that address space, ADA, and ingress and egress. It also has provisions for a License Agreement to address liability and to have the City as an additional insured.

Director Westbay reviewed the Staff Observations. He stated that regulatory bounds have been relaxed in several instances:

- incidental signs are not counted toward the Total Permitted Sign Area;
- off-premise signs are contemplated in the new *Code*, but the sign area would be allotted to the off-site property;
- total square footage of Freestanding signs would be increased from 50 square feet to 60 square feet;
- Window signs up to 12 square feet are exempt;
- in regard to Sandwich Board signs the [City's] number one duty is to ensure safety;
- Electric Message Centers are considered under the new *Sign Code*.

**Public Input.** Included in the public record are:

- a memo from Director Westbay with recommended changes to the proposed *Sign Code*;
- a letter from Mike Darnell stating that: motion signs attract business; off-premise signs should be considered; the Planning and Zoning Commission should focus on the health, safety and welfare of the community; decision makers should provide businesses support for success.
- a letter from Delaney Keating addressing: lighted signs; the location and appropriate number of sandwich board signs; the potential of limiting banners to a 30 day period; and that Off-premise signs should be developed in good taste.

Chair Beda clarified that, regarding Sandwich Board signs and License Agreements, the License Agreement is not new, but Sandwich Board signs are. Director Westbay further explained that historically, the process has been that License Agreements go to City Council, which is laborious to staff and Council. Revisions to the *Code* include provision of the *Public Street Code* and will include a provision for an Administrative License Agreement that would not have to go to City Council but that the City Manager can sign or send to Council.

Chair Beda asked if any members of the public wished to speak.

- Rick Miller addressed the Commission. He asked why Councilor Seymour and Commissioners Riggs and Ferchau were at the table since they have an interest in downtown businesses. Director Westbay responded that the City Attorney was contacted about members recusing

themselves. She provided opinions based on her knowledge of potential liabilities. She said that Commissioners Ferguson and Larson should recuse themselves because they purchased an Electronic Message Center for the computer store and have the potential for monetary gain based on the decisions on the *Sign Code* because they purchased a sign that is not allowed under the current *Sign Standards* and prior to approval of the new *Sign Code*. Mr. Miller responded that he thinks it is poor representation.

Commissioner Ferchau stated that he raised the question also [about whether he should recuse himself]. He said, "It is a quandary we face in a lot of the matters in the *LDC* discussion; there are a lot of us that are benefitting by decisions here. We feel we enable businesses to be successful and agree we are all benefitting. Apparently there was something in the joint meeting [with City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission] that emphasized their [Commissioners Ferguson's and Larson's] benefit from the sign in place. He stated he acknowledges the issue, but doesn't have an answer.

City Manager Ken Coleman provided further explanation. Staff did follow-up on a question posed concerning conflict of interest. It pertained particularly to a sign that was purchased that is not currently allowed, and if the *Code* were passed it would be allowed. They [Ferguson and Larson] would make gain in something already purchased. The others [Seymour, Riggs, and Ferchau] have signs that are already allowed.

Commissioner Ferchau observed that others on the Commission have Sandwich Boards and lighting that is are allowed, how do we address this *LDC*? Is it on a line item basis? Director Westbay responded that the *LDC* review is a legislative process; meaning that it is for the community at large, not individual property. The Planning and Zoning Commission has the prerogative to address the *LDC*. City Manager Coleman said that Council wants to see the *LDC* as a whole, but there is a question on the *Sign Code* that needed to be resolved and taken care of separately.

Mr. Miller stated, "I believe that the electronic sign in question is an approved sign under the existing *Code*. The new *Sign Code* is a matter of interpretation. I own one of the signs as well and was asked to stop using its full function because the interpretation is that it is not allowed. I think there is misbalance on way things are being handled – we are allowing sandwich boards."

Mr. Miller listed his specific concerns and made some observations:

- "Electronic signs – the proposed *Sign Code* stifles all opportunities of these signs;
- The newspaper article asked if they fit character of the community – what is the character of the community? I propose it is a service hub to the valley; we aren't a national historic district, when we refer to the character that is how it should be referred to;
- Regarding them causing a distraction – to me a distraction would be that you notice them. No one has had an accident because of the "Pizza" sign – the *purpose* is to draw attention.
- He asked the dollar amount of having the City as additional insured for License Agreements for Sandwich Board signs. Director Westbay responded that the amount of coverage comes from *State Statute* (\$600,000) but insurance companies have \$1 million coverage.
- Prohibited signs include inflatable signs – there are some for special events that should be allowed (such as inflatable gorillas);

- The definition of Animated signs and Patterned Illusionary Movement signs means that I can't have a tracing boarder on my sign, or flashing;
- Who enforces 5,000 nits under the General regulations – the “nit picker”?
- *General Regulations for Illuminated signs* says that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) determines Apparent Sunset. Why should I have to call NOAA to find out when to turn my sign off?
- Under Electronic Message Centers it says I cannot have scrolling, traveling, flashing spinning, rotating or moving effects – I can have a single message and can't use any of the technology that was referred to earlier.
- I am beside myself, not because I purchased one, I would have the same complaints if I hadn't. I encourage you to come to Main Street and try to support yourself. As a businessman I can ensure you I won't do anything to deter from the community. I purchased a piece of equipment I felt was approved under the *Code*. I have been told by Council members they think that sign is atrocious. I have had effective return on that sign. It is an effective way to translate my message to my clients. It gives a clear message. That is what a sign is about.
- I hope that the P&Z takes a lot longer look at Electronic signs and Sandwich Board signs making sure the technology that is here today can be used. We have to do everything we can to keep up. We will not become Las Vegas; there will not be a proliferation. There are five out there and 400 businesses. It is an alternative way to get the message across. I ask you to allow them and the full function of them. I don't want to call NOAA but would entertain a curfew on highly illuminated signs. We have gone way over board. We are making government thicker everyday and tougher to do business on Main Street every day. It is tough out there. Take another look at this. Walk downtown and talk to these people. I can show you what it [my sign] can do.
- I appreciate the ability to sit in front of you. Let's go back to a handshake and pat on the back [and less regulation].”

Chair Beda responded that “One of the reasons we are here is different interpretations. That is why we pulled this out; we are faced with it now.” Mr. Miller responded, “But illuminated signs have to be password protected. It is just a complication. This is a complaint-driven issue. There have been about six complaints. I put a message on my sign and had 15 people come in and 12 phone calls. I haven't had any complaints. So I tripled the return compared to complaints.”

Warren Wilcox addressed the Commission, stating he has been a resident since 1968. He made several observations:

- “One of the complaints I hear is that we [City residents] know where we are going to get to a business, but we have a lot of visitors who say they can't find anything in Gunnison. You have to address the fact that it isn't greedy business owners, but people who are trying to find a service.
- I have never been offended by any sign I have seen in this county, I can't understand why anyone would be. One of the first things I saw when I came here was bank signs with time, temperature, and announcements, and thought that was a nice service.
- Regarding businesses on the east/west streets off of Main, it is difficult to tell what is in those buildings; it should be feasible for them to have large enough signs to tell what business is there.

- A lot of people who can afford to travel are older – those are the ones with money and willing to spend it. We need to make it easier for them to find businesses.
- I don't understand the idea of 1997 being the grandfathering point, if you are changing it now, why not use this date? It doesn't seem like a logical path to pick some date out of the air.
- I don't understand some of the electronic problems; they are not any more distracting than the bank sign."

Commissioner Ferchau asked Mr. Wilcox if there are there any aspects he finds too limiting, and if, in principle, he is fine with signage. Mr. Wilcox responded, "I understand you are making them larger – that is good. I have never noticed anything that caused irritation. [The electronic sign standards] may be too far into the process of detail that makes it not reasonable. You shouldn't have to have a password or limit the timing of brightness. A sign is a sign. If it gets that hard to operate, it is too complicated. I shouldn't have to hire someone to change a sign."

Councilor Seymour stated that regarding sign size, "Under this proposed *Sign Code*, I don't think there is a sign in the city that would push that envelope." Mr. Wilcox responded, "I think that is good, a necessary change. Under the current economy people can't afford to build new signs."

Chris Madison addressed the Commission and made some observations:

- "I agree with what both gentlemen said.
- Electronic signs – that is the biggest question. You referred to the United States Sign Council. One thought is that with all these functions being regulated, it would be stifling their use if they have to be limited. If they are programmed to do these things, then they must be okay at a higher level. They have never been too distracting. I understand that we need to preserve as much as can as far as the look and feel of Gunnison, but we don't want to be stifling. People will go out of town; we can't bring in revenue if people are going to Montrose because regulations impede business growth.
- I suggest you take a good look at electronic signs, they are here to stay.
- If signs are built with the functions, they are meant to be used that way.
- Think about the future of the community and try to help businesses grow."

Paula Swenson addressed the Commission. She said:

- "I got in trouble in 1986 when I put a chalk board on the sidewalk.
- I commend you for taking this on, it is long overdue. The *Sign Code* is ambiguous for business owners and property owners. It [revising the *Sign Code*] is hard and grueling and people get upset.
- There are a few things that are good: increase in size, Sandwich Boards to be legal, I am also thankful that it is administrative review for License Agreements.
- Regarding electronic signs, there are lots of pros and cons. You shouldn't have to ask NOAA, just have a time frame."

Commissioner Ferchau asked, "So you support electronic signage with a scheduled time?" Ms. Swenson replied that she mostly looked at sandwich board signs. There is give and take to keep it under control.

Kirstin Dickey addressed the Commission. She stated she recently opened a sign shop and will be a downtown merchant. She observed:

- “The new standards are easier;
- I love the window lettering;
- One thing that concerns me is banners. [In her letter], Delaney [Keating] mentioned that under 30 days is good. I don’t like banners as permanent signage. It is a concern with the look and feel of Gunnison. If I were writing these I would move banners to temporary signage.
- Off-premise signage – will there be some kind of distance?” Director Westbay said that there is no specification. Ms. Dickey responded, “That concerns me. What if a Main Street business is advertising for the airport? The signage should be for your space.” Several Commissioners responded:
  - Chair Beda interjected that it is because of limiting on some square footage.
  - Commissioner Riggs said that “When we focused on it we used my business as example – putting a sign on Main Street to get people to turn a corner and walk down a block. We are trying to create opportunities for businesses that are not in prominent locations.”
  - Councilor Seymour said that it also allows use of window space in a different way, or a vacant store front.
  - Commissioner Ferchau stated, “What you are pointing out is there will be different opinions, some in favor, some not. Are we doing the most we can to promote business? We won’t all be happy, but we need maximum flexibility. Specifically on banners – I have mixed feelings on whether I like them or not. Temporary versus not – most people that shop downtown are not permanent residents, it is the visitors. So to them, if they are here a week, the banner is only here a week. The next week other people see it. Sometimes they can be weathered and tacky. Maybe we could have a time of year to take them down. Bright orange “Welcome Hunters” signs have always served a purpose. Everyone is here because they love being here. Rick [Miller] could have bought a larger sign, but he doesn’t want it to look like Vegas either.”

John Solanek addressed the Commission. He said,

- “Mr. Miller and Mr. Wilcox said a lot. I want to reiterate the character of town. Three dimensional formation and movement creates energy. Energy is contagious. It is understanding and being sensitive to the brick and mortar environment we live in, not the internet.
- We do have more people coming in who don’t know where they are going.
- Sandwich Boards create the opportunity to stop to see what is there. It makes sense to create that in the personality of a town.
- I have travelled with my kids a lot this winter and it is constant - why does Gunnison refuse to come up to specific terms that everyone else has? The national economy is the same everywhere. It feels different everywhere. [At a recent hockey tournament] we had eight different teams here and I was a coordinator so it was a convenience for people to ask where to go to eat. So, I gave directions. So often the responses were that they have never seen a town that refuses to promote themselves; there was no energy or feel; one person said they didn’t know a business was open until people came out. It [Electronic Signs] creates that movement, excitement and energy that this town seems to lack. The illusion of something going on will stop people and create three dimensional activity of movement.

- I encourage you to really lighten up on the sign laws. Sandwich boards create community.

Wayne Caska addressed the Commission and stated that he and his wife have a business on Main Street.

- He asked whether the City will allow restaurants to put offsite signs on Highway 50 so that as people travelling through will stop by knowing other businesses besides McDonalds and Taco Bell are here. They need to see good food establishments. Director Westbay replied that it would be allowed under the new *Code*.
- He said that regarding Electronic signs, they should be ok, if they are tasteful, but he wouldn't want to see all businesses have them, and they should be small.

Navid Navidi addressed the Commission. He said:

- "For the record, I agree with everything Rick and Warren said. Let people have flexibility. Let them use the full potential of the sign. I have been in business her for 30 years; there are a lot of people who make decisions who don't rely on making money in Gunnison. Let the businesses in this town breathe."

Vicki Johnson of The Sign Guys addressed the Commission. She said:

- "I have read a lot of codes. This is easy to read. It is in the middle of the codes I have read.
- Where are real estate signs? Are they temporary signs?
- Allowing Wall signs to be 12 inches away from the wall is a good addition.
- I don't see Electric signs restricting businesses. You should let business do what can to promote themselves."

John Solanek returned to the podium:

- "Signs that are existing right now, based on old school signs that are too big, do they have to be smaller?" Director Westbay replied that, "All nonconforming signs existing prior to the existing *Sign Code* are grandfathered. If it needs repair, they can fix it. If there are structural problems, we will allow them to change that. When the business is gone for more than six months or year, then that sign is no longer allowed to be used. For example, the Safeway sign; they can keep that sign as long as their total sign area is not exceeded. Once they take the sign down, it can't go back up." Mr. Solanek asked, "With all of this restriction, is it stopping community businesses from upgrading their curb appeal?" Director Westbay responded, using the Safeway sign as an example. It would have to be reduced to 60 square feet if they took down the old sign. Regarding the Pizza Mountain sign; if they decide they want a new sign, the size would it be reduced. They could apply for an Historic sign where the sign is exempt and the sign area isn't counted.
- Commissioner Ferchau clarified that it is the sign, not the sign area. He continued, by saying, "We have heard comments that we need to allow more square footage. What if there was no *Sign Code* and it was limitless? How different would it look? We are self-limiting individually. It probably wouldn't look any different. We aren't allowing that to happen. We concluded we are ok with some limitations. We have public hearings to make sure we are consistent with what the public thinks."

Warren Wilcox observed that looking at signs on Main Street in pictures of 1890, think about how energetic it looked then as compared to now.

**Commission Questions**

Commissioner Ferchau clarified that for Off-premise signs, the location that has the sign is the one that has to count the square footage. He then asked about the square footage for signage on buildings with two street frontages. Director Westbay stated that the aggregate sign area would still be 150 square feet. It would be proportional to the square footage.

**Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Szymanski said, "It was great public input. We have been working on it a long time, hearing it from you is helpful. It is challenging. As far as our process, we need to go back into this for more discussion."

Commissioner Ferchau: "I appreciate your input and concur that we need more flexibility and more openness to flashing and moving signs; we need to make some corrections and cleanup some things (i.e., banners and real estate signs)."

Councilor Seymour: "I appreciate the input. We heard a lot about the Electronic Message signs. By most interpretations the current *Code* does not allow them. We have taken a great leap. We can go back and look at them. We need to support business as much as we can. This Board is heavily presented by businesses. We also want to preserve the character of the community. I am excited to look at it again; clean a few things up. We have a good foundation and are in a good position to move forward."

Commissioner Riggs: "I mirror those sentiments. Thank you for contributing. It is good to have fresh eyes on it. Mike Darnell said it best – this is a living document and will be evolving. We do need to continue discussion at the next meeting. I encourage you to attend and provide input."

Chair Beda: "Thank you all for coming. This is my third or fourth time working on this since I've been here. This has been the most positive. We know businesses are hurting. We know we need to give them a break. We can all work together. We are going to revisit this." He asked Director to explain the procedure to continue discussion.

SW: Procedure was discussed. The Commission has 21 days to take action, or could extend the time period since the City is the applicant. It was decided to close public hearing and take action at a later date.

Chair Beda closed the public hearing at 9:23 p.m. It was decided to continue discussion on April 18th at 7:00 p.m.

**XII. ADJOURN. Chair Beda adjourned the meeting at 9:28.**

---

Bob Beda, Chair

Attest:

---

Pam Cunningham