

MANDAN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MINUTES

FEBRUARY 1, 2011

ROLL CALL: Leonard Bullinger/President, Joe Lukach/Vice President, Robert (Bob) Vayda, Jerome Gangl, Richard Barta/Building Official, Steve Nardello/Fire Chief and Kim Fettig/City Engineering.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jason Krebsbach and Rick Zander.

GUESTS:

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS: Proposal by Dave Mees, Heart River Storage, to construct three cold storage buildings at 2312 and 2400 5 St SE.

Mr. Mees indicated he purchased the property adjacent to his existing (116 units) cold storage facility and intends on building three additional structures. (1) 20 x 94 and (2) 40 x 98; 48 total units; same color, style and design as his existing buildings.

Rick joins the meeting at 1:02 p.m.

Leonard questioned the security lighting and Mr. Mees indicated there will be wall packs installed.

Kim made a motion to approve as presented.

Richard seconded.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passes unanimously.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS: Continue with discussion regarding Ordinance 1013.

Richard started the discussion with that he would like to see some verbiage that would give us the authority to require them (applicants) to come before this commission for review concerning existing homes that would become damaged due to fire or etc. Would they be allowed to rebuild? Jerome asked for clarification: Fringe, Core or both. Richard stated for the Core only. Richard noted that it has been the policy, in the past, the City allows the re-build if the same footprint is used.

Bob questioned the current verbiage used; footprint. Should this word be used? He asked if a larger or smaller blueprint could be used if a “similar” footprint was used. Richard stated that what he considers the same footprint is a foundation of the same size and shape or “like it was”. Bob stated that’s what he was getting at. Like it was. What if they wanted to add a couple feet to the previous size? Richard stated that then he would not approve and/or allow the new construction because it is not the same footprint. Steve asked, what if all setbacks are met and the zone requirements are met. Could they rebuild using a smaller/larger footprint? Steve added that he wouldn’t want to buy a house; have it burn down; and not be able to rebuild. Bob asked if a house burned down; and the owner purchased the land next door; wanted to rebuild a larger home on both properties; could they do it? Richard stated that the way the ordinance reads now, no. Richard added; he would at least like to see some wordage to allow them to come before this commission with some type of proposal so they wouldn’t lose value. Bob again states that he feels the word “footprint” should be addressed. Richard verifies that the word footprint is only used in a letter format and not in the actual ordinance.

Richard adds, that even though it’s a different zoning (commercial), it’s permissible to have a single family dwelling. He also thought it would be easier to re-write part of the grid. Add f. and implement “R” for review. Jerome thought that if similar square footage was indicated... Joe asked about following the setbacks upon review. Discussion then followed regarding lot coverage for different zonings. Leonard questioned sub-section h. on Page 10. This refers to development in the downtown Core. Richard thought this was geared more towards commercial and since this is residential, the motion should reflect that.

Richard made a motion to:

1. *Grid Definition, Page 3: include a notation that the present zone regulations must be met and the structure must be “similar” in nature.*
2. *Grid District, Page 3: replace the dashes with “R” for review.*
3. *Add in sub-section f to Page 3: indicates that this project must be reviewed.*

Rick seconded.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passes unanimously.

It was noted that Mary would forward a draft of said changes for review as soon as possible.

MINUTES: Approve the minutes from the January 18th meeting.

Rick made a motion to approve.

Kim seconded.

Upon vote, the motion passes unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Approved by:

Date

Transcribed by:
Mary Fahlsing/Admin. Specialist