

MANDAN ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MINUTES

February 26, 2013

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

ROLL CALL: Robert (Bob) Vayda/President, Steve Nardello/Fire Chief, Steph Smith, Jason Krebsbach, Richard Barta/Building Official, Rick Zander, & Kim Fettig/City Engineering.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jerome Gangl, Leonard Bullinger

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS: Proposal by Eric & Sandy Vogel of E & J Vogel Construction on an expansion to construct two self-storage buildings with 36 units in total located at 2231 3rd St SE in Lark Commercial Park 2nd. Currently, they are looking at constructing these two buildings and matching the existing adjacent buildings there. The colors will match. The exterior colors are evergreen and iced white. Steve indicated it appears they have proper access for the fire trucks and turnaround and that it will be hard surfaced all the way to the second building. It is designed wide enough to allow semis access.

Kim motioned to approve as presented.

Richard seconded.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passes unanimously.

DISCUSSION: Discussion of term limits, procedures and requirements for MARC members. Reviewed previous minutes from November 2, 2010 that reflects what decisions were made for three terms (9 years) that a member can serve. If they want to stay on as a member after that, then the member would need to reapply and submit an application. After reviewing, it was agreed that it will remain the same as it is still meeting our needs and it is done fairly and works well.

OTHER BUSINESS: Discussed certified letters that were sent out to the businesses that were in violation of our sign policy. Certified letters were sent out on January 9, 2013. All were signed for by January 15, 2013. No one has complied yet as of today, February 26, 2013; therefore, we will be contacting the City Attorney Malcolm Brown to take further action.

Bob mentioned another item that he researched and it goes back to about 1-1/2 years, by the Seven Seas, they built a new building to the west and they were supposed to put in trees, which was part of the minutes and they haven't done anything so he would suggest that we discuss it here and take an approach that maybe the building department needs to write them a letter. They also cut out some trees they were not supposed to so research the minutes on that. It might need a letter from Malcolm, as Steve recalls they came in to us for their second phase and it was brought up at that time that they would do it and they indicated that would

not be a problem. They put concrete in there but they can just cut squares in there and put trees in, but they never did that. As a courtesy, Richard thinks we should just contact Shannon that it needs to be addressed.

Jason brought up one that comes to mind was Big Willy's. Richard stated he stopped in there about four months ago and told them to contact him.

MINUTES: Approval of the minutes from January 22, 2013.

Kim motioned to approve.

Jason seconded.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passes unanimously.

MINUTES: Approval of the minutes from January 29, 2013.

Kim motioned to approve.

Richard seconded.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passes unanimously.

Further discussion was made regarding signs on roofs in the policy. Basically, we don't want signs directly mounted on a high slope roof but it depends on the situation so we left this so they could bring their proposed project into us and we can make a decision on a case by case basis because it would really be a judgment call. Our policy 18.5 reads – no wall sign shall extend beyond the width of the building or project above the roof line. Roof signs shall not project above the roof line, this includes mounting brackets. Canopy signs shall not extend more than 12 inches above or below a canopy.

Jason inquired about if anyone has opinion or a sense on how businesses are doing with temporary signs, are they adhering to the 30 day limit or abusing it. This will become a bigger and bigger problem as the city grows. We need to determine how these things will be handled and followed up on or enforced. Title IVX is where this is addressed and the city doesn't have the staff to follow up on this. The city has the ability to remove the sign and assess the expense to the property owner's taxes. They get one warning and if they don't comply, the city comes in, removes it and charges the taxpayer. Malcolm will need to follow up on these businesses for noncompliance. We have to decide how we are going to address this by speaking to Malcolm and what we can do to enforce this. Whatever is decided, it was mentioned that maybe we should have this as part of our sign policy.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Approved by:

Date

Transcribed by:

Rachel Hastings/Admin. Assistant