

**Excerpt from the  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**Minneapolis Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)  
Planning Division**

250 South Fourth Street, Room 300  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385  
(612) 673-2597 Phone  
(612) 673-2526 Fax  
(612) 673-2157 TDD

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

DATE: March 8, 2007

TO: Steve Poor, Manager, Community Planning & Economic Development -  
Planning Division

FROM: Jason Wittenberg, Supervisor, Community Planning & Economic Development -  
Planning Division, Development Services

CC: Barbara Sporlein, Director, Community Planning & Economic Development  
Planning Division

SUBJECT: Planning Commission decisions of March 5, 2007

---

The following actions were taken by the Planning Commission on March 5, 2007. As you know, the Planning Commission's decisions on items other than rezonings, text amendments, vacations, 40 Acre studies and comprehensive plan amendments are final subject to a ten calendar day appeal period before permits can be issued:

Commissioners Present: Huynh, LaShomb, Mains, Nordyke, Norkus-Crampton, Schiff, Tucker and Williams – 8

Not Present: President Motzenbecker (excused) and Commissioner El-Hindi

---

**4. Anne Gardner (Vac-1509, Ward: 13), Drainage and Utility Easements located on the properties at 3809, 3811 and 3813 Sheridan Ave S ([Becca Farrar](#)).**

**A. Vacation:** Application by Anne Gardner, on behalf of Coen Partners, Inc., to vacate the following right-of-way: All of the platted Drainage and Utility Easements (located on the properties at 3809, 3811 and 3813 Sheridan Ave S) in Lot 1, Block 1, BILTMORE ON CALHOUN Addition to Minneapolis, as of record at the Hennepin County Recorder's Office, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council accept the findings and **approve** the vacation subject to the provisions of easements dedicated to Comcast Cable and Xcel Energy over the entire described areas to be vacated.

Commissioner Tucker opened the public hearing.

No one was present to speak to the item.

Commissioner Tucker closed the public hearing.

Commissioner LaShomb moved approval of the staff recommendation (Huynh seconded).

The motion carried 6-0 (Commissioners Mains and Nordyke not present for the vote).

**13. Global One Hotel (BZZ-3419, PL-211 and Vac-1450, Ward: 7), 1125 4<sup>th</sup> Ave S ([Tara Beard](#)).**

**A. Conditional Use Permit:** Application by Mark Globus of Convention Center Hotel, LLC for a conditional use permit to increase wall sign height on two elevations of the proposed building for the property between 12th St S, 4th Ave S, 11th St S, and Highway 65. This property has never been platted and does not yet have a legal address or property identification number.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a conditional use permit for wall signs on the west and south elevations notwithstanding height limits for a building higher than 6 stories or 84 feet in a downtown district at 1125 4th Ave S.

**B. Variance:** Application by Mark Globus of Convention Center Hotel, LLC for a variance to increase the number of wall signs permitted higher than 6 stories or 84 feet from 2 to 3 for the property between 12th St S, 4th Ave S, 11th St S, and Highway 65. This property has never been platted and does not yet have a legal address or property identification number.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **denied** the application for a variance to increase the number of wall signs that exceed the maximum permitted height in the B4S district from 2 to 3 at 1125 4th Ave S.

**C. Variance:** Application by Mark Globus of Convention Center Hotel, LLC for a variance to increase sign height for a freestanding sign from 8 to 20 feet for the property between 12th St S, 4th Ave S, 11th St S, and Highway 65. This property has never been platted and does not yet have a legal address or property identification number.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **denied** the application for a variance to increase the maximum height of a monument sign from 8 to 20 feet at 1125 4th Ave S.

**D. Variance:** Application by Mark Globus of Convention Center Hotel, LLC for a variance to reduce the on-site parking requirement from 99 to 38 spaces for the property between 12th St S, 4th Ave S, 11th St S, and Highway 65. This property has never been platted and does not yet have a legal address or property identification number.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a variance to reduce required parking from 99 to 38 spaces at 1125 4th Ave S.

**E. Site Plan Review:** Application by Mark Globus of Convention Center Hotel, LLC for a site plan review for the property between 12th St S, 4th Ave S, 11th St S, and Highway 65. This property has never been platted and does not yet have a legal address or property identification number.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a site plan review at 1125 4th Ave S, subject to the following conditions:

1. No blank walls exceeding 25 feet will be located on any elevation of the building.
2. Provide at least 10% windows on all floors of the south elevation.
3. Provide screening via a hedge, fence, or combination of the two between the trash/loading area and 12th St S. as required by section 530.170 (b).
4. Non-durable EIFS will be replaced with an acceptable alternative, such as stucco.
5. One or a combination of the following: curb bump outs, crosswalk signage, and speed humps, will be provided at the new crosswalk proposed at 12th St S and 4th Ave S if permitted by Public Works.
6. CPED Planning staff review and approval of the final site and landscaping plans.
7. All site improvements shall be completed by April 13, 2008, unless extended by the Zoning Administrator, or the permit may be revoked for noncompliance.
8. The Travel Demand Management Plan will be completed and approved by the Planning Director prior to the applicant receiving a building permit.
9. A conditional use permit for the three surface parking spaces proposed in the Downtown Parking Overlay District will either be approved or the spaces will be removed prior to final site plan approval.

**F. Vacation:** Application by Mark Globus of Convention Center Hotel, LLC for a vacation of the Grant Street right-of-way east of 4th Ave S and an easement for public alley purposes where the existing building now stands. The property is between 12th St S, 4th Ave S, 11th St S, and Highway 65. This property has never been platted and does not yet have a legal address or property identification number.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council accept the findings and **approve** the vacation.

**G. Preliminary and Final Plat:** Application by Mark Globus of Convention Center Hotel, LLC for a preliminary and final plat for the property between 12th St S, 4th Ave S, 11th St S, and Highway 65. This property has never been platted and does not yet have a legal address or property identification number.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission adopted the findings and **approved** the application for a preliminary and final plat at 1125 4th Ave S

Staff Beard presented the staff report.

Commissioner Tucker: Are these new drawings since Committee of the Whole?

Staff Beard: They are.

Staff Beard continued with the staff report.

Commissioner Tucker: Do your conditions one and two...are they met by this newest design that you showed us?

Staff Beard: Conditions one and two of the site plan review?

Commissioner Tucker: No blank walls and ten percent windows.

Staff Beard: These aren't line drawings to scale and I just got these this afternoon so I haven't been able to do a full staff analysis. It definitely looks like they have mitigated a lot of the blank wall conditions. There are a couple spaces that I'm not sure were being met...

Commissioner Tucker: So if we just leave it in there then that can be worked out.

Staff Beard: Right. They clearly, on the south elevation, have added many windows. I'm not quite sure if we'd be to ten percent.

Staff Beard concluded the staff report.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: It looks like on the corner where the point sticks up, right around the crosswalk, there's nothing to indicate to a driver that you're entering a different zone. It just flows right in there so it just looks like another turn off to avoid getting on 94 or whatever. I'm just wondering if there are some other possibilities that can be discussed with Public Works sort of like, as one possibility of maybe making that, rather than keeping that curb like a v-shape, make it a true right angle, more so it looks like a standard curb with a crosswalk so there is a real clear indication there that this isn't just another turn off for automobiles. I don't see any cueing, any visual cueing, for somebody moving quickly down that road who isn't used to having something there, which why would they because there hasn't been anything there, to make it a little safer for pedestrians because once we have pedestrians there, there are going to be a lot of them. We're also going to have a lot of people from out of town that aren't used to the area who are going to get lost with all the streets going this way and that way and I'm just looking for something on that corner that might look like more of a standard curb that could be a visual cue to somebody coming down there that this isn't just a turn off, this is a legitimate pedestrian crosswalk because everything else around there is very auto-oriented. Has that been discussed or did that come up at all or is that something that we could possibly discuss with Public Works?

Staff Beard: When the applicant first came and started working with staff, they worked with Public Works very early on. In fact, they completed PDR back in August of 2006. They explored a variety of options to change access to this site, including could south become a two-way, could there be a curb cut off of 11<sup>th</sup>, could there be a traffic light put in here? Sitting in on a lot of those meetings and being at PDR, it seemed like a lot of answers to those questions were no. I can't speak to that specific issue. I don't know that straightening 4<sup>th</sup> Ave out was one of the

specific requests of the applicant. It was specifically said it wouldn't work. My suspicion is that it would have a lot of domino effect on how the area worked, but without traffic engineering expertise, I can't speak to that right at the moment.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: It seems like what we're trying to do is more place making in the front there and more place making for pedestrians so I was just trying to figure out a way...

Staff Beard: My opinion of the discussion here that I thought made the most sense from a Planning perspective, and I'm hoping from a Public Works perspective it works as that bump out, because this is a one way and this is a one way and this is a one way, the most dangerous situation that I see happening here is the car that realizes suddenly they're going on to 35W swerving over. If this were to be a bump out that narrowed this significantly, I see that as not being an option and they'd just have to get on the highway and figure out how to get back downtown. That showed the most promise to me from a Planning perspective.

Commissioner Tucker: I agree that the bump out seems to be what we're looking for most. I drove by there yesterday and the piles of snow seem to do a lot for the traffic calming so perhaps as a condition we should have a permanent pile of snow there.

Commissioner Tucker opened the public hearing.

Mark Globus (1225 LaSalle Ave): I represent the developer Global One Commercial. Dan Pellinen, our architect, is going to make a few comments. I'm a downtown resident. I live right downtown. I'm sensitive to new development and the types of issues it causes. We really are working closely with the neighborhoods here. I received a call from Lisa Goodman, we want to work with her. We want to help out the Grant Park folks. We wanted to have a nice sign up on our east façade facing HCMC and the dome, it's important for our marketing. We want people to know what the building is, but we felt the people in Grant Park didn't want it there. Lisa Goodman didn't want it there so we've decided that we'll take the top sign entirely off our building to be a good neighbor. There won't be any light from that top sign going into Grant Park. We felt that those folks deserved that and we're here to work with them. We've also made some important concessions as far as making the building more architecturally pleasing on the south side. There was also a lot of misunderstanding in Grant Park as far as the east side of the building went. The east side of the building that faces Grant Park actually looks exactly as the front side of the building does except it has no porte-cochere; it's a five color brick design, it's a lot of architectural elements in there. Frankly, many of them play off of Grant Park. It's really a nice side of the building. There's really not a back side of the building. We're excited about the project.

Commissioner Tucker: Could you just specify which of the two signs you want to keep? What sides are they on?

Mark Globus: We would like upper sign facing the south towards 35W as it comes into the city and on the western side of the hotel which would face into the CBD and sorts.

Commissioner Tucker: A question to staff, if we deny the three and allow the two, do we have to specify the two or they just get to choose?

Staff Wittenberg: We could ask the applicant to specify if they're removing one of those or if the commission has a strong preference you could specify or you could leave it up to them, it's the commission's choice.

Commissioner Tucker: You said your architect had a few words for us?

Mark Globus: Yes. Thanks for your time.

Dan Pellinen (150 Front St #42, Prescott, WI): I'm from Toshie Montgomery Architects out of Richfield, MN. We did have the meeting with the Committee of the Whole and with the neighborhood...the three neighborhood organizations were invited to the meeting. We did get good feedback. It was very valuable on the south elevation. As you can see...adding a lot more windows and architectural elements on that side. The other thing that was requested by the neighborhood meeting and by the window requirements was the addition of windows down on the first floor of the building on the east elevation, the side that faces 65 and the side that faces Grant Park. I would like to address the other sign variance that we're asking for on the monument sign. We believe that the site and the traffic...the city dictates how the traffic goes around the site, it is a hardship on the site and it's a safety issue on the site because of the odd shaped size of the site. It's hard to get any of the building down towards the south end of the site that would allow building signage to act as the signage for the 12<sup>th</sup> St exit. As presented by Tara, a lot of those people that use 4<sup>th</sup> Ave S, it's sort of that "oops, I have to make a quick turn off so I don't get on 35W and take a left at that intersection". With that one-way street coming down to that site and trying to find that building, it's sort of a hard way to find that building, people need to make a decision before they can see an eight foot sign so they need to see signage above the cars in front of them so that they can make the lane changes and then make the curve at a slower speed and help those pedestrians. As you can see on the site plan, there is no back of the building. We have four streets. We have to have service to the building. The way it works out is that the service is on the south side. The ordinance recommends that screening of the surface drive has to be put in. We're looking at, with encroachment permits, as you can see the landscaping since you last seen it... that we actually put a berm with some perennials and shrubs on that point that would screen our service drive and give a goodbye gateway to the city, but then we would need to have a higher monument sign to allow for the screening and to allow for those other things that I discussed. We're looking at the 20 foot monument sign back off the site and also improving the screening and the landscaping at that area. The way we're looking at the plan is that if the 20 foot monument sign is not allowed there, we can't look at trying to ask for the encroachment permit to put the berm in and to put the plantings in there because then it's going to get a little high. Our sign and our berming and screening is going to conflict with each other. I guess how that's how we would address the monument signage. As stated, we are going to take off the east sign, the tall top east sign. With emails and conversations with Lisa Goodman, I think that is probably one of the biggest thing that the neighborhood objected to with the building.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: We had talked about trying to do some place making in the front since it looks like that street didn't have a lot of car traffic, trying to make it a little safer for pedestrians or make it a little more inviting for people coming in and out of the hotel. Can you tell me what you've been working with along those lines and how wide the sidewalks will be at the...it looks like it narrows at certain areas there and I was just curious how that plays out.

Dan Pellinen: The sidewalk is eight feet wide all the way through this site. The building does, at the corner, come almost to the edge of the sidewalk. More importantly, which it doesn't really

show on that plan, the parking garage underneath actually comes to the property line [tape ended]...and it comes across here. The driveway and the porte-cochere is actually above the parking lot. We've added some trees in there. There are some trees in there right now, but unfortunately they're going to be lost during construction. We'll have to add the trees back in there. That's why you see the brick pavers on top of that area and then we have planters that are going to be in those areas.

Dick Thoreson (500 E Grant #1901): I live right across the street and this is in our front yard. My first feeling was that they can't do this to us, but after looking at it and getting all the help from Council Member Goodman and the help from the staff, I think that a lot of my concerns have been cleared up. I thank Mark for taking that sign off the east side. That's been one of the big things that we've been concerned with. I noticed that in item A, it still talks about three signs so I'm sure that those will come off. It says "three elevations" under the conditional use so we do thank him for that. The monument sign, the way it's going to be placed and everything, it doesn't bother me. I think that the parking thing at least needs to be considered. I don't know that much about parking, but I hope that the staff really considers or requires that they do have arrangements to park in these lots because if you see what happens at the auditorium or the convention center with all the people at the shows, people that come down for the concerts and so forth. I'm wondering where they're going to find the parking. I'd rather see them doing that, though, then adding a couple stories to put parking on there. Generally speaking, I think we appreciate what's been done. It's an architectural nightmare I imagine to try to put a hotel on that tiny little thumbprint of land. I think the architects have done a decent job there. Could I just ask three questions... is the placement on the site plan pretty much solid the way it is or are they likely to jiggle it around?

Commissioner Tucker: That's what we're approving.

Dick Thoreson: So then it would sit there, it wouldn't move around? Ok. Second question, will the roof be free of unsightly clutter? Living downtown, I've looked down on some nice area. Some places have nice tops, other places have a bunch of clutter. I hope they can do something about keeping mechanical clutter off there. Thirdly, the trash and recycle, will that be indoors or outdoors? I hate to see dumpsters sitting outside because that will be in the view of...

Commissioner Tucker: Thus the screening, I think asked for in one of the conditions.

Dick Thoreson: But I'm still wondering whether it's indoors or outdoors.

Staff Beard: It is indoors. Well, it's enclosed.

Dick Thoreson: It's indoors? Ok. I guess that's all I have.

Kathy Olson (500 E Grant St) [not on sign-in sheet]: I can't believe I sat here for three and a half hours to find out that the sign I was going to object to has been taken off. Thank you very much.

Andrew Howard [not on sign-in sheet]: I'm chair of the Downtown Minneapolis Land Use Neighborhood Association. We're very excited about the project. My only recommendation is that you go with the variance on C and allow the 20 foot monument sign.

Commissioner Tucker closed the public hearing.

Commissioner LaShomb: [not on tape]

Commissioner Tucker: May I suggest we specify the west and south?

Commissioner LaShomb: Sure (Nurdyke seconded). I don't think this needs discussion. I think we've talked it to death.

Commissioner Tucker: Ok. All in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 5-0 (Mains and Schiff not present for the vote).

Commissioner LaShomb: I'm going to move staff recommendation on B which is the variance on the signs (Nurdyke seconded).

Commissioner Tucker: The staff recommendation is to deny. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 5-0 (Mains and Schiff not present for the vote).

Commissioner LaShomb: I'm going to move approval of the variance on C and the reason is because I think the argument about street configuration is correct. There's such a strange configuration of streets there that, while I don't like signage overall, I think it's such a strange configuration of streets that I certainly would want some notice of what was coming if I were trying to find the place. I don't think that in this particular location having a 20 foot sign is particularly detrimental to the city's interest. I think it's probably a good idea so you don't have people who suddenly say "oh, there's a sign" and they go bolting into another lane to try to make the turn into the property.

Commissioner Tucker: Thus making the crossing that more difficult.

Commissioner LaShomb: Yeah, making it much more difficult. Whether it affects the screening or not, I don't really know, but I think the street configuration justifies the sign. They can't do anything about the street configuration.

Commissioner Tucker: So you're moving approval of item C. Is there a second? (Commissioner Williams seconded). Any further discussion?

Commissioner Nurdyke: I think that you're right, it's going to be confusing there. I don't think it's going to be confusing enough to warrant putting that kind of a large scale sign there so I speak against the motion and ask that we go with the staff recommendation to deny the variance on C.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I guess I wanted to clarify... is this speaking to the signs that we've already been talking about going from three signs to two signs?

Commissioner Tucker: No, this is the monument one on the ground level.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: Ok, thank you.

Commissioner Tucker: Other discussion? Ok. The motion is to approve the variance for the monument sign. All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion failed 3-2.

Commissioner LaShomb: Is 15 feet ok? I'll move 15 feet, how's that? Twelve is too low.

Commissioner Tucker: Your motion is to go to 15 feet? Do we have a second for that? Lacking a second, do you want to try for 10?

Commissioner LaShomb: No, I don't.

Commissioner Tucker: Ok. Can we get a motion on item C?

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: I move that we adopt the staff recommendation (Huynh seconded).

Commissioner Tucker: Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 4-1 (Mains and Schiff not present for the vote).

Commissioner LaShomb: I'll move the variance on D, approval (Nurdyke seconded).

Commissioner Tucker: Any discussion?

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: This is dealing with the parking, correct? I guess the only thing that I'm thinking about, and I have no problem with reducing the parking spaces per se on this site because there are a lot of things to walk to and there's a lot of other things, but I was just wondering for clarification, and I was thinking about this before we talked about it, are there any plans or would there be a viability of doing some kind of a shuttle or things like that just to take people...I mean, is that part of what a downtown hotel at this site would be doing as far as taking people to and from the Convention Center if they don't want to do that...I'm just thinking that if you offered that kind of a service, that would really make people much more comfortable with not having a car there which would solve a lot of problems for all of us.

Mark Globus: That's a very good point. We had a discussion with Lisa Goodman. We'd like to have our shuttle stop by the Metrodome site and try to bring people who are taking the train into downtown and get them over to our hotel and have a shuttle that would circulate.

Commissioner Norkus-Crampton: And maybe something going directly to the Convention Center or something like that for people who just aren't really, you know... I'm just trying to think of some things...you'd just be transporting them from the Light Rail to your facility, is that the...

Mark Globus: Or to other places in downtown. We are less than a block from the Convention Center, but if somebody is handicapped we can certainly help them.

Commissioner Tucker: Ok. We have a motion to approve item D. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 5-0 (Mains and Schiff not present for the vote).

Commissioner LaShomb: I'll move the site plan, items 1-9.

Commissioner Tucker: There are nine?

Staff Beard: Thank you so much, I completely forgot to mention it. I dropped off two additional conditions of approval that were sort of housekeeping items that just should have been there from the get go and one was that the TDM be approved before building permits are issued and the CUP that's referenced in the report should also be in the conditions of approval; that it be obtained or the surface parking be removed.

Commissioner Tucker: Ok. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 5-0 (Mains and Schiff not present for the vote).

Commissioner LaShomb: I will move the vacation and the preliminary plat and final plat (Huynh seconded).

Commissioner Tucker: Ok. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 5-0 (Mains and Schiff not present for the vote).

#### **14. Zoning Code Text and Map Amendment (Chapters 521 and 551, Ward: Citywide) ([Jen Jordan](#)).**

**A. Text Amendment:** Amending Chapter 521, Zoning Districts and Maps, and Chapter 551, Overlay Districts.

The purpose of the amendment is to consider rezoning to add the Transit Station Area Pedestrian Oriented Overlay District to parcels along the University Ave SE corridor consistent with city-adopted plans for the area. Base zoning is proposed to be changed for a small number of parcels.

**Action:** The City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council adopt the findings and **approve** the zoning text and map amendment for the rezoning of parcels.

Commissioner Tucker opened the public hearing.

No one was present to speak to the item.

Commissioner Tucker closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Schiff: There are three of four properties that are industrial that have become nonconforming as a result of this overlay district, can you tell me what the impact is to the businesses that are there now? I know as long as they continue those uses, that's the nature of the

nonconforming use, they're allowed to continue, but are we identifying sites that are just going to have to be redeveloped to be ultimately used? Is it realistic that the buildings we have here are going to be able to comply eventually with some type of conforming use? Can you go through each of those four properties and tell me what we're dealing with?

Staff Jordan: Here's University Avenue, here's the city boundary. The properties that are shaded are the nonconforming. In terms of the industrial properties, we have 150 26<sup>th</sup> Ave SE that is nonconforming and it's nonconforming because of the size of the industrial warehousing use.

Commissioner Schiff: How is that being used today? What's the business in there?

Staff Jordan: It's industrial manufacturing, it's not clear in each of these cases how much of a percentage of the use is actually being used for warehousing. We decided to take a worst case scenario and consider it nonconforming. It may not be because more of it may be manufacturing use as opposed to warehouse.

Commissioner Schiff: Do you know what type of manufacturing?

Staff Jordan: It's a plastic manufacturer.

Commissioner Schiff: Ok.

Staff Jordan: The next one is 2901 and that is right here. It is also an industrial manufacturer. Once again not clear in terms of how much of it is actually warehousing. Also 2929 [tape unclear]...and it includes auto repair so there's a mixture of uses already nonconforming due to the auto repair probably less so as opposed to the size of the industrial warehouse use but there are some industrial warehouse uses in that property. I think that covers it in terms of the four properties.

Commissioner Schiff: Did any of these four properties identify during the planning process as conflicts with surrounding uses? Were any of them sources of complaints?

Staff Jordan: No.

Commissioner Schiff: Ok. Thanks.

Commissioner Tucker: May I have a motion to approve staff findings and recommendations for the consent agenda items?

Commissioner LaShomb: I will move staff recommendations on items one, three, four, seven, eight, nine and fourteen (Commissioner Huynh seconded).

Commissioner Tucker: Discussion?

Commissioner Schiff: On item number 14, I'm going to vote to approve this, but I will just state that I'm concerned about these four industrial properties, making them nonconforming. If they are manufacturing jobs, the type of high paying jobs that we want in the city of Minneapolis, I don't know what we accomplish by taking these properties and making them nonconforming. If there aren't conflicts that we're trying to solve, I guess I'd ask what we are trying to accomplish

with this. I don't want to make it more difficult for the few manufacturing buildings we've got left in the city of Minneapolis to find new tenants and to continue to provide living wage jobs. I know this has one more step before it gets finalized before the City Council so I'll continue to ask questions of staff and those who gave input on this plan just to make sure we're not causing an undo hardship for these property owners.

Commissioner Tucker: Any other discussion? All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion carried 6-0 (Commissioners Mains and Nordyke not present for the vote).