

**CITY OF MINOT
ZONING ORDINANCE STEERING COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes
June 24, 2020
8:00 am – 10:00 am
Council Chambers, City Hall, 515 2nd Ave., SW

I. ATTENDANCE AND ROLL CALL

Committee: Rolly Ackerman, Gloria Larsgaard, Tom Ross, Rustin Roteliuk
Absent: Tim Baumann, Pat Graner, Tyler Neether
City Staff: Brian Billingsley, Community & Economic Development Director
Lance Lang, Principal Planner
Peter Baumgartner, Planner I
Emily Huettl, Assistant City Engineer
Glenda Sorensen, Planning Assistant
Consultant: Scott Harmstead, SRF
Guests: Dan Ternes (Sign Dzyn)
Craig Johnson (Signs Today)

Rolly Ackerman called the meeting to order at 8:00 am.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Roteliuk to approve February 19, 2020 minutes, second by Larsgaard. ayes: all, nays: none.
Absent: Baumann, Graner, Neether

Motion carries

Motion by Roteliuk to approve March 04, 2020 minutes, second by Larsgaard. ayes: all, nays: none.
Absent: Baumann, Graner, Neether

Motion carries

III. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Roteliuk to approve June 24, 2020 Agenda, second by Larsgaard. ayes: all, nays: none.
Absent: Baumann, Graner, Neether

Motion carries

IV. INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Dan Ternes representing Sign Dzyn
Craig Johnson representing Signs Today

V. CHAPTER 22 (SIGNS)

Presentation of Sign Regulations by Consultant Scott Harmstead

Section 22-1. Purpose

- No comments or changes.

Section 22-2. Sign Permits and Plans

B. Master Sign Plan

**Zoning Ordinance Steering Committee
Minutes
June 24, 2020**

1. Discussion on the wording “The Planning Department encourages a Master Sign Plan...” Do we want to require or encourage? The Committee decided to use the word “encourage”.

Section 22-3. Planning Department Authority

B. Sign Modifications in Planned Unit Developments

1. End of first sentence does not read well. “by way of an approved PUD Development Plan” should be moved forward in the sentence; “that may have gained approval of sign sizes, quantities and locations as a result of approval of a specific PUD Development Plan which signs would not otherwise been approved.” or something like that.

Section 22-4. Definitions

A. Sign-Related Terminology

11. and 12. Electronic signs. Some confusion as these two definitions are very similar. Trying to cover digital billboards, and electronic messaging signs, and Digital Display Screens. Perhaps remove the word “Signs” from 11 so it only applies to billboards and define other types of electronic signs, messaging centers, digital display, etc. in 12. Larsgaard inquired if 11 & 12 can be combined. Question tabled.

24. Sign Area

- b. Add “background panels” to this definition as in: “...including the advertising surface, background panels, any framing, trim, or...”

Add a definition for “Changeable Copy Sign.”

Sign photographs.

Replace the Wild Wings example with a better example of a directional sign, maybe with directional arrows, or copy that says “Exit” or “Enter” etc.

Section 22-5. Prohibited and Exempt Signs (All districts):

A. Prohibited Signs

7. Exception is ghost signs. Also take out verbiage in parenthesis “not in use”.
11. Remove in it’s entirety.

12. Remove language; “with off premise signs” at the end of the sentence. Consultant Harmstead also suggested the committee circle back to #12 at the next meeting.

A. Exempt Signs

- a. Change “bulletin boards” to “changeable copy signs”

Re-letter the order of this section – goes from a. to d. currently instead of a. to b. to c....

- k. (should be l) Change “eight (8) square feet” to “six (6) square feet”

l. (should be j, but we shall combine the two so it will actually be l for both) Change “four (4) square feet” to “six (6) square feet”. Combine “attached” directional signs” and “detached directional signs” into one line item.

**Zoning Ordinance Steering Committee
Minutes
June 24, 2020**

Section 22-6. Non-Conforming Signs

1. Extra space between “not” and “be” second line.

Section 22-7. On-Premise Signs

D. Design and Construction Standards

5. Structural stamp by a licensed PE. Brian will check with Chief Building Official Luke Tillema on whether we should require an engineering certificate on detached signs exceeding 150 s.f.

E. Permitted Permanent Signs by Type and Zoning District

Change “M3” to “OP.”

Apartment complexes often have monument signs. Move “RM” to next column and include with “R3C, RH, and MH.” Add “P” for permitted in the box below in the row for “Monument/Ground Sign.”

Ackerman questioned why billboards are not allowed in AG zones? Lang read the current ordinance. Only allowed in C2, M1 and M2 and only along major roads and highways. Lang said he does not think we should open availability to AG. Roteliuk said those types of signs need to be along busy highways with a lot of people, not in the rural areas.

Billboard – Are permitted in AG (P*, Wall sign permitted for home-based business only)

F. District Requirements for Detached On-Premise Permanent Signs

Change “M3” to “OP.”

Under “Notes” (b) - Huettl and Harmstead will research 75’ if sign faces an arterial road.

G. “P”, Public Zone is grouped in the column with CBD. The ordinance states that P district design standards follow C2 requirements. It was decided that it would be circled back to.

Change “M3” to “OP”

Monument Signs/Ground Signs are shown as “Not Applicable” in Agricultural and Residential Districts column. Add districts RM, RH, R3C and MH. After Baumgartner had mentioned that there is going to be a large number of defunct zoned Single-Family dwellings going to RM zoning it was decided that an asterisk/footnote should be added to the “Not Applicable” under AG and Residential districts for Monument/Ground Signs stating that there is an exception for multi-family dwellings in those districts to allow them. The committee agreed to require a CUP for detached monument signs in the AG zone.

Footnote b. Allows a pole sign in M1, M2, OP to increase in height from 50 feet to 75 feet if the sign “faces an arterial road.” The group discussed the implications of this language. There are many arterial roads in Minot’s jurisdiction, perhaps limit the listed roadways to Highways 2, 52, and 83 only? Lang said he thinks 75 feet is too high. Ackerman asked what about truck stops or other large transportation type uses? Harmstead and Huettl said they will research this issue further.

**Zoning Ordinance Steering Committee
Minutes
June 24, 2020**

H. Multiple Attached Signs/Multi-tenant Signs in Commercial and Industrial Districts.

Reference Master Sign Plan option. Group discussion about whether the code should require equal or proportional allotment of sign area to each tenant space or if that is up to the building owner. The problem in the past has occurred when the initial tenant wants a big sign and in effect takes more of the proportional allotment and then subsequent tenants are limited in the amount of sign area that is left over. A clear decision wasn't made and it was eventually decided that the ZOSC should circle back to it.

Ackerman requested that the sign regulations be sent to the Downtown Association as well as the sign companies we are currently working with.

VI. Next meeting to be held on Wednesday, July 8, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. at City Hall, Council Chambers

VII. Adjournment 9:59 am.