

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
INDEPENDENCE PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 20, 2020 – 7:30 P.M.
(Virtual Meeting)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the Independence Planning Commission was called to order by Gardner at 7:36 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL (all virtual)

PRESENT: Commissioners Gardner, Dumas, Thompson, Volkenant and Palmquist

STAFF: City Administrator Kaltsas, Assistant to Administrator Horner

ABSENT: None

VISITORS: Jeff Kazin, Tom Anderson, Mike Schrader, Jim Wehman, Donovan Des Marais

3. Approval of Minutes:

a. March 16, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting

b. April 6, 2021 City Council Meeting Minutes (For Information Only)

Motion by Thompson to approve the March 16, 2021 Planning Commission minutes, second by Palmquist. Ayes: Gardner, Dumas, Thompson and Palmquist. Nays: None. Absent: None Abstain: Volkenant. Motion Approved.

4. PUBLIC HEARING: Jeff Kazin (Applicant/Owner) is requesting the following action for the property located 7475 County Road 11 (PID No. 0911824120001) in the City of Independence, MN:

- a. A conditional use permit to allow the construction of a new detached accessory structure that exceeds 5,000 SF on the property.

Kaltsas said the applicant approached the City with plans to add a second detached accessory structure on the subject property. It was noted that the proposed 7,500 square foot detached accessory structure would exceed the maximum square footage permitted of 5,000 without a conditional use permit. The applicant would like the City to consider granting a conditional use permit to allow the proposed 7,500 SF accessory building to be added to the property.

In reviewing the request, the City determined that there was a possible wetland located in the general vicinity of the proposed building (see image below). The applicant worked through the wetland delineation process and last week it was determined that no wetlands existed in the vicinity of the proposed shed and or as shown on the national wetland inventory. All accessory structures greater than 5,000 square feet require a conditional use permit

530.01 Agricultural District established.

Subd. 3. Accessory uses.

(d) Detached agricultural storage buildings, barns, or other structures, accessory to an existing single-family dwelling and subject to the following criteria:

3. *The maximum square footage of any individual accessory building or structure shall be 5,000 square feet.*

The proposed detached accessory building is 7,500 square feet in size (60' x 125'). There is an existing ~5,500 square foot detached accessory structure already on the property. For properties greater than 10 acres, there are no maximum total allowable detached accessory structure square footage limitations. The proposed building would be used for the personal and private storage of agriculture equipment associated with the applicant's farm. There would be no commercial use of the accessory structure permitted. The proposed detached accessory structure would be constructed using materials and colors identical to the existing accessory structure. The building would be oriented so that the doors are facing to the west with no openings on the north, south and east sides. The applicant has provided the City with a site survey, floor plan and building elevations of the proposed building. It should be noted that there are no doors shown on the "open" side of the building, but the applicant intends to fully enclose the building in the future with overhead doors.

The proposed site and buildings have the following characteristics:

Site Area: 63.08 Acres

Required Setbacks:

Front Yard: 85 feet from centerline

Side Yard: 30 feet principal structure

15 feet accessory structure

Rear Yard: 40 feet

Proposed Setbacks:

Front Yard: N/A (500+ feet from CL of CSAH 11)

Side Yard: 15 feet (east side property line)

Rear Yard: N/A (500+ feet from rear property line)

The proposed detached accessory structure would meet all applicable building setbacks. The criteria for granting a conditional use permit are clearly delineated in the City's Zoning Ordinance (Section 520.11 subd. 1, a-i) as follows:

1. The conditional use will not adversely affect the health, safety, morals and general welfare of occupants of surrounding lands.
2. The proposed use will not have a detrimental effect on the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the proposes already permitted or on the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for uses predominant in the area.
3. Existing roads and proposed access roads will be adequate to accommodate anticipated traffic.
4. Sufficient off-street parking and loading space will be provided to serve the proposed use.
5. The proposed conditional use can be adequately serviced by public utilities or on-site sewage treatment, and sufficient area of suitable soils for on-site sewage treatment is available to protect the city form pollution hazards.
6. The proposal includes adequate provision for protection of natural drainage systems, natural topography, tree growth, water courses, wetlands, historic sites and similar ecological and environmental features.
7. The proposal includes adequate measures to prevent or control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise, or vibration so that none of these will constitute a nuisance.
8. The proposed condition use is consistent with the comprehensive plan of the City of Independence.
9. The proposed use will not stimulate growth incompatible with prevailing density standards.

The City has visited the site and discussed the proposed detached accessory structure with the applicant. The conditional use permit would allow an accessory structure larger than 5,000 SF. The City is being asked to determine whether or not the proposed accessory structure larger than 5,000 SF would meet the criteria for granting a conditional use permit.

Additional Notes/Considerations:

The applicant is proposing to construct a detached accessory structure to provide additional storage for use with their farm. The applicants live on the subject property. The applicant has not submitted any information pertaining to building lighting. All building lighting will need to comply with the City's lighting standards. The City typically reviews building lighting during the building permit review process. No additional building screening is proposed given the proximity of all structures on adjacent properties combined with the existing vegetation and general screening provided by the placement of the building. The applicant has prepared a site plan and building plans for the proposed site improvements. The City will want the applicant to submit a grading and drainage plan with the building permit to ensure runoff from the building is adequately routed and or mitigated prior to exiting the property.

The following conditions should be considered:

1. The conditional use permit will be reviewed annually by the City to ensure conformance with the conditions set forth in the resolution.
2. The applicant shall provide a proposed grading and drainage plan for review by the City.
3. The applicant shall provide the City with information and details pertaining to any and all building and site lighting. All lighting will be required to comply with the City's applicable lighting standards.
4. No commercial use of the proposed detached accessory structure shall be permitted.
5. No future expansion of the detached accessory structure shall be permitted without the further review and approval by the City through the conditional use permit amendment process.

Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission pertaining to the request for a conditional use permit with the following findings and conditions:

1. The proposed conditional use permit request meets all applicable conditions and restrictions stated in Chapter V, Section 510, Zoning, in the City of Independence Zoning Ordinance.
2. The conditional use permit will be reviewed annually by the City to ensure conformance with the conditions set forth in the resolution.
3. The applicant shall provide a proposed grading and drainage plan for review by the City.
4. The applicant shall provide the City with information and details pertaining to any and all building and site lighting. All lighting will be required to comply with the City's applicable lighting standards.
5. No commercial use of the proposed detached accessory structure shall be permitted.
6. No future expansion of the detached accessory structure shall be permitted without the further review and approval by the City through the conditional use permit amendment process.
7. The applicant shall pay for all costs associated with reviewing the application and recording the resolution.

Thompson asked if the CUP should encompass the other building as well as the considered building. Kaltsas said it could be made retro-active, but that other building would not be permitted to be expanded. Thompson said the CUP provides operation as a standard. Gardner said what happens if he decides to stop farming. Kaltsas said the CUP runs with the land so the private use of the building is still permitted.

Gardner opened the Public Hearing.

Public Hearing Open

Kazin asked if there were any questions. Gardner said it was pretty obvious in his mind. Kazin said he is going to continue to farm.

Thompson motioned to close the Public Hearing, second by Dumas.

Public Hearing Closed

Motion by Palmquist, second by Dumas to approve a conditional use permit to allow the construction of a new detached accessory structure that exceeds 5,000 SF for the property located 7475 County Road 11 (PID No. 0911824120001) in the City of Independence, MN: Ayes: Thompson, Dumas, Palmquist, Volkenant and Gardner. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion Approved.

5. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Thomas Anderson (Applicant/Owner) is requesting the following action for the property located at 2076 Copeland Road (PID No. 20-118-24-23-0002) in the City of Independence, MN:
 - a. A rural view lot subdivision that would create a new buildable lot.

The applicant approached the City several months ago about the possibility of purchasing the property and creating a rural view lot in accordance with applicable standards. The applicant is proposing to create one (1) rural view lot in accordance with the provisions set forth in the City's Zoning Ordinance. The subject property has a total acreage of 48.85 acres. The provisions in the Agriculture Zoning District allow one (1) rural view lot for every 40 acres of land under the same ownership. Under the current zoning standards, the subject property has the ability to realize one (1) rural view lot for a total of two (2) lots on this property.

Rural view lots must have the following characteristics:

Lot size required: between 2.5 and 10 acres

Lot size proposed: Parcel B – 6.62 acres

Minimum lot frontage required: 300 LF (for property between 5-10 acres)

Minimum lot frontage proposed: Parcel B – 524 LF **Ratio of lot frontage to lot depth required** - no more than 1:4

Ratio of lot frontage to lot depth proposed – Parcel A - ~1:1.5 (524:780)

In addition to the minimum size necessary to subdivide, the ordinance requires a minimum of 2.5 acres of buildable upland, 300 LF of frontage on a right of way and no greater than a 1:4 ratio of lot frontage to lot depth for each rural view lot. Based on the proposed subdivision, the rural view lot would have approximately 4.1 acres of useable upland and 524 LF of frontage on Copeland Road.

The proposed subdivision would produce a 6.62-acre rural view lot. The existing home and detached accessory structure would remain on the property being created as a rural view lot. The existing home meets all applicable setbacks in the after condition. The existing detached accessory structure appears to meet the setback from Copeland Road; however, the condition is not impacted as a result of the proposed subdivision and is either legal non-conforming or conforming (requires an 85-foot setback from the centerline of Copeland Road – centerline is not shown, and structure appears to be +83.6). The applicant worked with the City to configure the rural view lot in a manner that maintained conformability and worked with the existing house and detached accessory structure. In addition, the applicant wanted the

larger remainder property to maintain a significant portion of the wetland/pond area that is located on the west side of the property. The proposed angled lot line configuration provided appears to align well with the existing property conditions and also provides for the septic site on Parcel B. The remainder of the property (Parcel A) would comprise 42.23 acres and have one principal building entitlement. Parcel A would easily accommodate a new building pad given its overall size, topography and proposed dimensions. Any development on the property would need to meet all applicable setbacks including those from wetlands. The City received an on-site septic report verifying that both Parcel A and B can accommodate a primary and secondary on-site septic system.

The applicant has included the requisite drainage and utility easements as required by ordinance (Section 500.15, Subd.'s 1 and 2) for both the existing and proposed parcel. The remaining property will have **no** rural view lot subdivision eligibilities following this subdivision.

The newly created Parcel B will be required to pay the City's requisite Park Dedication fee. For this property the requirement is \$4,715.00. This fee will need to be paid prior to recording the subdivision. *Park dedication fee of \$3,500 per lot up to 4.99 acres, plus \$750 per acre for each acre over 5 acres.*

The proposed rural view lot subdivision appears to meet all applicable standards of the City. The proposed subdivision is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and maintains a larger agricultural property that can accommodate a future residential structure. Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission regarding the request for a rural view lot subdivision. Should the Planning Commission make a positive recommendation to the City Council, the following findings and conditions:

1. The proposed rural view lot subdivision meets all applicable conditions and restrictions stated Chapter V, Section 510, Zoning, in the City of Independence Zoning Ordinance.
2. City Council approval of the rural view lot subdivision is subject to the following:
 - a) The Applicant shall pay the park dedication fees in the amount of \$4,715.00, for the newly created Parcel B, prior to the applicant receiving final approval to record the subdivision by the City.
 - b) The Applicant shall pay for all costs associated with the City's review of the requested minor subdivision.
 - c) The Applicant shall record the subdivision and City Council Resolution with the county within six (6) months of approval.
 - d) The Applicant shall execute and record the requisite drainage and utility and right of way easements with the county within six (6) months of approval.
 - e) The remaining Parcel A will have no remaining rural view lot eligibilities.

Palmquist asked about the park dedication fee and which parcel it is based on. Kaltsas said it is typically based on the smaller parcel. In this case it is parcel B. Thompson said it may make sense to clean-up the process and codify the right approach instead of practice based.

Gardner opened the Public Hearing.

Public Hearing Open

Anderson asked if there were any questions. He said he worked with Otto for the best possible split.

Palmquist motioned to close the Public Hearing, second by Volkenant.

Public Hearing Closed

Motion by Thompson, second by Palmquist to approve a rural view lot subdivision that would create a new buildable lot for the property located at 2076 Copeland Road (PID No. 20-118-24-23-0002) in the City of Independence, MN: Ayes: Thompson, Dumas, Palmquist, Volkenant and Gardner. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion Approved.

6. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Mike Schrader (Applicant) and Jim Wehmann (Owner) are requesting the following actions for the property located at 6625 Fogelman Road (PID No. 10-118-24-43-0009) in the City of Independence, MN.
 - a. Rezoning from AG-Agriculture to RR-Rural Residential in accordance with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
 - b. A minor subdivision to allow the creation of a new lot on the property located at 6625 Fogelman Road.

Kaltsas said the applicant is proposing to create one (1) additional rural residential lot in accordance with the provisions set forth in the City's Zoning Ordinance. The ordinance stipulates that Rural Residential properties must be a minimum of 7.6 acres to allow for the subdivision of an additional lot. The new lot must be a minimum of 2.5 acres of buildable upland, have a minimum lot frontage on a public road and have no greater than a 1:4 lot frontage to lot depth ratio. In order for the City to consider granting approval for a minor subdivision to permit an additional lot using the provisions set forth in the RR-Rural Residential zoning district, the City would first need to consider approving the rezoning of the property.

Rezoning:

The property is currently zoned A-Agriculture and guided by the Comprehensive Plan as Rural Residential (see Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map attached).

There are several factors to consider relating to rezoning a property. The City's ordinance has established criteria for consideration in granting a zoning amendment.

520.07. Criteria on zoning amendments. Subdivision 1. The planning commission and the city council may consider, without limitation, the following criteria in approving or denying zoning amendments. Subd. 2. Zoning amendments must conform to the Independence city comprehensive plan. Subd. 3. The zoning amendment application must demonstrate that a broad public purpose or benefit will be served by the amendment.

Subd. 4. The zoning amendment application must demonstrate that the proposed zoning is consistent with and compatible with surrounding land uses and surrounding zoning districts.

Subd. 5. The zoning amendment application must demonstrate that the subject property is generally unsuited for the uses permitted in the present zoning district and that substantial changes have occurred in the area since the subject property was previously zoned.

Subd. 6. The zoning amendment application must demonstrate merit beyond the private interests of the property owner.

As it relates to meeting the criteria for granting a zoning map amendment, the following information can be considered:

Subd. 2. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Subd. 3. Rezoning this property to RR would allow the property to be subdivided which is generally consistent with properties surrounding the subject property.

Subd. 4. The property has historically been used as a residential property. The neighboring properties on all sides are currently used as rural residential.

Subd. 5. The property is currently zoned agriculture. The use of property as an agriculture operation is somewhat restricted due to the limited amount of tillable acreage. The city has identified that this property will be better suited for residential purposes.

Subd. 6. The City will need to determine that the rezoning of the property has public merit that reach beyond the interests of the property owner.

The rezoning from A-Agriculture to RR-Rural Residential does not appear to create a property that is inconsistent with the surrounding properties.

Minor Subdivision:

The proposed lot would have the following characteristics.

Lot size required: minimum of 2.5 buildable acres

Lot size proposed: West Parcel - 7.71 acres

East Parcel - 4.55 acres

Minimum lot frontage required: 250 LF (for property between 3.50-4.99 acres)

300 LF (for property between 5.00-10.00 acres)

Minimum lot frontage proposed: West Parcel - 529 LF

East Parcel - 313 LF **Ratio of lot frontage to lot depth required:** no more than 1:4

Ratio of lot frontage to lot depth proposed: West Parcel - 1:1

East Parcel – 1:2

Staff discussed the proposed subdivision with the applicant and identified a general configuration that would be compatible with the surrounding area and offer the least amount of impact to the surrounding properties. The survey confirms that all existing structures on the West Parcel will meet all applicable setbacks in the after condition. The east parcel will require a new driveway and provides a suitable area for a single-family home to be located on the property.

The existing home has an existing on-site septic system that will remain in use with the existing home. The applicant has provided the City with information verifying that both properties can accommodate a primary and secondary site (see locations on survey).

The proposed subdivision delineates drainage and utility easements along all property lines. The easements will need to be revised to meet the City's established criteria. They are currently shown as 5 feet along the side property lines and will need to be increased to 10 feet.

The newly created East Parcel will be required to pay the City's Park Dedication required fee. For this property, the park dedication payment amount is \$3,500.00. This fee will need to be paid prior to recording the subdivision.

Park dedication fee \$3,500 per lot up to 4.99 acres, plus \$750 per acre for each acre over 5.

4.55 acres- \$3,500 for first 5 acres = \$3,500.00

There is one other bit of information that should be noted by the City. The property located at the southwest corner of Fogelman and County Road 90 was also originally platted as a part of the French Hills Subdivision. That property was subdivided in 2016 in a similar fashion to this request. At the time it was subdivided, there were concerns raised relating to a covenant that was placed on this subdivision that would restrict future subdivisions. The City is not a party to any covenants and does not have authority to enforce private covenants on a property. The City therefore needs to consider its current zoning ordinances

and whether or not the proposed rezoning and subdivision are consistent with the current standards. As it relates to this point as well as the overall request, it appears that the proposed subdivision meets all of the applicable standards of the City's zoning and subdivision ordinance. The lots being created will fit into the character of the surrounding area and should have minimal impacts on the surrounding properties. The adjacent properties to the east, west, north, and south are similar in size to the proposed lots after the subdivision.

Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission for the requested rezoning and minor subdivision with the following findings:

1. The proposed rezoning and minor subdivision meet all applicable criteria and conditions stated in Chapter V, Section 500, Planning and Land Use Regulations of the City of Independence Zoning Ordinance.
2. The Applicant shall provide to the City a final survey indicating the requisite drainage and utility easements and legal descriptions for both lots.
3. The Applicant shall execute and record the requisite drainage and utility easement with the county within six (6) months of approval.
4. The Applicant shall pay the park dedication fees in the amount of \$3,500 prior to the applicant receiving final approval to record the subdivision by the City.
5. The Applicant shall pay for all costs associated with the City's review of the requested subdivision.
6. The Applicant shall record the subdivision and City Council Resolution with the county within six (6) months of approval.

Gardner opened the Public Hearing.

Public Hearing Open

Wehman said the reason for the trees stopping where they do is that they never really used that area.

Johnson, 6560 Fogelman Road, said when the lots were originally divided in the 90's they were not intended to be subdivided due to the agricultural zoning. He wondered if the zoning changed. Gardner said it is eligible to be rezoned. Palmquist said the Comp Plan has the property Rural Residential not Ag.

Thompson motioned to close the Public Hearing, second by Palmquist.

Motion by Thompson, second by Volkenant to approve Rezoning from AG-Agriculture to RR-Rural Residential in accordance with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and a minor subdivision to allow the creation of a new lot for the property located at 6625 Fogelman Road (PID No. 10-118-24-43-0009) in the City of Independence, MN. Ayes: Thompson, Dumas, Palmquist, Volkenant and Gardner. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion Approved.

7. Donovan Des Marais (Applicant) and Jerry Wise (Owner) are requesting the following actions for the property located at the northeast corner of CSAH 11 and Woodhill Drive (PID No. 01-118-24-34-0010) in the City of Independence, MN:
 - a. Concept plan review for a proposed subdivision of the subject property to create four (4) new lots (3 would have lakeshore on Lake Sarah).

Kaltsas said the applicant is asking the City to consider and provide feedback relating to a concept plan for the proposed subdivision of the subject property. A concept plan allows the City the opportunity to initially review the proposed subdivision and provide feedback and comments to the applicant prior to the submittal of any applications for rezoning and preliminary plat. In order for the City to ultimately consider approval of a plan similar to the proposed concept plan, the following steps would be required:

1. Consider Preliminary Plat approval.
2. Consider Final Plat approval. The applicant has prepared a concept plan for review by the City. The City has preliminarily reviewed this plan and provided review comments to the applicant. The property is currently zoned RR-Rural Residential and is also located within the S-Shoreland Overlay zoning district adjacent to Lake Sarah. The City Council recently concluded that properties zoned S-Shoreland and have access to sanitary sewer, can be subdivided into 1-acre minimum lots as long as all applicable requirements can be satisfied by the applicant. The applicable requirements that stipulate the number of lots generally relate to the minimum road frontage (200 LF – for lots less than 3.49 acres), minimum shoreline frontage (100 LF) and minimum width at the building setback line (100 LF).

505.13. Zoning provisions.

Subd. 1. *General.* The following standards shall apply to all proposed developments and subdivisions within the shoreland district of the protected waters listed in subsection 505.05. Where the requirements of the underlying zoning district as shown on the official zoning map are more restrictive than those set forth herein, then the more restrictive standards shall apply. The City has discussed the potential subdivision of this property with the applicant. The initial review of the subdivision contemplates a high-level review only of the proposed concept development plan. A detailed review of the storm water, grading, wetlands, and infrastructure details will be completed prior to consideration of any future applications. The City does not formally approve or deny a concept plan. The concept plan review will provide direction and comments to the applicant for their use during the preparation of future applications. The following comments should be considered by the City:

1. The subdivision of property and corresponding plans will be subject to the review and approval of the Pioneer Sarah Watershed Management Commission.
2. A wetland delineation will need to be completed prior to any formal preliminary plat submittal.
3. Building setback and OHWL lines have been added to the concept plan to provide better context for the Planning Commission and City Council to understand how the lots would accommodate a home and driveway.
4. The proposed subdivision creates a total of 4 lots: 3 with shoreland access to Lake Sarah. The City requires a minimum lot public road frontage of 200 LF per lot. This property has approximately 1169 LF of total frontage on Woodhill Drive and CSAH 11. The City can waive the minimum frontage requirement per lot if certain criteria are satisfied. The proposed layout appears to create a more advantageous configuration due to access for all lots coming off of Woodhill Drive versus CSAH 11. Hennepin County has indicated that an additional access onto CSAH 11 would not likely be approved. This issue should be noted for discussion by the Planning Commission and City Council.
5. The proposed layout is somewhat impacted by the existing detached accessory structure located on lot 2. This structure is not considered a legal structure as there is no principal structure located on this property. The City will need to further discuss how and if this structure can remain, noting that if this property is subdivided and sells, the lot would still not have a principal structure guaranteed. This structure is shown to meet applicable building setbacks in the proposed condition.
6. The proposed lots would be connected to the City's sanitary sewer system. The type of connection to the public sewer line will need to be further reviewed and considered by the City. In addition, the invert elevation of the public sewer may dictate additional restrictions for the elevations of the

proposed homes.

7. There is one existing connection to the sanitary sewer serving the existing detached accessory structure. This connection can be used for one of the proposed lots. The three new and additional lots would be subject to applicable connection fees in addition to the initial assessment fee of \$9,550 per lot. 8. Park dedication will be required for this development if it moves forward. The City's current park dedication fee is \$3,500 per lot (less than 4.99 acres).

The Planning Commission should review the plans and provide feedback to the applicant pertaining to the proposed concept plan. No formal action can be taken by the Planning Commission on the concept plan. There are additional steps that will need to be taken for any development of this property to occur.

Thompson said would the accessory building have to as it does not make sense to continue with an illegal nonconforming structure. Kaltsas said there is no precedent to fall back on but typically we do not allow additional illegal non-conforming structures to be included. Thompson asked if the plan could be more creative by combining some driveways etc. and acknowledging lot 3 cannot be lakeside. Dumas asked if Lot 4 would have an easement to get to the lake. Kaltsas said it could be granted privately and noted docks are not regulated by the City.

Des Marais said Lot 3 would be as proposed. He noted shared drives are not as appealing. Des Marais asked if there was an option to bring the nonconforming building into compliance. Thompson noted with shared driveways you would not have to rely on having a variance. Palmquist asked about the future structure to be placed on Lot 2. He said the appropriate setback appears to be north of Lot 1 or East of Lot 3. Palmquist asked about the drainage of Lot 3. Des Marais said there is a little drainage ditch that runs into Lake Sarah. He said there is plenty of room to walk down to the shoreline.

Thompson asked Kaltsas about the pond being right along Lake Sarah and would the inflow trigger anything with the DNR. Kaltsas said he does not know now but it will be looked at further. Gardner said there were not a lot of practical problems with the proposal.

Ron Lyrek said he has lived here for 33 years but he would love to have the homes being built as far away from his property as possible.

8. Open/ Misc.

9. Adjourn.

Motion by Palmquist, second by Volkenant to adjourn at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Trish Gronstal/ Recording Secretary