

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
INDEPENDENCE PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
SEPTEMBER 21, 2021 – 7:30 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the Independence Planning Commission was called to order by Thompson at 7:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Commissioners Thompson, Volkenant. Alternates, Story and Tearse
STAFF: City Administrator Kaltsas, Assistant to Administrator Horner
ABSENT: Gardner, Dumas & Palmquist
VISITORS: Sam Vandeputte, Mary Fehn, John Conlin, Mayor Marvin Johnson

3. Approval of Minutes:

- a. August 12, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion by Thompson to approve the August 31, 2021 Planning Commission minutes, second by Volkenant. Ayes: Thompson, Volkenant. Alternates, Story and Tearse. Nays: None. Absent: Gardner, Dumas & Palmquist Abstain: None. Motion Approved.

4. **PUBLIC HEARING (Tabled):** Adam Young / I & K LLC (Applicant/Owner) are requesting the following actions for the property located at 2076 County Road 90 (PID No. 23-118-24-23-0001) in the City of Independence, MN:
 - a. A variance to allow a new building to be constructed using steel siding which does not meet the applicable design standards of the CLI-Commercial Light Industrial zoning district.
 - b. Site plan review to construct a new detached accessory structure and outdoor storage on the property.
5. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Sam Vandeputte (Applicant) and 1985 Co Rd 90 Llc (Owner) are requesting the following actions for the property located at 1985 County Road 90 (PID No. 22-118-24-41-0005) in the City of Independence, MN:
 - a. Site plan review to construct a new principal structure and outdoor storage on the property.
 - b. A commercial conditional use permit to allow an increase in the total allowable impervious surface coverage above 30%.

Property/Site Information:

The property is located on the west side of CSAH 90 just north of the intersection of County Road 90 and Highway 12. The property has an existing single-family home and detached accessory structure that would be removed to allow for this development. There are wetlands and some existing trees located on the property. The property has the following characteristics:

Property Information: 1985 County Road

90 Zoning: CLI - *Commercial Light*

Industrial Comprehensive Plan:

Commercial Light Industrial Acreage:

7.56 acres

Discussion:

The applicant approached the City several years ago after acquiring the property to discuss its possible use and development. The applicant has prepared several different concepts for the development of the site and is now in a position to move forward with the proposed development of two new commercial buildings. The applicant is seeking site plan approval to allow the construction of two new 12,000 square foot buildings (total 24,000 SF) and associated site plan improvements. The site improvements include parking areas, outdoor storage areas and landscaping.

This site presents several challenges for development based on the existing conditions of the property. There are two wetlands located on the property. The applicant has worked with and received approval from the State and City to mitigate the front wetland. It was noted that this area represented a low-quality depression that would considerably impact the ability to develop the property for commercial use. Based on the ability to mitigate the front wetland, the applicant would like to develop the property to accommodate his own business (Sam's Landscape) as well as several new businesses in the northern building). Sam's Landscape is currently located across the street at 1960 County Road 90.

The subject property is zoned CLI – Commercial Light Industrial. Office, warehouse and outdoor storage are permitted within the CLI zoning district. The applicant would initially locate their landscape business on the property. New construction in the CLI zoning district requires the review and approval of the City. The review considers and analyzes how the proposed development meets the requirements of the zoning ordinance (Sections 530.17 and 530.23).

The City has adopted site and design requirements for commercial development. The City has reviewed the plans as they relate to the required standards provided in the zoning ordinance. The following items should be further considered by the Planning Commission:

1. Building Design – The City ordinance provides the following requirement for additions to commercial buildings:
 - a. Allowed materials for principal buildings. Principal commercial or industrial buildings in the commercial/industrial zoning district shall use the following materials on their

exterior facades:

- (1) Brick;
- (2) Natural stone or stone veneers;
- (3) Decorative concrete block (color impregnated with a split faced, robbed, or textured surface;
- (4) Glass curtain wall panels;
- (5) Stucco or synthetic stucco;
- (6) Exterior insulation and finish systems (EIFS).

The applicant is proposing to construct two commercial buildings on the property. It is likely that the applicant would construct the south building first and then construct the north building as demand for the spaces dictates. The proposed buildings would be constructed from tilt up concrete panels or EIFS equivalent panels and metal accents around the front doors. The initial plan indicates that the buildings would have a flat roof; however, the applicant has noted that the final design may include a standing seam metal pitched roof. The applicant has characterized the buildings as being similar to the existing building that he currently owns and constructed across the street. The applicant has prepared several illustrative images which further depict the proposed exterior building elevations and site improvements.

No exterior lighting is shown on the proposed plans. Any site or building lighting would need to comply with all applicable requirements of the City.

2. Parking Requirements - The applicant is proposing to construct new bituminous parking spaces and a loading area to serve the new addition. For industrial and manufacturing type uses, the City requires: one space for each 350 square feet of gross floor area. For office only uses, the City requires one space for each 250 square feet of floor area. The applicant does not fully know the interior space breakdown of each building, noting that it will be somewhat tenant dependent. The City would generally acknowledge that some of the interior square footage would be storage, meeting areas, warehouse, bathrooms, etc. For these reasons, the City would generally consider one space per 350 SF to be a good placeholder for this development. The total building square footage is approximately 24,000 square feet ($24,000/350 = 68$ parking spaces). The proposed plan provides for 69 parking spaces (4 accessible parking spaces). All parking spaces would be paved and would have the requisite concrete curb and gutter perimeter. The number of parking spaces proposed would generally satisfy parking requirements for this site.

1. Setbacks – The City has the following setback requirements for buildings located in the CLI zoning district:

Required	Proposed
a. Front yard setback: 100 feet from centerline of road.	89.67'
b. Side yard setback: 20 feet from side lot line.	21' N/89' S
c. Rear yard setback: 20 feet from rear lot line.	N/A
d. Setback from boundary of agricultural or rural residential dist: 100 feet.	N/A
e. Parking Setbacks: 20 feet from front lot line/10 feet from side lot line.	20'

front/10' side The proposed buildings would meet all applicable setbacks.

2. Landscaping - Landscaping is required for new construction within all requisite setback areas. Minimum landscape requirements in the protective buffer must include one tree (at least 2.5-inch caliper deciduous tree or six-foot-high conifer tree) for each 40 feet of property line. The protective buffer must also contain grass, ground cover or shrubs. No impervious surfaces such as concrete or asphalt may be placed in the protective buffer. The applicant has prepared a landscape plan that depicts proposed landscaping. The plan generally provides perimeter landscaping as well as some interior parking lot landscaping. The City requires 1 tree per every 40 LF of property line. For this property the total perimeter property line lineal footage is 2,796 LF ($2796/40 = 70$). The total required number of perimeter trees would be 70. The applicant is proposing a 57 perimeter trees. The City would like to focus landscaping along the north property line, County Road 90 frontage and a portion of the south property line that is visible from County Road 90. The applicant is proposing 5 interior parking lot landscape islands. These islands would be landscaped with an ornamental tree and corresponding groundcover. The City can continue to work with the applicant to revise the plan to meet applicable requirements. Staff is seeking further direction from the Planning Commission relating to the requisite landscaping. Staff recommends that a condition be added to the site plan approval which requires submittal and approval of a final landscape plan.
3. Storm Water Management – Storm water management is being reviewed by the City. This project will also require the review and approval of the watershed district. The City has reviewed the initial plan and will be seeking additional detail relating to the proposed stormwater plans. These plans can be reviewed and considered prior to City Council consideration of the site plan review. The applicant has provided a stormwater management pond in the southeast corner of the site to accommodate runoff and quality control.
4. Lot Coverage - The maximum impervious lot coverage in the CLI zoning district is 30 percent. The overall site is 7.56 acres or 329,314 square feet. 30 percent of the total site area would allow 98,794 square feet of impervious coverage. The applicant is proposing to cover 53% of the proposed site with impervious surface. The City stipulates the following relating to lot coverage in the zoning ordinance:

Lot coverage. Impervious lot coverage shall not exceed 30 percent of the lot area. Lot coverage of up to 75 percent may be allowed by conditional use permit provided stormwater run-off and surface drainage is no greater than pre-development rates for one-, ten- and 100-year storm events. Stormwater treatment ponding is required for all developments.

The applicant is asking for a CUP to allow additional coverage on the proposed site. The applicant is proposing to meet the applicable stormwater runoff requirements relating to the total site runoff. The City has criteria for granting a conditional use permit. The criteria generally require the City to find that any impacts associated with the proposed conditional use be adequately mitigated by the property owner. The applicant has noted that the additional impervious surface coverage would be mitigated by the landscaping, visible open space and additional stormwater management measures being proposed. It has

been additional noted by the City that the only other limitation on impervious surface coverage in the City is in the shoreland overlay district (25% maximum). Staff is seeking additional direction relating to the proposed impervious surface area and associated conditional use permit.

3. Outdoor Storage - The applicant is proposing to utilize the western portion of the site for outdoor storage. The proposed area would be gravel and enclosed with a chain link fence. All outdoor storage areas are required to be enclosed with a 6' tall opaque fence. Chain link fence would not meet the opacity requirements and would need to be comprised of a different material. In addition, the City requires all loading, parking and other vehicular areas to be paved. The applicant is proposing to provide a gravel outdoor storage area to the west of the proposed buildings.
4. Sanitary Sewer – There is an existing on-site septic system that would be removed as a part of the building/house demolition. The applicant has identified a primary and secondary septic site on the property. The sites are shown on the proposed plans and would be protected and remain unimproved in the proposed development condition.

The proposed development of this commercial property generally meets the intent and applicable requirements of the City's CLI zoning district. There are several items noted in the report that should be further considered by the Planning Commission. Based on direction from the Planning Commission, additional conditions may be required to be added to the recommendation.

Neighbor Comments:

The City has not received any written or verbal comments regarding the proposed site plan review and conditional use permit.

Recommendation:

Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission for the requested site plan review and conditional use permit. Should the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council, the following findings and conditions should be considered:

1. The proposed Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit request meets all applicable conditions and restrictions stated in Chapter V, Section 520.25, Site Plan Approval Procedures, in the City of Independence Zoning Ordinance.
2. The total impervious surface coverage for this property will not exceed 53% of the total lot area. The applicant shall meet the City's requisite mitigation measures relating to the additional impervious surface coverage.
3. The applicant shall submit a final landscape plan and receive City approval prior City Council consideration.
4. The applicant shall comply with all applicable storm water requirements and obtain all

storm water approvals determined necessary.

5. The applicant shall receive approval of the proposed access from Hennepin County.
6. Any new building or site lighting shall comply with the City's applicable standards. The applicant shall submit cut sheets to the City prior to obtaining building permit approval.
7. Any future development or improvements made to this property will need to be in compliance with all applicable standards relating to the Commercial-Light Industrial zoning district.
8. The Applicant shall pay for all costs associated with the City's review of the requested site plan and conditional use permit approval.
9. The resolution shall be recorded against the property.

Kaltsas explains the review to construct two new principle structures and outdoor storage on the subject property and a conditional use permit to allow and increase in the total allowable and impervious coverage above 30% on that property. There is an existing single family home and one detached accessory building. The property is zoned commercial industrial by the city. It is 7.5 acres in size. Any new construction requires site plan review in commercial industrial districts. The applicant owns the two lots directly across County Road 90 as well. The maximum impervious coverage in commercial industrial is 30% so the applicant is seeking a conditional use permit for a property to exceed the 30% which would allow up to 75% coverage. There are several wetlands on the property. Applicants have gone through the process to mitigate the front wetland. They are 2 one-story buildings of concrete or stucco panel similar to what they have on the other side of the street. They would like to construct the South building first and then the other. The parking requirements are one space per 350sqft. The spaces would call for 68 parking spots with 4 being accessible. They would all be paved. The applicant provided building setbacks and landscaping plans. Applicant has sized stormwater to the city's requirements on a 53% impervious surface coverage. The wetland on the back of the property would be better to maintain. Kaltsas suggests screening to the park to the North. He states that they would use an opaque chain link fence around the outdoor storage area. The outdoor storage area would be gravel or pavement. Story asks what the spirit is of the 30% impervious coverage. Kaltsas says that a 30% maximum is a little prohibitive. It just allows for the city to monitor anything greater than that amount. Thompson asks what is the fence issue and if it is a noncompliant site proposal. Kaltsas says this is a large area so does an opaque fence makes sense around the entire perimeter. Story asks what about just fencing the street front. Thompson asks about the setback of 100' from centerline of road for the front. Kaltsas says that the building is 119' from the centerline.

Public Hearing Opened

Sam Vandeputte speaks about wanting to develop the property across the street. He would be willing to do any kind of fence that the City is recommending. Currently they have a 6' chain link with the plastic throughout. If the color is picked right it would look fine. On the North side next to the park there are a lot of trees that would help with the buffering. Thompson asks Vandeputte to talk a little bit about the attempt for storage. They have a 13,000sqft building now so they share with other companies. They would like to start the one building as soon as they could and move into that space. It would open up the space they are currently using and market it for lease to another office warehouse. Thompson asks about what they do allow and what do they not allow as far as outdoor storage with the fencing. Vandeputte says look at what he runs now and he runs a pretty good ship. He plans on owning and maintaining these buildings for decades, not just years. He is fine with a fence around the entire storage area, but he is looking for a fencing option that is not high on maintenance. Tarse asks if we looked at his property at a previous meeting. Kaltsas clarifies which location and business. Story asks if he plans to occupy both sides of the

street. Vandeputte says possibly, but at the time they are full and need more space. Ideally, they would move across the street and do something with the other space in the future. Thompson asks about using the storage for retail storage. Kaltsas says outdoor storage must be associated with the business of the premise it is located on.

Motion to close public hearing by Tearse, second by Volkenant.

Tearse mentions that he thinks the applicant did a great job at presenting the plans. Thompson asks what are the thoughts regarding fencing. Story says that the treelines on the South side of the park is deducous and that will be good opacity. Tearse asks about the house that is on the property now. Vandeputte says that the goal would be to demolition the house this Winter or Spring. Kaltsas asks if the north building could slide a little. Sam says the way it is laid out, it would maximize the propert. Could stagger the trees and gravel pad but we would have way more green space. Story says that there are 57 trees proposed and add 20 extra trees along the South side and add the North opacity fencing.

Motion made by Tearse to approve the request at 1985 County Road 90, pursuant to all staff recommendation with fence opacity per the ordinance on the north side, second by Story. Ayes: Thompson, Volkenant. Alternates, Story and Tearse Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion Approved.

Bryant Johnson comments that the number of lots and interpretations are not very clear. They have made the changes for the city and county and will be providing easements for future development. The only way they would ask for realignment of the lots would not be by variance, but by use of a cul-de-sac. They are not going to be pushing too hard on this realignment; it would just be nice for residents and the lots in general. The most important thing they are asking for is the 13 lots versus 12. Palmquist says that the city has made a lot of points and asks Bryant Johnson if he is on board with the staff's recommendations and

what additional items would be needed to move forward. Bryant says yes, absolutely. He states that in regard to the connection to Quass, they are at an advantage since their family does own the properties that would need to be altered in order to connect these two points. Palmquist asks about the access point on County Road 90 and making it into a T. Johnson says that he sent a sketch that would make this a boulevard. Gardner asks about running the cul-de-sac into the property lines. It takes 66' off there somewhere. Kaltsas says in exchange for the connection, they are seeking the 66' on the North side without needing to connect the cul-de-sac.

Steve Grotting, lives on Drake Drive. He asks about the acquisition at County Road 90 and Turner Road heading to the East. Would Turner Road go all the way through? The neighborhood would not be in favor of having 100 lots connecting Turner Road to County Road 90. Kaltsas says it would be the South half of right-of-way. There is a little wetland so he is unsure how far.

Mark Kobilka lives in Maple Plain and his property backs up to the 60-acre piece that is going to be developed and he is concerned with the busy road that would be put in. Kaltsas said the road would run off County Road 90 to a point where it can be brought into this site. Most likely this road would come in and dip into the property. It is unlikely that it would go right on the North property line.

Motion made by Thompson to close the Public Hearing, second by Palmquist. Ayes: Gardner, Volkenant and Dumas. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion Approved.

Thompson says he can see what they are saying about being shorted on a lot. If the City is getting quite a few things from them that are being requested, it seems like they should be granted the tradeoff. Kaltsas says we can talk about clusters. We do need clarification. It is the collector street model.

Motion made by Palmquist to approve for Hilltop Farm for minor subdivision and rezone from Ag to RR and prelim plat for 13 lots subject to recommendations in staff report. Narrative has a variety of requests, second by Thompson. Ayes: Gardner, Volkenant and Dumas. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion Approved.

6. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Jessie Koch (Applicant) and Christopher Leines (Owner) are requesting the following actions for the property generally located near the northwest corner of County Road 11 and Lake Sarah Drive and identified by (PID No. 02-118-24-34-0003) in the City of Independence, MN:

- a. A minor subdivision to permit the creation of a new lot on the subject property.

Property/Site Information:

The subject property is generally located at the northwest corner of the intersection of County Road 11 and Lake Sarah Drive S. The property has no existing structures and is comprised of upland pasture, woodlands, and wetlands. The property has the following site characteristics:

Property Information: PID No. 02-118-24-34-0003 - County Road 11

Zoning: Rural Residential Comprehensive Plan:

Rural Residential Acreage Before: 31.17 acres

Acres After – East Parcel: 5.25 acres
Acres After – West Parcel: 25.92 acres

Discussion:

The subject property is zoned RR-Rural Residential and guided RR-Rural Residential by the City’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The applicant is seeking a minor subdivision of the property to create two lots. The City allows the subdivision of property in the rural residential zoning district in accordance with the requirements in the City’s zoning ordinance.

Minor Subdivision

The City allows the subdivision of property in the rural residential zoning district if it can be shown to meet all applicable criteria of the ordinance. Based on the rural residential lot provisions, the maximum number of lots this property could yield would be six (6). This number is only possible if all applicable requirements were met. It is not anticipated that this property could realize the maximum number of lots without the construction of a new public road due to the limited public road frontage. The City’s applicable standards are further defined as follows:

Subd. 3. Density. Lots of record in the rural residential district may be divided or subdivided into the following maximum number of lots, said maximum number to include the lot for any existing dwelling unit or other principal use: (Amended, Ord. 2010-01)

<u>Area of Lot of Record</u>	<u>Maximum Number of Lots Permitted</u>
7.5 acres or less	One
7.6 through 12.5 acres	Two
12.6 through 17.5 acres	Three
17.6 through 22.5 acres	Four
22.6 through 27.5 acres	Five
27.6 through 32.5 acres	Six
32.6 through 37.5 acres	Seven
37.6 through 42.5 acres	Eight
42.6 through 47.5 acres	Nine, plus one addn. lot for every five addn. acres of land.

In addition to the maximum lot density, the City has the following standards pertaining to Rural Residential lots.

530.03. Physical Standards.

Subd. 3. Physical standards. All lots and construction thereon must meet the following physical standards:

- (a.) Minimum lot area ^a 2.50 acres buildable land*
- (b.) Maximum lot area 10 acres*
- (c.) Minimum lot frontage on an improved public road or street:*

<u>Lot area</u>	<u>Minimum frontage</u>
2.50 – 3.49 acres	^b 200feet
3.50 – 4.99 acres	^b 250feet

5.00 – 10.00 acres ^b 300 feet

(d.) Lot depth. The ratio of lot frontage to lot depth must be no more than 1:4.

^a A lot must be a minimum of 2.50 acres buildable land with a demonstrated capability to accommodate two on-site waste disposal systems. Buildable land must be contiguous and not separated by streams, wetlands, slopes in excess of 10% or other physical impediments.

^b A waiver to permit lots with reduced frontage on a public right-of-way, neck lots or lots with no frontage on a public right-of-way but with frontage on a common driveway may be considered and granted or not granted. If granted, evidence must be provided that all standards established and defined in Section 510.05, Subdivision 20 of this zoning code are met: (Amended, Ord. 2010-06)

A more detailed breakdown of the proposed individual lots is as follows:

Lot No.	Gross Acres	Upland Acreage	Frontage	Lot Frontage/Depth
East Parcel	5.25 acres	~5.00 acres	457.81 LF	~1:1
West Parcel	25.92 acres	~23.7 acres	822.02 LF	~1:4

The proposed subdivision would create one new lot in addition to the existing. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the property so that the new lot would have access on Lake Sarah Drive S. The existing and remainder lot would still have frontage on CSAH 11. The applicant is also proposing to maintain a 66-foot-wide access point to Lake Sarah Drive S.

The 66-foot-wide access would provide the applicant with a potential access for a new road to be constructed to serve the remainder property. The City would generally support the concept of maintaining a future connection to Lake Sarah Drive to serve the remaining property.

As historically has been required, Hennepin County is requesting an additional 17 feet of right of way for future trail and road expansion. This has been a consistent request for all subdivisions along CSAH 11. The additional right of way is not currently shown on the plans and would need to be added.

In addition, the proposed east parcel would be required to provide the requisite 10-foot perimeter drainage and utility easements as required by ordinance (Section 500.15, Subd.'s 1 and 2).

The newly created east parcel will be required to pay the City's requisite park dedication fee. The total park dedication fee collected will be \$3,695.00. The park dedication fees will need to be paid prior to the City 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*

Other Considerations:

1. The property is guided rural residential by the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezoning and subdivision are in keeping with the intent and guidance provided by the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The applicant is in the process of providing the City with the requisite percolation tests verifying that each lot can accommodate a primary and secondary septic site. It should be noted that there is an existing sanitary sewer that runs along Lake Sarah Dr. S. This property is not included in the current service area for sewer.

Summary:

The proposed subdivision of this property appears to be in keeping with the comprehensive plan and with the character of the surrounding properties. The proposed lot being created conforms to all applicable criteria for rural residential lots. The proposed subdivision would not prevent the future development of the remainder property and provides for an additional access to the property from Lake Sarah Drive S. The proposed subdivision appears to meet all of the applicable standards of the City’s zoning and subdivision ordinance.

Neighbor Comments:

The City has not received any written or verbal comments regarding the proposed subdivision to permit a rural view lot.

Recommendation:

Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission for the requested Minor Subdivision. Should the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council, the following findings and conditions should be included:

1. The proposed Minor Subdivision meets all applicable conditions and restrictions stated Chapter V, Section 510, Zoning, in the City of Independence Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance.
2. City Council approval of the Minor Subdivision is subject to the following:
 - a. The Applicant shall address all comments and applicable requirements pertaining to the proposed subdivision.
 - b. The Applicant shall make all revisions requested in the staff report, by the Planning Commission and City Council. This includes, but is not limited to the following:
 - Prepare the requisite documents and convey the perimeter drainage and utility easements.
 - Submit and receive approval from Hennepin County.
 - Prepare the requisite documents and convey the additional 17 feet of right of way to the City as requested by Hennepin County.
 - Provide verification of a primary and secondary septic site for each property.
 - a. The Applicant shall comply with all applicable Hennepin County transportation review comments and requirements.

- b. The Applicant shall obtain all necessary City, County, PCA and other regulatory agency approval and permits prior to construction.
3. The Applicant shall pay the park dedication fees in the amount of \$3,695.00.
4. The Applicant shall pay for all costs associated with the City's review of the minor subdivision.
5. The Applicant shall execute all applicable documents to allow recording of the minor subdivision within six months from the date of the City Council approval.

Kaltsas explains that the applicant, Jessie Koch is requesting to split the lot to create a new lot. It is zoned Rural Residential and is 31 acres in overall size. After the proposed split the eastern part would be just over 25 acres and the smaller area is 5 acres. Because of the zoning it can be subdivided. The owner will preserve the 66' right-of-way in case a large parcel was to subdivide and they would need the access. We would accept that 66' easement. Hennepin County is requesting an additional 17'. They will be paying park dedication fees of \$3,600. Applicants are proposing primary and secondary septic. The sewer line runs down the street, but they won't be able to use it. Dumas says it seems pretty simple.

Public Hearing Opened

Jessie Koch thanks the Planning Commission for reviewing the plans. Gary Gardner, a neighbor asks if there is space for a road North of his property? What are the future plans for the property to the West? Kaltsas says there is a potential subdivision, but there is nothing formal right now. Gardner asks how much property is left? The total used to total 39 acres and I got 8 areas. Mine has been picked away and how many homes could go on the piece that's left? Kaltsas says that 22.6 acres could get 5 lots with that. Thompson says that it is pretty safe to get 5 lots but there would need to be a public road.

Motion made by Thompson to close the Public Hearing, second by Palmquist. Ayes: Gardner, Volkenant and Dumas. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion Approved.

Gardner says this sounds pretty simple. Thompson asks if there is a downside to the City to grant easements? Kaltsas says no. The question on this is, is this the right spot? It is a preference to the owner.

Motion made by Palmquist to approve minor subdivision to create new lot, second by Thompson. Ayes: Gardner, Volkenant and Dumas. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None. Motion Approved. They will try to take this to the September 7th City Council.

7. Open/Misc.

Thompson asks what we need to talk about regarding Cluster Development? Kaltsas states that we need to figure out how to calculate density and roads. Also, there is no standard on road frontage. Gardner asks what about the quality of preserved property. Kaltsas says we are going to open it up and talk about this. Palmquist asks if there is an update on the Comp Plan? Kaltsas says by the end of the year. Thomson asks if 34 is coming back? Kaltsas says, yes, around Late Fall.

8. Adjourn.

Motion by Thompson, second by Palmquist to adjourn at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amber Simon / Recording Secretary