

## **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES - CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS**

Tuesday, September 19, 2017 – 7:00 p.m.  
City Hall Chambers - 8150 Barbara Avenue

Commissioner Scales called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Tony Scales  
Armando Lissarrague  
Dennis Wippermann  
Jonathan Weber  
Joan Robertson  
Elizabeth Niemioja  
Pat Simon

Commissioners Absent: Annette Maggi

Others Present: Allan Hunting, City Planner  
Heather Botten, Associate Planner

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The September 5, 2017 Planning Commission minutes were approved as submitted.

### **WIDSETH SMITH NOLTING – CASE NO. 17-41PR**

#### **Reading of Notice**

Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider a major site plan review to construct a 10,600-square foot building addition, for the property located at 6070 Cahill Avenue. 38 notices were mailed.

Allan Hunting, City Planner, recommended that this item be tabled to the next Planning Commission meeting due to Engineering staff needing additional time to review significant changes made to the grading and stormwater plans.

#### **Opening of Public Hearing**

There was no public testimony.

#### **Planning Commission Recommendation**

Motion by Commissioner Wippermann, second by Commissioner Robertson, to table the request for a major site plan review to construct a 10,600 square foot building addition, on the property located at 6070 Cahill Avenue, to the October 3 Planning Commission meeting.

Motion carried (7/0).

### **CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS – CASE NO. 17-39VAC (tabled from September 5, 2017)**

#### **Presentation of Request**

Tom Kaldunski, City Engineer, explained that the City received a request to vacate an existing drainage and stormwater ponding easement on the River Heights Vineyard Church site at 6070 Cahill Avenue. The easement was secured in 2016 to provide an area to manage stormwater runoff from a parking lot expansion. In early 2017 the church asked the City to consider vacating this easement so they could consider constructing a future building. During the review of a future street improvement project in the area, the City was made aware of a high-water issue in the Carleda Avenue area, south of the church. Staff has not studied the complete drainage issue at

this point as the project has not yet been scheduled. In response to the Planning Commission's question as to whether there were other options for handling stormwater runoff, Mr. Kaldunski advised there are other options, including ponding on nearby City-owned parcels, rerouting the stormwater through existing storm sewers, increasing the pipe size, rain gardens, etc. If a proposal comes forward for a new building on the northern portion of the site, they will address stormwater at that time to ensure they treat the additional impervious surface. If a proposal does not come in, the existing system will continue to effectively service the area.

Commissioner Scales asked what process the City uses to put drainage easements in place.

Mr. Kaldunski explained that in certain areas, such as the Northwest Area, there is a comprehensive stormwater management plan in place. In older parts of the community, such as the location being discussed, there is not a plan identifying where issues are and where solutions might lie. They are generally addressed when working on a street project or when someone comes forward with a proposal. In this case the City was not aware of any potential flooding issues in the Carleda neighborhood until they started discussing a street improvement project for that area.

Commissioner Scales asked whether the stormwater rerouting would eventually occur but was just not feasible at this time.

Mr. Kaldunski replied that if the church comes in with a proposal for a new building the codes and ordinances in place give the City the ability to ask for an easement again. If a building does not get built and the City decides to correct this drainage, the City may have to buy back an easement in the future.

Commissioner Scales asked what the protection was for homeowners on Carleda if the easement was vacated.

Commissioner Robertson asked what was north of the proposed vacated easement area.

Mr. Kaldunski was unsure, but was not aware of any drainage issues to the north. The only issues he was aware of were to the south.

Commissioner Robertson asked if the entities to the north relied on the easement in question.

Mr. Kaldunski stated that their site likely drains to the low spot and infiltrates into the ground.

Commissioner Robertson asked if that would be an area that the City would not have to be concerned about should the easement be vacated.

Mr. Kaldunski replied there was always a potential for an unusually large rainstorm, but he believed the area would be protected in its current condition.

Commissioner Weber asked how far the proposed building would go into the existing easement.

Mr. Hunting clarified that the City received an application for an expansion of the church building. Mr. Kaldunski is referring to something different, which is a potential future proposal for a new detached building on the northern part of the lot. So far there have been only general discussions regarding this building.

Mr. Kaldunski showed where the proposed addition onto the existing church would be located and explained that it would not be in the easement area being discussed tonight. He advised that if a

proposal comes in for a new building on the northern portion of the site they can entertain other options for stormwater management as long as they have the needed storage capacity.

Commissioner Wippermann asked for clarification regarding a statement in the report that 'the city has determined it is not feasible to complete the stormwater rerouting at this time'.

Mr. Kaldunski stated the comment was more related to not having done a study yet on feasibility and a more detailed review of the pipes. There are several alternative options for stormwater management; however, as previously mentioned.

### **Opening of Public Hearing**

Rick Klun, Executive Director of Center City Housing Corporation, 105-1/2 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Duluth, MN, showed where the potential new building would be located.

Commissioner Robertson asked if they were anticipating additional parking associated with the potential new building.

Mr. Klun replied in the affirmative.

Peter Benedict, 9019 Coffman Circle, Pastor for River Heights Vineyard Church, stated he does not anticipate any drainage from the church site flowing to the vacant home north of them.

Commissioner Scales closed the public hearing.

### **Planning Commission Recommendation**

Motion by Commissioner Simon to approve the request to vacate an existing drainage and stormwater ponding easement on the River Heights Vineyard Church site at 6070 Cahill Avenue.

Commissioner Weber stated he was uncomfortable giving up an easement if the City may have to buy it back again.

Mr. Kaldunski stated that if the project never comes to fruition the church property would stay as it is today, which handles the drainage effectively. Giving up the easement now would allow them to explore the possibility of a new building which would be good for the community. There would still be a requirement for them to give the City an easement.

Second by Commissioner Weber.

Motion carried (7/0). This item goes to the City Council on September 25, 2017.

## **GERALD SALMEY – CASE NO. 17-44V**

### **Reading of Notice**

Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider a request for a variance to allow a zero setback for a driveway, whereas five feet is required, for the property located at 8460 Cooper Way. 6 notices were mailed.

### **Presentation of Request**

Heather Botten, Associate Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. She advised that the property is zoned R-1C, Single-Family Residential. The applicant is proposing to improve his driveway by installing blacktop over the existing rock parking area. The existing rock has been in place for over 20 years and goes up to the property line. The variance is being requested

because driveways and parking areas are required to maintain at least a five foot side yard setback from property lines. The applicant uses the existing rock area to park his RV. In 2016 the parking ordinance was amended to require recreational vehicles to be parked on a solid parking pad. In addition to that requirement, the parking pad has to be immediately connected to the driveway and located on the side opposite the front door. If the applicant were able to follow all those requirements the property is not able to meet the setback requirements. The property is also located along a curve, with a lot width of 74 feet at the curb. Also, the house is not located in the center of the property. If it were, there would be enough room for the applicant to comply with the five-foot setback. Staff recommends approval of the request with the practical difficulty being the lot width of the property, placement of the home, and the fact that the required parking area for an RV is not able to meet setbacks on the property without a variance. Staff recommends approval of the request with the one condition listed in the report. Staff heard from the neighbor to the north, who is in support of the request, and also received one general inquiry.

Commissioner Robertson stated a precedent had already been set as the Planning Commission recently recommended approval of a similar request.

### **Opening of Public Hearing**

Gerald Salmey, 8460 Cooper Way, advised he was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Scales asked the applicant if he read and understood the report.

Mr. Salmey replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Simon asked if a property line survey had been done.

Mr. Salmey replied that it had not; however, he and his neighbor were in agreement as to its location.

Commissioner Simon asked the applicant how long he had lived there.

Mr. Salmey replied since 1983.

Commissioner Simon noted that was prior to the new front yard parking ordinance.

Commissioner Wippermann asked if the proposed blacktop would go right up to the neighbor's blacktop.

Mr. Salmey replied that it would not. He advised that the neighbor would like it to, but in order to do so she would have to get a variance as well.

Commissioner Scales closed the public hearing.

### **Planning Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Wippermann did not agree with the following portion of the practical difficulty as the statement applies to every variance request: 'the required parking area for an RV is not able to meet setbacks on the property without a variance'.

Commissioner Niemioja noted that the parking area also had to be immediately connected to the driveway on the side opposite the front door, which constitutes a practical difficulty in that there is only one spot that meets all the requirements, as well as being grandfathered in after 20 years of parking there.

**Planning Commission Recommendation**

Motion by Commissioner Simon, second by Commissioner Niemioja, to approve the request for a variance to allow a zero setback for a driveway, whereas five feet is required, for the property located at 8460 Cooper Way, with the condition listed in the report and the practical difficulty being that the ordinances changed and the only way for the applicant to comply with the new ordinance was to get a variance.

Motion carried (7/0). This item goes to the City Council on September 25, 2017.

**SEAN WRIGHT – CASE NO. 17-40V**

**Reading of Notice**

Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider a request for a conditional use permit to expand a non-conforming structure up to 30% of its gross floor area, a variance to exceed a 30% expansion of a non-conforming structure, and a variance to exceed the 25-foot maximum building height, for the property located at 6825 Cahill Avenue. 18 notices were mailed.

**Presentation of Request**

Heather Botten, Associate Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. She advised that the property is zoned B-1, Limited Business. The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit and two variances to expand the existing home and add an attached garage. The property is .41 acres in size and zoned B-1, Limited Business. The house was built in 1930, prior to the adoption of the city code, which makes the house a legal non-conformity. There is no garage on the property; City code allows a garage addition if none previously existed. The zoning code allows existing non-conformities to conditionally expand the gross floor area by up to 30%. The applicant is proposing to add 2,150 square feet of living space; therefore, a variance is being requested to exceed 30%. The applicant is also requesting a variance to exceed the maximum height requirement in the B-1 district (25 feet) to allow a building height of 35 feet, which is in compliance with our residential height requirements. The applicant is proposing a 2,150-square foot home addition and a 1,200-square foot attached garage addition. Approval of the request would reduce the opportunity for commercial redevelopment, but would be compatible with the surrounding single-family neighborhood. Staff finds the footprint of a two-car garage, which would be allowed by code, plus an addition that would meet the height requirements of a residential district, to be more of a reasonable request for the site. The property has historically been used as a residential property and is located in the most restrictive commercial district. If the property had been in the B-2 or B-3 district a 35-foot height would be allowed. Staff supports the height variance because it complies with the residential height requirements. Staff recommends approval of the CUP to expand a legal non-conformity by up to 30% and also recommend approval of the 35-foot building height, with the conditions and rationale listed in the staff report. Staff does not support the size variance as presented due to the fact that they do not find the property so unique or limiting that it cannot be used in a reasonable manner without the request. The large addition would be considered a convenience to the applicant rather than a practical difficulty. Staff received a voicemail from one neighbor but was unable to contact them so not sure whether they were in support of the request or not.

Commissioner Scales asked where the requirement to allow a two-car garage was in city code.

Ms. Botten replied that it was in the non-conforming use section of the code. It does not specify a two-car garage but states that if a garage never existed they are allowed to have one.

Commissioner Robertson asked if the code specifically prohibited anything larger than a two-car garage.

Ms. Botten advised that the code does not specify two-car, but in conversations with the City Attorney it was determined that a two-car garage would be deemed a reasonable request.

Commissioner Simon asked where the garage would be in relation to the proposed addition.

Ms. Botten showed where the attached garage addition was proposed to be located, with another stall in the back.

Commissioner Weber asked if the single-car garage would be underneath the two-car garage on the other side of the house.

Ms. Botten replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked what the thought was behind the house height.

Ms. Botten replied that the maximum height for residential, B-2, and B-3 districts was 35 feet. She was unsure why the height maximum in the B-1 district was only 25 feet.

Mr. Hunting advised that restriction has been in existence for quite some time and it was likely assumed only single-story buildings would be in that zoning district.

Commissioner Weber asked what the smallest residential district allowed for a maximum height.

Ms. Botten replied 35 feet.

Commissioner Wippermann asked for confirmation that the City had recently changed the ordinance to permit greater residential use on the northern portion of Cahill Avenue.

Ms. Botten replied in the affirmative, stating it was in relation to a multi-use property. That does not apply in this case because there is not a business being operated on the property.

Commissioner Wippermann stated in his opinion when they approved the last request and changed the ordinance the City was basically making the decision to convert this area to more residential rather than business.

Commissioner Robertson asked if there were any concerns regarding this commercially zoned property currently being used, and proposed to be used, solely as residential.

Ms. Botten advised there were several properties along Cahill zoned B-1 but used as residential.

Commissioner Niemioja suggested that this area be addressed in the comprehensive plan update process.

Mr. Hunting advised that the Planning Commission would have an opportunity during the comprehensive plan update to raise this as a concern. The Planning Commission can also address tonight whether they think the area should be rezoned or re-guided to residential.

Commissioner Robertson was concerned about the existing homeowners as they were not protected from someone coming in with a business that conforms to the B-1 zoning district.

Ms. Botten agreed that if such a business came in the neighbors would be notified of the public process, but they would not be protected from it.

Commissioner Robertson noted that until the comprehensive plan was officially changed the homeowners were potentially vulnerable.

Ms. Botten noted that there were some homes in that area that also had businesses on the property.

Commissioner Scales recalled that in the 1970's and 1980's this area was anticipated to change over to commercial and the houses were expected to be moved out over time. That never happened; however, and he recommended that they look at the area more as what it has been used for and not worry about business coming in in the future.

Commissioner Robertson stated now that they are aware of this issue the City may have an accountability to rezone the property appropriately.

**Opening of Public Hearing**

Sean Wright, 6825 Cahill Avenue, advised he was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Scales asked the applicant if he read and understood the report.

Mr. Wright replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Simon asked the applicant if he would have adequate space to access the lower garage.

Mr. Wright replied in the affirmative, stating the proposed addition would be 16 feet from the property line.

Commissioner Niemioja asked the applicant if he planned to stay awhile on the property.

Mr. Wright replied in the affirmative, stating to him the proposed changes made sense as the house was small and was not laid out very well.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked the applicant what he did for a living.

Mr. Wright replied remodeling.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked the applicant if he would be agreeable with the smaller addition that staff was recommending.

Mr. Wright replied he was not sure if it was possible.

Commissioner Robertson asked if the proposed addition would comply with impervious surface maximums.

Ms. Botten replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked staff what their main concern was.

Ms. Botten replied they were mostly concerned about the amount of proposed additional square footage.

Eleanor Denzer, 6781 Cahill Avenue, and Verna Wilson, 3491 East 71<sup>st</sup> Street, stated concerns

regarding the proposed addition. It was determined; however, that they were mistakenly discussing a different property.

Ms. Denzer advised that although her property was zoned B-1 she was using it solely as residential and planned to remain residential.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked who owned the property.

Mr. Wright replied it was owned by him and his wife and he planned to live there with their two children.

Ms. Denzer asked the applicant if he planned to paint cars or engage in noisy activities.

Mr. Wright replied he only does woodworking.

Commissioner Robertson asked the applicant how he could reduce the size of the proposed addition to bring it into compliance with the 30% allowed by code.

Mr. Wright replied he was unsure. He advised that his first thought would be to eliminate the lower garage, which would require building a large retaining wall and bringing in a lot of fill. He advised that the house was originally set up as a duplex and he would like to keep the two separate living spaces.

Commissioner Weber asked the applicant how many square feet of additional livable space he was proposing.

Mr. Wright replied a little under 2,200 square feet.

Commissioner Robertson asked what the total square footage would be.

Mr. Wright replied approximately 3,500 square feet.

Commissioner Robertson stated that although she understood the applicant's desire for more space, she was concerned about the fact that he was aware of the size of the home when he purchased it and was now asking for more space than the City could comfortably approve.

Commissioner Simon stated she would have a difficult time approving the variance to exceed the 30% expansion as the applicant would have reasonable use of their property without the addition and it seemed to be a want rather than a need.

Mr. Wright responded that the home was only 1,300 square feet in size, including both levels, and 30% would only be an additional 400 square feet. He stated the home was undersized for the lot.

Commissioner Robertson reiterated that the applicant knew the size of the home when he purchased it.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked how much it would cost to build the addition.

Mr. Wright replied approximately \$200,000.

Commissioner Scales closed the public hearing.

**Planning Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Niemioja stated she supported the request as she thinks that area will eventually be changed to residential and therefore what he is proposing would fit with the ultimate comprehensive plan guiding.

Commissioner Robertson asked how staff arrived at the 30% maximum expansion.

Ms. Botten replied by city code residents can expand the gross floor area of the non-conformity by 30% with a conditional use permit; anything exceeding 30% requires a variance.

Commissioner Scales recommended that the 30% maximum be revisited as it depended on the size of the house you started with. He believed we would likely see more of these situations as there were many smaller homes in the City on large lots. In his opinion, it was unreasonable to allow only an additional 400 square feet on the subject property.

Commissioner Lissarrague noted that the applicant was adding value to the neighborhood and he supported the request.

Commissioner Simon asked if the variances would be necessary if the property was zoned residential rather than B-1.

Ms. Botten stated she would have to review it more, but likely it would be conforming in a residential district; however, an additional variance from front yard setback would be necessary. Staff would likely support that variance if they did not encroach further than the existing building.

Commissioner Simon stated after hearing further testimony she would now support the variance on the basis that the southern portion of the B-1 neighborhood would likely eventually be rezoned to residential.

Commissioner Wippermann stated by approving a previous ordinance change they have supported allowing more residential in the B-1, and he had no issues with the request.

### **Planning Commission Recommendation**

Motion by Commissioner Weber, second by Commissioner Lissarrague, to approve the request for a conditional use permit to expand a legal nonconforming structure by 30% of its gross floor area, a variance to exceed the 30% expansion of a nonconforming structure, and a variance to exceed the maximum height allowed in the B-1 district, for the property located at 6825 Cahill Avenue, with the conditions listed in the report, and with the practical difficulty being that the property has been used as a residential property rather than commercial and should be zoned as a residential property.

Motion carried (7/0). This item goes to the City Council on October 9, 2017.

### **BITUMINOUS ROADWAYS – CASE NO. 17-43CZ**

#### **Reading of Notice**

Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider the request for a conditional use permit amendment for the mining and processing of sand and gravel, an asphalt plant and contractor's yard with open storage and a five-year sand and gravel overlay district for the property, and an ordinance amendment for the renewal of a five-year sand and gravel overlay permit for the property located at 11661 and 11201 Rich Valley Boulevard. 28 notices were mailed.

**Presentation of Request**

Allan Hunting, City Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. He advised that Bituminous Roadways operates an asphalt plant and sand and gravel mining operation in the southern half of the City on Rich Valley Boulevard since 1963. A condition of the sand and gravel overlay district requires renewal every five years; the last approval was in October 2012. Bituminous Roadways is requesting three changes to the current approvals, including 1) that the asphalt plant be allowed to start up and move some of their trucks that have been parked overnight out onto the road at 6:00 a.m. rather than 7:00 a.m., 2) be allowed to utilize an existing driveway on the southern end of the property as a backup secondary access, and 3) modify the monitory plan to eliminate the testing of the wash plant sedimentation ponds as they seal up with sedimentation and do not infiltrate or accurately identify content. Staff is not aware of any issues that exist with the site. If the Planning Commission supports the utilization of the secondary access it should be added as a condition of approval. Mr. Hunting noted that he misstated the language in Condition 5 regarding hours of operation. The language should be modified to match that of the narrative in regard to allowing vehicles that were parked overnight to exit the site. The applicants want the ability to have Bituminous Roadways trucks exit out of the site and to allow startup of the asphalt plant at 6:00 a.m. The resident who is surrounded by the plant, Mr. Wicker, has been notified of the request and he has voiced no concerns with the proposal. Staff recommends approval of the sand and gravel renewal for five years with the changes to the operation as laid out in the conditions.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked how the hours were originally set at a 7 a.m. start time.

Mr. Hunting replied that requirement has been in place for many years and he believes it was chosen as it was considered a typical startup time for many businesses.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked if that was a general startup time for Inver Grove Heights businesses.

Mr. Hunting replied not in all cases. The City generally likes contractors working in residential areas to refrain from starting work before 7:00 a.m.

Commissioner Lissarrague stated 7:00 a.m. would be considered a reasonable hour to begin work.

Commissioner Wippermann asked if there were any other sand and gravel operations in the City.

Mr. Hunting replied he was aware of two others in the City; Dawnway Demolition Landfill and the Max Steininger operation off Clark Road.

Commissioner Wippermann asked if tonight's approvals would set precedence for the other sand and gravel operations.

Mr. Hunting advised that he did not believe the others had established hours of operation.

**Opening of Public Hearing**

Kent Peterson, CEO of Bituminous Roadways, 6130 – 150<sup>th</sup> Street SE, Prior Lake, advised he was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Scales asked the applicant if he read and understood the report.

Mr. Peterson replied in the affirmative. He advised that the extra hour they were requesting would enable them to get a jump on production. Also, there would likely be only three trucks leaving in the morning.

Dale Nelson, 9860 Rich Valley Boulevard, stated that Rich Valley Boulevard is a narrow road that has sustained a lot of additional traffic and is also very popular with bicyclists. He advised that it has become a very dangerous situation because of dump trucks and side dumpers crossing center lines, exceeding sound and speed limits, etc. and he recommended that the permit not be renewed.

Terri Stark, 9860 Rich Valley Boulevard, stated that trucks going by on Rich Valley Boulevard wake them up in the morning and allowing them to begin work an hour earlier would affect the lives of the people living along that road.

Commissioner Scales closed the public hearing.

### **Planning Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Wippermann asked if there was language in the conditions of approval prohibiting drivers from using Rich Valley Boulevard unless they were going to a project in Inver Grove Heights.

Mr. Peterson replied in the affirmative, stating their trucks are expected to go north to Cliff Road or south to 117<sup>th</sup> Street unless there is work in the area. He advised there are a lot of trucks in the area that are not hauling for Bituminous Roadways.

Commissioner Lissarrague stated he lived close to this area and it was true that it was a dangerous traffic situation as the number of trucks traveling has greatly increased. He was not in favor of allowing the asphalt operation to begin at 6:00 a.m.

Mr. Peterson clarified that no trucks would be able to enter the site until 7 a.m. and there would be no loading of trucks before 7 a.m. The extra hour would be for asphalt trucks that are onsite overnight.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked the applicant to explain the following statement in the report 'including startup of the asphalt plant'.

Mr. Peterson replied that would allow them to store asphalt as they are making it prior to loading it into the trucks.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked if the entire operation would be starting an hour early.

Mr. Peterson replied that was not correct; they would not be loading any trucks or allowing trucks to enter the site until 7:00 a.m.

Commissioner Niemioja stated although she sympathized with Mr. Nelson and Ms. Stark's concerns, she did not see a reason not to support the request. She noted that, unlike earlier requests, the business was not located in the middle of a residential neighborhood, and she does not place all the blame for the traffic issues on this applicant as there were many other trucks in the area.

Commissioner Weber advised that his house was very close to Rich Valley Boulevard and he also hears a lot of trucks. However, most of those trucks come from construction areas in other cities; not this location.

Mr. Nelson stated he will continue to monitor the traffic and will contact law enforcement with any issues.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked if perhaps they should require the other sand and gravel operations to follow the same hours of operation.

Commissioner Scales stated he does not want to limit business owners because of what others are doing, and in this case he felt the traffic issues were more of a law enforcement issue.

**Planning Commission Recommendation**

Motion by Commissioner Weber, second by Commission Niemioja, to approve the ordinance amendment for the renewal of a five-year sand and gravel overlay permit, for the property located at 11661 and 11201 Rich Valley Boulevard, with the listed conditions and an additional condition to allow the applicant to utilize an existing driveway on the southern end of the property as a secondary access for the business.

Motion carried (6/1 - Lissarrague). This item goes to the City Council on October 9, 2017.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Hunting asked Commissioners if they would be available to attend a two-hour work session on October 24 to discuss land use alternatives regarding the comprehensive plan update. He will ask the Housing Committee to attend as well and will keep Commissioners informed of the meeting details.

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous vote at 8:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Fox  
Recording Secretary