

CITY OF AFTON
APPROVED PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
October 5, 2015, 6:30 PM

1
2
3
4
5 1. **CALL TO ORDER** –Chair Barbara Ronningen called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
6

7 2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – was recited.
8

9 3. **ROLL CALL** – Present: Langan, Wroblewski, Chair Ronningen, Kopitzke, Patten, Nelson and Doherty.
10 **Quorum present.** Excused Absence: Seeberger. Kilmer arrived at 6:35 p.m.
11

12 **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE** – City Administrator Ron Moose and Council Member Liaison Stan Ross.
13

14 4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** –
15 **Motion/Second: Patten/Nelson. To approve the October 5, 2015 Planning Commission agenda as**
16 **presented. Motion carried 7-0-0.**
17

18 5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –
19 a. August 31, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes – On Line 169 the line should read: “The
20 conditions ~~are~~ were not created by the actions of the owner.”
21

22 **Motion/Second: Wroblewski/Patten. To approve the August 31, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting**
23 **minutes as amended. Motion carried 7-0-1 (Abstain: Doherty.)**
24

25 6. **REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS** – none.
26

27 7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS** –

28 a. Elaine Murphy Application for Conditional Use Permit for Grading at the Parcel west of 15824 50th Street
29 with PID 27.028.20.43.0001 – Chair Ronningen opened the Public Hearing at 6:32 p.m.

30 Administrator Moose summarized the application from Washington Conservation District for constructing
31 a grassed waterway on the northern portion of 15824 50th Street to catch and transport surface water to prevent
32 the water from running down an existing waterway and existing rills (gullies) and causing erosion. Using soil
33 from the grading of the grassed waterway, the existing waterway will be filled and the gullies will be filled.
34 Additional fill will also be placed over a shallow natural gas line. The water flowing in the proposed grassed
35 waterway will outlet into a grassy area and make its way through a wooded area to a grass corridor, then on to
36 the St. Croix River. The volume of water that will reach the grass corridor will not increase. The speed at which
37 the water travels should be reduced as it flows though the grassy area and woods vs. flowing down the gullies.
38 The City Engineer reviewed the grading plans. After reviewing concerns about possible erosion issues through
39 the wooded area, it was determined the area has a substantial amount of grass which will help to prevent erosion
40 in the wooded area. The City Engineer also recommended a level spreader be installed at the outlet of the
41 northern grassy waterway to spread the flow of water as it leaves the waterway and flows into the grassy area
42 prior to entering the woods. James Landini, of the Washington Conservation District, added the level spreader to
43 the project plans.

44 There were no public comments.
45

46 **Motion/Second: Doherty/Patten. To close the public hearing at 6:36 p.m. Motion carried 8-0-0.**
47

48 Commission Discussion

49 There was a question about the natural gas pipeline. There was confirmation of the 10-year water event. The
50 WCD was questioned about why they wanted the grassed waterway fertilized.
51

52 **Motion/Second: Ronningen/Doherty. To recommend approval to the City Council for the Elaine Murphy**
53 **application for Grading CUP at the Parcel West of 15824 50th Street with PID # 27.028.20.43.0001with**

54 **the conditions as recommended by staff and with the addition of the sentence on #5 below. Motion carried**
55 **8-0-0.**

56
57 Conditions

- 58 1. All appropriate provisions of the Afton Code of Ordinances shall be complied with for the duration of
59 the permit.
- 60 2. Grading plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.
- 61 3. Any changes to the project shall be approved by the City of Afton.
- 62 4. City Engineer specifications and recommendations for all work shall be met for the duration of the
63 permit.
- 64 5. The grading plan shall be constructed according to plans approved by the City Engineer. Silt fences or
65 other types of erosion control shall be properly installed prior to construction; and shall be maintained in
66 good condition until the construction is complete. Any changes to the plan shall be reviewed and
67 approved by the City Engineer.
- 68 6. Non-compliance with the conditions of this permit shall be considered a violation, and may result in
69 revocation of this permit.
- 70 7. The property owner will adhere to the operation and maintenance plan dated July, 2015, and the
71 grassway shall be maintained as such for 10 years.
- 72 8. The operation of the proposed grassy waterway will be monitored on a periodic basis, particularly in
73 relation to erosion in the wooded area. If erosion is occurring, remedial action will be taken to address
74 and prevent the erosion.
- 75 9. Compliance with conditions of this permit shall be monitored on a periodic basis.
- 76 10. Construction shall begin within one year of the date of issuance of this permit or the permit shall
77 become null and void.

78
79 b. Guy Reithmeyer, et.al. Minor Subdivision at 1093 Lake Edith Lane and 1093 Indian Trail S. – Chair
80 Ronningen opened the Public Hearing at 6:38 p.m.

81 Administrator Moore summarized the application by Guy Reithmeyer who owns the property at 1093 Lake
82 Edith Lane. The property is nonconforming in size, at 1.889 acres. The property at 1093 Indian Trail South has
83 six owners located across the U.S. An application is being routed electronically to the owners for their
84 signatures. Mr. Reithmeyer and the owners of the adjacent property at 1093 Indian Trail South have applied for
85 a minor subdivision to transfer 15,443 sq. ft. of land to expand the Reithmeyer property at 1093 Lake Edith Lane
86 and combined will become a little over 2 acres. The proposed land division will not create any new lots. The lot
87 line rearrangement could not be accomplished through a simple subdivision because that requires both
88 properties to be conforming both before and after the subdivision. As the 1093 Lake Edith Lane property is less
89 than 5 acres, it is nonconforming. The land division will increase the size of the property, in conformance with
90 Section 12-1262. Land Division:

91 *B. In cases where adjoining contiguous property owners wish to exchange or otherwise divide land*
92 *with the intent of enlarging one of the parcels and as a result of such division neither parcel will*
93 *be more nonconforming in accordance with the zoning ordinance, article II of this chapter,*
94 *approval must be obtained from the City Council upon recommendation of the Planning*
95 *Commission after review of the minor lot subdivision application.*
96

97 **Motion/Second: Nelson/Kopitzke. To close the Public Hearing at 6:48 p.m. Motion carried 8-0-0.**

98
99 Commissioners felt the application was straightforward.

100
101 **Motion/Second: Doherty/Kilmer. To recommend approval to the City Council for the Guy Reithmeyer, et**
102 **al application for a Minor Subdivision at 1093 Lake Edith Lane S. and 1093 Indian Trail S. Motion**
103 **carried 7-1-0 (Nay-Kopitzke).**
104

105 c. Jessie Wilcox After-the-fact Variance Application at 14725 Afton Boulevard S. – Chair Ronningen
106 opened the Public Hearing at 6:50 p.m.

107 Administrator Moose summarized the Jessie Wilcox “after-the fact” variance to enable two existing
108 accessory buildings that exceed the maximum allowed total square footage to remain on the property. In 2004,
109 the property contained a house and a garage. The then-current property owner wanted to build a large pole barn
110 on the property, but the pole barn along with the garage was going to exceed the maximum allowed square
111 footage of accessory buildings. To address this issue, the property owner provided a letter to the city indicating
112 the garage would be joined to the house to create one large principal structure. This remodel would make the
113 pole barn conforming. After a building permit was issued for the pole barn and it was constructed in 2004 the
114 property owners did not eliminate the garage. After the construction of the pole barn, the property owner
115 demolished the garage and replaced it with a building designed to be used as a dwelling unit. This was done
116 without a building permit, and therefore, without the knowledge or consent of the city. The property has, since
117 that time, been sold to two different owners. Moose indicated that the current owner, Mr. Wilcox, did not have
118 knowledge that the buildings were nonconforming when he bought the property; he is requesting a variance be
119 granted to enable both accessory structures to remain on the property. The parcel size is 10 acres, which allows a
120 maximum of 2,500 sq. ft. of accessory buildings. The two existing accessory buildings total 3,020 sq. ft., which
121 is 520 sq. ft. over the maximum allowed. Also identified at issue on this property is the smaller accessory
122 building that was built as a second dwelling unit/guest house. The structure has a kitchen, a living room, a
123 bathroom, and a loft area. Sec. 12-186 of the City Code requires that “There shall be no more than one
124 residential dwelling unit on any one parcel of land described in Section 12- 132, unless otherwise allowed in the
125 Zoning Code. The three exceptions are a duplex, a temporary accessory dwelling unit and an accessory dwelling
126 unit (mother-in-law apartment). Both the duplex and the accessory dwelling unit require the second dwelling
127 unit to be in the principal structure. The temporary accessory dwelling unit must be a temporary structure that is
128 easily removable, such as a manufactured trailer home. Moose continued that if the Planning Commission
129 recommends that this structure can remain, the recommendation should include conditions to ensure the
130 structure cannot be used as a second dwelling unit. The conditions could include a declaration signed by the
131 property owner and recorded against the property indicating that the structure will not be used as a dwelling
132 unit, including a guest house, will not be rented, etc. The conditions could also include internal changes to the
133 structure so that it cannot be readily used as a dwelling unit, such as removing plumbing, removing appliances,
134 eliminating access to the loft area, prohibiting closets, etc.

135 Mr. Wilcox spoke about the application and the issues on his property. He does not wish to add on to the
136 house or accessory structure to connect them.

137 Don Barrett, 15526 Afton Hills Drive, stated he bought the property before Mr. Wilcox on the advisement
138 from the realtor that the property was in compliance with the city. He supports the request of the variance.

139 Raenette Manderfeld-Pung, 14801 Afton Blvd Ct, is not in support of the variance, feels there is a
140 discrepancy in the parcel acreage, and asked if anyone could think that a pergola really connects the accessory
141 structure to make it a part of the principal home. She asked how many acres is the parcel? How does that affect
142 the amount considered for the accessory structure?

143 Moose explained that the road easement is considered part of the acreage. The part the County purchased
144 for the road is not considered as part of the property.

145 Gregg Lauderdale, 14825 Afton Blvd Ct, stated according to the County the Wilcox property is not a 10
146 acre property.

147 David Pung, 14801 Afton Blvd Ct, stated Wilcoxs have stated they wanted to split the property. So the
148 designation of the acreage as 10 acres or 9.67 acres is important to the neighbors.

149 Wilcox spoke of the options available to them to split the lot.

150
151 **Motion/Second: Doherty/Wroblewski. To close the Public Hearing at 7:10 p.m. Motion carried 8-0-0.**

152
153 Commission Discussion

154 Commissioners discussed what constituted being connected. Kopitzke suggested that the deck, pergola and
155 block wall connect the dwellings so that a variance is not needed. If there was a deck or pergola, does that

156 “connect” the structures? If it is six feet away, is it a part of the principal structure. (The second dwelling unit is
157 25 feet away according to the drawings.) The Commission spent a considerable amount of time in 2014
158 discussing the “standards” that make a structure be considered as part of the principal structure, and that the
159 “connection” must be livable space. Is the city following those standards? It was noted that the ability for an
160 accessory structure to be part of the principal structure if it was within six feet **did not** include allowing **two**
161 **dwelling units** within 6 feet being considered one structure.

162 Ronningen confirmed that city ordinance does not allow two dwelling units on one parcel, which this parcel
163 clearly has, and there is no variance before them that asks for a variance to allow the second dwelling unit on the
164 parcel. She felt that the illegal dwelling unit is a bigger issue than the accessory building square footage
165 exceeding the allowable.

166 Wilcox responded that there are multiple properties in Afton that have guest houses.

167 Moore clarified that the application is only asking for a variance to keep both buildings; it does not ask to
168 keep the second building as a dwelling unit. The Planning Commission, should they recommend approval to
169 Council, can set conditions for the applicant to decommission the structure as a dwelling unit by removing
170 plumbing, bathroom and raised the possibility of removing one element of the second dwelling, such as the
171 kitchen.

172 Nelson felt that if the applicants had applied to increase the 1968 home's finished space in a way that would
173 connect the two dwellings it could be viewed favorably, but framing the application in terms of economic
174 reasons creates a barrier.

175 Kopitzke requested clarification that a dwelling unit contains a bedroom, a kitchen and a bathroom.

176 Ronningen commented that if the lot is not 10 acres, then the variance is for a much larger square footage
177 discrepancy.

178 Doherty asked, in trying to move towards a solution, if the two dwelling units were connected, could that
179 work?

180 Ronningen reiterated the problems with the property parcel: the Pole Barn accessory structure is in front of
181 principal structure; there is a second dwelling unit on the parcel; the square footage for accessory structures is
182 far exceeded; the variance application asks if this variance would confer upon the applicant privileges not
183 allowed to other people in the neighborhood, and the applicant indicated “no,” however, she stated, approving a
184 variance would give special privilege to this property owner. She sympathized with both of the former property
185 owners, but stated it is a prickly situation for the city. She asked if the applicant was willing to tear down one of
186 the houses.

187 The applicant handed out a list from the County of properties that have “guest houses” which don’t comply
188 with the city ordinances or code, but were allowed to be built.

189 Kopitzke thought another option would be to require the kitchen to be removed which would make this an
190 accessory building and the building should not be used as a guest house.

191 Nelson thought the questionnaire would have to say it is not being done purely for economic reasons.

192 Doherty thought the variance could be approved if they retracted the second dwelling unit.

193 Ronningen spoke about two properties from the list provided, stating that for the one on Valley Creek Trail,
194 the PC recommended the condition be placed on that it would never be used as a dwelling unit; she indicated the
195 mayor’s house was to create an office building, not a dwelling unit. She didn’t know any details on any others,
196 but stated that the Planning Commission’s job is to hear the applications and to apply the city ordinances. She
197 stated, in this case, the commission doesn’t have any reason to approve the variance as the ordinances are very
198 specific: there is way too much square footage in accessory buildings, past variances weren’t complied with, a
199 building was built without a building permit and may not even pass inspection now because of the way the
200 electricity was done, and there are two separate dwelling units on one parcel, which is not allowed in Rural
201 Residential zoning districts unless it is a duplex. The variance states it is for economic reasons, which is not one
202 of the allowable variance factors of practical difficulty, and the parcel was sold with two dwelling units on it,
203 which is not compliant with city code. If a variance was approved, it would afford this property owner privileges
204 not afforded to others in the neighborhood. Therefore, she felt they needed to recommend denial to the City
205 Council.

206 Kopitzke stated that the only viable option then would be to connect the two dwelling unit structures with a
207 covered walkway.

208 Ronningen stated that the “connection,” according to the discussion of standards for an accessory structure
209 to be part of a principal structure, would need to be fully livable space or be within six feet of the principal
210 structure.

211 Kilmer preferred to offer options to the applicant. One would be to combine the structures into a duplex.

212 Ronningen stated that other options may be discussed with the City Administrator.

213 Kopitzke stated that the property could be sold with full disclosure of the problems that it has.

214
215 **Motion/Second: Ronningen/Patten. To recommend DENIAL to the City Council of the Jessie Wilcox**
216 **application for an After-the-Fact Variance at 14725 Afton Boulevard, based on:**

- 217 1. **The application does not meet the variance requirements.**
- 218 2. **It would confer special privileges on the property not afforded to others.**
- 219 3. **That there are more variances required than the excessive square footage for accessory buildings.**
- 220 4. **The reason for the variance is for economic reasons, per the applicant’s own answer to the**
221 **variance questionnaire, which is not a practical difficulty.**

222 **Motion carried 8-0-0.**

223
224 **It was recommended that the applicant work with the city to find an alternative to the variance to remedy**
225 **the problems with the property, so that it may be sold as a compliant property.**

226
227 d. Gary Maas Minor Subdivision at 15990 32nd Street – Chair Ronningen opened the Public Hearing at 7:45
228 p.m.

229 Administrator Moorse summarized the Gary Maas application for a Minor Subdivision to divide the existing
230 1.04 acre property into two 22,582 sq. ft. lots. An existing house is on the southern portion of the existing
231 property and will be on the proposed new southerly lot. Both parcels meet the requirements for a subdivision in
232 the VHS-C zone.

233 Moorse explained the City has acquired a 19-foot-wide easement along the eastern side of the property for
234 road, levee, stormwater and sanitary sewer purposes. Several easements are required for stormwater and sanitary
235 sewer lines, and to maintain a 15-foot clear zone along the toe of the levee, there will not be any permanent
236 above-ground improvements in the easement area. In addition, in Sec. 12-1384. Easements, the City Code
237 provides for the dedication of the following easements as part of a subdivision:

- 238 A. *Provided for utilities. Easements of at least 20 feet wide, centered on rear and other lot lines as*
239 *required, shall be provided for utilities where necessary as recommended by the City Engineer.*
240 *Where underground utilities are being installed, a ten-foot wide front or side yard easement may*
241 *be required.*
- 242 B. *Provided for drainage. Easements shall be provided along each side of the centerline of any*
243 *watercourse or drainage channel, whether or not shown on the comprehensive plan, to a*
244 *sufficient width to provide proper maintenance and protection and to provide for stormwater*
245 *runoff and installation and maintenance of storm sewers.*
- 246 C. *Dedication. Utility and drainage easements shall be dedicated for the required use.*

247 The City Engineer recommended dedicating drainage and utility easements along the perimeter of the property.

248 With the upcoming construction of the sanitary sewer system to serve the downtown area, the applicant is
249 not required to demonstrate adequate septic system sites. The additional lot will be developed with municipal
250 sewer service. The proposed conditions of the subdivision approval include the connection of each lot to the
251 sewer system and an assessment waiver and agreement to pay the cost to hook up both lots to the sewer system.

252 During the survey work for the subdivision, it was discovered that the property on Afton Boulevard South
253 directly west of the subject property has a garage that encroaches 0.4 feet onto the subject property, and the eave
254 of the garage encroaches 1.4 feet. The applicant is proposing to grant a five foot wide easement for the garage,
255 so that it will not be illegally encroaching on the property. There is also a shed that fully encroaches onto the
256 property. The shed is to be removed from the property.

257 Joe Bush, developer for the owner, spoke briefly about the application.
258

259 **Motion/Second: Patten/Doherty. To close the Public Hearing at 7:49 p.m. Motion carried 8-0-0.**
260

261 Commission Discussion

262 It was clarified that the easement for the garage does not subtract any square footage from the proposed
263 parcel square footage.
264

265 **Motion/Second: Wroblewski/Nelson. To recommend approval of the Gary Maas application for a Minor
266 Subdivision at 15990 32nd Street S. with conditions as listed. Motion carried 8-0-0.**
267

268 Conditions

- 269 1. **Drainage and utility easements as recommended by the City Engineer shall be granted.**
- 270 2. **Park dedication requirements shall be satisfied for one newly created lot prior to recording of the**
271 **subdivision, in accordance with Section 12-1270 of the Subdivision Ordinance.**
- 272 3. **The principal structure on each lot shall be connected to the City's sewer system when the system**
273 **is available.**
- 274 4. **The applicant shall sign an assessment waiver and agreement to pay the costs required to hook up**
275 **both lots to the city sewer system.**
- 276 5. **A five foot wide easement for the encroaching garage shall be recorded prior to the recording of**
277 **the subdivision.**
- 278 6. **The shed that fully encroaches onto the property shall be removed prior to recording the**
279 **subdivision.**
- 280 7. **A driveway permit is required for the construction of a driveway to serve the northerly lot.**
281

282 **9. NEW BUSINESS**

283 a. Washington County Revised Septic Ordinance (Land Spreading of Septage) – The memo provided
284 background on the septage issue: The former County septic ordinance did not specifically address the land
285 application of septage. The updated ordinance allows it within a set of standards. Septage is most commonly
286 hauled to a sewage treatment system and pumped into the system. Land application of septage provides another
287 method of treatment. The land application of septage is supported by septic pumpers and some of their
288 customers because the land application option is less costly than hauling and disposing of septage at the Pig's
289 Eye treatment plant.

290 Administrator Moose explained that the Planning Commission's charge is to recommend whether or not
291 Afton would allow the spreading of septage, which was added to the new County subsurface sewage treatment
292 system ordinance, which Afton has adopted in the past by reference. The new County ordinance defines Septage
293 as “...solids and liquids removed from an SSTS and includes solids and liquids from cesspools, seepage pits,
294 other pits, or similar systems or devices that receive sewage. Septage also includes solids and liquids that are
295 removed from portable, incinerating, composting, holding, or other types of toilets. Waste from Type III marine
296 sanitation devices, as defined in Code of Federal Regulations, title 33, section 159.3, and material that has
297 come into contact with untreated sewage within the past 12 months is also considered septage.”

298 Moose indicated that the County will honor each city's wish on whether they will allow the spreading of
299 septage.

300 Ronningen stated that she recommends that the City Council not change our ordinance to allow the
301 spreading of septage, as Afton's land is highly susceptible to very high drainage and permeability, and since
302 Afton properties use well water, it is not a good idea.

303 Wroblewski commented that it seemed as if it is being allowed for economic reasons.

304 Kopitzke wondered whether this would be a better substitute than commercial fertilizer.

305 Ronningen pointed out that septage also contains bacteria, flushed drugs, and in the case of Cottage Grove,
306 contamination by Perfluorochemicals (PFCs).

307 Cottage Grove adopted an ordinance prohibiting the spreading of septage.

308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357

Motion/Second: Ronningen/Wroblewski. To recommend to City Council to adopt the language from Cottage Grove regarding prohibiting the land spreading of septage in Afton. Motion carried 8-0-0.

b. Burning Permits in the Village Historic Site (VHS) District – Administrator Moose summarized that the Fire Department regularly issues burning permits for brush in the rural area of the City. The Fire Department also issues burning permits for brush in the Village Historic Site (VHS) District, but does so rarely. The City does not have a policy regarding larger brush fires vs. recreational fires in the VHS District. While large brush fires are rare in the VHS District, the City has received complaints regarding a large brush fire in the VHS District. The complaints were related to burning embers landing on roofs. Due to the small lots in the VHS District, staff recommended to the City Council that they consider limiting fires in the VHS District to small recreational fires and prohibiting larger brush fires. A recreational fire is a fire of 3’ x 3’ x 3’ contained in a fire pit. Standards for a brush fire can be made for within the VHS. These could include diameter, height, setback from structures, acceptable materials and the need for a burning permit. The Council’s discussion included comments that the size of brush fires should be restricted, that the fires should be restricted to only on-site brush, and brush fires must be an appropriate distance from any structures. The Fire Department needs policy guidance from Afton on what will be allowed in the VHS.

Commissioners discussed the nuisance of smoke odors, not just in the VHS, but in other areas of Afton with smaller lots, materials allowed to be burned, flame height, embers not leaving the property.

Staff was directed to gather the burn ordinances from the neighboring Valley cities for review at the next Commission meeting.

c. Comprehensive Plan Update - Met Council System Statements – The Commission was provided with the newly released Metropolitan Council System Statements for Afton to guide the City’s Comprehensive Plan update process. The System Statements include population, household and employment forecasts. The detailed information regarding the Transportation, Water Resources/Wastewater and Regional Parks System Statements was provided to the Planning Commission members by email. Prior to the release of these System Statements, the City reviewed the Thrive MSP 2040 forecasts and provided feedback that the population and household forecasts were far beyond what the City’s Comprehensive Plan would allow. In response, the Metropolitan Council substantially reduced those forecasts which are reflected in the 2015 System Statements.

Chair Ronningen wondered if the PC and CC should have a joint meeting to discuss. Moose agreed that any other long-term strategic planning for the Comprehensive Plan could be discussed in a joint session.

Slopes for large lots was discussed as a possible amendment to consider. There may be others. The Comp Plan calls for Public Input sessions and a Public Hearing.

10. OLD BUSINESS

a. Meeting Start Time Review – Chair Ronningen wanted commissioner feedback to the early meeting start times. Some stated it has been a challenge, as it conflicts with youth sports; some work until 7:00 p.m., but can usually get out to make the early time. Some work on the other side of the metro, so it is harder to get through traffic for the earlier time. Getting supper before the meeting is sometimes difficult. Commissioners agreed they would like to have the meetings end by 9:00 p.m.

Next month the meeting will be at 7:00 p.m. and they will continue to discuss how the earlier start time is working for the members.

b. Draft City Council Minutes - Update on City Council Actions – Council Member Ross reported that the Paddock and Dickinson applications were approved by Council with many conditions. He indicated that the council did not come to consensus on a standard “minimum” lot size or having other guidelines for decisions and would like to continue reviewing applications on a case-by-case basis.

358 The wedding venue topic came back up with complaints by neighbors. Ross stated he has received several
359 calls about the events happening at the property. The owners say they are not “charging” for the weddings,
360 therefore, it is not a commercial venture. The city had not had complaints up to this point, but residents need to
361 call in to 911 for citing of noise complaints. The owners plan to come in to the city again for approval.
362

363 **11. ADJOURN –**

364
365 **Motion/Second: Doherty/Patten. To adjourn the meeting at 8:26 p.m. Motion carried 8-0-0.**
366

367 Respectfully submitted by:

368
369
370 _____
371 Kim Swanson Linner, Deputy Clerk

372
373 **To be approved on November 2, 2015 as (check one): Presented: _____ or Amended: X**