



**City of Lake Elmo  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes of March 24, 2014**

Chairman Williams called to order the meeting of the Lake Elmo Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Williams, Dodson, Kreimer, Larson and Haggard;

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Yocum, Dorschner, Lundgren and Morreale;

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director Klatt and City Planner Johnson.

**Approve Agenda:**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**Approve Minutes:** March 10, 2014

Williams requested three changes to the minutes.

M/S/P: Williams/Kreimer, move to approve the minutes as amended, **Vote: 5-0, motion carried unanimously.**

**Public Hearing:** *Conditional Use Permit Amendment – 901 Lake Elmo Avenue*

Johnson started his presentation by explaining the request by Family Means. The applicant would like to amend the existing conditional use permit (CUP) to construct a 4,000 square foot community center to serve as an accessory use to the park. The community or youth center would be used for after-school and summer programming for youth in the Cimarron Park community. Johnson further described the request by presenting the various plan sets that were submitted by the applicant. Johnson also confirmed that there is enough parking remaining on the site to serve all of the users. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the CUP Amendment request.

Dodson shared his concern that the lease space did not include and parking area. He noted that if the property owner of the manufactured home park changes, the parking situation could be an issue.

Kreimer asked about the existing situation of the parking lot. Johnson noted that the lot is currently under-utilized. Kreimer asked if any busses drop students off. Johnson did not think so, but he deferred to the applicants who are in attendance.

Larson asked if people from the greater Lake Elmo community can sign up for programming. Johnson again deferred to the applicants.

Brian Larson, representing Family Means, addressed the Planning Commission regarding the discrepancy of parking. He noted that when using the City's new required dimension of 9x18, they were able to site 108 parking stalls.

Tom Yuska, the Family Means program director, talked about how most of the participants traveled to the site. He noted that Lake Elmo Elementary does route a bus in front of the existing clubhouse. Yuska also shared that other participants are welcome beyond the Cimarron Park population, but that the program is focused on this population.

Larson asked if the center planned on providing before school care. Yuska noted that they do not have the capacity to provide before-school care.

Dodson asked how many students could be served by the facility. The program director noted that they likely serve 50-70 kids per day. Dodson asked what would happen to the building if they lost funding.

Public Hearing opened at 7:26pm.

No one spoke.

The City received no written comments.

Public Hearing closed at 7:27pm

Williams stated he supports the request.

M/S/P: Larson/Kreimer, move to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit Amendment submitted by Family Means to allow for the construction of a 4,000 square-foot youth center based upon the request meeting the City's 12 required findings for a CUP, **Vote: 5-0, motion carried unanimously.**

**Public Hearing:** *Variance - 09.029.21.11.0015 (Lot 9, Krause's Addition at Jamaca and Jane Road)*

Klatt started his presentation by explaining the request for a lot size variance. The code requires the lot size to be 0.9 acres and the subject property is 0.785 acres, 0.12 acres

short of the minimum. The applicant has also requested a variance from the 12-month time limit for the commencement of work associated with the lot size variance. The applicant does not plan to build on the lot within a one-year period of time.

Klatt continued by providing background information about the parcel, starting with the location. The parcel is on the northwest corner of the intersection of Jane Road North and Jamaca Avenue North. The parcel is just north of Lake Jane. He moved on to present the site plan, describing the topography of the lot. Klatt noted that the northwest portion of the lot collects drainage, and that if the Variance were granted, the City should require that a drainage easement be provided where the water collects.

Klatt then described the general area, specifically noting the parcel sizes of the surrounding properties. He noted that the properties that are located close to Lake Jane are all smaller or similar in size as the subject property. The properties to the north of the subject parcel were platted at a later date.

In terms of history, he noted that the subject property was granted a variance in 1985. The applicants purchased the property at this time, when the lot was likely considered buildable. However, variances are typically valid for a one year period of time. It should be noted that according to current zoning rules, the lot is not considered buildable. In terms of additional info, Klatt described two road reconstruction projects, one in the 80s and one in 2012. In the 80s, the lot was assessed as buildable. In 2012, staff determined that the lot was not buildable.

Klatt discussed the required findings related to a variance. He noted that Staff has provided draft findings in the Staff Report. Klatt noted that the lot is able to site a septic system that will meet Washington County approval.

To wrap up, Klatt noted that Staff is recommending approval of the variance with 5 conditions of approval:

1. Staff is recommending that the driveway for the future home be located on Jane Rd. N.
2. The applicant must provide drainage easements on the site.
3. Staff is recommending that the Variance be valid for 5 years, as opposed to the indefinite approval that the applicant is requesting.
4. The variance is conditioned upon the approval of a future building plans.
5. The future building plans must meet the approval of Valley Branch Watershed District.

Haggard asked why there is a one year valid time period for variances. She also asked if the site will be able to be built upon with the condition that the driveway must be on Jane Rd. Klatt noted that the one year time period is standard because if the variance

were open ended, there could be a lot of changes of City policy in the long interim period between when the variance is granted. Also, the site can change over the years. Regarding the second questions, Klatt noted that the septic design that was submitted to the City included a septic system on the eastern side of the site. Staff is confident that a home can be built with the driveway access condition.

Dodson asked what the risks might be related to the Valley Branch Watershed District approval. Klatt noted that the risks are not great, that meeting VBWD standards are a common part of the process. Staff is recommending the condition so that the applicants are aware that a VBWD permit is likely.

Dodson asked about the northwest corner of the lot, where water pools at this time. Klatt noted that the City does not have topographic information of the surrounding properties. However, when the building permit is submitted, staff would work to ensure that the existing drainage condition is not exacerbated by the construction of the home.

Kreimer asked if the property was assessed in 2012. Klatt noted that it was not.

Williams asked if the septic system has been approved by Washington County. Klatt noted that the system has yet to be approved. Staff did send the variance and proposed system to Washington County for review. The County did not respond, which they typically would if they had concerns.

Following up on Kreimer's earlier question, Klatt noted that if the variance were granted, the City may wish to revisit the 2012 assessment. Haggard noted that the assessment should be triggered as soon as the variance would be granted.

Larson asked about the impacts to adjacent properties. He asked if constructing the home would be an improvement to the drainage situation. Klatt stated that without a plan to review, it is difficult to be sure. However, there will be an overall decrease in impervious surface.

Christine Cirilli, representing the Horning Family, provided some background information on the request. She noted that the applicants have been paying taxes and assessments for the lot from 1985 to 2012 as a buildable lot. The status change to non-buildable in 2012 was a surprise to the applicants. The representative of the family noted that the applicants understand that they have to comply with all of the other zoning and building requirements. They intend to build a home that is consistent with the character of the neighborhood.

Public Hearing opened at 8:06pm.

Greg Zeipelt, 4940 Jamaca Ave. N., noted that his property is directly north of the subject property. He noted that he was not aware of the plans to possibly build a home on the property. He shared that he is lived in the neighborhood for 16 years. When his family purchased their home, their realtor researched the subject property and determined that the subject property was not a buildable lot. He continued by talking about the drainage issue. He noted that since the road project in 2012, the drainage has gotten worse in the northwest corner of the site.

Bill and Valerie Brass, 8930 Jane Road North, stated that they live to the immediate west of the subject property. She noted that she is concerned about the precedent of allowing variances for additional homes in the neighborhood. She also noted that all of the smaller parcels in the area are on the lake, not to the north of Jane Road. She finished up by stating her concern about the drainage issue. Bill added that they built their house in 1980, and the subject parcel was always the low spot in the area. He agreed that the drainage issue has gotten worse since the road project in 2012. Williams asked a question...the applicants answered

Jason Brash, 9030 Jane Road North, noted that he just moved to Lake Elmo. He noted that they moved here for the open space and large lots. He suggested that it stay that way.

Public Hearing closed at 8:18pm.

Williams asked if staff were aware of the drainage issues. Klatt noted that the City Engineer was aware that PW staff had visited the site. However, the Engineer did not note that any future action was pending.

Dodson noted that he is concerned about the drainage. However, he noted that the property owner does need to be considered. He feels that the property owner has a right to sell their property. It is clear that they have been paying taxes on the property as a buildable lot. Dodson noted that he is in favor of the variance and the 5-year timeframe.

Larson noted that due to the drainage problem, it is not yet determined if a home can be built on that site. It should be the responsibility of the City to ensure that the land can drain properly to serve all of the properties. Williams asked if condition #2 in the staff report would address his concern.

Kreimer noted that he does have some concerns related to the lack of a building plan.

Haggard wanted to clarify that this requested action is not a lot split. Klatt confirmed this fact.

Haggard also noted that she is concerned with the drainage. She would like the ultimate drainage situation to be improved. In addition, she does have concern about runoff to the lake. Also, she added that she would not like to see additional variances in the future. Klatt noted that any future variance would have to go through the Planning Commission and Council, and staff is not anticipating any future requested variances.

Williams noted that in general he supports granting the variance. However, he would like to offer additional or different findings. Williams noted two proposed changes to the findings. He also recommended two additional conditions:

Condition #6: The applicant will submit a letter from Washington County that an approved septic system can be located on the site at the time of building permit.

Condition #7: The owner shall pay an assessment comparable to other properties in the area related to the Jane Road reconstruction project.

Williams asked if everyone was agreeable to these changes. Everyone agreed.

Larson asked if some additional information should be added to better address the drainage concern. Klatt suggested that some additional language could be added to state that the post home construction conditions not be worse than the existing condition related to the drainage area on the northwest corner of the site. Williams stated that the overall impervious coverage will be reduced. Klatt noted that is correct, but it is hard to note what the future condition will be without a plan. Williams asked if it would be helpful to add to condition #2. Klatt suggested adding language to condition #4 to state that the post-construction condition will not exacerbate the existing drainage situation.

Haggard asked if everyone was agreeable to the five year timeframe. Everyone agreed that the five-year timeframe is reasonable.

Larson asked about the ability to request an extension. Larson wanted it noted in the minutes that the request to extend the time period beyond 5 years should be legitimate and warranted.

M/S/P: Dodson/Williams, move to approve the variance from the minimum lot area requirements for 5 years for 09.029.21.11.0015 based upon the findings of fact as amended by the Planning Commission with the conditions as amended by the Planning Commission, **Vote: 5-0, motion carried unanimously.**

Haggard asked if the City is setting any precedent with the five-year timeframe. Klatt noted that each variance must be considered by its own merit.

**Public Hearing: Zoning Map Amendment and PUD Concept Plan – Launch Properties**  
(PID: 09.029.21.11.0015 - Lake Elmo Avenue and Hudson Boulevard)

Klatt started his presentation by stating that there are two requests, both warranting a Public Hearing. Request #1 is a zoning map amendment to change the zoning of the property from Rural Development Transitional District (RT) to Business Park (BP). In addition, request #2 includes the submittal of a PUD Concept Plan for a business park of a total of 380,000 square feet of warehouse/light manufacturing space. Klatt presented the City's Future Land Use Map and Official Zoning Map, showing the location and designation of the subject parcel.

Moving forward, Klatt explained the PUD Concept Plan. Klatt noted that they are requesting a planned development because they are requesting flexibility from the City's zoning ordinance in two areas:

1. They are requesting a zero lot line situation for the parking areas in the middle of the two proposed buildings.
2. They are requesting reduced setbacks for the principal buildings and parking areas. More specifically, these reduced setbacks relate to the area along the northern property boundary.

Klatt provided an aerial view of the area. The site is currently used for agricultural purposes. He then proceeded to present the existing conditions map and concept plan that were submitted. Klatt talked about PUDs generally and the aspects of the proposed project that warrant consideration. Klatt shared some of the Engineer's concerns related to the access along Hudson Blvd. In addition, the County reviewed the plan and wanted to ensure that the access road along Lake Elmo Ave. is not used for truck traffic. Washington County has requested a traffic impact study, which will be provided as part of Preliminary Plans. Klatt also described a review comment of the engineer that relates to storm water management. Klatt then presented the elevations for the buildings that were submitted. He noted that the applicants have incorporated elements from the City's Theming Study into their plans, including fencing and a possible monument sign at the key gateway of Lake Elmo Ave. and Hudson Blvd.

Staff is recommending approval of the Concept Plan with conditions related to the City Engineer's review comments, the traffic impact study, additional permits (VBWD), detailed landscape plan, final architectural plans, signage, park dedication fees, easements, storm water ponding and infiltration areas and, finally, a PUD development plan.

Dodson asked for clarification regarding proof of parking. Klatt noted that the applicant anticipates that the provided parking to the south of the office in building number 1 should address the parking needs. However, if additional parking is needed in the

future, they are providing a proof of parking for the area that can be improved as additional parking at a later date.

Haggard asked about the setback to the proof of parking area to the west. Klatt noted that the same setback would not apply because the proof of parking area is not adjacent to a residential zone. There was a general discussion of setbacks.

Dan Regan, Launch Properties, noted that they are hoping to provide a clean and low- nuisance light industrial business park. He stated that he hopes the use will be beneficial to the I-94 Corridor and stimulate additional development and jobs in the areas. Regan noted that they are committed to working with City Staff and Washington County to address the access spacing issues. Regarding recs, he estimated that the first phase will include 18 or 19 rec units. He estimated that the total site could go up to 90 recs. Regan also noted that the likely tenant is a tire storage and distribution warehouse. The applicants will work on a high powered sprinkler system to address any concerns over fire safety.

Haggard asked how much truck traffic will be generated by the first phase. Regan noted that truck traffic is less than would be expected. The likely use is more storage than distribution, such as would be associated an amazon.com distribution center or similar use.

Williams asked about the berm planned for the northern property boundary. Regan noted that the berm is 4-6 feet in height with evergreen planting to provide year-round screen. The berm would include irrigation, and a cross-section will be provided with the Preliminary Plan to demonstrate the berming and screening.

Williams asked the applicant if there was any concern about restricting parking within the fire lane. Regan noted that there are no concerns about restricting parking in this area.

Williams asked about the trailer parking for the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase building. Regan noted that there is enough space, 185', to allow for full turning movements for tractor trailer trucks. He added that he does not anticipate all of the spaces to be filled with trailers at all times.

Williams also asked about the green stripe running down the center of the site. Regan noted that there likely would not be a median or physical barrier. The lot would be striped to designate the lot line or boundary. Dodson asked about the center island. Regan noted that the island would be necessary to direct internal traffic appropriately.

Public Hearing opened at 9:30pm.



Linda Anderson, 275 Lake Elmo Avenue North, noted that they are concerned about traffic noise from trucks. More specifically, she notes that trucks tend to arrive early in the morning and idle until the building opens. She asked if there was any restriction of time for trucks to be operating. She noted some concerns about the traffic speed along Lake Elmo Ave. She also shared some information about existing drainage that slopes to the south onto the applicant's property in the northwest corner. To summarize, she noted that the truck traffic is the biggest concern.

Public Hearing closed at 9:35pm

Dodson stated that he is not excited about the design of the building, as it still resembles a large concrete block. He would suggest additional berming in other locations. As presented, Dodson noted that he does not support the building.

Haggard noted that she like the truck area is internal to the site and the landscaping and other components are nice. However, she does have concerns about the façade, that is should be more broken up. In addition, she thinks that the office should be oriented on the main street. Finally, she noted that she does not support the reduced setbacks.

Dodson wanted to clarify his earlier comments that he thinks that the proposed berms is too small. Larson stated that the berm in Fields of St. Croix is 10 or 12 feet high.

Williams noted that the use is appropriate and the size of the buildings is fine. However, he would like to see the elevations tweaked, as well as greater variation in the roof line. He thinks that the fire lane setback is appropriate, however, the building setback is a problem and should be greater. Williams suggested planted islands within the truck court to break up the monotonous pavement. Williams also felt that the berm should be increased and irrigated. Moving on, Williams noted that the drainage in the northwest corner can be registered as a concern. Finally, regarding the fire lane, Williams suggested an island, as well as signage, at the entrance to discourage truck traffic.

Williams asked staff how to best address the comments of the Planning Commission. Klatt offered some direction as to how best incorporate the Planning Commission's concerns into a motion. Some concerns can be included as conditions of approval, and others can be simple suggestions to the applicant.

Williams suggested that the setback from the north property line be maintained at 150 feet unless a design of a berm can be provided that would sufficiently mitigate the reduced setback. He added that he is not concerned about the location of the fire lane or the location of the parking as shown. Haggard noted that she does have concerns about the reduced setback for the fire land and parking, and she does not support the reduced building setback.

Larson asked that the applicants look at meeting the intent of the design standards manual, but on a larger scale due to the size of the building. He also stated that it looks like a wonderful business park. Anything that can be done to make it more "Lake Elmo" would be appreciated. Larson also noted that there could be a designated truck waiting area so that the idling does not negatively impact neighbors. Larson also commented on the drainage.

Dodson asked Chairman Williams about the setback issue. He noted that it may change the allowed square footage of the building. Williams noted that the Planning Commission can change the recommendation, and it does not need to contain a square-footage for the building.

Williams asked if they could separate the motions for the zoning map amendment and PUD Concept Plan. Klatt noted that they can separate the actions.

M/S/P: Larson/Dodson, move to recommend approval of the zoning map amendment to change the zoning of the subject parcel from RT to BP, **Vote: 5-0, motion carried unanimously.**

Williams suggested that the proposed exception for the building setback be denied unless a letter of support from the neighboring property owners to the north is received or if the berming and landscaping is increased to mitigate the building setback concern.

Haggard asked if the location of the driveway and fire lane must be in that location. The applicants noted that the fire land must be in that location to gain access to the northern side of the building and meet County spacing guidelines. Todd Erickson, the civil engineer, noted that they may be able to sweep the fire lane further south to allow for more room for berming and screening adjacent to the residential parcels to the north. Regan also added that trucks are not able to use the fire lane because the turning radius is not large enough for tractor trailers. In addition, trucks cannot access the trailer court from the north. Finally, Regan noted that the size of the berm can be increased.

Williams proposed to add additional language to condition #5 to break up the continuous and flat roof line.

Williams also added a condition, condition #11, that the exception for building setback is denied unless either a letter of support is received from the adjacent property owners to the north or the berm is increase to mitigate the building setback concern.

Haggard note that there are two setback situations. Williams noted that he is not concerned about the parking setback.

M/S/P: Williams/, move to approve the PUD Concept Plan and Zoning Map Amendment for Launch Properties PID #36.029.21.33.000 at Lake Elmo Avenue and Hudson Boulevard with the conditions of approval as amended by the Planning Commission, **motion fails for lack of a second.**

Haggard asked if condition #5 could be amended to include considerations related to the façade and entrances. Dodson noted that the main entrance is on Hudson Blvd., so it is compliant with the design standards. Williams discussed the possibility of protrusions and recessions along street facing facades. Erickson suggested additional plantings and berming along these facades. He noted that with this type of construction, it is difficult to make substantial recessions and protrusions. Dodson suggested additional plantings or berming along the western and Northern portion of the site. Williams summarized by stating that the roof line is still a concern, and that the façade can be mitigated by additional plantings and berming. Haggard suggested that they understand the intent of the Planning Commission's comments. They will improve the plan the next time they bring it forward. She also asked that the condition related to the building setback be amended to state that they need both the property owner's consent and additional berming, as opposed to either or. Erickson noted that this amendment would make it difficult to move things forward. Regan stated that he is committed to working with the Anderson family to come to a reasonable solution.

Williams asked for a straw vote to determine whether the fire lane must meet the parking setback. The straw vote was 3-2, with the fire lane not needing to meet the parking setback. Klatt discussed normal setback requirements for driveways.

Klatt reread the original motion to the Planning Commission.

M/S/P: Williams/Dodson, move to approve the PUD Concept Plan with condition 5 amended and Condition 11 added, **Vote: 5-0, motion carried unanimously.**

Williams wrapped up by stating that other areas of concern include the drainage in the northwest corner and internal island landscaping in the trailer court.

**Business Item:** *Outdoor Wedding Venue Ordinance*

Klatt started his presentation by reviewing the changes incorporated into the draft ordinance of the Outdoor Wedding Venue Ordinance that was discussed at the last meeting. He noted that staff is proposing a public hearing on the ordinance on April 14, 2014.

Haggard stated that she feels that the property owner should be in attendance to ensure accountability of the conditions or rules. Dodson agrees with this idea.

Haggard asked about larger parcels, such as 40 acres. She asked if they could they have additional events or guests. The Planning Commission discussed the topic, noting that the total number of events allowed per week is two.

Staff suggested that the City needs to define wedding ceremonies.

Haggard suggested that there should be a limit to the number of total events per year. Klatt noted that the number of events per year can be regulated under the interim use permit process, allowing the City to better address frequency concerns on a site-by-site basis.

Haggard asked some questions about the City's noise ordinance. Klatt relayed the exact standards in the noise ordinance, noting that the allowed level is based on duration.

The Planning Commission discussed the required parking for outdoor social events. Klatt noted that the 1 space per three attendees is consistent with other parking quotas of similar uses, such as place of worship and community center.

Klatt asked if they would like staff to move forward with the public hearing. The Planning Commission noted that they are comfortable setting public hearing for the next available meeting.

**Business Item:** *Site Plan Review Ordinance*

Johnson explained the purpose of the proposed ordinance amendment. He noted that the action does not require a public hearing.

M/S/P: Dodson/Kreimer, move to recommend striking the site and building plan review ordinance, **Vote: 5-0, motion carried unanimously.**

**Business Item:** *Easton Village Sketch Plan Discussion*

Klatt noted that the Planning Commission requested to discuss the updated Sketch Plan. He shared that the applicant has been working to prepare a preliminary plat application. Providing a general overview of the changes, Klatt noted that there are less cul-de-sacs, greater pedestrian connectivity, and the park areas have been modified based on feedback from the Park Commission.

Williams asked why there are no connection between the centrally located streets and Village Pkwy. Todd Erickson, the civil engineer, noted that the road is a minor collector road and does require access spacing. Johnson noted that the access spacing per City standard is 1/8 of a mile. Williams noted that the separation between the southern cross street and the property to the south will not meet the spacing. Erickson noted

that the access to Manning may be more permanent. Johnson spoke generally about access spacing guidelines and how they are put into practice.

Williams presented the Village Master Plan. He noted that there are no cul-de-sacs in the plan. Erickson noted that cul-de-sacs are highly desirable to families purchasing the homes. In addition, the Easton Village design accounts for the difficult drainage of the site, as well as the location of the natural gas main. In addition, the builder has requested to have some cul-de-sacs.

Williams noted that he is presenting the Village Master Plan to the Planning Commission for discussion purposes. He prefers greater inter-connectivity between neighborhoods, particularly in the Village. Kreimer notes that he prefers and supports cul-de-sacs, as long as they have trail connectivity. Erickson noted that the connectivity has been improved, especially to Reid Park. He added that he is attempting to balance the needs of the developer and the input of the Planning Commission, Park Commission and City Council.

Haggard shared her concern that if the connection to Manning is permanent, that road should be upgraded to handle that traffic. Klatt noted that these properties may register concern later down the road if this access is permanent. He stated that the Engineer's recommendation will be to make the access temporary or restricted, such as right-in/right-out. With this restriction, more traffic would likely go down to 30<sup>th</sup> Street, which may have a signal at Manning in the future.

Referring to the Village Master Plan, Dodson asked how a more grid layout improves livability. Williams noted that it would function more like a traditional residential area, where a grid-pattern is more common. Dodson asked if the current old village is what is trying to be emulated. Williams noted that the Laverne and Layton area is more grid like, whereas the areas to the west of Lake Elmo Ave are dead-ends or cul-de-sacs. Williams noted that if the blocks are smaller, there is more human interaction and a more neighborhood-feel. Dodson felt that people interact differently today, and the layout would not prohibit or reduce human interaction.

Haggard shared a concern about speeding in the Easton Village neighborhood.

Kreimer asked about the density of the project, being that the lot widths proposed are 65 feet. Klatt explained that this project is on the high end of the density range, and the Gonyea project is on the low end of the medium density range. There was a general discussion single family neighborhoods and density.

### **Updates and Concerns**

#### *Park Commission Update*

Larson provided background information about the last Park Commission meeting, where the Schiltgen Farms and Wildflower (Engstrom) developments were discussed.

*Council Updates – March 18, 2014 Meeting*

1. Zoning Text Amendment – Accessory Building passed as presented.
2. The City Council Reviewed the Schiltgen Farms, Parcel B Sketch Plan.

*Staff Updates*

1. Planning Commission Discussion Series – “Meaningful Dialogue with the Public”
2. Upcoming Meetings
  - a. April 14, 2014
  - b. April 28, 2014
3. Lake Elmo Ave (CSAH 17) Open House was held on March 13, 2014, where 50-70 people attended.

*Commission Concerns*

Dodson asked about how many lots are in the community that are unbuildable according to the zoning but are being taxed as buildable. Klatt noted that it is hard to know, that this generally doesn't come up unless an assessment is proposed. There are not that many of the unbuildable lots out there. Johnson noted that the tax classification is determined by the County.

Meeting adjourned at 11:38pm

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Johnson  
City Planner