

1 **APPROVED MINUTES**

2 **EMILY PLANNING COMMISSION/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

3 **REGULAR MEETING**

4 **April 1, 2025**

5

6 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

7 The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Rheume at 6:00 pm.

8

9 **2.** Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

10

11 **3. ROLL CALL**

12

13 PRESENT: Pat Rheume, Mark Mosman, Lynn Bartel, Faye Hughes and
14 Dave Johnson (Attended Remotely)

14

15 Council: Greg Koch (Liaison)

15

16 Staff: Steve Jones, Zoning Administrator (Sourcewell), Sue Fahrendorff , Zoning Clerk

16

17

18 **4. ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO AGENDA**

19

a. Addition to Agenda regarding Mining to be added to New Business

20

21 **MOTION MADE BY COMMISSIONER BARTEL TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS**
22 **PRESENTED WITH THE ADDITION OF THE TOPIC OF MINING ADDED TO NEW**
23 **BUSINESS. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HUGHES. ROLL CALL VOTE:**
24 **JOHNSON, MOSMAN, HUGHES, BARTEL, AND RHEAUME ALL VOTED AYE.**
25 **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

25

26

27 **5. DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS**

28

28 Commissioner Rheume reviewed the Public Hearing Procedures handout that was provided in
29 the Planning Commission packet.

29

30

31 **6. OPEN FORUM**

32

None

33

34 **7. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

35

36 a. Public Hearing for a Variance request for Michael & Michelle Healy, XXXX Preserve Point,
37 Parcel Number 21060506, Lot 1, Block 1, Wood Lake Preserve, City of Emily, Crow Wing
38 County, MN to allow the following Variances:

38

39

- 40 1) House is 50 feet from the OHW, 100 feet required (50 foot variance request)
- 41 2) House is 13 feet from NW Bluff, 30 feet required (17 foot variance request)
- 42 3) House is 23 feet from SW Buff, 30 feet required (7 foot variance request)
- 43 4) Septic System: 57 feet from the OHW, 100 feet required (43 foot variance request)
- 44 5) Septic System: 2 feet from Bluff, 30 feet required (28 foot variance request)

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MINUTES

Emily Planning Commission

April 1, 2025

49 **Variance Request Staff Report**

50 Applicant: Marka Architecture (Vaughn Larson) on behalf of Michael and Michelle Healy

51 Application Date: February 13, 2025

52 Planning Commission/Board of Zoning Adjustment Hearing Date: April 1, 2025

53 City Council Review Date: N/A (Only if appealed.)

54 60-Day Rule Ending Date: April 14, 2025 (Extended on Feb. 18, 2025 to June 13, 2025-See Attached Letter)

55 Staff Report: Steven Jones, Senior Community Development Administrator, Sourcewell

56 Property Owner: Michael and Michelle Healy, 3375 162nd Lane NW, Andover MN, 55304

57 Property Address: Pending

58 Parcel Number: 21060506

59 Property Legal Description: Lots 1, Block 1, Wood Lake Preserve, City of Emily, Crow Wing County, MN (The
60 owners also own the adjacent Lots 2 and 3, but they are not part of this application.)

61 Lake Classification: Recreational Development Lake (RD)

62 Lot Square Footage: 1.08 acres, 47,045 square feet

63 Notices: Legal in Newspaper March 3rd, 2025 and letters to property owners within 350 feet on March 6th, 2025.
64 The Notice was also posted at city hall and on the city web site. The DNR notification letter emailed on February
65 18, 2025.

66
67 **Comprehensive Plan Review**: The Comprehensive plan (page 14) talks about Shoreland Residential: To
68 establish and maintain a land use district for riparian residential development that preserves the natural shoreline.
69 Under "Community Input" (page 24) "The lakes serve as an economic driver for the community. Respondents
70 noted that the lakes and rivers as the number one asset in the community. (90% response) Preservation and
71 protection are a priority to residents." Under Environment and Natural Resources, Goal 1: Protect historic
72 landscapes through appropriate land use designations including "Review conditions on variances, CUPs, and plats
73 when appropriate to protect natural resources."

74
75 **Initial Findings and Discussion**: On or about January 14, 2025, Vaughn Larson of Marka Architecture applied
76 for a Variance for Michael and Michelle Healy for Parcel #21060506 to build a new home. After initial review,
77 staff contacted the applicant and informed them that they considered the application incomplete (for various
78 reasons outlined in the city files). Over the next few weeks staff and the applicant (Vaughn Larson) discussed the
79 project in person, via emails and phone calls. Staff recommended they look at alternatives. In the end, after
80 discussion, review and completion of final steps and the applicant furnishing the additional information required
81 by the city, the applicant completed the revised application on February 13, 2025 at which time the city accepted
82 the application as complete.

- 83
84 1) Owners: Michael and Michelle Healy
85 2) Parcel #21060506
86 3) Legal Description: Lots 1, Block 1, Wood Lake Preserve, City of Emily, Crow Wing County, MN
87 4) Zoning: Shoreland Residential (SR)
88 5) Lot Size: 1.08 acres, 47045 square feet
89 6) Proposed square footages of residence, 1729 total main floor with mechanical space plus 880 garage (974
90 upper floor and 463 upper unfinished storage), 4046 total square footage.
91 7) 3,289 total square feet in OHW Setback, but about 2,600 first floor space with garage.
92 8) Impervious Calculation: 39,231 sq ft, lot 1 only, 3006 sq ft, house, stoop and covered patio, 747 sq ft,
93 driveway, 65 sq ft, sidewalk from lake entry to patio, 3818 sq ft total impervious, or 9.7% (20% allowed).
94 9) Lake Classification: Recreational Development Lake (RD)
95 10) Well location, just south of the covered porch (see map).
96 11) The proposed house is 27'-4" to the peak, 18' - 10" at the mid-point of the trusses (meets code)

MINUTES

Emily Planning Commission

April 1, 2025

97 12) Meets side and rear setbacks, but is almost 100% outside buildable areas.

98 13) The property is on Wood Lake, which is a 93 acre lake, with 3 miles of shoreline. The lake is relatively
99 shallow, with an average depth of 17 feet and a maximum depth of 35 feet.

100 14) Roughly half of the lot are bluffs, or bluff like conditions.

101
102 **Staff Comments:** Staff has concerns about this proposal. Almost none of the usable building space (per code) on
103 the lot is being used. The applicant supplied a secondary plan that showed most of the house being built on a
104 buildable piece of land of the adjacent property (per code), but in the end this proposal was withdrawn and the
105 applicant returned to the original application. In addition to the house placement and basic building plans, the
106 placement of the proposed SSTS is outside buildable areas, and no additional information was given on why it
107 could not be placed on buildable (per code) areas. Staff has been told that placement of the house in the buildable
108 areas is difficult (elevation) and adds to the cost (and is the least desirable spot for their home). Staff has also been
109 told that the applicant wants to go forward with the original proposal, and if not approved, the owners will sell the
110 property.

111
112 **City Attorney Review:** N/A

113
114 **Required Planning Commission/Board of Zoning Adjustment Action:** (Within 60 days, unless an extension is
115 requested.)

- 116 1) The Board of Zoning Adjustment holds the required Public Hearing and reviews the variance application.
117 The application was accepted by the City as complete on February 13, 2025. The 60 days end date,
118 without extension, would have been April 14, 2025, but the city has implemented an additional 60 days
119 extension until June 13, 2025 (see attached letter). The City hopes to complete action by April 1, 2025.
- 120 2) The Board of Zoning Adjustment reviews all pertinent information, research, findings of facts and
121 analysis of the three-factor practical difficulty test and makes a finding on if the application meets the
122 three-factor practical difficulty test for all proposed variances. If additional information is needed a
123 decision can be delayed, taking into account the 60-day rule, and any extension.
- 124 3) The City Council only reviews the findings if it is appealed by the applicant.

125
126 **Harmony with other land use controls (City Code and Comprehensive Plan):**

127 The Comprehensive plan (page 14) talks about Shoreland Residential: "To establish and maintain a land use
128 district for riparian residential development that preserves the natural shoreline." Under "Community Input"
129 (page 24) "The lakes serve as an economic driver for the community." Respondents to the plan noted that the
130 lakes and rivers as the number one asset in the community (90%). Preservation and protection are a priority to
131 residents." Under Environment and Natural Resources, Goal 1: "Protect historic landscapes through appropriate
132 land use designations" (Review conditions on variances, CUPs, and plats when appropriate to protect natural
133 resources."

134
135 **Economic: (Economic factors can't be the sole reason for consideration of a variance):** The owners have
136 stated that construction in the buildable areas will raise the costs of the construction due to elevation issues,
137 bluffs, and soil conditions.

138
139 **Neighborhood/Public Opinion:** Staff received two letters of support from neighbors.

140
141 **DNR Comments:** Notice was sent to the DNR, no comments have been received.

142
MINUTES

Emily Planning Commission
April 1, 2025

143 **Staff Recommendation:** The Board of Zoning Adjustment has two routes to proceed.

- 144 • The Board of Zoning Adjustment (BZA) has the right to deny the application, based on the Findings
- 145 and Interpretation of the “Three Factor Practical Difficulty Test”
- 146 or the Board of Zoning Adjustment could make the finding that the “Three Factor Practical
- 147 Difficulty Test” can be met for all of the variance requests.

148 The Board of Zoning Adjustment may also place conditions on the variance application.

- 149
- 150
- 151
- 152 • **Staff Note:** A variance is an exception granted by the Planning Commission/Board of Zoning
- 153 Adjustment from the literal provisions of the zoning ordinance. Variances can be considered where
- 154 there are unique conditions of a property that do not apply to other areas in general. Simply put, a
- 155 variance is a deviation from zoning requirements. In Minnesota, variances may only be granted
- 156 relating to physical attributes of a property (e.g., setbacks, lot size, structure height, etc.). Economic
- 157 difficulties alone do not constitute practical difficulties; the problems must extend beyond economic
- 158 considerations.

159

160 **POSSIBLE THREE-FACTOR PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY TEST CONCLUSIONS:**

- 161
- 162 1) **PART 1: House Variance Requests:** The planned construction (House) is 50 feet from the
- 163 **Ordinary High Water Level (OHW), 100 feet required (50 foot variance request), the House is 13**
- 164 **feet from the NW Bluff, 30 feet required (17 foot variance request), and the House is 23 feet from**
- 165 **the SW Bluff, 30 feet required (7 foot variance request).**

166

167 A variance may be granted if the landowner can satisfy a three-factor practical difficulty test. To

168 constitute a “practical difficulty all three factors must be satisfied.

169

170 **NOTE:** If the Board of Adjustment finds the response in “subpart b” to any of the variance criteria below to be

171 true, the variance request must be denied.

- 172
- 173 1) **Reasonableness:** Will the variance allow the property owner to use the property in a reasonable
- 174 **manner?**
- 175
- 176 A) *Yes – The variance will allow the Healys to build the home they want on the property in the*
- 177 *location that makes the most sense. The requested home location is the only flat area on the*
- 178 *property. The area allowed by the setbacks has an approximate 16 foot drop from what would*
- 179 *be the front of the home to the rear. This would significantly increase the difficulty and cost to*
- 180 *build the new home. The Healys are desiring to build a slab on grade home. This would allow*
- 181 *them to more easily stay in the home as they grow older and also make the home more*
- 182 *affordable to build. A full basement would add at a minimum \$300,000 or more to the cost of the*
- 183 *home. (Applicant Comments)*
- 184
- 185 B) *No, the property includes a buildable area, which is not being utilized in the plans for the new house*
- 186 *construction. Almost the entirety of the proposed construction is outside of established building areas.*
- 187 *The request is excessive and could be mitigated. A Practical Difficulty has not been shown or proven.*
- 188
- 189

MINUTES

Emily Planning Commission

April 1, 2025

190 2) **Uniqueness:** Is the variance necessary because of circumstances unique to the property (not caused
 191 by the landowner)?

192
 193 A) Yes – The property has a very unique shape being long and skinny. The vast majority of the area
 194 of the lot is either bluff itself or OHW setback. The only area not in the OHW setback falls down
 195 a relatively steep hill away from the lake into wetland on the backside of the property.

196 *(Applicant Comments)*

197 B) No, even though property is long and narrow, there is a buildable area on the lot, and there has been
 198 no attempt to quantify the difficulties creating a Practical Difficulty. Other properties along the lake
 199 have been built further away from the OHW.

200
 201 3) **Essential Character:** Will the variance alter the essential character of the locality? For example,
 202 will the resulting structure be out of scale, out of place, or otherwise inconsistent with the
 203 surrounding area?

204
 205 A) No, the new home will not alter the essential character of the locality. The nearest structure to
 206 the south of The Healy's proposed home (parcel 21060503) appears to be an equal distance to
 207 the lake from what we are requesting. The nearest to the north also appears to be
 208 approximately 50' from the lake. The properties would all appear very similar and unison.

209 *(Applicant Comments)*

210 B) Yes, the proposed house construction will alter the essential character of the locality. This property
 211 is the next to last lot on the north side of the city with an existing building (proposed), to the South,
 212 chiefly along Wood Lake Boulevard, only one house is less than 100 feet from the OWH (63 feet), in
 213 City Limits to the South, 7 structures others are 145, 115, 103, 112, 147, 215 and 125 from the OHW.
 214 This proposal would place a new building closer to the OHW than any almost other main structure in
 215 the immediate vicinity. (There is a structure 550 feet to the north, outside city limits, within about 40
 216 feet of the OHW). The adjacent Wood Lake is a small (92 acre) Lake, relatively shallow, with the
 217 deepest part 35 feet, with an average depth of 17 feet. Water quality, according to the DNR, can be
 218 poor, with an abundance of plant and algae growth. There is approximately 3 miles of shoreline
 219 along this lake. The close proximity to the OHW and adjacent bluffs could further damage the lake
 220 with increased runoff and erosion.

221
 222
 223 **PART 2: SSTS Variance Requests:** The Septic System is 57 feet from the Ordinary High Water Level
 224 (OHW), 100 required (43 foot variance requested), the Septic System is 2 feet from the Bluff, 30 feet
 225 required (28 foot variance request).

226
 227 A variance may be granted if the landowner can satisfy a three-factor practical difficulty test. To
 228 constitute a "practical difficulty all three factors must be satisfied.

229
 230 **NOTE:** If the Board of Adjustment finds the response in "subpart b" to any of the variance criteria below to be
 231 true, the variance request must be denied.

232
 233 1) **Reasonableness:** Will the variance allow the property owner to use the property in a
 234 reasonable manner?

- 236 A) *Yes – The variance will allow the Healys to build the home they want on the property in the location*
 237 *that makes the most sense. The requested home location is the only flat area on the property. The*
 238 *area allowed by the setbacks has an approximate 16 foot drop from what would be the front of the*
 239 *home to the rear. This would significantly increase the difficulty and cost to build the new home.*
 240 *The Healys are desiring to build a slab on grade home. This would allow them to more easily stay in*
 241 *the home as they grow older and also make the home more affordable to build. A full basement*
 242 *would add at a minimum \$300,000 or more to the cost of the home. (Applicant Comments)*
- 243
- 244 B) *No, the property includes buildable areas, which are not being utilized in the plans for a septic*
 245 *system installation. Almost the entirety of the proposed construction is outside of established*
 246 *building areas. A Practical Difficulty has not been shown or proven. The request is excessive and*
 247 *could be mitigated.*
- 248
- 249 **2) Uniqueness: Is the variance necessary because of circumstances unique to the property (not**
 250 **caused by the landowner)?**
- 251
- 252 A) *Yes – The property has a very unique shape being long and skinny. The vast majority of the*
 253 *area of the lot is either bluff itself or OHW setback. The only area not in thOHW setback*
 254 *falls down a relatively steep hill away from the lake into wetland on the backside of the*
 255 *property. (Applicant Comments)*
- 256
- 257 B) *No, even though the property is long and narrow, there is a buildable area on the lot, and no*
 258 *evidence has been provided that this location could not be adequately used for a Septic System.*
 259 *Other properties in the area also have small lots and for the most part have structures farther*
 260 *from the lake.*
- 261
- 262 **3) Essential Character: Will the variance alter the essential character of the locality? For**
 263 **example, will the resulting structure be out of scale, out of place, or otherwise inconsistent with**
 264 **the surrounding area?**
- 265
- 266 A) *No, the new home will not alter the essential character of the locality. The nearest structure*
 267 *to the south of The Healy’s proposed home (parcel 21060503) appears to be an equal*
 268 *distance to the lake from what we are requesting. The nearest to the north also appears to*
 269 *be approximately 50’ from the lake. The properties would all appear very similar and*
 270 *unison. (Applicant Comments)*
- 271
- 272 B) *Yes, the proposed SSTS will alter the essential character of the locality. This property is the last*
 273 *lot on the north side of the city with an existing building (proposed), to the South, chiefly along*
 274 *Wood Lake Boulevard, only one house is less than 100 feet from the OWH (63 feet) 7 others are*
 275 *145, 115, 103, 112, 147, 215 and 125 from the OHW. The adjacent Wood Lake is a small (92*
 276 *acre Lake), relatively shallow, with the deepest part 35 feet, with the average depth of 17 feet.*
 277 *Water quality, according to the DNR can be poor, with an abundance of plant and algae growth.*
 278 *(There is a structure 550 feet to the north, outside city limits, within about 40 feet of the OHW).*
 279 *There is approximately 3 miles of shoreline along this lake. The close proximity to the OHW and*
 280 *adjacent Bluffs could further impact the lake and could increase runoff, erosion, or water quality.*

MINUTES

Emily Planning Commission

April 1, 2025

POTENTIAL CONDITIONS ON A VARIANCE

- 281
282
283
284 1) If variances are approved, consider making it contingent upon lots 2 and 3 being combined with
285 Lot 1 (Lots 2 and 3 are small, substandard lots.) It is our understanding that the owners are
286 amenable to this lot combination.
287
288 2) If variances are approved, add the Condition that the applicant must apply for and obtain a SSTS
289 permit for the proposed site. Unless the site is approved by the city SSTS inspector, no land use
290 permit will be issued. Only a preliminary review has been done on the proposed site due to Winter
291 conditions.
292

293 Discussion from Planning Commissioners regarding septic design. Jones stated a septic design would need
294 to be submitted by the applicant to Planning and Zoning and reviewed by our septic inspector prior to a
295 septic permit approval.
296

297 **Open Public Comments**

298
299 Vaughn Larson, Marka Architecture, stated he was representing the property owners and was available to
300 answer any questions. He stated the property is a difficult lot to build on and the property owners purchased
301 the lot in good faith from the previous owners and were told that it was a buildable lot.
302

303 Eric Larson builder representing the property owners, stated the location of where the proposed building
304 site is located is the best spot on the entire lot. The alternate sites would be extremely challenging to build
305 due to topography, slope, and excavation requirements.
306

307 **Closed Public Comment**

308
309 **8. Consideration of Healy Variance Request:**

310 Commissioner Bartel asked if there are any alternative sites that could be considered. Vaughn Larson stated
311 there are 2 other sites, however the other sites are not flat and would require extensive excavation and are
312 not considered desirable.

313 Jones asked the applicants if they would consider a smaller house. Mr. Healy stated they have had this plan
314 drawn up and this is the size of the house they want to build.

315 Planning Commissioner discussion regarding consideration of a detached garage, questioning if this lot is
316 buildable due to how many variances are necessary, and where the secondary septic site location would be
317 since it wasn't provided in the application.
318

319 **MOTION BY COMMISSIONER RHEAUME TO DENY ALL 5 VARIANCE REQUESTS**
320 **BASED ON THE FAILURE TO MEET THE THREE FACTOR PRACTICAL**
321 **DIFFICULTY TEST SPECIFICALLY:**

322 **1. REASONABLENESS-THE CONSTRUCTION WOULD BE OUTSIDE THE**
323 **ESTABLISHED BUILDING AREAS, IT IS EXCESSIVE, IT COULD BE MITIGATED**
324 **AND BUILT ON A DIFFERENT BUILDING FOOTPRINT.**

MINUTES

Emily Planning Commission

April 1, 2025

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
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371

2. UNIQUENESS-EVEN THROUGH THE PROPERTY IS LONG AND NARROW, THIS IS A BUILDABLE AREA ON THE LOT AND THERE HAS BEEN NO ATTEMPT TO QUANTIFY THE DIFFICULTIES CREATING A PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY. OTHER PROPERTIES ALONG THE LAKE HAVE BEEN BUILT FURTHER AWAY FROM THE OHW.

3. ESSENTIAL CHARACTER-THE PROPOSED HOUSE CONSTRUCTION WILL ALTER THE ESSENTIAL CHARACTER OF THE LOCALITY. THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE IS CLOSER THAN MOST (BUT NOT ALL) OTHER STRUCTURES TO THE OHW. THERE IS POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED RUNOFF, EROSION AND THIS PROJECT COULD IMPACT THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LAKE.

THESE PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES ARE THE SAME FOR ALL 5 VARIANCES INCLUDING THE HOME AND SEPTIC SYSTEM. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JOHNSON. ROLL CALL VOTE: JOHNSON, BARTEL, HUGHES, MOSMAN, AND RHEAUME ALL VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

9. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. March 4, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BARTEL TO APPROVE MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HUGHES. ROLL CALL VOTE: JOHNSON AND BARTEL ABSTAINED FROM VOTE, HUGHES, MOSMAN , KOCH, AND RHEAUME ALL VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

10. LAND USE ORDINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING UPDATE

- a. Revised Variance Application.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER HUGHES TO ACCEPT REVISED VARIANCE APPLICATION AND FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL FOR REVIEW. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MOSMAN. ROLL CALL VOTE: JOHNSON, BARTEL, HUGHES, MOSMAN, AND RHEAUME ALL VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

The Land Use Ordinance Subcommittee will be discussing sheds and storage containers at their May meeting.

11. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Recommendation to City Council to accept the resignation of Denise Vukelich as Planning Commissioner.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER JOHNSON TO ACCEPT DENISE VUKELICH'S RESIGNATION FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MOSMAN. ROLL CALL VOTE: JOHNSON, BARTEL, HUGHES, MOSMAN, AND RHEAUME ALL VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

- b. Recommendation to City Council of appointment of Planning Commissioner Faye Hughes.

372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER JOHNSON TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THE APPOINTMENT OF FAYE HUGHES AS PLANNING COMMISSIONER. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARTEL. ROLL CALL VOTE: JOHNSON, BARTEL, HUGHES, MOSMAN, AND RHEAUME ALL VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

c. Mining Business
Commissioner Mosman requested the Planning Commission or City Council review the ordinance regarding mining extraction and how it will impact the city. Discussion regarding whether the Planning Commission should be responsible for the research or City Council. Jones stated it should start with the Planning Commission since it relates to land use. Discussion on having a professional or expert hired, at the mining company's expense, to provide knowledge and expertise on behalf of the city's best interest. Discussion on having a mining subcommittee formed to look into issues.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER RHEAUME TO FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL THE PROPOSAL FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION TO HAVE A MINING ENGINEER HIRED, AT MINING COMPANY'S EXPENSE AND CITY'S CHOICE OF COMPANIES, TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON HOW TO BEST PROTECT THE CITY'S INTERESTS. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HUGHES. ROLL CALL VOTE: JOHNSON, BARTEL, HUGHES, MOSMAN AND RHEAUME ALL VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

12. OLD BUSINESS
None

13. P & Z ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
Fahrendorff stated that the volume has been slower during the winter months and the Planning and Zoning office is now on winter hours. Once volume picks up, the hours will change to accommodate the work volume.
Jones stated there will possibly by 2 more variance requests in the future.

14. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER HUGHES TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARTEL. ROLL CALL VOTE: JOHNSON, BARTEL, HUGHES, MOSMAN AND RHEAUME VOTED AYE. MOTION CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 6:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Fahrendorff,
Zoning Clerk