

**MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**SEPTEMBER 28, 2006**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Hart called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Cheleen, Dahl, Brandt, and Hart were present. Britain and Frisque were absent. Adams arrived at 6:45 p.m., shortly after action was taken on the September 14, 2006, minutes.

Staff members present: Community Development Director Ron Rankin, Principal Planner Cary Teague, Planner Susan Thomas, Natural Resource Manager Jo Collieran, Planning Technician Jeff Thomson, and City Attorney Desyl Peterson.

- 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** The agenda was approved as submitted. Teague submitted the change memo dated September 28, 2006.

- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** September 14, 2006

*Cheleen moved, second by Brandt, to approve the September 14, 2006, meeting minutes as submitted.*

*Cheleen, Brandt, and Hart voted yes. Adams, Britain, and Frisque were absent. Dahl abstained. Motion carried.*

**5. REPORT FROM STAFF**

Teague briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting of September 25, 2006:

- Adopted a resolution approving a vacation of drainage and utility easements and a variance for an addition to the home concerning home improvements at 14603 Woodhill Circle for Lawrence and Nancy Wigley.

**6. REPORT FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Chair Hart thanked Teague for his six years of service with the city of Minnetonka and congratulated him on his position as planning director for the city of Edina.

**7. PUBLIC HEARINGS: CONSENT AGENDA**

No items were removed from the consent agenda for discussion or separate action.

***Dahl moved, second by Cheleen, to approve the items listed on the consent agenda as recommended in the respective staff reports as follows:***

**A. Sign setback variance for a freestanding sign at 14525 State Highway 7 for Woodhill Plaza, LLC. (06054.06a)**

Adopt the resolution on pages A1-A3 of the staff report, which approves a sign setback variance from 10 feet to 5 feet to construct a monument sign at 14525 State Highway 7. This resolution is based on the following findings:

- 1) There is a unique hardship to the property because:
  - a. The topography and landscaping of the property limit the visibility of a monument sign.
- 2) The variance would meet the intent of the ordinance since:
  - a. The sign is reasonable since it conforms to code provisions regarding size, height, and items of information, and would replace a monument sign at the same location.
  - b. The sign will not alter the character of the neighborhood since it will be setback similarly from the street as other freestanding signs in the area.

Approval is based on the following conditions:

- 1) Submit proof of having recorded this resolution with the county before the city issues a building permit.
- 2) The sign plans must be revised such that they conform to the zoning code's definition of a monument sign before the city issues a sign permit.
- 3) The sign is limited to three items of information as required by the sign ordinance.

- 4) This variance will end on December 31, 2007, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

**B. Front yard setback variance for an addition to the home at 3949 Brown Lane for Bob Noeldner. (06057.06a)**

Adopt the resolution on pages A1–A3 of the staff report, which approves a front-yard setback variance from 35 feet to 33 feet for a garage addition at 3949 Brown Lane. This resolution is based on the following findings:

- 1) Strict enforcement would cause undue hardship because of the following circumstances that are unique to this property:
  - a. The proposed garage addition is reasonable.
    - (1) Just 42 square feet of the garage would encroach into the required setback. This is a point intrusion.
    - (2) The proposed garage would have less area than a standard 24-foot by 24-foot garage.
- 2) The variance would be consistent with the spirit and intent of this ordinance for the following reasons:
  - a. The typical front-yard setback in the Brown Lane area is 30 feet. The proposed garage would meet this neighborhood standard.
  - b. The proposed garage would have no negative impacts on neighboring properties.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Before the city issues a building permit:
  - a. Submit proof of having recorded this resolution with the county before the city issues a building permit.
  - b. Install a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, and tree protection, as required by the city's natural resources staff. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

- 2) This variance will end on December 31, 2007, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.
- C. Front yard setback variance to add a covered porch and entry way to the existing house at 16827 Scenic Lane South for TCO Design. (06059.06a)**

Adopt the resolution on pages A1-A3 of the staff report, which approves a front yard setback variance from 35 feet to 25 feet to construct an entryway and covered porch addition to the house at 16827 Scenic Lane South. This resolution is based on the following findings:

- 1) There is a unique hardship to the property caused by:
  - a. The location of the existing house on the lot since the house has a non-conforming front yard setback.
- 2) The variance would meet the intent of the ordinance since:
  - a. The entryway addition would not extend into the front yard setback any further than the existing house.
  - b. The proposed addition is a reasonable use of the property since the current house does not have an entryway.
  - c. The proposed addition would not alter the character of the neighborhood since it will line up with the existing building line along Scenic Lane.

Approval is based on the following conditions:

- 1) Submit proof of having recorded this resolution with the county before the city issues a building permit.
- 2) Install and maintain a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, tree protection, as required by the city's natural resources staff.
- 3) This variance will end on December 31, 2007, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

**D. Variance to maintain the current status of properties at 14521/14523 Excelsior Boulevard for City of Minnetonka and Xcel Energy (99039.06a)**

Recommend that the city council adopt the resolution on pages A1–A3a of the staff report, which approves the proposed variance, to allow inside storage for a towing company at 14521 Excelsior Boulevard, and a vacant unused building at 14523 Excelsior Boulevard, despite the buildings being removed. This resolution is based on the following findings:

- 1) Strict enforcement would cause undue hardship because of the following circumstances that are unique to this property:
  - a. If the variance were denied, the existing buildings, which are in poor condition and are unsightly, would remain.
- 2) The variance would be consistent with the spirit and intent of this ordinance for the following reasons:
  - a. The aesthetics of the site would be improved.
  - b. The property owner would still maintain his existing rights on the property.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Submit proof of having recorded this resolution with the county before the city issues a demolition permit.
- 2) Submittal of a signed agreement with the city prior to issuance of a demolition permit.
- 3) All conditions of the agreement between the city and the property owner must be met.
- 4) This variance will end on December 31, 2007, unless the city has issued a demolition permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

**E. Multiple variances for additions to the house at 4932 Shady Oak Road for Cliff Williams. (06053.06a)**

Adopt the resolution on pages A1–A4 of the staff report, which approves multiple variances for additions to the home at 4932 Shady Oak Road for Cliff Williams. This resolution is based on the following findings:

- 1) Strict enforcement would cause undue hardship because of the following circumstances that are unique to this property:
  - a. Current setback requirements present a practical difficulty. With 25-foot setbacks required from all property lines, the property has just 187.5 square feet of buildable area. Any addition to the house would require variances.
- 2) The variance would be consistent with the spirit and intent of this ordinance for the following reasons:
  - a. The property is substandard in size and width and lacks frontage on a public street. This is a unique circumstance not common to every R-1 zoned property.
  - b. The existing house has just a single-stall garage. The proposed additions would result in a 22-foot by 22-foot garage, still substandard by city policy. Living space would be directly above this garage area.
  - c. The property is heavily wooded, with a vacant property to the east and south. The additions would be visible only from the house immediately to the north. The additions would not be closer to this neighboring house than the existing home.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Before the city issues a building permit:
  - a. Submit proof of having recorded this resolution with the county.
  - b. Erosion control and tree protection fencing must be installed, subject to review by the city's natural resources staff. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

- c. Submit a construction management plan for staff review. The plan must indicate: (1) how equipment will avoid roots of trees to be saved; and (2) location for stockpiling of earth and construction materials and equipment.
- 2) This variance will end on December 31, 2007, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

***Cheleen, Dahl, Adams, Brandt, and Hart voted yes. Britain and Frisque were absent. Motion carried and items on the consent agenda were approved as submitted.***

## 8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

### A. Preliminary plat for a two-lot subdivision, with lot depth variance, at 11601 Timberline Road for Michael Burg. (06024.06a)

Chair Hart reviewed that staff reported and she opened the public hearing at the September 14, 2006 meeting. The public hearing was continued until this meeting. Chair Hart introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Thomas reported. She recommended denial of the application based on the findings listed in the staff report.

In response to Dahl's question, Thomas explained that the provided illustration was an example of a house located so as to minimize tree loss. Because there is no home design, the lot width and depth is measured through the buildable area.

Adams confirmed with Thomas that a storm sewer improvement project is scheduled for the area in 2008.

Ryan Boe, an attorney with Larkin Hoffman, representing the applicant, provided a drawing in support of the lot depth requirement having been met. He stated that:

- o The lot is not an ordinary lot.
- o It meets all subdivision and ordinance requirements.
- o Drainage seemed to be the greatest concern of the planning and engineering staff.
- o He proposed postponing the vote until the next meeting to allow time to explore drainage issues. It would allow the plat to move

forward and, potentially, lot one to be developed with lot two with an option to become buildable in a couple years when the improvements are completed.

- The lot depth calculation has been met.
- He would waive the 60-day rule.

Brook Oldre, 3417 West 102<sup>nd</sup> Street, Bloomington, business partner of Mike Burg, stated that:

- There are a variety of ways that the lot depth measurement can be made.
- The 1.55 acre parcel is more than large enough for two lots. It has well over 6,000 square feet of buildable area.

Chair Hart asked if postponing the item should be considered. Teague stated that postponing would be an option. The city engineer had reviewed the plan and does have concerns. Chair Hart stated that if the drainage issues would not be worked out, an alternative would be to restrict development of lot two until after the capital improvement project. She requested Peterson address the lot depth calculation.

Peterson explained the definition of a front lot line. The longest lot line along Timberline Road is the front lot line. The distance from the front lot line and the line directly opposite is too short to meet the lot depth requirement. The ordinance does allow the discretion of the planning director to review other types of measurements through the building itself. There is no building. The general rule to interpret in favor of the land owner would not apply in this case. It is a discretionary option for the city planner to use and, in her reasonable discretion, determine a reasonable approach. The normal definition of lot depth finds the lot too short.

In response to Chair Hart's question, Thomas confirmed that the measurement line travels from the mid point of the front property line through the mid point of the widest point of the buildable area.

Chair Hart clarified with Peterson that the lot drawn on the diagram represents the definition of the lot depth. Staff attempted to draw an alternative line at the planning department staff's discretion, but it still did not meet lot depth requirements. Peterson answered in the affirmative and reiterated that the applicant does not have an automatic right to the alternative.

The public hearing was continued.

Patrick Knowlan, Live Oaks Drive, represented a group of neighbors. He stated that:

- The project is marginal. A lot of the measurements are close to not meeting requirements and do so only with some manipulation.
- The wetland restricts the buildable area.
- It marginally meets steep slope requirements.
- There is a drainage problem on the hillside.
- Standing water forces buses to turn around on Live Oak Drive.
- The neighborhood welcomes the opportunity to discuss building a home compatible with the neighborhood on the upper site, but a second home on Live Oak Drive would not be compatible.

In response to Chair Hart's request, Thomas defined buildable area. Thomas stated that the site contains a significant slope, but it does not meet the steep slope ordinance definition.

George McGibbon, 11500 Timberline Road, has lived there over 50 years. He enjoyed the ambience of the trees, hills, and curving roads. He did not object so much to the division, because it is a large lot, but he felt that the setbacks and regulations serve a purpose. When a variation to the regulations is requested to put a residence closer to the road, he gets nervous. The proposed structure would be twice the size of the existing structure. That, in its self, would be imposing. He questioned how tall the structure would be. He invited everyone to visit the unique area and determine if it would change the neighborhood in any way. He would like it to stay as close to the way that it is as possible.

Jim Couling, 11619 Live Oak Drive, lived the first 20 years of his life in Sherwood Forest and returned 30 years later. He stated that:

- He canoed on Live Oak Drive a few springs.
- He came back to Sherwood Forest because it is a forest. When he returned, he discovered 6 other people who came back for the same reason he did.
- He is not opposed to an owner's property rights or a house being built on the lot.
- One nice house would benefit the property owner as well as two.
- The delays by the landowner should be stopped.
- He hoped for denial of the project.

Amy Norelius, 11608 Live Oak Drive, reiterated Mr. Knowlan's drainage concerns, appreciated the forest-type surroundings, and wanted action to be taken to deny the application. She asked if the storm sewer system was planned to be done. Chair Hart confirmed that the storm water sewer improvement project is scheduled in the capital improvement budget to be done in 2008.

Mr. Boe appreciated the neighbors' concerns. He stated that:

- The city has determined that there needs to be a 60-foot setback from the wetland. That factors into the buildable area and significantly decreases the area of the lots that can be built on.
- There is flexibility with the buildable area where the structures can be located. It is not illegal to remove the trees, but there is an ordinance requiring the replacement of trees. The home was moved to save trees, but then a setback was not met. The applicant is willing to apply for a variance to protect the trees.
- The applicant does want to move the project along. The last delay was not at the applicant's request. It was continued for two weeks to allow for notice of the public hearing.
- The applicant is well aware of drainage issues.

Colleran explained tree removal and replacement regulations for developments.

Judy Jost, 11700 Live Oak Drive, stated that just because an improvement is scheduled on the budget to be completed, that does not guarantee it will be done. Chair Hart agreed.

Sharon Whiting, 11621 Live Oak Drive, drives by the property every night. She was surprised that any of it is buildable. Wetlands and forests were not considered as important in the past as they are now. Building on lot two would destroy an important part of the area and the city.

Chair Hart had Thomas point out the 100-year storm elevation and wetland boundaries. The buildable area must meet the 60-feet from the wetland setback and 20 feet from the 100-year storm water elevation requirements. The area in yellow designated the outlet for the water to overflow.

Peterson shared that the storm water management plan restricts the grading for the area because of the overland outlet until such time as a permanent solution is in place. That is another reason staff does not support the project at this time. No permit would be issued until the drainage issue is resolved to engineering staff's satisfaction. Any development in the city must comply with the storm water

management plan. The lot is currently not buildable because of that problem. Engineering staff has indicated that they are willing to review any engineering solutions the applicant suggests.

Mr. Boe was not aware of the storm water management plan. He received the Basset Creek Water Management Commission policy that describes best practices. Mr. Boe stated that the storm water management water quality policy discusses erosion and grading plans and other best management practices, but he was unaware of the prohibition. Peterson explained that the city's water management plan is different from the watershed district's management plan. Peterson will make sure Mr. Boe receives a copy of the storm water management plan.

Mr. Knowlan questioned if removal of the trees would increase the size of the wetland. Chair Hart explained that a grading and drainage plan would be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Colleran explained that the wetland is considered a preserve wetland. It has a 50-foot buffer and a 10-foot setback from the buffer requirement. Wetlands naturally increase and decrease in size over time. The amount of impervious surface would not change enough to impact the setback. Engineering staff would look at the overall grading plan and determine the impact on the wetland.

Mr. Knowlan noted that the property might be subdivided, but, because of the drainage and wetland setbacks, it might not be a buildable lot. Chair Hart explained that the continuance would provide time for the drainage issues to be worked out.

Mr. Knowlan favored one nice lot and home for the site.

Colleran clarified that the city would not require the wetland to be delineated again if the proposal would be approved. The current information would be used.

Cheleen asked what the impact of the storm sewer project would have on the buildable lot at its completion. Peterson met with Minnetonka Assistant Engineer Steve Lillehaug. He stated that the idea for the project would be to install storm sewer pipes under ground so that the overflow outlet would no longer be necessary. It is unknown what the final plan would be at this time.

Peterson confirmed with Chair Hart that a written extension would be required from the applicant to postpone action of the application to the next meeting. Chair Hart acknowledged the neighbors' desires to take action on the application at the

meeting. The last continuance was not the applicant's request. Mr. Boe indicated that the written time extension would be provided.

Cheleen asked if it would be possible to approve the application with the restriction that lot two not be developed until the storm water improvements would be completed. Chair Hart and Cheleen discussed that as a possibility to be considered if a resolution is not reached by the next planning commission meeting.

Mr. Couling stated that, based on how things stand today, the application should be denied. He does not feel comfortable with the "what ifs." The lot is not dividable today. He understood the error that caused the continuation last time, but he referred to continuations that occurred prior to that. The decision should deal with the situation as it is today. It should be denied instead of speculating, compromising, and designing the applicant's way out of this. It contains too much speculation.

Peggy Liemandt, 11616 Live Oak Drive, stated that the water from the wetland drains across the street into a pond. When it rains hard, the pond overflows. The water then drains down the street. The sewer system would need to be able to handle a large capacity of water. Ms. Liemandt's driveway flooded last year. The mail carrier was unable to deliver mail. The school bus could not travel on the road. It is a major water problem. Roadblocks are used at Timberline Road and Live Oak Drive.

Peterson commented that the engineering staff is aware of the major drainage problem in the area. That is why it is on the capital improvement plan for 2008.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Chair Hart received the written request from the applicant. Peterson found it acceptable.

Brandt stated that a continuance for lot two would not solve the issue for lot one. Lot one does not meet the size requirement. A continuance would not solve that. The applicant applied for a lot division, without applying for a required variance. He agreed with staff's measurement of the lot depth. He favored taking action on the item.

Adams agreed with Brandt. He understood the serious drainage problem. His kids used to ride the school bus in that area. The engineering staff cannot change the need for a variance. There is no hardship. The lot is acceptable for a

single-family home. He supported staff's recommendation. His opposition to the application included the findings listed in the staff report.

***Adams moved, second by Brandt, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution on pages A1–A3 of the staff report denying the Burg and Oldre Addition, date stamped June 16, 2006. Denial is based on the following findings:***

- 1) There is an existing drainage problem in the Timberline Road/Live Oak Drive area. The proposed plat may exacerbate this problem due to increased impervious surface and alteration of an existing drainage way.
- 2) The lot depth variance is not based on any unique circumstance inherent to the property. Rather, the lot depth variance is based entirely on the owner's desire to divide the lot. This is a self-created circumstance, which does not justify a variance.
- 3) Denial of the subdivision would not deny reasonable use of the property. There is currently a vacant, single-family home on the property. This home could be occupied or a new single family home could be built.

***Cheleen, Dahl, Adams, Brandt, and Hart voted yes. Britain and Frisque were absent. Motion carried.***

Chair Hart noted that the applicant could still work with the engineering department to address the drainage issues. It is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council at its October 9, 2006 meeting.

**B. Site and building plan review, with variance, to replace the existing house with a new house at 5235 Woodhill Road for West Suburban Alano (06020.06b)**

Chair Hart introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Teague reported. He recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Adams confirmed with Teague that the previous proposal retained the existing house with an addition. Peterson explained that the height would be four feet lower. The neighbor on the north side approved of the landscape plan.

The public hearing was opened.

Grace Sheely, 14325 Grenier Road, was concerned with the view of the structure from the street. She was not sure if it would be an improvement for the neighborhood. The view from the ball park would be fine, because it would be separated by the parking lot. She does not want the facility to look commercial from the street.

Peterson explained that the grading would be done in a manner to hide the first story. It would not appear as imposing as the direct view of the south side. An illustration of the view from the street was provided. The width would occupy approximately the same space as the existing home.

In response to Dahl's question, Chris Van Hauer responded that the exterior would be stucco with brick and stone accents. The patio area was moved closer to the front than the rear of the building in response to neighbors' requests.

Carol Breczinski, 5221 Woodhill Road, opposed the patio being located on the north side. People commented to her that the parking lot blocks the view of ball field two. Chair Hart clarified that the patio will still be on the north side of the house, but moved further west. Chair Hart pointed out the patio on a diagram. Ms. Breczinski stated that the new position helps.

Ms. Breczinski asked if the site would have to be rezoned. Chair Hart answered in the negative. Alano would have a conditional use permit. Peterson explained that the conditional use permit would be required because the institutional use is allowed in a residential area with a conditional use permit. It is similarly treated as a church or meeting place. Alano could sell the property to an owner who would be allowed to use it as a meeting place. Peterson described updated improvements in the plan for the retaining wall.

Ms. Breczinski asked who would be responsible to maintain the landscaping. Chair Hart answered Alano.

Ms. Breczinski was not sure she liked the 4,000-square-foot building. She was not sure if it fit in with the neighborhood. She did like it better than a 6,000-square-foot building.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Cheleen commented on the great job Alano management did maintaining their previous building. He believed they would do a great job on keeping up the grounds and building. Since the facility would be lower, it would be an excellent

buffer and transitional use from residential to the ball field and commercial areas. It makes a lot of sense.

Chair Hart reviewed the primary issues.

***Cheleen moved, second by Adams, to approve the site and building plan with building setback variances from 50 feet to 43 feet from the west lot line; from 50 to 35 feet from the north lot line and from 50 to 10 feet from the east lot line. Approval is based on the following findings:***

1. The proposal would meet the required standards and ordinances for a site and building plan approval.
2. The proposal would meet the required standards for a variance, because:
  - a. The new building would not encroach further into the setbacks than the existing structure.
  - b. The property to the east is the Glen Lake Park.
  - c. There would be extensive landscaping along the north lot line to screen the building from the adjacent single-family home to the north.

Approval of the site and building plans is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:
  - Site plan date stamped August 25, 2006.
  - Grading plan date stamped August 25, 2006.
  - Landscaping plan date stamped August 25, 2006.
  - Building elevations date stamped August 1, 2006.
2. The following must be submitted to the city before the city issues a building permit:
  - a. A final landscape and irrigation plan for staff approval
3. A 6-foot trail segment must be added on the west side of the batting cages.

4. The property owner is responsible for replacing any required landscaping that dies.
5. All rooftop and ground-mounted mechanical equipment, and exterior trash and recycling storage areas, must be enclosed with materials compatible with the principal structure, subject to staff approval. Low profile, self-contained mechanical units that blend in with the building architecture are exempt from the screening requirement.
6. Approval does not include the signs shown on the drawings. Separate permits are required from staff.
7. Construction must begin by December 31, 2007, unless the planning commission grants a time extension.

***Cheleen, Dahl, Adams, Brandt, and Hart voted yes. Britain and Frisque were absent. Motion carried.***

Chair Hart stated that an appeal of the planning commission's decision must be made in writing to the planning division within 10 days.

**C. Sign plan review for monument and wall signs at Minnetonka Crossing, 6001 Shady Oak Rd, for True North Investments. (06006.06a)**

Chair Hart introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Thomas reported. She recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Chair Hart confirmed with Thomas that the number of tenant identification signs would be restricted to three.

Adams learned from Thomas that no feedback was received from Michael Jennings.

Chris Novak, 10327 West 34<sup>th</sup> Circle, applicant, was present to answer questions. He thanked staff for their help.

The public hearing was opened. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

***Brandt moved, second by Cheleen, to approve the sign plan for Minnetonka Crossings as shown on pages A5–A7 of this staff report. Approval is based on the following findings:***

- 1) The proposed monument signs are reasonable.
  - a. The property is located on a one-way roadway system, with just one entrance and exit point.
  - b. There will be two distinct buildings on the site, building A on the north side of the site and building B on the south.
  - c. Tenant identification would be limited to three tenants.
- 2) Wall signs consistent with ordinance restrictions for both commercial and office spaces are appropriate.

Approval is subject to the following conditions.

- 1) Each monument sign is allowed to display no more than three tenants.
- 2) The size and location of wall signs must conform to the staff recommend plan dated September 17, 2006.
- 3) Office wall signs may be located on the north and south facades or on the west and south facades, but not all three.
- 4) Wall sign letters may be stacked, but total stacked area must not exceed 26 inches in height.
- 5) Sign permits are required.
- 6) Monument signs must meet a minimum 10-foot setback from all property lines.
- 7) All signs listed in the “Prohibited Signs” section of code are prohibited.

***Cheleen, Dahl, Adams, Brandt, and Hart voted yes. Britain and Frisque were absent. Motion carried.***

9. ADJOURNMENT

*Dahl moved, second by Cheleen, to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m.  
Motion carried unanimously.*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lois T. Mason  
Planning Secretary