

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS
SPECIAL MEETING
PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 18, 2021, 5:00 p.m.
Park Rapids City Hall, 212 Second Street West
Park Rapids, Minnesota**

1. CALL TO ORDER: The May 18, 2021, Special Meeting of the Park Rapids Planning Commission was called to order at 5:00 p.m. by Chair Swanson.

2. ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners, Robb Swanson and Bruce Johnson, Nancy Newman, Scott Hocking and City Council Member Liz Stone. Absent: Staff Present: City Administrator Angel Weasner, City Planner Ben Oleson and Planning/Administrative Assistant Carmen L. Lockhart. Others present: Stephen Larson, Harry Zentz and Robin Fish of the Park Rapids Enterprise. Others present via Zoom: Nicholas Gadbois of Wolf River Electric.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: A motion was made by Newman, seconded by Hocking, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda as presented.

4. APPROVAL OF WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 2021: A motion was made by Stone, seconded by Johnson, and unanimously carried to approve the April 26, 2021 Minutes as presented.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

5A. Comprehensive Plan Revision and Future Land Use Map Revision from Multi-Family Residential to Commercial by Josh Grover for a parcel consisting of approximately 2.50 acres. Property is located East of Henrietta Ave N on an undeveloped street. PID#32.19.01911: APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

5B. Zoning District Boundary Amendment from Josh Grover to rezone one parcel located East of Henrietta Ave N on an undeveloped street, consisting of 2.50 acres, from R-3 Medium Density Residential District to B-1 Highway Business District. PID#32.19.01911: APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

5C. Variance request from Lawrence Stephen Larson to allow greater than 12 units apartments for a total of 15 units in the R-B-Residential Business Transitional District; AND to allow less than required (1.5) parking stalls per dwelling unit, for a multi-family apartment building located at 205 Pleasant Ave. PID#32.37.03400:

Oleson introduced himself for those that hadn't met him before. Oleson explained the first application is a variance with two aspects to it. One was being more than 12 apartment units. He currently has 11 so he is asking for 4 additional units to bring it up to 15. And the variance is also for not having the required 1.5 parking stalls per unit. Oleson stated I understand this is something that has been before you in the past as a Conditional Use Permit so there is some history here I'm getting up to speed on. Basically as staff looked at this and talked about the different aspects of it, we

determined that these two aspects were variances. I know at the last meeting there was a recommendation for approval that went to the City Council and then the City Council sent it back asking Mr. Larson to provide some more detailed parking plans and he can address that. My understanding is that he did look into it with an engineer and basically found that there was no room for parking on the site, not even one row of parking really with an angle parking situation. Oleson explained Mr. Larson explored the idea of adding parking by adding land from the neighboring property owner and that wasn't going to happen so he is asking for the variance to have four additional units with the parking spaces that are on site and on the street as they are now. Oleson said the minutes said there were three parking spaces that could be credited towards what he was allowed there. In the back there are four potential parking stalls in the garage that would take some modification to make those available. Cleaning out those and modification of the walls in at least one of them. There is some alley parking that has been used historically and maybe three or four spaces that are actually on the property next to the garage, so that's the parking situation. He would obviously like to make the main floor that used to be the dental clinic into four apartments. There are existing apartments in the basement and upper level. Those are the basics of the variance. I put together a report that lays out some starting points for discussion in terms of Findings of Fact. You should feel free to add or subtract from those and there are potential conditions that could be added as well if you were to approve it.

Johnson asked if we've heard from the neighbors? Oleson stated we haven't received any comments but they are aware and were notified.

Larson said he has some information he would like to hand out from the surveyor if you're interested.

Johnson stated I don't have time invested in the investigation of this but the first thing that jumps out at me is are we opening Pandora's box again by doing this and allowing that to happen. The next person comes along and now we've set precedence. We worked very hard to come up with the zoning matrix that we came up with and I think for us to just let that go, I'm very reluctant to do that personally. Not to say that I couldn't be convinced but I sure would question this particular thing. How many parking spaces do you have per unit then? If we include the three spaces on the street if we can include that in the parking situation, what do we end up with and how many units do we have available per unit? Oleson said if it's 15 units total which is what he is asking for, 1.5 – that's 22.5 spaces rounding up to 23 spaces. If you take those three away then there's 20 left to provide and he has about 8 or 9 at the most. Johnson commented so less than 50%? Oleson said correct. Johnson said that would be my concern.

Stone said that was my concern too, is that if I did my math right, there's not even really enough parking spaces to accommodate the 11 apartments that are already there. While I want to make more housing available and I like the idea of turning them into apartments, my concern is basically the rules, 1.5 spaces per apartment and we haven't even met that with the 11 current apartments that are there.

Oleson said I believe these apartments have been there for a long, long time, but certainly to add more would be a whole other situation which is what we are dealing with here. Stone said right.

Swanson said in a sense we are already dealing with a noncompliant, grandfathered in property. Oleson said right.

The public hearing was opened at 5:09 p.m.

Larson provided a letter from Matt Murray of Murray Surveying, Inc. in Bemidji who I hired to take a look at this situation and has some comments here that I share.

Swanson read Matt Murray's letter into the record. (refer to letter)

Larson said I see Matt's vision here and understand the board's concern about the requirements. However, I think Matt clearly points out here that if we were to meet or to deny the variance I think a very strong case could be made that would create even more parking problems which is ironic because we would like to have the space. This was originally zoned downtown and as we know, a lot of buildings in Park Rapids and many other cities have 50, 80 and 90 years ago didn't have parking problems. But because structures are now in place, many of those businesses on Main Street wouldn't be able to provide other than street parking for one space. Fortunately, Park Rapids somehow in the past, I don't know how, had the brilliant idea of having mid street parking downtown and it's a unique characteristic of Park Rapids a lot of people recognize when they come through here. But getting back to the situation here, yes, stuck at the beginning I guess a variance would in fact or you could say maybe encourage more but this is a single issue and there's nothing we can do about it. We firmly feel that we would create more problems if I put three commercial sites in that \$3,000 sq. ft. during the daytime. That if we turn it into apartments where people are off to work at various businesses in the area throughout the prime time period. So I think that's the argument that Matt makes and I feel that pretty strongly. I don't think we should shoot ourselves in the foot and create more problems because I think we would.

Johnson asked Mr. Larson how long have you owned that property? Larson responded it was built in the mid 50's and I've owned it since the late 70's. Johnson said okay so the main level of the building has been commercial space? Larson said it's pretty much been dental offices (inaudible) and we had parking issues because you have people coming in all the time and you have a pretty big staff too. When the county medical facility moved across the street, not too far away, I presume they created parking problems too because they have a big staff and they have a lot of people running through there every day. My choice was so commercial would, I would say, increase the parking issues definitely between 9 to 5 or put in apartments, I would rather put in apartments. I'm going to sell it. I'm going to be 81 years old in June and we have buyers, quite a few buyers who have been waiting through this process and pretty much every one of them feels that from a business aspect they would want those converted to apartments so this decision will affect the sale of the building too.

Johnson asked but it's currently fixed for commercial office space? Larson responded yes, it's vacant and this, if the variance comes about then this will be beneficial for me from a selling standpoint but for a moral standpoint too I believe and for you know whoever buys it. I mean I guess even if we did have the space which we don't, to blacktop it, I know the neighbors on both sides and I can get something in writing from them. I personally have spoken with one of them and I know the other and they will be very concerned about a parking lot between our two buildings and that will create a lot of noise after hours too potentially, especially on the weekends in close proximity to that house and to the building. That's probably a minor issue compared to the (inaudible) issue that I see is we are going to create more parking problems during working hours I believe. Green space is an issue too, you know, important for all of us to think about. Those are all factors and I think it would be best for the city, best for the people in the city, for the owners and everyone not to create a greater parking issue

there by going commercial, that's pretty much how I feel about it. We retain the green space which is a nice one, right across the street.

The public hearing was closed at 5:21 p.m.

Swanson requested Oleson go through the staff findings. Swanson said I appreciate the work you put in this for reasons for approval and reasons to deny which helps us a lot.

Oleson said he realizes he's getting used to your process and everything too and my understanding is that you have typically gone through the Findings analysis of each of the criteria and this again is just a way to kind of start out that process.

Oleson referred to page 5 of the packet, page 5(c)-3 of his report:

Findings of Fact: The following findings of fact are presented by Staff for consideration by the Board of Adjustment:

1) Variances shall only be permitted when they are in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the official control.

The spirit and intent of the relevant ordinances are as follows:

The spirit and intent of the ordinance's requirement to limit the number of apartment units in a building and for 1.5 parking stalls per unit is to ensure that there is adequate parking available for residents of the apartment units.

Findings Supporting Approval

The proposed improvements would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the requirements because the site has long been used for apartments and a main floor business (dental office) that encompasses approx. 2,868 sq ft and would have been required by ordinance to provide 11.5 parking spaces. The proposed four rental units to replace the former dental office would only require 6 spaces by ordinance (1.5 spaces x 4 units).

Findings Supporting Denial

The proposed improvements would not be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the requirements because it would create the need for approx. 6 additional overnight parking spaces whereas a business use of the property would possibly create the need for more parking, but of a nature that is short-term and could make use of the public parking lot across the street in addition to on-street parking.

2) Variances shall only be permitted when they are consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Findings Supporting Approval

The granting of the requested variance(s) is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan because residential use is an anticipated use within the relevant zoning district(s). There is also mention of a need for affordable housing and finding ways to accommodate such uses.

Findings Supporting Denial

The granting of the requested variance(s) would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan because there is repeated mention in the Comprehensive Plan about concerns related to the location and availability of parking and the proposal would create need for additional overnight parking that wasn't present previously with the dental office on the main level.

3) The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by an official control.

Findings Supporting Approval

The proposed use of the property is reasonable because the applicant is seeking to make use of existing building floor space that will result in a lesser requirement for off-street parking (by ordinance) than what would otherwise be required.

Findings Supporting Denial

The proposed use of the property is not reasonable because the ordinance limits apartment buildings to 12 units - presumably partly as a way to ensure that parking needs do not overburden areas outside of the building site itself.

4) The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner.

Findings Supporting Approval

The plight of the landowner is due to factors that they did not create because the need for the variance(s) is due largely to the long-standing presence of the building on the lot, the lot size and the parking requirements of the City.

Findings Supporting Denial

The plight of the landowner is due to factors that they created themselves because they are seeking to add more apartment units than is allowable by ordinance and by extension, the need for more overnight parking spaces.

5) The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

Findings Supporting Approval

The essential character of the area would not be altered because both the size and appearance of the building is not changing.

Findings Supporting Denial

The essential character of the area would be altered because it will create additional need for overnight parking on public areas not located on the property itself.

6) Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties.

Findings Supporting Approval

Economic considerations are not the only reason the applicant cannot meet the requirements of the ordinance because there are non-economic factors involved - primarily the small lot size and lack of space for additional off-street parking.

Findings Supporting Denial

None Oleson added - But could make an argument that it's certainly not going to cost him more. It's not a cost issue in terms of providing parking, it's just a space issue. But you could make an argument that if this is something that makes him more money by renting it out this way than as a business then maybe that by itself shouldn't be a reason to approve the variance.

7) No variance may be granted that would allow any use that is not allowed in the zoning district in which the subject property is located.

Findings Supporting Approval

The proposed use for residential rental units is a use that is anticipated and allowed for in the RB zoning district.

Findings Supporting Denial

The ordinance does not explicitly allow for more than 12 rental units per building in the R-B district as either a permitted or conditional use.

Oleson added I draft those up as starting points for discussion and trying to present both sides so it's up to you and the City Council to decide which ones make more sense.

Stone said like I expressed earlier initially I am concerned because there aren't enough parking spaces to accommodate for the current number of apartments. But, I do also agree with the practical difficulty that was presented. I do appreciate Mr. Murray's line of thinking and I think he does have a valid point in regard to pressure, the increased pressure of parking if commercial businesses were there during that 9 to 5 time period. Because of the points that Mr. Murray raised, I guess I am in favor of allowing the four apartments to go in there verses keeping it commercial. And because of this, I think that we wouldn't be opening pandora's box because it is a unique situation and it's something that has evolved from the last what, 50 years? Larson said 70. Stone said 70, I apologize. Stone said in that respect upon further thought, I would be in favor of having apartments as opposed to keeping it commercial.

Newman said if you're adding four more apartments is that altering the fire code? Larson said we've gone through all the steps of approval through the state, county and city regarding all the changes that we require, plumbing, and fire code, spaces, so this is the last step for us in the approval process.

Hocking said just two comments – We've already set precedence that we don't want more than 12 units now we're going to go to 15 units here and then the parking in the parking lot across the road is designed for city overflow for parking for the day and it would be for the business, if he stays commercial his employees and stuff would be allowed to park in that city parking lot where it's already been designated to park, would be my answer to you with creating more parking in front of his building. We already have parking across the street that was designated for that, that would be my comments to the situation.

Johnson stated I'm digesting what Liz said and as much as I would like to see residential, if the man wants to make the building residential instead of commercial I would be in favor of that right up to the point where it flies right in the face of what we've worked so hard over the last two years to put into place which was an ordinance matrix with defined rules and here we are once again stepping over the boundary and saying to an owner, I mean this isn't just a little bit, you know. If we were talking about 20% or 30% that would be okay but what we have right here is we have, he's got less than 50% of the required parking. Less than 50%, that's not even close you know in my mind. I just can't help but to go back and think about how we agonized over each and every one of those things in that matrix to come up with what we felt was reasonable and here we are stepping out of that, not by a little bit, we are taking a big step here. So, personally, I can't support it for the reasons for number 4. Is it consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, I think the answer to that is clearly no, but I'm only one vote.

Stone said my response to that, I do agree with you, but I also, there's been a lot of discussion in different instances where we've talked about wanting there to be more residences you know in the center of Park Rapids. Promote the walkability of Park Rapids. So, I think this is a nice answer to that, we've got the opportunity for four more apartments that are within walking distance of downtown. Maybe these individuals won't even have a car because they can walk to the grocery store, they can walk to a variety of churches, they can walk to downtown, the drugstore. I mean I think it's an ideal location for that and that I know has been a, maybe it isn't a formalized goal, but it's been an encouraged thought among city employees.

Swanson said Bruce, I like the word digesting this because this is one where you can see both sides and we have worked really hard to protect that Pandora's box to make sure that we aren't putting ourselves in a liable situation. If something comes before us in the future, and doesn't meet the same criteria, but looks like it does and we deny that one. And then on the other side as I'm reading the Murray Surveying and thinking about the practical difficulty being the age of this building. It was overbuilt for our standards now and that's the practical difficulty so even as we say it's in noncompliance right now, so it will continue to operate in noncompliance and can. Which direction is better, to go residential or the commercial? I do agree there's the overflow parking lot. But in some notes I wrote down, if we think about putting a cap at 12 in the R-B District those are changes that came to this facility after the fact after he owned it, after it was built, those are decisions that we've made and now have put on that building. I think that would still be the standard for new construction or you know changes to the use of buildings that were coming in the future. I think about the side street parking and on the west side there is a lot of, you know there's the St. Peter's Catholic Church there's a lot of larger properties that it's pretty open. It's not like house after house after house and driveway after driveway, so I think there are a lot of cities that have very open overnight side street parking rules. Not that I want to change the rules on that. It brings me to thinking of if it is approved what are some conditions that we could put on Mr. Larson, like the snow removal in the winter for side street parking there's going to have to be clear communication for the tenants to know which side to park on which days. I think that the back would really have to be cleaned up and I think that's written in here pavement, striping, signage, that garage being utilized completely so they are maximizing everything that that property has right now. I've had to wrestle with this one. I think right now I'm on the side of approving it. Because honestly, I really see it as a variance to just allow more side street parking, I mean the 15, the building is already built that big. You can't take that away, so it's overbuilt for the standards that we put in the last two years but it wasn't originally. So I see this as how much more side street parking are we going to allow in this one instance? And there isn't a property opportunity to make more parking for you so I recognize that.

Weasner stated for the record I would like to state that all of our zoning districts have a 12 maximum other than the multi-family apartment in R-3 that are way up there, that you're allowed for an apartment complex but all the other general ones are 12, just so you are aware. That is one thing we did look up.

Swanson asked so even just like rezoning that one parcel to? Weasner said exactly.

The Findings of Facts were reviewed. The commissioners came to the following conclusions:

Lockhart added the request should also include to allow less than required 1.5 parking stalls per dwelling unit as stated in the ordinance.

(A variance may be granted only where the strict application of the Park Rapids Zoning Ordinance will result in practical difficulties and the variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the official controls and is consistent with the comprehensive plan. Practical difficulties exist only upon a positive finding of each of the following criteria, but economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties:)

1. Does the applicant propose to use the property in a reasonable manner that is prohibited by an official control? All commissioners answered YES.
2. Is the property owner's plight due to circumstances unique to this property, which were not created by the landowner? All commissioners answered YES.
3. Can the variance be granted without upsetting the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance? All commissioners initially answered NO.

After further discussion regarding the purpose and intent of the ordinance Stone and Swanson changed their response to question #3 to YES. The majority of the commissioners, Johnson, Newman and Hocking still responded NO.

4. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? All commissioners answered YES.
5. Can the variance be granted without altering the essential character of the surrounding area? All commissioners answered YES.

The Planning Commission must make an affirmative finding on all of the five criteria listed above in order to grant a variance. (The applicant for a variance has the burden of proof to show that all of the criteria listed above have been satisfied.)

Oleson instructed the commissioners that his understanding of this, having been to different trainings on it and that kind of thing, is that it is all five of the variance criteria has to be met in order to grant a variance and if even one of them isn't, then it's grounds for denial.

Further Discussion: The commissioners debated further on various topics including but not limited to the following:

- interpretation of the intent and purpose of the ordinance;
- requesting staff to investigate how long the ordinance has been in place;
- interpretation of the language in the questions for the Findings of Fact;
- the Comprehensive Plan Goals for affordable housing;
- consulting with an attorney for an opinion;
- setting precedence;
- reviewing the proposed matrix;

Larson commented he would make use of the entire lot and also limit by contract that the renters would be limited to one vehicle to show good faith in the maximum possible effort to conform with the conditions.

A motion was made by Johnson, seconded by Hocking, to recommend to the City Council to deny a Variance request from Lawrence Stephen Larson to

allow greater than 12 units apartments for a total of 15 units in the R-B-Residential Business Transitional District; AND to allow less than required (1.5) parking stalls per dwelling unit, for a multi-family apartment building located at 205 Pleasant Ave. PID#32.37.03400.

The vote was called.

The following Commissioners voted in favor: Johnson, Newman & Hocking

The following Commissioners voted nay: Stone & Swanson

The following Commissioners were absent: None

The motion passed.

5D. Conditional Use Permit from Nicholas Gadbois of Wolf River Electric on behalf of Harry Zentz of 104 Riverside Avenue, located in an R-2, Single, 2-Family and Townhouse Residential District to allow a renewable energy system (roof mounted active solar system). PID#32.44.03900:

Oleson stated Mr. Zentz is present and Mr. Gadbois is on line. Oleson stated this is a Conditional Use Permit to allow a roof top solar energy and the ordinance does require a Conditional Use Permit for any kind of solar energy for the district that it is in. This property is in the R-2 Single, 2-Family and Townhouse District and also is in the Shoreland Overlay District next to the Fish Hook River. On page 25 of the packet I referenced the staff comments which basically talks about it cannot cast shadows or obstruct solar access for other properties and meet all the other required zoning and building code regulations and be in compliance with state and federal regulations which would be electrical and also meet the requirements of the Park Rapids Municipal Airport Zoning Ordinance. Those are the main criteria in this case that the ordinance spells out for these kinds of projects. We do have pictures and a drawing showing this would go on top of the south side of the garage.

Oleson stated he provided Findings of Fact for and against and frankly it's a little difficult to find anything that's against because there is nothing specific in that list of things that it doesn't really meet or wouldn't have to meet by permitting requirements.

Newman asked how big it is? Oleson directed her to the picture on page 38 of the packet. Oleson stated Mr. Gadbois could discuss the layout of how it is configured on the roof. Oleson stated he did ask if it laid flat against the roof verses something that was tilted up and he indicated it was flat against the roof.

The Public Hearing was opened at 6:22 p.m.

Zentz stated he had no comment.

The Public Hearing was closed at 6:23 p.m.

Newman inquired if the neighbors made any comments? Lockhart advised she had not received any comments from anyone that was notified.

Oleson stated in speaking with Mr. Zentz, you had mentioned there was a tree that was there. Zentz said he was going to take that tree out, yes. Oleson asked is that tree entirely on your property? Zentz responded the major part of the tree is on his property but it does touch the neighbor's property, it is a big tree. But it will allow the sun then to hit the roof completely where it shields half of the roof if I leave it there. I may try

just to take the limbs down you know on that side and not take the tree down but I'm trying to open up the roof to the sun.

Oleson stated he doesn't know the legalities of that but I think if part of that trunk is on the neighbor's property you would be well advised to either get their permission or make sure that he has the legal right to do that. Zentz stated he knows the Konshok's very well and they own the property next door. Zentz said he will get their permission before I do anything with the tree.

Swanson said that would definitely be our recommendation is that you have their permission in writing and make sure that all the legalities of taking that tree down are covered. Zentz responded yes I understand.

The Findings of Facts were reviewed. The commissioners came to the following conclusions: Is the proposed use identified as a conditional use in this zoning district? YES.

1. *Are there characteristics of the proposed use that may violate the public health, safety, or general welfare of Park Rapids City residents? NO.*
2. *Is the proposed use inconsistent with the intent of the Park Rapids City Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance? NO.*
3. *Does the proposed use present any unique concerns regarding erosion, runoff, water pollution or sedimentation? NO.*
4. *Could the proposed use create any special problems with parking? NO.*
5. *Would the proposed use cause any problems with access or traffic generation? NO.*
6. *Is the proposed use incompatible with other uses located in the zoning district? NO.*

For each response answered affirmatively, are there conditions that could be attached to the granting of a permit that would mitigate the adverse impact. Oleson and the Commissioners recommended the following condition:

1. Obtain written permission from neighbor and make sure all the legalities of taking the tree down are covered.

A motion was made by Stone, seconded by Johnson, to recommend to the City Council to approve a Conditional Use Permit from Nicholas Gadbois of Wolf River Electric on behalf of Harry Zentz of 104 Riverside Avenue, located in an R-2, Single, 2-Family and Townhouse Residential District to allow a renewable energy system (roof mounted active solar system). PID#32.44.03900 with the following condition:

1. **Obtain written permission from neighbor and make sure all the legalities of taking the tree down are covered.**

6. INFORMATIONAL/DISCUSSION:

Oleson asked the commissioners if there is anything in particular you want to continue discussing that you've already been discussing or not? I know there was a lot

of discussion about the matrix and I'm frankly not up to speed on all that discussion. Are there things you want on the agenda that we should be talking about in particular?

Stone said I think we should probably talk about the matrix just in a sense that if we were to accept it, we need to understand what the far reaching effects of the matrix would be. I was not aware that it would require extensive rewriting of a majority of the ordinances that are already in place. I think we need to be clear if we accept the matrix, what's the trickle down effect going to be? Swanson agreed and stated the board has put a lot of time and work into that but it would be good to know how it moves forward.

There was further discussion concerning reviewing the proposed matrix as to what it would cost to implement it. Stone asked if Bemidji was using their matrix? Weasner reported that they repealed it. Oleson and Weasner will review it.

Oleson said another thing I was going to put in your things to think about is we had a question come up recently about shouse construction, shed/house construction. There is different terminology for them but it's the pole shed that has a house in it as opposed to a house with an attached garage. That has come up in a number of communities that I've worked in and they seem to be getting more and more popular and it's not real clear in the ordinance whether we allow for those or don't allow for them. I don't see anything that expressly prohibits them. Lockhart said they have to meet the square footage for the living portion of it. Oleson said right. Lockhart asked do we want a bunch of pole buildings with metal siding?

There was further discussion and it was determined to put this item on the next agenda. Oleson said he has done research for other places and we can talk about that next time. It's like a lot of things, it's all over the board as to what's being allowed or not.

Johnson stated thanks to the decision on chicken coops, we now have three in the neighborhood. Lockhart reported I only have one permit so let me know who they are and I can send a letter. Weasner said yes, if you could please inform us they are required to have a permit and we don't obviously have a permit for them.

7. ADJOURNMENT: A motion was made by Stone, seconded by Newman, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 6:37 p.m.

Chair Robb Swanson

ATTEST:

Carmen L. Lockhart
Planning/Administrative Assistant