

**MINUTES
CITY OF EDINA, MINNESOTA
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARCH 28, 2011
7:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Grabel called the meeting of the Edina Planning Commission to order at 7:00 PM.

II. ROLL CALL

Answering the roll call were Commissioners Scherer, Forrest, Schroeder, Rock, Potts, Platteter, Cherkassky, Fischer, Carpenter, Staunton, Grabel

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Commissioner Platteter moved approval of the meeting agenda. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

IV. ANNUAL MEETING – ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND ADOPTION OF BYLAWS

Chair Grabel explained that the City has standardized Bylaws for all board and commissions. Grabel said the role of the Planning Commission is different from most boards and commissions so Commissioner Carpenter would be reviewing the bylaws from a Planning Commission perspective. After his review the Commission would adopt the bylaws at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Grabel reported it's time to elect new officers to the Commission.

Commissioner Staunton nominated Commissioner Carpenter as Secretary. No other nominations were offered.

Commissioner Scherer moved to close the nomination. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye. Commissioner Carpenter appointed as Secretary to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Fischer nominated Commissioner Staunton as Vice-Chair. No other nominations were offered.

Commissioner Scherer moved to close the nominations. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted aye. Commissioner Staunton appointed as Vice-Chair to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Staunton said the next position was to elect the Chair of the Commission.

Commissioner Fischer nominated Chair Grabiell as Chair. No other nominations were offered.

Commissioner Forrest moved to close the nominations. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye. Chair Grabiell appointed as Chair to the Planning Commission.

It was pointed out that the Planning Commission Chair can serve two consecutive terms and members of the Planning Commission rotate officers on an annual basis.

V. APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS

Commissioner Staunton moved approval of the March 14, 2012 meeting minutes. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried

Commissioner Staunton suggested that people review the video on the discussion on the Sketch Plan Review for Byerly's. Staunton said the Commission and presenter of the sketch plan had a full discussion on the topic.

VI. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Variance - 4613 Browndale Avenue - Clifford and Jane Taney

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague informed the Commission the subject property is located east of Browndale Ave. consisting of a two story home with an attached, side loading, garage behind the home, The property owners Are hoping to add more living space above the non conforming 2-stall garage that has existing living space over ½ the garage below. The existing garage is nonconforming regarding rear yard setback. The minimum rear yard setback for an attached garage is 25 feet. The existing garage is 16 feet from the rear lot line so a 9 foot rear yard setback variance is needed to extend the upper floor living space to match the garage area below. Setbacks of the garage will remain the same with living space to match the setback of the east wall of the garage. The east side wall is nonconforming regarding setback/ height and may be extended at the same setback without the need for a variance. The ordinance allows for an equal amount of encroachment when maintaining a nonconforming setback.

Planner Teague explained that the property is located within the historic Country Club District and is subject to a Heritage Preservation Overlay Zoning. The proposed project will not be visible from the street so a Certificate of Appropriateness is not required from the Heritage Preservation Board. The City Staff Liason to the Heritage Preservation Board has reviewed the plans and determined that no Heritage Preservation Board action is necessary.

Planner Teague concluded staff recommends approval of the variance based on the following findings:

- 1) With the exception of the variance requested, the proposal would meet the required standards and ordinances for the R-1, Single Dwelling Unit District and the Heritage Preservation Over-Lay District.
- 2) The proposal would meet the required standards for a variance, because:
 - a. The proposed use of the property is reasonable; as it is consistent with surrounding properties and matches the nonconforming setback that has historically been provided by the existing garage.
 - b. The imposed setback limits design opportunity to the second floor above the garage.
- 3) The intent of the ordinance is to provide adequate spacing between properties and structures. Spacing on both sides of the home will not change. The unique circumstance is the original nonconforming placement of the home.

Approval of the variance is also 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: Survey date stamped February 15, 2012. Building plans and elevations date stamped February 12, 2012.

Appearing for the Applicant

Clifford and Jane Taney

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Taney informed the Commission letters were sent to the immediate neighbors informing them of their project, adding neighbors indicated they support the improvements as submitted.

Mrs. Taney said she believes the proposed improvements create a more finished look to the house.

Discussion/Motion

Commissioner Fischer said in his opinion this request is very straightforward and he had no questions.

Commissioner Fischer moved variance approval based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion. All

voted aye; motion carried. 9-0

B. Preliminary Plat with Variances – 6120 Brookview Avenue for JMS Custom Homes, LLC

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague informed the Commission JMS Custom Homes is proposing to subdivide the property at 6120 Brookview Avenue into two lots. There is an existing air conditioner located on the proposed lot line. Should this proposal be approved, the air conditioner would have to be relocated to meet the required 5-foot setback.

Teague noted that to accommodate the request the following is required:

1. A subdivision;
2. Lot width variances from 75 feet to 50 feet for each lot; and
3. Lot area variances from 9,000 square feet to 6,676 and 6,671 square feet.
4. Lot depth variance from 133.8 feet to 133.7 feet for Lot 2.

Teague explained that both would gain access off Brookview Avenue. Within this neighborhood, the median lot area is 6,707 square feet, median lot depth is 133.8 feet, and the median lot width is 50 feet. The new lots would meet the median width, but would slightly shy of the the median lot size and depth.

Planner Teague concluded that staff recommends that the City Council deny the proposed two lot subdivision of 6120 Brookview Avenue and the lot width variances from 75 feet to 50 feet for each lot, lot area variances from 9,000 square feet to 6,676 and 6,671 square feet, and a lot depth variance from 133.8 feet to 133.7 feet for Lot 2.

Denial is based on the following findings:

1. The proposal does not meet the required standards and ordinances for a subdivision, because the proposed lots do not meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements.
2. The two proposed lots do not meet the minimum lot area, lot width, and lot depth requirements.
3. The proposal does not meet the required standards for a variance, because:
 - a. The property exists as a conforming single-family residential lot with a single-family home. Reasonable use of the property exists today.
 - b. The size of the Subject Property does not create practical difficulties. The Subject Property is only 4,347 square feet larger than the minimum lot size. This is not a practical difficulty. There are no circumstances unique to the property that justifies multiple variances.
 - c. The practical difficulty is self-created by the applicant's proposal to subdivide the property.

- d. The proposed lots do not meet the 6,707 square foot median lot area for lots in this neighborhood.
- e. The Subject Property is similar in size to several lots in the neighborhood including five lots to the north and west on Oaklawn Avenue, and two lots to the south and two lots to the east on Brookview Avenue.

Appearing for the Applicant

Jeff Schoenwetter and Steve Bona, JMS Custom Homes, LLC

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Bona addressed the Commission and acknowledged that the proposed subdivision has a "past" and is very "charged". Bona reported that JMS mailed out letters to residents inviting them to attend a neighborhood meeting informing them of their plan to subdivide the property at 6120 Brookview Avenue. Bona said six residents came and viewed the subdivision and plans for the new house.

Bona delivered a power point presentation on the project. Bona explained that the new house would be 2,600 square feet, 28-feet wide with a building height of 26 ½-feet. Continuing, Bona said the plan for the house was generally well received and if the Commission so chooses JMS would be agreeable to place restrictions on the new house above what's required by ordinance.

Discussion

Commissioner Staunton asked when the existing house was built. Mr. Bona responded the house was constructed two years ago. Staunton questioned why JMS didn't seek a subdivision at that time. Bona responded that in hindsight that would have been a good idea; however they didn't do it.

Public Comment

Chair Grabiell acknowledged that the Commission was aware of the history of this site adding that at this time he would read two letters from residents; one in support of the proposal and one in opposition. Grabiell said if anyone has something new to share different from what's in the letters they are welcome to do so.

Chair Grabiell read letters from Doug and Jenny Nelson and Dan Urhammer (attached as Exhibit "A").

Mr. Valentine, 5024 Hankerson Avenue addressed the Commission reporting that a new house is being built near him and while he has some concerns on its size, etc. he believes that the new house will benefit his property.

Janey Westin, 6136 Brookview Avenue, spoke in opposition to the project. Westin said two wrongs don't make a right and suggested that the City purchase the property and move the house on the southernmost portion of the lot to the middle of the lot and at the proper front yard setback.

Jenny Nelson, 6117 Oaklawn Avenue told the Commission she supports the request. Nelson said her concern is viewing the vacant lot. She noted without a house on a lot the vacant parcel becomes messy and unkempt because no one is there on a day to day basis to care for the property.

Miroslava Turk, 6141 Brookview Avenue stated she opposes the request to subdivide. She pointed out that the subject block was unique because there are other lots on the block in excess of 50-feet. Turk noted that this is an affordable area, adding she would like to see it remain affordable.

Trudy Landgren, 6104 Brookview Avenue spoke in opposition to the project. Landgren said she and the neighbors aren't fighting development; however, have very real concerns with the size of the new houses being built in the area. Landgren said in her opinion Edina needs moderate priced housing and if all lots that are redeveloped build such large homes the neighborhood character would be changed. Concluding, Landgren reiterated the importance of maintaining moderate housing prices.

Carol Carmichiel, 6112 Brookview Avenue said that while the proposed house could suit the site she is concerned with the history of the lot and that history might repeat itself. Carmichiel said she doesn't want to see another overly large house built on the lot at the wrong setbacks.

Chair Grabiell questioned if the applicant assures the neighborhood the house they depicted would be built would they still object. It was acknowledged that neighbors have trust issues with this developer.

Mr. Bona responded that he understands the trust issues neighbors have expressed, adding if the neighbors concern is house size JMS will stand by their offer to build a house with setbacks more stringent than allowed by ordinance.

Chair Grabiell asked if anyone else would like to address the Commission; being none Chair Grabiell called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Carpenter moved to close the public hearing period. Commissioner Staunton seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Discussion

Commissioner Carpenter commented when one views the drawings this neighborhood appears to be a neighborhood of 50-foot wide lots. However, after further review he decided if one only looks at this lot and block, it becomes apparent this block is different because it contains a number of lots in excess of 50-feet. Continuing, Carpenter said he agrees with staff that the need for variances are self-created because of the applicants' intent to subdivide.

Commissioner Fischer said he struggles with this being self-created. He questioned how this request was self-created when similar subdivisions in the area weren't. Fischer asked if anyone could articulate how this request was different from the recent subdivisions in the immediate area.

Planner Teague responded if one only views this lot on this block this block contains a number of oversized lots. That couldn't be said with some of the other subdivisions. Commissioner Fischer said he agrees with that; however how can this be self-created. Commissioner Carpenter responded variances wouldn't be necessary if the lot wasn't subdivided. Continuing, Carpenter said he believes the applicant acquired the property knowing the ordinance requirements.

A discussion ensued on if the variances were "self-created".

Commissioner Staunton said there are standards that can be used to "test" if this proposal meets the intent of the ordinance – 1) is the use reasonable 2) uniqueness of the circumstances, and 3) neighborhood consistency. Staunton said he finds the use reasonable, it's a single family house; but if he applies the other standards this subdivision is different and that makes a big difference in establishing neighborhood character. Continuing, Staunton pointed out that he voted to approve a subdivision at 6109 Oaklawn, pointing out on that block there were no other lots with a lot width of 100-feet. Continuing, Staunton said the same could be said for the other subdivision request on Oaklawn. Staunton did acknowledge that the subdivision that was approved on the 5800 block of Brookview did contain lots larger than 50-feet; however, some of those sizes were the result of the roadway easements, etc.. Staunton concluded that he was uncomfortable supporting this request, adding in his opinion this one block is different.

Commissioner Schroeder said in his opinion it can be argued that the essential character of this neighborhood is the variable lot sizes. The original plat was for 50-foot lots; however, over the years the neighborhood evolved with people combining those 50-foot lots.

Chair Grabel asked Commissioners how they would feel if this was reversed and a buyer was purchasing two small lots; combines them and builds one large house. Staunton acknowledged that that could happen; however he pointed out

City Code allows that, it doesn't allow this.

Commissioner Platteter questioned if Commissioners were indicating that neighborhood character can't change. He pointed out neighborhoods are always evolving, ordinances don't stand still. Schroeder agreed; however defining neighborhood isn't that simple.

Commissioner Scherer told the Commission she can't support this request. Scherer said in her opinion residents should be able to rely on the ordinance; adding she reviews each request on its individual merits. Concluding, Scherer said that the subject lot wasn't unique and the applicant fails to meet the "test".

Commissioner Forrest commented that in reality the house proposed for this lot is a nice house; however, the request doesn't meet the intent of the ordinance. Forrest said if the Commission wants to preserve these small lot neighborhoods and believes neighborhoods originally platted with lots under 75 feet in width should be protected a better way to achieve maintaining neighborhood character would be for the Planning Commission to change the zoning ordinance and eliminate the minimum lot width, depth and lot area requirement. Forrest noted that if constructed on a 50-foot wide lot the house itself wouldn't require variances; because of the subdivision the lot requires the variances. Concluding, Forrest said she can't support the variances; therefore, can't support the subdivision.

Motion

Chair Staunton moved to deny the request by JMS to subdivide property located at 6120 Brookview Avenue. Denial is based on 1) a 100-foot wide lot is not unique to this block; there are multiple lots in excess of 50-feet 2) the new house built to one side cannot be considered unique, an "orphan" lot was created; however, this was self-inflicted and 3) although building one single family house is reasonable subdividing this lot isn't because it doesn't maintain the character of this block. Denial is also based on staff findings. Commissioner Scherer seconded the motion.

Commissioner Fischer stated for him this was a tough decision, adding he struggled with it being self-created. He acknowledged at first glance this was a 50-lot neighborhood but the comments from Commissioners Staunton and Schroeder persuaded him otherwise.

Chair Grabiell said he can't support the motion, adding he doesn't agree with the logic that this subdivision request is different from ones previously granted.

Ayes; Forrest, Scherer, Schroeder, Potts, Platteter, Carpenter, Staunton, Fischer. Nay; Grabiell. Motion for denial approved 8-1.

VIII. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Sketch Plan Review for Senior Housing – 5109-5125 West 49th Street for Hunt Associates

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague reported that the Planning Commission is being asked to consider a sketch plan proposal to redevelop three lots at 5109-5125 49th Street West. The applicant is proposing to tear down the existing two apartment buildings and single-family home and build a new six story, sixty foot tall, 98-unit senior housing building.

Teague pointed out the existing properties are zoned PRD-2, Planned Residential District which allow residential buildings containing six or fewer units. Teague said should the City decide to rezone these sites to PUD, the proposed setbacks, height of the building and number of parking stalls would become the standards for the site.

Continuing, Teague said a traffic study would need to be completed to determine impacts on adjacent roadways. Concern was expressed from residents in regard to congestion that would be created at the intersection of Brookside Avenue and Interlachen Boulevard.

Concluding, Teague stated which the proposal would be an improvement over the existing buildings on the site, staff is not sure that the proposal would rise to the level of meeting the purpose and intent of a PUD. The proposal far exceeds allowed densities. Seven variances would also be required under traditional senior housing zoning.

Appearing for the Applicant

Daniel Hunt, Hunt and Associates, David Motzenbecker, BKV Group

Chair Grabiell explained that before the Commission this evening is a sketch plan review. Grabiell clarified that a sketch plan wasn't a public hearing. It's an opportunity for the developer to obtain feedback from the Planning Commission on their concept.

Discussion/Comments

Chair Grabiell told the Commission he seems to remember the Commission and Council approving a development concept in this area for townhomes, adding he doesn't remember the unit count. Planner Teague responded that Chair Grabiell was correct. The Council approved a 6-unit townhouse development; however, the townhouse development only included the R-1 lot and right-of-way.

Commissioner Forrest observed that ordinance stipulates a building height limit of 2-stories in the PRD-2 zoning district. Planner Teague agreed adding PRD-2 also contains a density cap of 6-units.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Hunt addressed the Commission and said he believes the proposed use of the site as senior housing is good. Continuing, Hunt explained in Edina there is demand for senior housing. Edina residents want to be able to remain in their community when it comes time for them to sell their home. This proposal gives them that option. Hunt introduced David Motzenbecker to speak more on the proposal.

Mr. Motzenbecker told the Commission that in his opinion this is a key piece and an excellent location for a senior building. Continuing, Motzenbecker said that the project will entail tearing down the existing two apartments and single-family home to construct a new 98-unit, 6 story structure and rezoning the site to PUD incorporating the requirements of the City's PSR-4 zoning. The parcel is located adjacent to the Vernon Avenue exit ramp and West 49th Street. Motzenbecker said in his opinion the proposed building would bookend with Grandview. With graphics Motzenbecker pointed out design elements and the goal of incorporating this site into the greater Grandview area. Motzenbecker also noted the goal of the ETC was to establish a comprehensive living streets policy that integrated all modes of transportation. Motzenbecker said he believes this project is a step in the right direction in implementing that goal. Concluding, Motzenbecker said they looked to the Grandview small area development plan and incorporated its key principles into their site. One principle was key; turning perceivable barriers into opportunities. In this respect the natural topography actually became an asset.

Discussion/Comments

Chair Grabiell said in his opinion this may be a very difficult area to "get out of" including getting onto Interlachen Boulevard. Mr. Motzenbecker acknowledged that and informed the Commission a traffic study needs to be completed to ensure traffic is handled appropriately. Continuing, Motzenbecker said they also anticipate improving the sidewalks and boulevard along Vernon. Chair Grabiell noted their reference to senior housing and asked exactly what type of senior housing this would be. Motzenbecker said that the population served would be able bodied seniors 62+. Chair Grabiell asked if the units would be market rate or something else. Motzenbecker responded that the units would be market rate and be around \$2,000 per month depending on unit size.

Commissioner Staunton said he has a concern with the request as it relates to zoning/PUD/PSR-4. Staunton said to him it appears to be an excuse to get around

code. Mr. Motzenbecker said their intent was to create the best development possible and tie into the Grandview small area plan by bringing connection to the Grandview area. Vernon Avenue would also be enhanced through landscaping and walkways along with boulevard enhancement. Aligning the project with the PSR-4 zoning district provides the opportunity for the project to implement bonuses.

Commissioner Fischer said he has a difficult time justifying a building of this size and density in a small residential neighborhood. Mr. Motzenbecker said their intent was to set the building as far back from the street (49th Street) as possible and add amenities to the front of the building. Motzenbecker said the building would be 200' from the nearest residents across 49th. Concluding, Motzenbecker said they took advantage of the topography when designing the building pointing out that the topography absorbs the building height.

Commissioner Carpenter said in his opinion the building is too large. Carpenter asked the developers how parking was handled; not only parking for residents of the building but for guests. Mr. Motzenbecker said the building was designed with 132 enclosed parking spaces those spaces include spaces for visitor parking. Carpenter questioned if that would really work.

Commissioner Staunton stated in his opinion this plan is very aggressive and causes him concern. Staunton said he likes the attention paid to Vernon Avenue; however the unit count is way too high; more attention needs to be paid to the north side and traffic is a major concern. Staunton noted the one-way in and out scenario is difficult at best.

Commissioner Platteter agreed and questioned site circulation, traffic circulation on West 49th St, site drop-off, metro mobility, deliveries and visitor parking. Platteter said that he doesn't think the drop-off area as sketched would work. There's just too much going on with this building.

Commissioner Forrest added she was also concerned with the circulation on the site and on 49th St. This proposal will certainly add additional traffic into the area pointing out it's a one way in and out. Continuing, Forrest also said in her opinion the building is too tall, the site is too tight (especially on the east), and it's just too much. Concluding, Forrest said the Commission also has to keep in mind housing trends change over time, adding it may be a senior building today but maybe not in the future.

Commissioner Schroeder said the site intrigues him with the question of how you transition from Vernon into the residential neighborhood while maintaining the residential character. Schroeder said in his opinion this isn't a very friendly project. He added the building needs to relate better to the R-1 neighborhood. Concluding, Schroeder said the building at least at the residential level on 49th St. needs to be scaled back.

Commissioner Staunton agreed with Schroeder's comments pointing out the proposal increases the density 10-fold. It's just too much. Concluding, Staunton said that he's also not sure if this is consistent with the GrandView Framework. The building is way out of scale.

Mr. Motzenbecker asked the Commission if they could provide some guidance on the number of units they would be comfortable with.

Commissioner Staunton said traffic is another large issue. He said the one way in and out nature of this neighborhood along with the RR tracks is key in redeveloping this site and achieving the correct unit count. Staunton concluded that he doesn't know the "right" unit number.

Commissioner Potts suggested that the applicant take another look and respond more to the topography and to the residential neighborhood. Potts asked if their intent was to build the building and sell it or would they continue to manage the property. Mr. Hunt responded they would build and manage the property.

Commissioner Fischer asked the applicants if they spoke with their neighbors. Mr. Motzenbecker responded they had, adding around 15-20 neighbors came to a neighborhood meeting. Motzenbecker said they received both positive and negative feedback.

Commissioner Forrest indicated the proposed use is fine with her, reiterating her concern is massing and traffic. Forrest said in her opinion this project isn't the right "transition" into the neighborhood. Concluding, Commissioner Forrest said that in her opinion 20 units at 2 ½ stories may be the right transition. As presented it's just too large.

Chair Grabiell said he agrees with all comments thus far adding his concern is that the building is just too large and the transition into the R-1 neighborhood just isn't there. Grabiell said he doesn't want to give false encouragement, adding he believes the use is right; however this is just way to large.

Mr. Motzenbecker said he understands the Commissions comments indicating they want to see a smaller building. He asked the Commission if they could provide him with a unit range.

Commissioner Schroeder commented that he understands the applicant is looking for a number; however, that can't be provided. Schroeder said he wants to see a creative solution that is sensitive to the neighborhood. Concluding Schroeder said there are other options out there.

Commissioner Carpenter suggested considering other areas, adding this may not be the right site.

Chair Grabiell thanked the applicants for their presentation adding the Commission would be receptive to them bringing forward another sketch plan for review.

Public Comment

David Valentine, 5021 Hankerson, told the Commission he doesn't think a building of this size belongs in a residential neighborhood. Valentine said he has no objection that it's a senior building; however, the building is just too large with too many units.

B. Modification to the Redevelopment Plan for Southeast Edina Redevelopment Project Area and the TIF Plan for the Establishment of the Southdale 2 TIF District.

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague informed the Commission the City Council is considering the establishment of a new TIF District that would include Southdale and surrounding parcels.

Teague explained the purpose of creating the new TIF was to facilitate improvements to Southdale including the following renovations to common areas; new entrances, flooring, lighting, signage, restrooms, parking deck lighting, exterior seating, columns and interior treatments. Teague said at this time there are no proposed changes in use of the property with the proposed improvement project.

Teague told the Commission that at this time they are being asked to determine by resolution that the proposed improvement to the common areas are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioners asked Planner Teague to clarify their action.

Planner Teague explained the Commission is being asked to determine by resolution that the proposed use of TIF funds to improve common areas was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Motion

Commissioner Fischer moved to adopt the resolution as outlined by City staff on page A1. Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried 9-0.

IX. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

Chair Grabel acknowledged receipt of Council Connection and attendance.

Commissioner Fischer asked staff if they could add to the attendance sheets the compliance percentage. Planner Teague responded that staff would be happy to add that.

X. CHAIR AND COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS

Commissioner Staunton told the Commission the GrandView District Development Framework is moving along and would return to the Planning Commission on April 11th for their approval. The City Council will hear the presentation at their April 17th meeting.

XI. STAFF COMMENTS

Planner Teague reported that the City Council approved the City's first PUD for 6996 France Avenue.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Potts moved meeting adjournment at 10:05 PM. Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Jackie Hoogenakker
Respectfully submitted