



**City of Newport  
Planning Commission Minutes  
December 12, 2013**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Lund called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

**2. ROLL CALL -**

Commissioners present – Dan Lund, Matt Prestegaard, Janice Anderson, Susan Lindoo, Anthony Mahmood

Commissioners absent –

Also present – Deb Hill, City Administrator; Renee Helm, Executive Analyst; Tom Ingemann, Council Liaison; Sherri Buss, TKDA Planner

**3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**A. Planning Commission Minutes of November 14, 2013**

**Chairperson Lund** - I had a couple items. On page three, aloud is spelled "a-l-o-u-d" instead of "a-l-l-o-w-e-d." Also, on page seven, the second paragraph, I don't recall my words exactly but the sentence that says "I know the County spent \$9 million last year to subsidize it because it's cheaper," I don't really know what that means but it wasn't what I intended so if we just removed "because it's cheaper" that would be fine.

**Susan Lindoo** - I had one thing on page eight. The fifth one up from the bottom, Chairperson Lund, I think it's supposed to be "r-a-z-i-n-g." I was also going to ask Sherri about the smells. You were going to ask Barb Dacy about whether the PCA could monitor the garbage plant.

**Ms. Buss** - We followed up with the County Health Department on that. They said that they receive about one complaint per year on that facility. They always follow up on it and take the person to the facility to see if they can smell the same smell and they have found that it's not that facility, it's the facilities in South St. Paul.

**Susan Lindoo** - Is that a rendering plant?

**Ms. Buss** - There's a rendering plant and one other, like a tannery. There are two things in South St. Paul that the City is trying to work on but they are long historic businesses. Because people see the recycling plant they think that's it but it's not. The County will be doing a study of that facility next year to determine if the County should still be using that method, something different, or changing the building. Any complaint they have received so far has not been them, it's the South St. Paul facilities.

**Susan Lindoo** - That's good to know, thank you.

**Janice Anderson** - We're approving the minutes, not discussing.

**Susan Lindoo** - No but I wanted to ask her while we're on it, I apologize for that.

**Chairperson Lund** - Thank you Sherri, I appreciate the update.

**Ms. Buss** - Yes, it was a big issue for the transit station because of the comments from the County Commissioner so we wanted to get that information to the Mayor to say something back about those comments.

**Motion by Prestegaard, seconded by Mahmood, to approve the November 14, 2013 minutes as amended. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.**

#### **4. APPOINTMENTS WITH COMMISSION**

##### **A. Public Hearing – To consider an application from Gary Banaszewski for Approval of a Variance for Property Located at 1970 8th Avenue**

Sherrri Buss, TKDA Planner, presented on this item as outlined in the December 12, 2013 Planning Commission Packet.

**Vice-Chair Prestegaard** - I had one question. It seems the variance is for 13 feet and I'm a little curious how the two inches per step adds up to 13 feet.

**Ms. Buss** - They're also extending the entry way out a bit, it's not just the stairway. I'm basing it on their architect's drawing, I haven't actually drawn it out.

**Susan Lindoo** - I had a question about the lot coverage. I was trying to figure it out and the numbers weren't adding up. The lot is 10,455 square feet and the house is 793 square feet and I figured that was about 7% of the lot, so I was wondering what the other 30% was.

**Ms. Buss** - Deck, garage, and driveway.

**Susan Lindoo** - The deck doesn't count because it's not a covered room?

**Ms. Buss** - No it does count.

**Susan Lindoo** - But it's not part of the 793 square feet?

**Ms. Buss** - No and it's actually 973 square feet, I may have inverted some numbers.

**The Public Hearing opened at 6:12 p.m.**

**Gary Banaszewski, 1970 8th Avenue** - There was a question as to the size of the house and the house is 1,020 square feet. I have a document showing that today. There were three different dimensions and according to the survey it's 1,020.

**Susan Lindoo** - And that doesn't include the deck?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - No.

**Ms. Buss** - The footprint of the actual house.

**Susan Lindoo** - And that's pretty close to the 973.

**Ms. Buss** - Can you submit a copy of that to the City?

**Chairperson Lund** - Is that the same that's in our packet?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - It's the same except it actually gives the square footage of the house.

**Ms. Buss** - They didn't give us any of the dimensions so I called the architect and he said it was 973 square feet so it's helpful that they fixed that.

**Susan Lindoo** - And that proposed garage has already been built?

**Ms. Buss** - It's partly built.

**Chairperson Lund** - Part of your construction plans are to replace the garage but you don't require a variance for that?

**Ms. Buss** - That's to be determined but we can't discuss that tonight.

**Chairperson Lund** - We can't even mention it?

**Ms. Buss** - No, they started building the garage and we determined today that it was too tall and so they have stopped construction and have a couple options but he needs time to think about it and we don't have enough information to talk about it tonight.

**Chairperson Lund** - It's just good to have context to the issue in front of us.

**Vice- Chair Prestegaard** - Do you mind talking about the extension to the entryway and what you're doing there?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - The steps were between the kitchen and living room, they took that out and restructured all the beams underneath the kitchen. The steps right now are 11 steps, 84 inches long at five feet six inches high. It should be 110 inches, so it's 26 inches too short. The treads are under eight inches wide and the State Code requires 10 inches, so I need to extend it 26 inches past where it is now and that puts me into a brick wall. I would have to structurally change the beam which is a total structure replacement which is more than we can do because we're putting in new siding and windows.

**Councilman Ingemann** - The plumbing is not affected at all by this.

**Mr. Banaszewski** - No, it's not.

**Councilman Ingemann** - So the statement in there about the plumbing is incorrect. I lived at 1949 Barry Drive and the floor plans are the same for all of the houses. The original way the house was built was you walked into the backdoor and the stairs went straight down. What he has now is that the stairs go alongside the house. If he were to put the stairs out so far with the correct Code, put a landing and continue the other way, he won't need an extension. All of the plumbing is along the back of the house. The original house had wood beams going down the center of the house and they were 16 inches. So what's happened is whoever had the house before you put the stairs the short way and put a railing in. If you were to keep it going that way with a landing you can still get into the basement.

**Chairperson Lund** - So your point is that you could take out some of the living room and have the stairs make a 90 degree turn.

**Councilman Ingemann** - No, you can leave it the way it is because this is a closet.

**Janice Anderson** - Where are the stairs coming from?

**Councilman Ingemann** - They're going down.

**Chairperson Lund** - From the kitchen?

**Janice Anderson** - From the living room. What do the stairs go into downstairs?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - A rec room, it's a big opening. I would take out some more headers and the closet. The stairs right now, the trusses are five feet six inches so I need to duck down.

**Susan Lindoo** - Where would the opening to the stairs be with what you're proposing? Would it be towards the wall of the house? Tom, could you point on the paper where the opening is?

**Councilman Ingemann** - The opening is by the back door.

**Susan Lindoo** - What it would be on the proposed way?

**Councilman Ingemann** - If he were to change it and have the stairs going the other way he would still have the short distance problem. Underneath are the main beams and wooden trusses.

**Susan Lindoo** - The idea is that it would come out in the entryway now right?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - When you walk into the front door, the steps would go down to the basement and there would be two steps into the living room. It would not interfere with the structure of the house.

**Chairperson Lund** - So how does it create more space if you're not cutting joists?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - The stair goes away and I can make the living room full again.

**Chairperson Lund** - So you're putting the stairs in the entryway completely?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - Yes.

**Ms. Buss** - So I think the critical question for us is whether or not there's an alternative to what he's proposing.

**Vice-Chair Prestegaard** - Tom's asserting that the landing is one alternative.

**Ms. Buss** - Have you discussed a landing with your architect?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - We drew it that way but the height of the studs would need to be removed and they would need to pre-fab a beam to go from one wall to another and it would need to support the house.

**Janice Anderson** - So that's a structural change.

**Ms. Buss** - That's a major change to the structure. So the critical issue in terms of the variance is whether or not there's a reasonable way for him to do this without a variance. Structurally, it's possible to do it the way that Tom is suggesting but you're saying that it's a high cost?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - Yes. We're investing a lot of money into it with new siding, roof, windows and a fireplace. I don't plan on moving and want to make it comfortable for us.

**Ms. Buss** - I think that's the question for you guys, is he asking for something reasonable.

**Susan Lindoo** - The house now is 30 feet back so you would be bringing the entryway out 13 feet?

**Ms. Buss** - That includes the stairway. We need to count the front entry stair as part of the structure.

**Mr. Banaszewski** - The living room will be above grade so that water doesn't go in.

**Susan Lindoo** - Personally, I'm less bothered by it sticking out from the house than I am from the increased lot coverage because all of the years that I've been on the Planning Commission one of the recurring issues is flooding because there is no place for the water to go to. I'm not sure it will destroy the symmetry of the street. Obviously you've been stuck with something that a former owner did wrong and you're trying to remedy that and I certainly have a lot of sympathy with that.

**Vice-Chair Prestegaard** - It is nice to see that you're making home improvements and generally I would be supportive of that. I would be interested to know if a 90 degree turn would be viable.

**Councilman Ingemann** - He has a short distance going down, if you're short you'll be able to make the turn but if you're taller than five feet you'll hit your head. The 90 degree turn is not good.

**Ms. Buss** - So it's not a good option?

**Councilman Ingemann** - No.

**Anthony Mahmood** - I have the exact same setup you do and I have to do the same thing moving things downstairs. I drove by your house tonight and I don't see an issue.

**Councilman Ingemann** - I'm looking at the drawing and don't think the entryway will be obtrusive and stick out.

**Mr. Banaszewski** - The plan is to match the roof line with the existing roof line.

**Ms. Buss** - I do think there's a priority about meeting State Code.

**Susan Lindoo** - I would ask if there are other ways to reduce the lot coverage. If the garage hasn't been fully built maybe that can be smaller. I have a lot of concern about lot coverage because of the flooding and maintenance issues that we keep hearing about.

**Mr. Banaszewski** - The garage is structurally built. There's a problem with the height and square footage. With the addition, the house will be bigger than the garage. I've been talking with my architect and contractor to get some drawings to shorten the garage. It's going to be rather expensive.

**Ms. Buss** - I asked John about whether we should be concerned about the 100 square feet. The basic issue about lot coverage already exists so we can't do anything about that and John's feeling is that there's nothing practical we can do for this little space.

**Susan Lindoo** - I think I know that, I'm just going on record that I think lot coverage is a real issue because over the years, the biggest issues we get is flooding problems. Aesthetically, I don't see a problem with it.

**Janice Anderson** - The extension comes toward the street ten feet more and it's only seven and a half feet wide, I would rather see it ten feet wide and seven and a half feet forward.

**Ms. Buss** - That doesn't give him enough space for the stairway and a decent entryway.

**Mr. Banaszewski** - It takes away from the picture window.

**Janice Anderson** - So those extra three feet are not available because of the window?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - Yes.

**Chairperson Lund** - I like the design, I think it's reasonable given the current floor plan. At the end of the day you're trading living room space for an entryway because you're going to recapture the stairway space and make that part of your living room. That said, I don't know that it meets the legal justification for a variance.

**Ms. Buss** - It does if there's not another way to do it. If we're making this fit the Code it definitely meets the rationale.

**Councilman Ingemann** - The only other way is to make it go back to the original way which is a major construction.

**Chairperson Lund** - Or take up more of the living room. Is that enough for the variance?

**Ms. Buss** - We don't make people wreck their houses or ruin the values of their homes. It's reasonable that this house not lose a lot of value.

**Janice Anderson** - Is there an option to put it on the side of the house?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - I would lose driveway space.

**Chairperson Lund** - Are we approving lot coverage that allows the bigger garage?

**Ms. Buss** - No, you're not doing anything with the garage tonight. You're approving the additional lot coverage for the entryway.

**Chairperson Lund** - If he chops off his deck can he get a bigger garage?

**Ms. Buss** - We're really not getting into that tonight. The garage already exists, the previous garage was above the limit as well.

**Chairperson Lund** - The current garage was already built?

**Ms. Buss** - It's under construction. The previous garage plus driveway plus house was over coverage also. If we get something related to the garage it would be related to the height and the relationship of the size of the garage to the house, it wouldn't be related to the coverage.

**Chairperson Lund** - How would it not be related to coverage if it's bigger than the old garage?

**Ms. Buss** - They were already over the coverage with the old garage. The garage is not an issue tonight it's the coverage for this.

**Chairperson Lund** - Coverage is coverage so let's talk about the garage as it stands now and see if we can approve that and if he brings the height down he won't need to come back.

**Admin. Hill** - We should not.

**Ms. Buss** - We can't talk about that.

**Chairperson Lund** - Because it wasn't part of the public hearing?

**Admin. Hill** - That's right.

**Ms. Buss** - He has not brought an application forward related to the garage so it's not part of the discussion.

**Chairperson Lund** - I'm not willing to have someone tell me what we can talk about but I understand that we can't vote on it. Your point is that it wasn't part of the public hearing, he's only asking for a variance for lot coverage that doesn't include the garage that already exists but includes an entryway that he hasn't built yet and it will still be nonconforming for the lot coverage because this garage does exist but we can't talk about that today?

**Ms. Buss** - Yes, we shouldn't because he hasn't made an application related to it and you don't have any information in front of you, we would just be speculating about it.

**Chairperson Lund** - I don't have any issue with the garage but I like to talk about the world as it exists.

**Janice Anderson** - That whole neighborhood must exceed the lot coverage, so was the present lot coverage ordinance in place?

**Ms. Buss** - We don't know.

**Executive Analyst Helm** - These homes were built in the 60's so there probably wasn't a maximum.

**Chairperson Lund** - If you build this entryway the garage will be smaller than the house?

**Mr. Banaszewski** - Yes.

**Chairperson Lund** - And then we'll have to revisit the lot coverage.

**Ms. Buss** - Depending on what they decide to do.

**Chairperson Lund** - I think that should be part of this current discussion because we generally don't have people tear down their buildings.

**Vice-Chair Prestegaard** - Referring to the garage construction that has already started?

**Janice Anderson** - It's under construction now but it has stopped.

**Chairperson Lund** - So how far is it...

**Ms. Buss** - Honestly, that is not an application that is before you tonight. They need to make a decision, they can reduce the height of the garage and then you won't hear about it at all.

**Chairperson Lund** - They'll need to come back for the lot coverage.

**Ms. Buss** - No.

**Executive Analyst Helm** - That's part of tonight's Resolution.

**Chairperson Lund** - That's what I just asked.

**Ms. Buss** - The garage is not the same size but there was a slab there before so they're not increasing the lot coverage. The issues for the garage is the height and size.

**Chairperson Lund** - That clears it up.

**Vice-Chair Prestegaard** - We understand that John is not suggesting any changes related to drainage so I'm not sure I have any conditions to add so I would move to approve the Resolution.

**The Public Hearing closed at 6:38 p.m.**

**Motion by Prestegaard, seconded by Anderson to approve Resolution No. P.C. 2013-12 as presented recommending that the City Council approves a Variance requested by Gary Banaszewski for property located at 1970 8th Avenue. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.**

**B. Public Hearing – To consider amendments to the Zoning Code, Chapter 1300, Section 1300 General, Section 1340 Residential Districts, and Section 1350 Nonresidential Districts**

Sherrri Buss, TKDA Planner, and Executive Analyst Helm presented on this item as outlined in the December 12, 2013 Planning Commission Packet.

**Chairperson Lund** - Did we make the rear setback the same as the side?

**Ms. Buss** - It's 20 feet.

**Executive Analyst Helm** - It's the same.

**Vice- Chair Prestegaard** - There's a section here about defining adult uses.

**Ms. Buss** - That's something that Renee discovered. We didn't have a definition of that in the Code and we really do need one. She took a look and grabbed one from Woodbury. We're hoping tonight that you'll add that. We're trying to clean the Code as we make these changes. You'll see we also removed 1300.07 that had some things from accessory structures in it and two other items that were covered elsewhere. We moved the items about the accessory structures to Section 1340 and the swimming pool item exists in another chapter.

**Chairperson Lund** - What about the air conditioner?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - That was not addressed anywhere but the setback for some homes is 10 feet so if an air conditioner was placed on the side it would not meet the 20 foot setback.

**Chairperson Lund** - I wonder if that was intentional because they can be so noisy.

**Susan Lindoo** - I wondered about that as well. It looked like it could not be in the front yard and I think that should be kept in however it's rewritten.

**Chairperson Lund** - I think the whole thing should be kept, 20 feet is not very far.

**Ms. Buss** - But houses are allowed to be 10 feet away.

**Chairperson Lund** - But there's no reason they need to be at the corner of the house.

**Susan Lindoo** - Are there any situations where it could be in the front yard?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - No. All residential districts, except for the RE have a 10 foot setback.

**Chairperson Lund** - So a house may be 10 feet from the lot line but you can't put your air conditioner at the corner of your house if it's that close.

**Susan Lindoo** - So it's 10 feet from the side and rear?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - No it's 30 feet from the rear.

**Susan Lindoo** - So they could go in the rear then?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - Yes.

**Chairperson Lund** - 20 feet is not that far. It shouldn't create any structural problems to put it in the back. I don't see any reason to take this out.

**Ms. Buss** - We can put it in the accessory structure section.

**Chairperson Lund** - In regards to the table for accessory structures, if we want to be very precise it should be "2 - less than 5 acres."

**Ms. Buss** - This is the typical way to write it for codes.

**Susan Lindoo** - It does say "4.99."

**Chairperson Lund** - So the intent is anything less than five acres?

**Ms. Buss** - It says "Less than 2 acres, 2 to 4.99 acres, and 5 or more."

**Executive Analyst Helm** - I don't think acres go beyond two digits.

**Chairperson Lund** - What if it's 4.995?

**Ms. Buss** - Surveyors will never do that.

**Vice-Chair Prestegaard** - All we have left is the adult use thing. I don't think I want to personally go into it.

**Ms. Buss** - Overtime there has been so much litigation in this issue that cities need to be very precise.

**Chairperson Lund** - This definition prefers to "specified anatomical areas" and "specified sexual activities," where are they specified?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - I'm not sure.

**Councilman Ingemann** - Back in the 90's I asked for this ordinance. We cannot prevent them from coming here but we can limit where they are allowed.

**Chairperson Lund** - I'm aware of that strategy and I think it's legally appropriate but my question is that the draft refers to these but they're not specified.

**Susan Lindoo** - Would that be the Minnesota Statute?

**Chairperson Lund** - They're saying activities classified as obscene. The Supreme Court has said that governments are allowed to restrict obscene activities so I'm assuming that's what the Minnesota Statute is so that would be different from the specified items. Did the Woodbury code define these?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - I copied it directly from the Woodbury code.

**Ms. Buss** - Why don't you look and see if they have definitions for those or if it's in the Minnesota Statute.

**Susan Lindoo** - Renee could you find a way of defining that clearly?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - Yes.

**Susan Lindoo** - I think it would benefit to look at Woodbury's and use the same language they do.

**Vice-Chair Prestegaard** - So we're feeling good about these changes and just have two things. The first is that we want to move the air conditioner subdivision to the accessory structure section. Secondly, we wanted to clarify what the specified areas are within adult use.

**Ms. Buss** - If you're willing to have Renee look into that and add that without you seeing it again you can move this with that direction.

**Janice Anderson** - I'm fine with that.

**Chairperson Lund** - I think we agree and understand the general strategy that we're trying to be as restrictive as possible without running afoul of what the Supreme Court says we can do.

**Vice-Chair Prestegaard** - So what would we do because I can move the resolution?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - First you need to have the public hearing.

**The Public Hearing opened at 6:56 p.m.**

**The Public Hearing closed at 6:57 p.m.**

**Susan Lindoo** - I have one other item. The maximum building height and feet in the table is 35 feet or 3 stories but in no case higher than 1,000 feet U.S.G.S. sea level elevation. I was just curious how high Newport is, no one would go over that right?

**Councilman Ingemann** - St. Paul is 870 and they're higher than us.

**Chairperson Lund** - Why do we have that?

**Ms. Buss** - It might be something related to the airport zoning.

**Executive Analyst Helm** - To answer Matt's question, you can move the motion and direct staff to move the air conditioning language and look at the "specified anatomical areas" and "specified sexual activities" and add language to the definitions for those and then move it forward to the City Council.

**Chairperson Lund** - Our general instruction is to tag on to what Woodbury did.

**Vice-Chair Prestegaard** - I'll move to approve Resolution No. P.C. 2013-13 with two modifications, one is to move the air conditioning language to the accessory structure section and two is to check with the City of Woodbury to see what they have and add those definitions to the Code in regards to specified areas in adult use.

**Motion by Prestegaard, seconded by Anderson to approve Resolution No. P.C. 2013-13 as amended recommending that the City Council approve a Zoning Amendment to Section 1300 General, Section 1340 Residential Districts, and Section 1350 Non-residential Districts. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.**

## **5. COMMISSION AND STAFF REPORTS**

**A. Invitation from the Heritage Preservation Commission to their Annual Meeting on January 8, 2013 at 5:30 p.m.**

Executive Analyst Helm presented on this item as outlined in the December 12, 2013 Planning Commission packet. The HPC invited the Planning Commission to their annual meeting on January 8, 2014 to discuss the Historic Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District.

**Chairperson Lund** - Did you indicate the general skepticism that we need a historic overlay district?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - Sherri indicated that.

## **B. 2014 Vacancy**

**Executive Analyst Helm** - We will have a vacancy in 2014, Janice has elected not to seek reappointment after 14 years on the Planning Commission. We would like to thank her for her service on the Planning Commission, she'll be greatly missed.

**Susan Lindoo** - We're losing a lot of history.

**Executive Analyst Helm** - With that we are advertising for her vacancy. We haven't received any applications yet so if you know of anyone that would like to serve it would be a three year term. Next, I would like to discuss the meeting in January. The next meeting is January 9, 2014, we have not received any applications for planning requests and I think we're still waiting for St. Paul to amend their brewery ordinance so I don't think we'll have any items so if it's okay with the Chair, we can cancel that meeting.

**Susan Lindoo** - If we meet with the HPC it needs to be announced as a joint meeting if more than two of us go so we'd be meeting January 8 instead of January 9.

**Chairperson Lund** - Will that impact what's going on with the Red Rock?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - Not with the brewery, there are a lot of State and Federal regulations that they need to go through and that takes about six months so they're hoping to open that in the summer. Sherri was anticipating that St. Paul would be done by the February meeting.

**Susan Lindoo** - When the City Council approved the Red Rock thing were they safe to approve it when we don't have an ordinance for it yet?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - That was just a liquor license, there'll be a different license for the brewery.

**Chairperson Lund** - There's no option of allowing an on-sale liquor license to allow brewpubs?

**Executive Analyst Helm** - No, there are State regulations that say they need a brewpub license and they need to go through the Federal and State regulations before we can issue one.

**Susan Lindoo** - It looks like HPC wouldn't be ready for us until 6.

**Chairperson Lund** - Back to your original question I don't think there's a need for a meeting if we don't have anything.

**Executive Analyst Helm** - Ok, I'm guessing the HPC meeting would be ready for you around 5:45. Let me know if you're planning on going. We'll cancel the January 9 meeting so the first one will be February 13.

**Chairperson Lund** - I know the park isn't really our domain but has there been any movement on the island park?

**Admin. Hill** - First I was going to mention that the Knox Lumber building is coming down. Nothing has changed in regards to the park since the last time. We do have a pending purchase agreement for the Johnson properties, they surround the mill pond. I know the HPC is interested in one of the homes, it has remnants of one of the oldest log home structures in the State.

**Susan Lindoo** - Would that be flooded? Will the City preserve that structure?

**Admin. Hill** - It wouldn't be flooded and I don't think it'll be preserved in its entirety.

**Susan Lindoo** - What is the City going to do with that land?

**Admin. Hill** - The Council has been looking at this land for several years, it surrounds where the storm drainage goes into the Mississippi.

**Susan Lindoo** - Will it be park land then?

**Councilman Ingemann** - Houses.

**Admin. Hill** - It would be a passive park at best around the mill pond.

**Chairperson Lund** - You're not planning on building?

**Admin. Hill** - There's enough sites to build maybe four houses. There's a house by Steve Marko that would be condemned and torn down.

**Chairperson Lund** - So the City's purpose is redevelopment? I was wondering if it was to add buffer space.

**Susan Lindoo** - Will most of it be redeveloped like a money-making thing for the City?

**Admin. Hill** - We'll probably break even.

**Susan Lindoo** - Why did the City buy it, were there no developers?

**Councilman Ingemann** - To get some stuff moving, right now it's vacant land.

**Susan Lindoo** - But some of it will be part of the park?

**Admin. Hill** - It protects the mill pond, yes.

**Susan Lindoo** - That'll be interesting to ask the HPC about, if they have any plans.

**Admin. Hill** - I've been in contact with Bob Vogel, they've been waiting for about 10 years for it.

**Susan Lindoo** - So it'll be like an archeological site for Vogel?

**Councilman Ingemann** - Pretty much.

**Admin. Hill** - The log structure sounds interesting.

**Susan Lindoo** - Yea, it would be cool to preserve some parts of it.

## **6. NEW BUSINESS**

**7. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

A. Upcoming Meetings and Events:

- |   |                        |           |
|---|------------------------|-----------|
| 1. City Council Meeting                         | December 19, 2013      | 5:30 p.m. |
| 2. City Offices Closed for Christmas<br>Holiday | December 24 - 26, 2013 |           |

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion by Prestegaard, seconded by Anderson, to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting at 7:10 P.M.  
With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dan Lund, Chairperson

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Helm  
Executive Analyst