

The following are minutes of the Bettendorf Planning and Zoning Commission and are a synopsis of the discussion that took place at this meeting and as such may not include the entirety of each statement made. The minutes of each meeting do not become official until approved at the next meeting.

**MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 17, 2014
5:30 P.M.**

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting of September 17, 2014, was called to order by Wennlund at 5:30 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 1609 State Street.

1. Roll Call

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bennett, *Bert, Kappeler, Peters, Rafferty, Stoltenberg, Wennlund

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Greg Beck, City Planner; Bill Connors, Community Development Director; Lisa Fuhrman, Community Development Secretary; Kristine Stone, City Attorney; Brian Fries, Assistant City Engineer; Steve Knorrek, Fire Marshal

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of August 20, 2014.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Peters, that the minutes of the meeting of August 20, 2014 be approved as submitted.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

*Bert arrived at this time.

3. Review of Commission procedures.

Rezoning

4. Case 14-072; 3412 State Street, C-4 and R-4 to C-3, submitted by Green Valley Roofing, LLC.

Beck reviewed the staff report.

Kappeler asked for clarification of the details regarding the applicant's proposed business expansion. Beck explained that the applicant may use part of the lot for storage of materials for the roofing business. Connors added that the applicant would like to construct a building to be used for storage of materials and parking of vehicles associated with the business.

Wennlund asked if the entire parcel is proposed to be rezoned. Beck explained that approximately the southern half of the property would be rezoned to C-3, adding that it is currently zoned both C-4 and R-4.

Kappeler asked how the proposed rezoning of only half of the lot would affect the use of the remainder which would be zoned R-4. Beck explained that the steep topography of the lot and the ravine on the property renders it mostly useless.

Rafferty asked for clarification of the zoning classifications of the adjoining properties. Beck stated that the property to the east is zoned C-4 and that the properties to the west and northeast are zoned C-3.

Wennlund asked if there was anyone present wishing to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request.

Rhiannon Tucker, representative of the applicant, stated that the applicants have purchased the property and are currently in the process of renovating the house for use as an office.

On motion by Bennett, seconded by Stoltenberg, that the rezoning of 3412 State Street, C-4 and R-4 to C-3, be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

5. Case 14-073; Property generally located east of the terminus of 53rd Avenue, A-1 to R-1, submitted by KW Development, LLC/Bob Walter Building Contractor, Inc.

Beck reviewed the staff report.

Kappeler asked if the three lots to the west on Allison Drive are a part of the proposed rezoning and if they would be impacted in any way. Beck explained that they are a part of a different subdivision, adding that the entrance to the property currently being rezoned would be from Allison Drive.

Wennlund asked if the zoning exhibit is only a concept at this time. Beck confirmed this, adding that a preliminary plat would be submitted at a later date.

Wennlund asked what the developer has planned for the outlots near the creek shown on the concept plan. Beck explained that the developers are currently working with the Corps of Engineers to determine if it would be possible to straighten out the creek, adding that any property remaining in the 100-year flood plain would be designated as an outlot on the plat.

Wennlund commented that he would prefer that developers do not install medians at the entrance to subdivisions as is shown on the concept plan. He added that the medians preclude motorists from parking adjacent to those lots.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Rafferty, that the rezoning for property generally located east of the terminus of 53rd Avenue, A-1 to R-1, be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Final Plat

6. Case 14-075; Spencer Hollow First Addition, submitted by Mike Janecek.

Beck reviewed the staff report.

Wennlund asked for clarification of the condition listed in the staff report regarding Lots 30, 31, and 32. Beck explained that because there is a drainage easement that runs through those lots, their lowest entry elevation should be noted on the plat.

Wennlund stated that a homeowner in the adjacent subdivision had asked him for confirmation of how storm water runoff from the proposed subdivision would impact Nottingham Lane. Fries explained that the applicant's engineer has submitted storm water calculations which show that if a 100 year flood event occurs, the water will remain below the lowest entry elevation for the existing homes. Wennlund asked if it is still the case that runoff from the proposed subdivision would remain at or below the level that is currently experienced by the homeowners in Sterling Woods. Fries confirmed this. Connors commented that the applicant has complied with the request by the engineering department that the applicant's engineer measure the elevations of the existing homes adjacent to the proposed subdivision to ensure that the drainage will not negatively impact the properties of the homeowners in Sterling Woods.

Wennlund asked if there was anyone present wishing to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request.

Mike Janecek, the applicant's engineer, stated that because Lots 30, 31, and 32 are not in a sump condition no drainage easement or low entry elevations are necessary. He added that there would be no overland flow route between those lots even if the inlets overflow because there is no low point on the adjacent north-south street. He explained that the low points of the subdivision are at the southeast and northeast corners which are indicated on the plans. Janecek reiterated that the drainage calculations prove that the homeowners in Sterling Woods will have the equivalent or less flow through the subdivision as a result of construction of Spencer Hollow First Addition.

Greg Jager, attorney representing the applicant, indicated that if after discussions between the city's engineering staff and Janecek it is determined that a drainage

easement is necessary, the plat would be modified to include it. Fries commented that he would require that Janecek submit a grading plan for his review so that he can verify whether a drainage easement is necessary on those lots. Janecek commented that if storm water inlets overflow during a rain event, the runoff would be directed toward the southeast corner of the subdivision where a detention area is located. He added that low entry elevations are given for the lots in the subdivision that are in a sump condition.

Mark Robson, 7016 Nottingham Lane, asked if the stakes that are currently located west of his home are a true representation of the boundaries of the proposed subdivision. Connors stated that he is unsure of the purpose of those stakes, adding that before construction of the subdivision begins a survey will be completed and the property lines will be verified. Robson commented that the stakes are very close to or actually in what some residents consider to be their back yard.

Robson asked if there would be any access from Sterling Woods to the proposed subdivision. Connors stated that Landcaster Drive would not be extended.

Robson asked if the Commission is currently considering just the rezoning of the property, not a final plan for the property. Connors explained that the Commission is considering the final plat of the subdivision. Robson asked when construction would begin. Nick Kremer, the applicant, stated that as soon as grade elevations are established construction would begin. He indicated that he hopes to begin grading this fall. Kremer added that the start of sewer work would depend upon weather conditions.

Robson asked if the developer's intention is to leave the existing trees undisturbed or to remove them. Kremer explained that all of the existing trees will remain except for those required to be removed to allow for drainage and storm water easements. Robson asked if the developer has chosen which trees would be removed for the project. Kremer stated that until a site assessment is conducted, he cannot determine which specific trees will either remain or be removed by the developer. Jager added that once a future homeowner purchases a lot, he or she would have the right to remove any trees or vegetation that is on his or her property. Robson asked how he could get a survey that he could show to his representative to determine if the property lines are accurate. Janecek stated that a registered land surveyor has determined the location of the property lines based on found pins in the field, adding that when infrastructure construction is complete, property pins would be set at the lot corners. Kremer suggested that if Robson is concerned about the location of his property pins, he should obtain the services of a registered land surveyor to locate them.

Fries asked for clarification of which type of easements would be present on Lots 30, 31, and 32. Janecek explained that while there is no need for a drainage easement for overland flow, there is a sanitary sewer easement between Lots 30 and 31 and a storm sewer easement between Lots 31 and 32.

Beck reiterated that an additional 33 feet of right-of-way must be dedicated to the city along Forest Grove Drive and must be shown on the plat prior to City Council consideration. Wennlund asked if the plat as submitted shows the correct amount of right-of-way to be dedicated to the city. Beck explained that it does not, adding that

the plat must be corrected to show an accurate depiction of that dedicated right-of-way before council consideration. Wennlund asked if the increase in dedicated right-of-way would result in a reduction in depth for the lots adjacent to Forest Grove Drive. Connors explained that those lots would remain the same size as is indicated on the plat, adding that the developer technically owns the property from the centerline of Forest Grove Drive to the southern border of the subdivision.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Rafferty, that the final plat of Spencer Hollow First Addition be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations and the correction to the plat indicating the additional right-of-way along Forest Grove Drive to be dedicated to the city and the verification by the city's engineering staff of whether a low entry elevation is required for Lots 30, 31, and 32.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

7. Case 14-076; Villas at Glengevlin Fourth Addition, submitted by Towne & Country Bettendorf, LLC.

Development Plan

8. Case 14-058; Proposed Villas at Glengevlin Fourth Addition, submitted by Towne & Country Bettendorf, LLC.

Beck reviewed the staff reports.

Rafferty asked if there have been any significant changes to the project since the preliminary plat was approved. Connors explained that an earlier concept plan showed 5-foot side yard setbacks on all of the lots that were to have been used for single-family detached condominiums. He indicated that after discussions at the City Council level, the developer decided to use 4 of the lots for 2 duplex units, adding that the resultant design allowed him enough space to offer a 15-foot total combined side yard setback for the detached units rather than the 10-foot total combined side yard setback that is shown for the duplex unit lots.

Jager explained that the Commission had recommended approval of the development plan for Villas at Glengevlin Fourth Addition at the same meeting where the developer's rezoning request was considered. He reiterated that the developer has decided that a 15-foot total combined side yard setback is appropriate for the single-family detached unit lots. He indicated that the street design and location remains the same, adding that the final plat mirrors the design indicated on the revised development plan.

On motion by Rafferty, seconded by Bennett, that the development plan for the proposed Villas at Glengevlin Fourth Addition be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

On motion by Rafferty, seconded by Peters, that the final plat of Villas at Glengevlin Fourth Addition be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

Site Development Plan

9. Case 14-065; 2700 Middle Road, submitted by Heritage Church. (Deferred from meeting of August 20, 2014.)

Beck reviewed the staff report.

Rafferty asked for clarification of staff's statement with regard to a requirement for a 4-foot wide sidewalk along the Happy Joe Drive right-of-way. Beck explained that in further staff discussions it had been decided that the requirement for a sidewalk along Happy Joe Drive would only be triggered by construction of a new building, not for the flatwork that is being proposed. Rafferty asked if the Commission should disregard Condition #6 in the staff report. Beck confirmed this.

Wennlund commented that the private road to the church is in poor condition and asked who is responsible for its maintenance. Beck explained that it is the shared responsibility of the adjacent lot owners. Wennlund stated that there is an area along that access easement where the soil washes out onto Happy Joe Drive during heavy rains.

On motion by Bennett, seconded by Stoltenberg, that a site development plan for 2700 Middle Road be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations.

ALL AYES

Motion carried.

10. Case 14-066; 6550 State Street, submitted by LeClaire Manufacturing.

Beck reviewed the staff report.

Bennett stated that she would abstain from discussion and voting on Case 14-066.

Kappeler asked for clarification regarding the staff comments regarding the storm water detention system. Beck explained that a new storm water detention facility will collect enough water from the north that is currently not being detained to offset the amount of water that will be released from the remainder of the site to the existing ditch along

State Street. Kappeler asked where the water from the new detention area would be released. Fries explained that the water would travel around the building and eventually outlet to the existing ditch on State Street.

Kappeler asked if the building addition would supplant existing parking and if so, would more parking spaces be required. Beck explained that parking requirements were calculated using the number of shift employees on site at any given time, adding that the existing parking is adequate. Wennlund asked if the building's square footage is used in the calculation of parking requirements. Beck explained that the requirement is based on the maximum number of shift employees that would be on the site as supplied by the applicant. He stated that the calculations differ depending on the use. Wennlund asked if more parking would be required if a different user had many more employees. Beck confirmed this.

Wennlund asked if the applicant owns the property where the new storm water detention area will be located. Beck confirmed this.

Wennlund asked if there was anyone present wishing to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request.

John Schutter, 5541 Valley Drive, asked if the proposed detention pond would be adequate to prevent water from running off on to his property which is adjacent to the site. He indicated that the engineer whom he hired had informed him that in order to accomplish that goal, the proposed pond's elevation would have to be 577.8 feet or less. Schutter also expressed concern about the pollution that is generated by the applicant's facility. He asked what the proposed use of the new building addition would be. Rob Zimmerman, the applicant, explained that the facility will be primarily used for shipping, tool repair and storage, and grinding and finishing. Mark Harpole, the applicant's engineer, explained that the elevation of the outlet from the detention area will be 577.04.

On motion by Kappeler, seconded by Bert, that a site development plan for 6550 State Street be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION

AYE: Bert, Kappeler, Peters, Rafferty, Stoltenberg, Wennlund
NAY: None
ABSTAIN: Bennett

Motion carried.

12. Case 14-078; Amendment to the Bettendorf Urban Renewal Plan establishing Urban Renewal Area #4A, submitted by Steve Van Dyke.

Van Dyke reviewed the staff report.

Bennett stated that she would abstain from discussion and voting on Case 14-078.

Rafferty asked if any of the site is currently located in an urban renewal area. Van Dyke explained that the entirety of the LeClaire Manufacturing site would be added, not just the building addition. He stated that rather than including the entire Valley Drive/State Street area in the urban renewal area, the decision was made to add individual properties at such time as requests are made. Van Dyke indicated that this approach gives the public the opportunity to be involved in the process when revisions to the Urban Renewal Area Map are proposed.

On motion by Stoltenberg, seconded by Peters, that the establishment of Urban Renewal Area #4A be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION

AYE: Bert, Kappeler, Peters, Rafferty, Stoltenberg, Wennlund
NAY: None
ABSTAIN: Bennett

Motion carried.

11. Case 14-077; 2207 Falcon Avenue, submitted by Mark Roemer.

Beck reviewed the staff report.

Kappeler asked if the plantings on the west side of the property are sufficient to meet the requirements listed on the plat regarding landscaping. Beck confirmed this, adding that the original plantings required must be maintained in a healthy condition to ensure that the opaque barrier is preserved. Kappeler asked if the applicant plans to enhance the landscaping along the west side of the property. Beck reiterated that the existing plantings meet the ordinance requirements, adding that the applicant plans to install additional trees to increase the opacity of the buffer yard and replace any trees that are dead.

Kappeler commented that it would have been helpful if enough Board of Adjustment members had been available to render a decision regarding the proposed outdoor service area at their regularly scheduled meeting on September 11. She stated that while she understands that the use of the building and the proposed outdoor service area are not in the Commission's purview, she has some questions regarding the patio. Connors stated that it would be appropriate to ask those questions. Kappeler stated that the use of the patio would be different depending upon what type of business it is associated with, adding that it could affect the neighborhood.

Rafferty asked for clarification of how the existing vegetation would be maintained if the building, cooler, and trash enclosure are located so close to the berm. Wennlund asked how the waste hauler would be able to empty the dumpster if a car is parked in the southernmost parking space. Mark Roemer, the applicant, explained that he has made arrangements for the dumpster to be emptied after 8:00 a.m. in accordance with the wishes of the neighbors. He added that the restaurant that will be located in the

adjacent space will likely not be open until at least 11:00 a.m. on Fridays and Saturdays and not at all in the afternoons on the other days. He indicated that the restaurant will most likely be a gastro pub that he would own, adding that the owner of a Mexican restaurant has also indicated interest in the space. He explained that there will be a sidewalk running along the rear of the building which can be used for access to the berm. Roemer stated that he plans to install a fence at the highest elevation possible on the berm, adding that at the request of the neighbors he will allow them to utilize a portion of the berm on the south side of that fence. He indicated that allowing them permission to maintain a part of the berm will make it appear as though their rear yards are larger. He explained that the initial design showed the restaurant on the west side of the property along with the patio area but that he had reversed the configuration so that the outdoor service area would be as far from residential homes as possible.

Rafferty asked if the applicant had considered moving the building to the north so that it would be further from the neighbors. Roemer explained that if the building were moved there would not be adequate space for required parking. He indicated that his landscaping company would be maintaining the berm. Rafferty stated that he believes that the detention area located on the north side of the lot should be moved to the south side to increase the space between the building and the neighbors.

Bert indicated that it is his understanding that the proposed use would be a restaurant where alcohol is served rather than a bar. Roemer confirmed this, adding that most likely the sales would be 60 percent from food and 40 percent from alcohol. He indicated that the restaurant would be similar to Governor's or Crust.

Bert asked for clarification regarding the proposed hours of operation. Roemer explained that as long as customers are in the restaurant they will be served. He indicated that at Crust, typically customers who are there late are inside the restaurant.

Wennlund commented that while he understands Rafferty's concerns regarding the location of the building, he does not believe there is a functional way to use the space reserved for the detention area as parking. Rafferty stated that it is not the Commission's responsibility to make the design work, rather that the members should express their concerns about the site development plan that was submitted. He commented that the Frank's Pizza restaurant is located further away from the berm with parking located behind the building. Rafferty stated that he believes it is the Commission's responsibility to make a decision that won't negatively impact adjacent residents. Roemer indicated that at one time he had considered a different configuration with the building's being placed further from the berm because he thought he might install a drive-up window on one side. He stated that he had revised the plan because in his opinion the neighbors would be more opposed to traffic in the rear of the building than a closer proximity. He stated that he had received no pushback from the residents regarding the placement of the building during the neighborhood meeting that was held.

Peters commented that she believes that it would be more disruptive to the neighbors if there were parking in the rear of the building such as at Frank's Pizza. She indicated that those parking areas tend to be where employees and customers congregate after

business hours. Peters stated that eliminating public traffic in the rear of the building could only benefit the neighbors.

Roemer explained that there will be a 3500 square foot office on the west side of the building and that there should be no activity there after 5:00 p.m. He indicated that the center unit as shown on the site plan will be divided into two spaces. He reiterated that the problems with other businesses on the east side of 18th Street are in large part because of the disturbances which occur in the public parking area in the rear of the building. Roemer explained that the additional trees he plans to install along with the fence to be placed at the highest point possible on the berm will almost completely shield the proposed structure. He stated that the lighting on the property will be facing in and downcast so as to not affect the residential neighbors.

Dave Berntgen, 5177 Dove Court, expressed his appreciation for the Commission's efforts to encourage McDonald's to submit a revised site plan that negatively impacts the neighbors less than the initial plan. He stated that in his opinion, the result of the McDonald's development is a win for the restaurant, a win for the city, and a draw for the neighbors.

Berntgen asked if the restaurant would be allowed to be open until 2:00 a.m. on weekdays as customers could cause a disturbance affecting the neighbors. He indicated that he is aware of the restriction on hours of operation for the patio at Crust that was imposed by the Board of Adjustment. He expressed concern about the lack of an opaque buffer from the residences as the evergreens on the berm adjacent to his property are not mature and also a possible reduction in property values. Berntgen stated that the neighbors are also concerned about the noise, traffic, smell, and rodents generated by the structure.

Wennlund asked Berntgen what revisions could be made to the site that would make it more acceptable to the neighbors. Berntgen commented that his biggest concern is how the hours of operation and the service of alcohol would affect the neighbors with small children. He stated that he believes that it is the city's obligation to protect the safety of the citizens. Wennlund commented that it is neither the Commission's nor the Board of Adjustment's purview to limit hours of indoor operations of the restaurant. Berntgen commented that the Board of Adjustment limited the hours during which alcohol is allowed to be served on the patio at Crust. He asked if a similar condition could be imposed on the proposed business owner regarding service of alcohol inside the restaurant as well as on the patio. Stone explained that if the rezoning of the property was necessary for the applicant to proceed with his plans, that type of limitation could be imposed as a part of a conditional rezoning. She stated that because this is merely a request for approval of a site development plan, the Commission does not have that authority. Connors added that the only way such a condition could be imposed is with a written agreement from the owner prior to a decision.

Roemer reiterated that a fence would be placed on top of the berm and that additional trees would be planted as well as he had indicated at the neighborhood meeting. He added that a restaurant is a permitted use in the C-2 district. Berntgen commented that the neighbors are concerned that the proposed business will be similar to The

Clubhouse on the east side of 18th Street. He reiterated that he would be in favor of limiting the hours during which alcohol is allowed to be served inside the restaurant. Roemer commented that his financing is partially dependent upon his business model which includes the service of alcohol inside the restaurant being allowed at all times the restaurant is open. He added that if he cannot obtain the financing he plans to lease the space to another business owner and that he could not control what type of business locates there. Roemer stated that his preference is to open a gastro pub which would be similar in atmosphere to Crust, adding that it would not be at all like The Clubhouse. He reiterated that the placement of the building close to the berm was done to reduce the likelihood that people would congregate at the rear of the structure and possibly disturb the neighbors.

Todd Bankson, 2214 Lindenwood Drive, indicated that he shares the concerns expressed by Berntgen. He stated that he is also concerned about the density of the screening on the berm, adding that he would like to have a solid fence rather than a staggered board fence that sound can travel through. Bankson commented if the police were called to the proposed business, kids could escape through the unfenced lot adjacent to the applicant's property through his yard and to Lindenwood Drive. He stated that if there is not enough parking, people could park on Lindenwood Drive and walk through his yard to reach the applicant's restaurant during all hours of the night. He indicated that the sound from the dumpster's being emptied will travel around the corner of the fence to his yard. Bankson expressed concern about how much fill would have to be brought in to contain storm water runoff.

Wennlund commented that the public hearing regarding the issue of the hours of operation for the patio would be held at the Board of Adjustment on September 18. He reiterated that neither the Commission nor the Board of Adjustment has the authority to limit the hours of indoor operations of the restaurant.

Wennlund asked if the applicant would be able to accommodate Bankson with regard to the design of the fence. Roemer confirmed this, adding that even though the owner of the adjacent lot cannot be required to do so, he had indicated at the neighborhood meeting that he would be willing to continue the fence across the rear of his property. He indicated that he is interested in purchasing that lot. Wennlund commented that the two fences may or may not be in the same location. Roemer explained that he plans to place the fence in a location that is as beneficial to the neighbors who wish to make their rear yards appear larger. He indicated that while he is not giving the residents on Lindenwood Drive his land, he plans to have his attorney draw up a document allowing those residents to maintain it while it remains under his ownership. Roemer stated that the owner of the adjacent lot is willing to install a fence that is in line with his fence.

Julie Feeney, 2192 Lindenwood Drive, stated that the landscaping on the berm has not been maintained nor have dead trees been removed. She stated that while Roemer may be willing to allow the adjacent residents to maintain the berm, a future owner may not. She indicated that the existing mature trees that create an opaque barrier would have to be removed in order to install a fence. Feeney stated that the dumpster at McDonald's is sometimes emptied at 4:00 a.m.

Roemer asked Feeney if the trees to which she referred are on top of the berm or are on her property line. Feeney stated that they are on top of the berm. Roemer stated again that he would be willing to place the fence on the north side so that the residents are able to enjoy his trees, adding that if necessary, the fence could be placed so as to preserve the mature trees.

Kristi Ziskovssky, 5200 Dove Court, expressed concern about the noise caused by the dumpster being emptied and the light that may escape the applicant's lot to her yard as the lights at McDonald's do. Connors explained that there is an ordinance regulating how much light can filter onto an adjacent property and that when it was discovered that one fixture at McDonald's was in violation, it was corrected.

Bennett asked if there is a way to ensure that the dumpsters are emptied at a reasonable hour. Roemer reiterated that he has made arrangements to have the dumpster emptied after 8:00 a.m. He added that he plans to give the residents a number that they can call if the dumpsters are emptied before then. He stated that since the restaurant would not open until at least 11:00 a.m., he believes it should be fairly easy to control that schedule.

Wennlund commented that any of the issues that are agreed upon between the current owner and the residents would not be enforceable for a new owner unless a written agreement is recorded against the property.

Kappeler commented that while she understands Berntgen's concerns regarding a public safety in light of the activities that occur at the bar on the east side of the 18th Street, Roemer has a stellar track record in Bettendorf for development of different businesses. She added that she has a lot of confidence in his pride as a business owner that he will respect the neighborhood.

On motion by Stoltenberg, seconded by Peters, that a site development plan for 2207 Falcon Avenue be recommended for approval subject to staff recommendations.

Rafferty commented that he would be unable to recommend that the site development plan be approved as submitted. He expressed concern about the intensity of the use because of the proximity to single-family homes.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION

AYE: Bennett, Bert, Kappeler, Peters, Stoltenberg,
Wennlund
NAY: Rafferty

Motion carried.

Other

12. Commission update.

Connors stated that subsequent to the last meeting the following case was approved:

Outlots 1 and 2, Mastland Subdivision, A-2 to A-1, Public hearing and first reading of ordinance

Connors stated that last week meetings were held with the consultant overseeing the Comprehensive Plan update. He added that he has suggested that on October 27 at 5:00 p.m. a joint meeting of the City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission be held in order to inform the members of the progress that has been made.

He stated that the first meeting of the Streetscape Committee would be held on September 29 at 4:00 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:15 p.m.

These minutes approved

Gregory W. Beck, City Planner