The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Dan Erickson. Members present were Scott Moller, Victoria Hallin, Eldon Johnson, and Gene Stoeckel (Princeton Twsp. Rep). Staff present were Robert Barbian (City Administrator), Stephanie Hillesheim (Community Development Specialist), and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Development).

Absent was Jeff Reynolds.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON JULY 15, 2019
HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 15, 2019. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:
HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO ADD UNDER VERBAL REPORT, ITEM 3, MARCIA ANDERSON. UNDER NEW BUSINESS, ITEM A, REMOVE FROM THE AGENDA THE FAÇADE GRANT APPLICATION AT 519 FIRST STREET. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING:
A. #19-03 Interim Use Permit for Chickens at 414 7th Avenue South

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Memo:

BACKGROUND
Ashleigh & Robert Blasey have submitted an Interim Use Permit application for the raising and keeping of chickens on their property located at 414 7th Avenue South. The property is zoned R-2, Residential District.

The public hearing notice has been sent to the properties 350 feet from this site. Two neighbors have contacted staff and said the applicants already have the chickens and they are in support of allowing the Interim Use Permit.

ANALYSIS
The housing and keeping of chickens in the R-2 District requires an Interim Use Permit. Chapter VI.BB lists the review criteria for the housing of chickens:

No person shall own, keep, harbor, or have custody of any live chickens without first obtaining an Interim Use Permit in writing from the City, in accordance with the provisions of Section IV.6 of the Zoning Ordinance and subject to the following conditions:

a. The keeping of any poultry besides chickens is prohibited.

Comment: This shall be conditions of approval.
b. Roosters are prohibited.  
Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

c. No more than four (4) chickens shall be housed or kept on any one residential lot in any area of the city zoned R-1, R-2, or R-3.  
Comment: The applicant is requesting to have 4 (four) chickens and understands this is the allowed limit, and will be a condition of approval.

d. Chickens shall only be allowed on single family home lots.  
Comment: This condition is met, still will be a condition of approval.

e. Outdoor slaughtering of chickens in city limits is prohibited.  
Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

f. Chicken fighting shall not be allowed within city limits.  
Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

g. Leg banding of all chickens is required. The bands must identify the owner’s name, address, and telephone number.  
Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

h. Chickens shall not be housed in a residential house or an attached or detached garage.  
Comment: The applicant has provided a layout of a chicken coup and run area that will be installed, still will be a condition of approval.

i) A separate coop is required to house the chickens. Coops must be constructed and maintained to meet the following minimum standards:  
1) Located in the side or rear yard.  
Comment: The applicant will have the coop located in the fenced area of their rear yard.

2) Meet the accessory structure setback requirements.  
Comment: The proposed location meets the setback requirements.

3) Construction shall be adequate to prevent access by rodents.  
Comment: Per the proposed coop design, the coop will be anchored on four post that will be 24” inches above the ground.

j. A run or exercise yard is required to be provided and must be enclosed by a fence.  
Comment: The applicant’s back yard is fenced and the run area will have its own fencing.

k. All premises on which chickens are kept or maintained shall be kept clean from filth, garbage, and any substances which attract rodents. The coop and its surrounding much be cleaned frequently enough to control odor. Manure shall not be allowed to accumulate in a way that causes an unsanitary condition or causes odors detectible on another property.
Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

1. All food shall be stored in an enclosed, rodent proof container.
Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

m. Dead chickens shall be disposed of according to the Minnesota Board of Animal Health rules, which require chicken carcasses to be disposed of as soon as possible after death, usually within 48 to 72 hours. Legal forms of chicken carcass disposal include offsite burial, offsite incineration or rendering, or offsite composting.
Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

Interim Use Permit Review Standards: When reviewing the application for an interim use, the City shall base its judgement on the following factors it may deem appropriate for the specific property. The interim use may be granted if:

1. The proposed use is an interim use listed in the district in which the application is being made.
Comment: The keeping of chickens is an Interim Use in the R-2 District.

2. The date or event that will terminate the use can be identified with certainty and continued.
Comment: The Planning Commission shall recommend to the City Council a date or event that will terminate the keeping of chickens. Staff would recommend that the keeping of chickens terminate when the current property owners sell the property. The Interim Permit can also be reviewed upon complaints.

3. The interim use does not result in adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare nor does it create additional pollution for ground and surface waters.
Comment: If the listed conditions are met, the interim use does not appear that it will result in adverse effects on the public health, safety, and welfare, nor does it create additional pollution potential.

4. Permission of the use will not impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future.
Comment: It does not appear the use will impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION
Based on the findings that the proposed Interim Use appears to meet the standards for the keeping of chickens and the general review standards for an Interim Use Permit, as listed in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff would recommend the Planning Commission approval of the proposed Interim Use Permit to keep chickens at 414 7th Avenue South, subject to the following conditions (as listed in the Ordinance):

1. The keeping of any poultry besides chickens is prohibited.
2. Roosters are prohibited.
3. No more than four (4) chickens shall be housed.
4. Outdoor slaughtering is prohibited.
5. Chicken fighting shall not be allowed.
6. Leg banding of all chickens is required. The bands must identify the owner’s name, address, and telephone number.
7. A separate coop is required to house the chickens. Coops much be constructed and maintained to meet the following minimum standards:
   a) Located in the side or rear yard.
   b) Meet the accessory structure setback requirements.
   c) Construction shall be adequate to prevent access by rodents.
   d) If the coop is 120 SF or larger, a building permit is required.
8. A run or exercise yard is required to be provided and must be enclosed by a fence.
9. All premises on which chickens are kept or maintained shall be kept clean from filth, garbage, and any substances which attract rodents. The coop and its surroundings must be cleaned frequently enough to control odor. Manure shall not be allowed to accumulate in a way that causes an unsanitary condition or causes odors detectible on another property.
10. All food shall be stored in an enclosed, rodent proof container.
11. Dead chickens shall be disposed of according to the Minnesota Board of Animal Health rules, which require chicken carcasses to be disposed of as soon as possible after death, usually within 48 to 72 hours. Legal forms of chicken carcass disposal include offsite burial, offsite incineration or rendering, or offsite composting.
12. The keeping of chickens terminate when the current property owners vacate the property.
13. The Interim Permit can be reviewed upon complaints.

The Planning Commission recommendation shall to the City Council at their August 22, 2019 meeting.

****************************************End of Memo****************************************

Ashleigh Blasey, Applicant’s Memo:

I, Ashleigh Blasey would like to have the allowed amount of 4 chickens on my own property. I have read the rules and the stipulations of the Ordinance 691. I also have made my thoughts known with close neighbors, and they think it’s a great idea. I will keep my coop clean and closed up to deter predators, and if any mice get in the coop, I’m sure the chickens will them, because they’re little dinosaurs.

****************************************End of Memo****************************************

Two of the neighbors each wrote a letter of support that was brought into City Hall today, August 19, 2019:

Marlys Baldwin
607 4th Street South
Princeton
I have no problem with the neighbor having chickens in their yard.

Gloria Bromberg
412 7th Avenue South
Princeton

Dear Hearing:
I am the next door neighbor and I have no problem of them getting chickens. I also talked to some of the neighbors and they all approve of the ones I have talked to. I will be fun to hear some chuckling again.

DeWitt explained to the Planning Commission the Ordinance for the raising and keeping of the chickens. An Interim Use Permit will be reviewed by the Planning Commission tonight and final approval will be by the City Council. A public hearing notice had been sent out to the neighboring properties 350 feet from the site and staff did receive two notes from neighbors that were dropped off at City Hall and phone calls also from them saying they support their neighbor having chickens. The two memos where handed out to the Planning Commission Board. Robert Blasey the applicant was present to answer any questions the Board may have.

Barbian asked what will the materials be for construction.

Blasey said plywood and FRP material and also green treated wood. The design of their coop is almost exact to the plans shown.

Moller asked if the city residents have to apply for an Interim Use Permit to raise chickens.

DeWitt said yes, and the Council will have final approval. If approved the Interim Use Permit will be recorded with Mille Lacs County.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

There was no one present with any comments.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF ITEM #19-03 INTERIM USE PERMIT FOR CHICKENS AT 414 7TH AVENUE SOUTH, FOR ASHLEIGH & ROBERT BLASEY, IN THE R-2 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
1. THE KEEPING OF ANY POULTRY BESIDES CHICKENS IS PROHIBITED.
2. ROOSTERS ARE PROHIBITED.
3. NO MORE THAN FOUR (4) CHICKENS SHALL BE HOUSED.
4. OUTDOOR SLAUGHTERING IS PROHIBITED.
5. CHICKEN FIGHTING SHALL NOT BE ALLOWED.
6. LEG BANDING OF ALL CHICKENS IS REQUIRED. THE BANDS MUST IDENTIFY THE OWNER’S NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER.
7. A SEPARATE COOP IS REQUIRED TO HOUSE THE CHICKENS. COOPS MUST BE CONSTRUCTED AND MAINTAINED TO MEET THE FOLLOWING MINIMUM STANDARDS:
   A) LOCATED IN THE SIDE OR REAR YARD.
   B) MEET THE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE SETBACK REQUIREMENTS.
   C) CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE ADEQUATE TO PREVENT ACCESS BY RODENTS.
   D) IF THE COOP IS 120 SF OR LARGER, A BUILDING PERMIT IS REQUIRED.
8. A RUN OR EXERCISE YARD IS REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED AND MUST BE ENCLOSED BY A FENCE.
9. ALL PREMISES ON WHICH CHICKENS ARE KEPT OR MAINTAINED SHALL BE KEPT CLEAN FROM FILTH, GARBAGE, AND ANY SUBSTANCES WHICH ATTRACT RODENTS. THE COOP AND ITS SURROUNDING MUST BE CLEANED FREQUENTLY ENOUGH TO CONTROL ODOR. MANURE SHALL NOT BE ALLOWED TO ACCUMULATE IN A WAY THAT CAUSES AN UNSANITARY CONDITION OR CAUSES ODORS DETECTIBLE ON ANOTHER PROPERTY.
10. ALL FOOD SHALL BE STORED IN AN ENCLOSED, RODENT PROOF CONTAINER.
11. DEAD CHICKENS SHALL BE DISPOSED OF ACCORDING TO THE MINNESOTA BOARD OF ANIMAL HEALTH RULES, WHICH REQUIRE CHICKEN CARCASSES TO BE DISPOSED OF AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER DEATH, USUALLY INCINERATION OR RENDERING, OR OFFSITE COMPOSTING.
12. THE KEEPING OF CHICKENS TERMINATE WHEN THE CURRENT PROPERTY OWNERS VACATE THE PROPERTY.
13. THE INTERIM PERMIT CAN BE REVIEWED UPON COMPLAINTS.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Is the proposed use an interim use listed in the district in which the application is being made? Yes.
2. Is the date or event that will terminate the use can be identified with certainty and continued? Yes.
3. The interim use does not result in adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare nor does it create additional pollution potential for ground and surface waters? No.
4. Would permission of the use not impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future? No.

The Commission recommends approval of a Interim Use Permit, based upon the Findings of Fact, with the noted conditions.
B. #19-04 Variance for Home Addition at 1302 Third Street North
Mary Lou DeWitt, Community Development Memo:

BACKGROUND
Jason & Deanna Stock have submitted an application for a variance for a rear yard setback of 14.5 feet from the required 30 foot setback, current setback is 18.5 feet from the property line. The property site is located at 1302 3rd Street North and zoned R-2 Residential District.

ANALYSIS
The subject parcel is located on a corner lot with the Mille Lacs County Fairgrounds on the west and 13th Avenue North on the east.

Jason & Deanna Stock currently have a breezeway that connects from the house to the single car garage. Their home was built in 1960 with 936’ square footage. They would like to expand the breezeway into a home addition where it would increase the size of the kitchen/dining room area and create a mud room and office. This expansion would be 4’ feet beyond the rear of the house and match up with the front of the house, with 8’ feet in width, that totals 240’ square feet. The applicants have expressed in the attached memo that the current kitchen is too small to cook in and lacks storage space as well as the dining room only accommodates three people at the table. Expanding the interior area will improve the function, enjoyment, and value of their home.

The proposed attached garage would be 28’ x 28’ area, a total of 784’ square feet, replacing the current attached one car garage west of the home. The new garage would allow both vehicles to be parked inside and accommodate storage for home and yard equipment. The extra 4’ feet to the rear allows space for the truck or boat. The current garage foundation and newly cemented driveway would stay to keep the cost down.

The R-2 Residential District rear yard minimum setback is 30 feet. The applicants have recently had their property surveyed and the rear yard setback is 18.5 feet. For this proposed addition, the current 18.5 foot setback would be reduced to 14.5 feet from the rear property line. The neighboring property owner that is adjacent to the back yard has given their written support of the variance, and this is provided for review.

The side yard setbacks are met with this addition as well as the front yard setback. The applicant will be building an attached 5’ x 20’ covered deck, total of 60 square feet. The requirement for the front yard setback can be reduced to 20’ feet for a porch. With the proposed porch, the setback will be 25’ feet.

Variance Review Standards: According to Section 2 of Chapter IV of the Zoning Ordinance, requests may be made for a variance from the literal provisions of the Zoning Ordinance in instances when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the Zoning Ordinance.
A variance shall not be granted by the Planning Commission unless it conforms to the following standards:

1. **Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance?**
   **Comment:** One of the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance is to establish regulations to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the residents of Princeton, which is accomplished through regulating the location of structures. This property was built in 1960 and has a rear yard setback of 18.5 feet. The proposed addition and attached garage would be built 4’ feet into that setback, leaving 14.5 feet instead of the required 30’ feet setback from the rear property line. The neighboring property owner has given written support for the variance.

2. **Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?**
   **Comment:** The act of renovating/adding on to an existing home is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan identifies that the traditional neighborhoods are not designed for today’s family and encourages the maintenance and enhancement of the older housing stock.

3. **Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance?**
   **Comment:** The property owner proposes to use this portion of the property as a single-family home addition, which is reasonable. The layout of the lot makes it difficult to meet the rear yard setback.

4. **Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowners?**
   **Comment:** This property was built in 1960 with 936’ total square footage. The current Zoning Ordinance requirement for a single-family dwelling minimum finished ground level main floor area shall be 1,000 sq. ft. with basement and 1,100 sq. ft. without basement. It is not unreasonable for the property owner to expand the living area of their home and be able to park both of their vehicles inside a garage.

5. **Will the issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?**
   **Comment:** The issuance of the variance appears that it will maintain the essential character of the locality. This is a residential neighborhood and the proposed addition would keep with the surrounding area.

6. **Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?**
   **Comment:** Yes, the alleged practical difficulty involves more than economic considerations. The Comprehensive Plan support rehabilitation and upgrading of single-family housing as the family needs change.

**CONCLUSION**
To approve the variance request, the City must find that the proposal uses the property in a reasonable manner, and that the applicant has demonstrated that there are practical difficulties, unique to the property not created by the property owner, that interfere in using
the property in such a manner. The proposed use as a single family home addition is clearly using the property in a reasonable manner in a residential district in the City. The practical difficulty in this case is not caused by the property owner, but by the location of the home, which was constructed in 1960 prior to the current zoning regulations resulting in an 18.5 foot rear yard setback. It is not unreasonable for the applicant to request a variance for an addition of 4’ feet into the 18.5 foot rear yard setback.

RECOMMENDATION
Review standards:
1. The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The variance is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
3. The property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance.
4. There are circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner.
5. The issuance of the variance will maintain the essential character of the locality.
6. The alleged practical difficulty involves more than economic considerations.

Based upon the above review standards, staff would recommend approval of the variance with the following conditions:
1. A Building Permit must be submitted and approved prior to construction.
2. The exterior materials of the new living area or porch shall be consistent or complementary in color, texture and quality with those visible at the front of the dwelling, and consist of building materials in common use in residential construction.
3. The roof of the new living area or porch is properly proportioned to and integrated with the roof of the dwelling, and consist of building materials in common use in residential construction.
4. Sodding or seeding needs to be replaced in the areas that have been disturbed. If because of weather conditions sodding and/or seeding is unadvisable, it must be in compliance by no later than July 1st of the following year.

**************End of Staff Memo**************

Jason and DeAnna Stock Memo dated July 29, 2019

Dear Zoning Administration,

We respectfully request a variance to the rear yard minimum setback requirement so that we can expand our home and garage. The expansion would reduce the current setback by 4 feet and increase the functionality, value and enjoyment of our home.

Currently we have a one car garage that is connected to our home by a breeze way. We would like approval to increase the size of the breeze way to the width of the home plus 4 feet to the rear. Also replacing the current 1 car garage with a 2 car garage which will also extend 4 additional feet to the rear of the home.
The additional garage space would allow us to park both our vehicles inside and accommodate storage for home and yard equipment. The additional 4 feet expansion to the rear allows adequate space for parking our truck or boat in the garage. Due to the front garage foundation, newly cemented driveway, and short length of the driveway; expanding the garage towards the front of the home would be costly and reduce parking area from the road. Expanding the garage further to the west of the property instead of to the rear would not allow the garage to accommodate parking larger vehicles or boat and would require a beautiful large tree be cut down. Being that our lot is on a corner and is small our family uses the area to the west of our garage for activities like having fires, family BBQs, and playing sports. My son often shoots hockey pucks into his net that would not be safe on the east side of the home due to the road.

The added interior space will allow us to increase the size of our kitchen/dining room, have a small mud room and office space. The office space could be converted to a main level laundry room when needed. Without expanding the breezeway to the width of the home plus 4 additional feet to the rear there will not be adequate square footage to allow for the added rooms to work as intended. Our home is a small two bedroom, one bath home. The current kitchen area is small, hard to cook in and lacks storage. The dining area is small and only accommodates 3 people at the table. Expanding the interior area will improve the function, enjoyment and the value of our home.

Thank you for your consideration for this variance application and we would greatly appreciate your approval to reduce the rear yard setback to allow for the expansion of our home/garage.

Sincerely, DeAnna Stock

************************************End of Memo************************************

DeWitt reviewed the variance request to the Planning Commission Board. The Planning Commission will have final approval of this variance and the City Council will receive information only on it. Jason and Deanna Stock are present to answer any questions the Planning Commission Board may have.

Hallin asked if there will be any tree removal.

Jason Stock said no.

MOLLER MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Barbian asked the applicants who is doing the work on the addition.

Jason Stock said a friend who is a contractor and him.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.
MOLLER MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO APPROVE ITEM #19-04 A VARIANCE TO THE 30 FOOT REAR YARD SETBACK REQUIREMENT FOR A HOME ADDITION AND GARAGE TO BE 14.5 FEET FROM THE REAR YARD PROPERTY LINE IN THE R-2 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 1302 THIRD STREET NORTH, PID #24-033-1180. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes.
3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes.
5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality? Yes.
6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations? Yes.

OLD BUSINESS:
A. Adoption of the Façade Design Guidelines & Grant Program
Community Development Memo:

BACKGROUND
City staff has been working with the Planning Commission & Economic Development Authority to set up a couple of downtown initiatives to assist property owners to reinvest in their store fronts.

In November of 2018 the city hired the architecture firm MacDonald and Mack to conduct an architectural case study of specific downtown facades, as well as create design guidelines to direct future improvements in the downtown. The original quote from MacDonald and Mack Architects was for $11,950. The finished product included “before and after” renditions of five sites as well as 15 copies of the design guidelines formed.

Subsequently, in January of 2019, the architecture firm visited the City of Princeton and began working on case studies of buildings identified through previous projects, staff and community recommendations, as well as the architect’s consideration. City staff and MacDonald and Mack Architects held a community meeting gathering ideas from building owners, businesses and community members.

ANALYSIS:
In June, Bob Mack from the architecture firm debuted the case studies and presented the proposed design guidelines for the Planning Commission and interested community members. Each member of the Planning Commission was furnished with a copy of the Design Guidelines and the document was also shared on Facebook and the City of Princeton website.
The role of the Planning Commission moving forward on this project will be to ensure downtown redevelopment projects requesting funding through the Façade Grant Program adhere to the guidelines created through this initiative.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
The recommendation from city staff is to consider the proposed Design Guidelines for adoption as well as provide input on necessary changes to the proposal. This should be followed by providing a recommendation to the Council.

Hillesheim said at last month Planning Commission meeting this was tabled so all the members could review the guidelines and address any questions they may have.

Hallin said the EDA Board approved with the guidelines with increasing the architect fee up to $500 and the remodel fee of $2,500.

Moller asked where we got the funds from.

Barbian said from the Capital Improvement Plan. If someone had a building and it was not included in the study, they could hire their own architect for design features. The architect fees will not exceed the $500 from the City.

Hillesheim said there were seven sites chosen for the design guidelines and a few of them are interested and we are in discussion with them.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE FAÇADE GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

This will go to the City Council for final approval.

**NEW BUSINESS:**
A. Façade Grant Application at 519 First Street
Hillesheim said the applicant rescinded their application.

**COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:**
A. Verbal Report
1) July Building Permit List
DeWitt gave a review of the July Building Permit list.
2) **SOAR Women’s Conference**
Hillesheim said the City is partnering with the Women’s Business Alliance and has setup a Women’s Conference. The date is October 10, 2019 at the Northern Lights Ballroom and Banquet Center in Milaca. The tickets are $69 and the time is 8:00 A.M. till 4:00 P.M. After is a social hour till 6 P.M. Everyone is welcome to attend. There will be seven speakers throughout the day. Good information will be shared.

3) **Marcia Anderson – Princeton Township Property Owner**
Marcia Anderson attended the February 25, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. At the end of the meeting she introduced herself. The minutes from that meeting state the following:
Marcia Anderson lives at 8075 Bluff Road in Princeton Township and said she is here tonight representing a group of neighbors that are wondering what are the regulations to be annexed into the city. Is it a requirement to be connected to City sewer and water.

On August 15, 2019 Marcia Anderson came into City Hall and requested for this correction in the minutes is necessary as it has been reported in two local papers by City officials that she did ask for annexation. She would like the minutes to read as follows:

Some neighbors and I were wondering if an area is annexed if they are required to connect to city water and sewer. She did not seek and request annexation for this area.

DeWitt told Anderson that she will inform the Planning Commission of this request, but the February minutes have been approved and that her request will be in this Planning Commission minutes. She was fine with that.

B. **City Council Minutes for July**
The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

MOLLER MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:43 P.M.

ATTEST:

___________________________   ____________________________________
Dan Erickson, Chair     Mary Lou DeWitt, Community Development