

APPROVED
Minnetonka Beach Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
September 26, 2023 – 7 pm

1. Call to Order

Chair Breazeale called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Roll Call

Present: Commissioners Anderson, Blodgett, Breazeale, Finnegan, Steinfeld, Swanson, Wortman and Council Liaison Halverson. Absent:

Staff in attendance: City Administrator Heidi Honey

3. Approve Agenda

(Swanson motion, Anderson second to approve the agenda; all ayes.) Motion passed.

4. Approve Minutes - Regular Meeting of August 28, 2023

(Steinfeld motion, Blodgett second to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of August 28, 2023; Ayes - Blodgett, Breazeale, Finnegan, Steinfeld, Swanson, Wortman. Abstain – Anderson.) Motion passed.

5. Election of Officers – Chair and Vice-Chair

(Swanson motion, Anderson second to nominate Jeff Breazeale as Chair; all ayes.) Motion passed.

(Wortman motion, Anderson second to Joe Steinfeld as Vice Chair; all ayes.) Motion passed.

6. **New Business**

6.1. Appeal of Zoning Administrator’s Decision Regarding Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment Requirement – Lafayette Club Fence

Honey provided a summary memo regarding the fence in the packet. She stated that the Planning Commissioners are to give their opinion on if the installation of a fence at the Lafayette Club near hole #7 and abutting 2669 and 2663 Woodbridge required a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) amendment. She added that in the packet is Zoning Administrator Phil Carlson’s reasons for coming to the decision that a CUP amendment was not needed, and also Paine’s appeal and their support thereof. Paines also distributed materials to the commission prior to the meeting starting. Honey stated that after Planning makes it’s recommendation, it will be reviewed by the City Council acting as the Board of Adjustment and Appeal and hold a public hearing at that time. She stated that the Board’s decision will be in the form of a resolution that states reasons for the decision and asked that the commissioners substantiate the reasons for their decision using the Review Criteria in the Zoning Code which states: an order, decision, determination, or interpretation shall not be reversed or modified unless there is competent, material, and substantial evidence in the record that the order, decision, determination, or interpretation fails to comply with either the procedural requirements, substantive requirements, or intent of this ordinance or state law. She added that “this ordinance” is referring to the entire zoning code. Honey added that Mayor Pagano is attending tonight’s meeting because this matter will be heard at the October 10 Council meeting and he wanted to observe but not speak to this matter.

Breazeale stated the discussion is about the process and whether or not a CUP amendment was required and it is not about personal thoughts on the fence itself. He introduced those presenting as Paines (appellant), Zoning Administrator Carlson and representatives of the Club.

Lindsay Paine – 2663 Woodbridge Rd. Paine stated the Beach is not a community that happens to exist around a county club but rather it is community that allows the Club to operate within its borders under a CUP. A CUP amendment process is required for any improvement that affects the surrounding property or properties “to ensure compatibility between the proposed use and surrounding properties”. He referred to Carlson’s email of June 30th and to Honey’s email of July 6 both refer to this code provision with Honey’s email also referencing a conversation with the city attorney, and also in Carlson’s July 26 email. Paine stated this was a “180” from Carlson’s June 30 email stating Carlson acknowledges that in the CUP itself that the applicant and the city are aware that, in the event that such other issues need to be addressed in the future, an amendment to the CUP may be required by the city. He asked the number of CUP amendments to date. Honey replied 12. Paine asked if an amendment has ever not been required for improvements. Honey stated they would have to research what has been done at the Club. Paine referred to Zoning Code table 2.1. which shows Conditional Use Permit approval process flow chart (Section 2.4(D) of old code, now Table 3.2.1. of code) and stated his opinion is that the Zoning Administrator does not have authority to make this decision but only makes recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council. Paine again referred to Carlson’s July 26 email where he describes the fence as “similar to fencing already in place in several places on the course”. Paine stated he does not know if there are any other fences that abut residential property, but does not think there are and that would make this fence unique and not similar. He went on to say even if it were similar, it would not exempt the proposed use from the CUP amendment process as there is no similarity precedent or exemption mentioned in the CUP and in fact it states that “approval of a use at a location within a zoning classification does not mean the same conditional use can be conducted on any other parcel with the same specific zoning classification. Every application for a CUP will be individually reviewed on its own merits, and the facts surrounding the subject property will determine the appropriateness of the proposed use”. Paine stated that they are requesting the Planning Commission recommend this fence, like all previous fences and other Club improvements, all of which required amendments to the CUP, be put back into the correct sequence of: Application, Zoning Administrator recommendation, Planning Commission review and recommendation, City Council consideration which includes public input, and ultimately City Council decision. A new fence abutting and impacting residential properties is not the appropriate time or reason to alter and circumvent the CUP process depriving the elected and appointed City leaders, impacted neighbors, and Minnetonka Beach residents the opportunity to consider the impact of this fence on the affected adjacent properties as well as the surrounding community. He stated, “that is at the very core of the CUP under which the Lafayette Club exists and operates in our city of Minnetonka Beach”.

Anderson asked if the fence was being discussed when they moved here June 2021. Paine replied it was not and a snow fence went up in the fall, the property at 2669 Woodbridge changed hands in September or October, and they learned a permanent fence would be installed in May 2022.

Steinfeld stated he looked at the property and stated Paine’s property abuts only 60 ft of the fence. He asked hypothetically if they had only put the fence along 2669 Woodbridge, would Paine be appealing the fence. Paine stated he did not think so and added that the application materials all talk about new construction at 2669 Woodbridge, not his property. He said that his home has been there 100 years and safety was never a concern in the past. Steinfeld stated that Paine thinks the fence needs a CUP amendment but has no objection to the fence if it did not abut his property. Paine stated he would have to see the fence to determine if he objected to it, but he would not have initiated an appeal.

Zoning Administrator Phil Carlson - Carlson stated interpretation of zoning code is something he does on a daily basis as part of his job, including many calls and emails that are not seen by other staff about things like building height, hardcover, and setbacks. He stated some parts of the code need special attention and come to the Planning Commission such as variances, CUPs, and code amendments. He explained that a CUP is understood in state law and court rulings that a CUP is a permitted use to which reasonable

conditions can be attached. He taught seminars on planning and zoning over 30 years with land use attorneys. There are conditions that can arise from some uses which usually have to do with traffic, noise, activity, lighting, landscaping, and size of structure where you can impose conditions to address those. Lafayette Club is the largest single use in the city, that kind of facility is indicated as a conditional use and a number of improvements on the property have required amendments to the original CUP. Carlson stated in this situation of building an 8 ft fence along a residential property line, fences do not require a permit in the city but there are standards to be followed. There is an 8 ft height limit in the code. There is a section in the code regarding recreational fencing for recreational facilities if it is customary, and this kind of fence the Club installed, in his mind, fits exactly into the customary kind of fence for a recreational facility. He looked around and sees this in golf courses and tennis courts and other kinds of facilities all over the metropolitan area. It clearly is that kind of customary fencing. He summarized that it doesn't require a permit and if anyone else put it up, a permit would not be needed; it doesn't violate height standards; it is customary for this kind of facility; and no permit is needed for any other kind of fence. He went on to say that Minnetonka Beach is mainly residential, and people can put fences up on their property lines. He understands that neighbors may not want a fence on their property line, but the other property owner can put up the fence. Carlson then stated this comes into a gray area and the interpretation he made in his July 26 letter. He stated he thinks it is important to distinguish this fence from the other fences that required CUP amendments: this fence stays below the 8 ft height limit and other fences were above that limit, some other fencing was on the public trail which was very visible and a different situation than on this side and rear lot line, and it stays further back than the required setback. His interpretation is this fence does not need a permit and it is the kind of fence that does not need an amendment to the conditional use permit.

Steinfeld stated anyone can put up an 8 ft fence, but it cannot be chain link unless it is recreational. He asked Carlson if because a golf course is recreational then it can have a chain link fence, wouldn't need a permit and would be allowed. Carlson agreed. Steinfeld asked about the screening. Carlson did not see it as an issue.

Rita Howarth – Past president of Lafayette Club. She stated that she has been working on this with Carlson and Honey over the past two years. She appreciates that the Paines are unhappy with the fence, but they did extensive studies for safety and the implications of golf balls flying into 2669 Woodbridge. The Club cared for the property at 2669 for over 20+ years when it was owned by Shermans at 2663. The Club had an agreement with Shermans that the Club would care for the property and use it as part of the golf course. Paines bought Shermans home at 2663 but Shermans kept and later sold 2669 separately. This changed the agreement that was in place and the Club could no longer use the property. The Club asked the golfers to no longer use the property. The Club had golf pros hit balls to determine how far golf balls were going into the lot to determine if there were safety concerns, and there were. They discussed it with their attorneys and decided to try a fence as the first phase, and if it did not work, they would maybe have to get a variance and add a net or something. She stated they tried to work with the owners of 2669 on agreements and give options to try to help with the fence option for two years but did not get anywhere. It has always been about safety for the property, the future home, the people working on the home, the people living at the home and the members of Lafayette Club.

Jacob Saufley, attorney at Larkin Hoffman representing the Lafayette Club – Saufley stated he submitted a letter later that afternoon (it was distributed to commissioners prior to and at the meeting) that basically agreed with Carlson's presentation. He stated the thrust of the appeal is unsubstantiated by the record citing appellants saying this fence was a surprise yet emails show it was discussed for a couple of years. There is a claim that that Carlson did not adequately consider the application before making a determination, but his understanding is that Carlson is fully within his right in his position to make this type of determination. The record shows he clearly gave good consideration to the project as the project evolved from concept to reality, his findings are well supported by law, the City's zoning code, and the

CUP. He added that Carlson’s decision is consistent with how this body and the City have evaluated the CUP in the past. Extraordinary fences have extraordinary land use decisions attached to them and ordinary fences do not. In this case we have a fence that’s allowed by right under code. If the tables were turned and the homeowners wanted to build a fence, it would be silly for Lafayette Club to be attacking the process if they wanted a six-foot fence to screen their yard.

Steinfeld asked about the clause on recreational fencing and discussed the fabric screening that did not look like anything he had seen on the property. Carlson stated there are materials mentioned in the code that are acceptable for a fence, but the section he cited in his letter of July 26, 4.3.(b)(1)(i) says recreational fencing is exempt from code requirements on fences so any kind of customary fencing for a recreational facility does not need to follow standards for fencing for a homeowner. You may like or dislike the material, but the material is not covered by City standards. His review of at least a dozen golf courses and tennis courts from Google Earth found fences very similar to this fence. Some were chain link that you could see through, and some had fabric with a range of opaqueness.

Swanson discussed that a property owner could put up a solid wood eight ft fence. Opacity would not be an issue. Carlson agreed. Steinfeld stated you normally can’t do chain link but clearly, they exist for tennis courts and golf courses. The issue for him is what triggers when a permit is needed, such as if it was hot pink or full of patterns. Carlson discussed the term “customary” and stated plain chain link and translucent to opaque fabric he sees at many recreational facilities and believes it is customary. Steinfeld discussed a wood fence and Carlson said that would meet the other material standards. Steinfeld stated they are discussing if a CUP amendment is needed and asked if the Club had any other fences of similar material. Carlson does not know for certain if the Club has the same material. Swanson stated it is the same at the tennis court. Breazeale asked how to determine what is customary and read the following are exempted from requirements of the fencing section – “customary fencing provided as part of a permitted tennis court, athletic field or other recreational facility”. Breazeale stated he does not recall chain link on golf courses between homes and the golf course, and asked how chain link is customary on a golf course. He stated that the Club could surround its perimeter with an eight ft fence based on this. Breazeale also stated the permit for a tennis court would cover the fence, and asked if the permit for the existing golf course covers the fencing? Carlson stated it is clear the Club is a golf course which has been permitted by the City, therefore recreational fencing for that facility is allowed by his interpretation. Breazeale stated if black chain link with mesh was customary then they could put it wherever they want. Carlson stated there would likely be places where they needed that type or other types of fencing, and it could be argued there may be places where it would not be allowed or inappropriate. He then referred to the fencing along the trail that is highly visible, larger, and different materials. Carlson stated in his research he found several examples with chain link between the homes and course and determined it as customary. Finnigan asked if the Comprehensive Plan is considered in this discussion. Carlson stated the zoning code should implement the intentions of the Comp Plan.

Breazeale stated the conditional use needs to conform to the Comprehensive Plan and be compatible with the existing neighborhood. Breazeale read from Section 2.4 Definitions: “CONDITIONAL USE. A specific type of structure or land use listed in the official control that may be allowed but only after an in-depth review procedure and with appropriate conditions or restrictions as provided in the official zoning controls or building codes and upon a finding that certain conditions as detailed in the zoning ordinance exist, that the structure and/or land use conforms to the comprehensive plan, and that the structure and/or land use is compatible with the existing neighborhood.” He then read excerpts from Section 3.4.4 Conditional Use Permits: Purpose. “The Conditional Use Permit process is intended to provide the City with an opportunity to review a use in order (to establish reasonable conditions necessary) to ensure compatibility between the proposed use and surrounding properties.” and “Every application for a CUP will be individually reviewed on its own merits”. Breazeale stated the way to assure something is allowed in the code, for

example the interpretation of “customary”, and understand if the proposed use fits with the Comprehensive Plan in the neighborhood is usually done by holding a public hearing. An applicant has to state the proposed change meets requirements including it will not be detrimental to the persons residing near and will not result in any nuisance including sight pollution, which the complaint is that it is unsightly. He then reviewed the conditional use process which is the most rigorous process they have: review by zoning administrator, public hearing and Planning Commission recommendation, and City Council decision. Breazeale referred to section 3.4.4.J stating any change shall be considered an amendment and subject to the full review procedure, a conditional use may be amended modified only in accordance with this procedure. A request for a change in the conditions of a conditional use permit shall be considered an amendment. Breazeale stated that Bill Whitely from the work group helped him with research. Breazeale read from Carlson’s June 30th email that states “I conclude from the above that although the fence as proposed by Lafayette Club would be considered permitted under the Code, the general provisions of the CUP section of the code and the specific provisions of the current CUP require the fence at its border with the residential lot to be reviewed as an amendment to the CUP. He again stated the requirements: is it allowed in the code, how does it affect the neighborhood, and is it in line with the Comp Plan. He went on to say that the following week, Honey sent an email that she spoke to the city attorney and Carlson, and they would require an amendment to the CUP. The fence would be permitted but because it would be located on property that has an existing CUP and CUP standards specifically note it impacts the surrounding properties we will require an amendment to the CUP. Breazeale stated even if it is allowed in the code, there is a more stringent review because of the CUP. Swanson asked how Carlson came to his initial opinion. Carlson stated that Honey and Mayor Pagano asked him to look at his opinion again carefully which he did. He stated it is a gray area which is shown by all of the back and forth. In his mind, even though there is a CUP covering the Club, it does not cover everything they do. They do not have to ask to paint the building, restripe the lot, mow, and there are many things they can do to the property without permission. There are also things they cannot do without permission such as putting on an addition or expanding the parking lot. He has to determine where that line is. He looked at it as what he considered fair and reasonable with his July 26 approval letter. This fence is permitted and exempt from other requirements in the code, and he did not think it rose to the level of needing a CUP amendment. In the initial emails and conversations he had with Howarth, he was imagining a 30- 50 ft high mesh that catches golf balls and that would have required special consideration. When it came down to an eight ft chain link fence, that in all other instances is simply permitted in the code, that’s where he came to his decision as stated in the July 26 letter.

Breazeale stated because the Club has a CUP they cannot do what is allowed in the code without an amendment to the CUP adding that any change shall be considered an amendment. Carlson stated the code specifically states recreational fencing is exempt. Breazeale stated if the Club wants to do things following standards in the code, they can’t just do it, they need an amendment.

Steinfeld understands as long as the fence is recreational it would be exempt but had additional concerns beyond the chain link that would not be allowed for a residence. Six feet tall is maximum opaqueness and above that requires 25% transparency. This fence is 8 ft opaque. The finished portion must be on exterior portion of fence so the screening should be placed on the other side. Carlson asked if the screening or the fence is the exterior. Steinfeld stated would you find a fence finished in this manner abutting a residential property. He would think netting would be more customary because the landowner would have a view and it would protect the property. Steinfeld asked if they decided to build a fence entirely around Hole 7, would that be allowed. Carlson discussed setbacks need to be met. Steinfeld asked if the 60 ft section abutting the appellant was determined to be unnecessary, would it still be allowed under the CUP. Carlson stated they are referring to what is “customary” for a recreational facility. Necessity could be a judgement call and there were emails about where golf balls landed. Breazeale stated for him it has to be allowed in the code and it should be compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and surrounding properties which

needs a public hearing to determine compatibility with surrounding area and follow the approval process. He did not recall instances where the zoning administrator made the call on compatibility to surrounding properties without input and compatibility with the comp plan are usually done by Planning and Council. Carlson discussed determining the use of the conditional use process and then what are the features and characteristics that bring it to the level of needing an amendment, and that is what the commission is to judge. Breazeale stated he does not see it as a gray area and any change requires an amendment according to Section 3.4.4.J. Finnegan stated it appears "change" has been interpreted differently over the years because striping the parking lot could be considered a change. Breazeale stated he thinks if there is a change on something covered in the zoning code, that change would need an amendment. Carlson stated it is clearly a change to the existing conditions. He further explained that the Club has higher scrutiny because of the CUP than a resident.

Finnegan stated they are determining if the Club needed a CUP amendment to install the fence and consider Section 3.4.4 in making this decision. The outcome of requiring a CUP amendment does not need to be considered.

Blodgett discussed the 60 ft section of the fence abutting Paine's property and asked if the Club would be happy with the fence if that portion were removed. This is outside of their recommendation tonight.

Steinfeld stated that Carlson was unable to find a similar fence on the golf course and looked at online examples.

Swanson stated that much of the golf course is surrounded by the lake so it is atypical.

Steinfeld and Breazeale discussed that they did not think this type of fencing is typical abutting residential property. Wortman stated the Club has netting around the 9th tee.

Breazeale reviewed code sections 2.4 and 3.4.4. again. Code must allow it and it must be compatible with the Comp Plan, and also compatible with surrounding properties. He stated this requires going before Planning and Council as well as getting public input. Any change requires an amendment following the process.

Steinfeld stated if the Club had a previously approved similar fence, it would set a precedent and be more customary. Breazeale stated a CUP will be individually reviewed. There was discussion about how code applies to CUP applications and amendments. Changes to conditions of a CUP require following the amendment process.

Swanson stated if they grant the appeal, they will be kicking this can down the road and starting the process over. Breazeale stated they are giving an opinion on an appeal regardless of the consequences. Swanson stated she agrees with Carlson's analysis.

Finnegan stated Carlson's opinion is that the fence is allowed based on his interpretation of the code. She did not initially think an amendment was needed because the fence is allowed in the code but now understands based on Section 3.4.4., if you make a change, an amendment is needed.

Swanson asked what the city attorney's opinion was, which was on page 7 of the packet. His memo talked about the Board of Appeal process and that "a formal amendment is appropriate when the modification is significant in terms of physical change to the site plan or the operations of the facility". Swanson stated he doesn't really make a call on this decision. Breazeale stated Honey talked to the city attorney and noted an amendment would be required and then later it was not required. Breazeale asked why they didn't

follow the process since there was a lot of back and forth. Steinfeld stated they should err on the side of additional review with Planning and Planning should have weighed in since it was a grey area. Nobody can complain when everyone is heard.

Carlson stated their recommendation is an official action of the Planning Commission.

(Steinfeld motion, Blodgett second that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that they consider the appeal favorable based on the fact a Conditional Use Permit amendment should be required because of code Section 2.4. Definition of Conditional Use which states: “A specific type of structure or land use listed in the official control that may be allowed but only after an in-depth review procedure and with appropriate conditions or restrictions as provided in the official zoning controls or building codes and upon a finding that certain conditions as detailed in the zoning ordinance exist, that the structure and/or land use conforms to the Comprehensive Plan, and that the structure and/or land use is compatible with the existing neighborhood”, and Section 3.4.4. Purpose and Scope of a Conditional Use Permit and amendments thereto as: “The Conditional Use Permit process is intended to provide the City with an opportunity to review a use in order to establish reasonable conditions necessary to ensure compatibility between the proposed use and surrounding properties. Approval of a conditional use at a location within a zoning classification does not mean the same conditional use can be conducted on any other parcel with the same specific zoning classification. Every application for a CUP will be individually reviewed on its own merits, and the facts surrounding the subject property will determine the appropriateness of the proposed use.”, and also the City Council consider any changes are considered amendments in Section 3.4.4(J) as set forth therein: (1) A Conditional Use Permit may be amended or modified only in accordance with the procedures and standards established when originally securing the Conditional Use Permit. (2) A request for a change in the conditions of approval of a Conditional Use Permit shall be considered an amendment and subject to the full review procedure set forth in this subsection. (3) An additional application fee may be required before the consideration of the amendment request.); all ayes.) Motion passed.

7. Old Business

7.1. Amendment to City Code Appendix A (Zoning) – Chapters 1 and 3 regarding Shoreland

Breazeale stated he wants everyone to understand all of the changes so they will continue to go through and present all of the amendments in sections. He stated the work group discovered that current code has 2 Base Districts - Trail and Residential, and a number of overlay districts (PUD, telecommunications, wetlands - located off Old Beach Road, floodplain - a small area at Huntington Point, and shoreland which applies to the entire city). It is confusing and difficult to find things, so the work group wants to move Shoreland Overlay, Section 4.7.6., to the main code. He reviewed sections removed from Section 4.7.6. and moved to other areas and other changes.

4.7.6. A moved to 1.2.

1.3. changed “Purpose” to “Policy”

1.3.2. was 4.7.6(B)

1.3.3. added title “Minimum Requirements”

1.5. Title Applicability Jurisdiction”

1.11.5. – numbering was missed and added

1.12. Abrogation and Greater Restrictions added. Pg 185 of packet, standard language from DNR Model Ordinance was added that was not in zoning code.

Page 186 of packet – Shoreland Management Controls were added to the definitions

3.0. Title changed

3.1. Purpose language changed to that from DNR model ordinance.

Table 3.2.1 inserted DNR in areas where their approval is needed

Table 3.2.1. They discussed adding that administrative appeals go to Planning Commission first and then Board of Appeals. The task is not to change code language so they will reorder the code now and keep a list errors and things that need to be changed. Since they identified this error, it could be changed now. Swanson asked if they can change roles of decision making bodies regarding the zoning administrator. It could be added to the list of things to be reviewed later. Swanson discussed adding the DNR Certificate of Compliance also.

3.2.4. Added model ordinance language added where DNR needs to be involved.

3.3.4(B) numbering for 5 was missed and added

3.3.4(B)(6) with (a) through (g) was added from model ordinance

3.4.2(A) moved portion regarding PUDs

3.4.2(D) added review language from the DNR model ordinance for ordinance text and map amendments. Will have to remove the ability of the zoning administrator to approve amendment to map for PUD. (3.7.7.)

3.4.3(D)(3) added DNR model ordinance language regarding variances and renumbered rest of section

3.4.4(C)(2) Page 198 added DNR language regarding requirements for conditional use permits.

3.4.4(D)(2) added DNR model language regarding DNRs review of CUPs.

Carlson suggested that shoreland management are limited to shore impact controls zone and bluff impact zone. Any of the original 3/7 agreement items need to remain in shoreland management. He and Breazeale will review definitions before presentation to council.

Added F. on page 203 that land development standards apply to all land within Minnetonka Beach.

Disregard highlighted areas because they are for Breazeale's use.

There was discussion about DNR's role in reviewing variances. They review and make recommendations, but do not get involved in making zoning decisions for all of the lakes they have in their jurisdiction so they leave that up to local government.

Swanson and Finnegan would like to look at it comprehensively within entire code sections instead of specific pages. Carlson and Breazeale will update the shoreland management section and bring all of these amendments back to Planning for final review and also do a preliminary review of the next section at the next meeting. There was discussion about if all of the amendments should be presented to Council in sections or all at one time. Breazeale will ask Council for their preference, but he prefers approvals continue as in the past and are done packet by packet. Carlson stated they are not making any controversial changes, just moving things around, and adding DNR language. The DNR involvement may lend itself to having approvals in sections.

8. Reports

Halverson asked that commissioners read the draft City Council meeting minutes for an update.

9. Adjournment

(Steinfeld motion, Wortman second to adjourn; all ayes.) Motion passed.

Chair Breazeale adjourned the meeting at 9:33 p.m.

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE – The following individuals were in attendance: Bill Whitely, Lindsay and Laura Paine, Jacob Saufley (Lafayette Club attorney), Rita Howarth (Lafayette Club), Steve Doyle (Lafayette Club).

Minutes respectfully submitted by City Administrator Heidi Honey

Heidi Honey, City Administrator