

4. There will not be any signs on this property related to this use.
5. There will not be any exterior indication of the proposed use.

The Planning Commission at its meeting of October 8, 1963, approved the conditional use permit based on the Planner's recommendations for a period of two years. Other conditions specified by that group were that the hours would be from a normal starting time to no later than 9 p.m.; off-street parking will be restricted to 91st Street side of the property and that she should not request a permit for an oversize sign.

Motion was made by Viitala and seconded by Hoffman to uphold the recommendation of the Planning Commission and approve the request for conditional use permit based upon the conditions specified by that group. Hasselberg said he felt there was a misstatement in the conditions set forth by the Planning Commission as he said the Planning Director had recommended no sign and the Commission had said the petitioner should not ask for an oversize sign. He requested amendment of the motion to read that the petitioner shall not ask for a sign. Viitala and Hoffman agreed to the amendment of the motion as outlined by Hasselberg and all voted yea.

Subdivision of Land  
Case 4153

The Council was requested by Mr. Ladislav J. Cikovsky to consider granting approval of a subdivision of his land at the intersection of County Road 18 and 494 in an R-1 zone. The property was cut up by Interstate 494 and the petitioner wants to establish three lots, each on a separate corner of the intersection. The Planner recommended that this be treated as a hardship since the owner had no control over the situation. Mr. Odegard indicated, however, that any further division of any of the lots would have to be considered as a separate matter. The Planning Commission at its meeting of October 8, 1963, recommended approval of the subdivision in accordance with the Planner's recommendation on a hardship basis. They further noted that any future division of these lots would have to be considered as a different matter and not on a hardship basis.

In answer to a query by the Council, the Planner stated he understood that the petitioner had no particular use planned for the property but wished permission for the division of the land.

Motion was made by Hasselberg, seconded by Nelson, and all voting yea, to uphold the recommendation of the Planning Commission and approve the division of land as requested.

Conditional Use Permit  
for Multiples  
Case 4163

The Council was requested by Mr. Robert Keller to consider approving a conditional use permit for a multiple dwelling development at 8201 Normandale Boulevard in an FD-1 zone.

The Planning Commission at its meeting of October 8, 1963, approved the concept of apartments in this area with the following provisions: (1) the petitioner obtain an architect; (2) that the street situation in the area be coordinated with the surrounding properties; (3) that the City staff study the street plans and help coordinate them with the architect's plans; (4) that the various types of apartment units be considered as to proper size; (5) that consideration be given to existing topography; (6) that the area between Bridgeman's and 82nd Street be reserved for apartment use, office use or other compatible use.

Nelson commented that it seemed the only dissenting opinion about these apartments was voiced by the City Planner and he asked him to present his views on this subject. Mr. Odegard said he did not favor apartments in this area because he does not believe residences should be placed in the middle of an industrial and commercial area. The Council discussed the location briefly and Viitala commented he felt there should be a plan for the complete parcel of land before any decision is made regarding this development.

The City Engineer stated that the service road going past this property and Bridgeman's possibly will be extended in the future to 84th Street. He said in response to a question by Viitala about the turn-off into Bridgeman's that this would be expected to be eliminated at that time and this location would exit only onto the service road.

Motion was made by Hasselberg, seconded by Nelson, and all voting yea, to uphold the recommendation of the Planning Commission and approve the concept of apartments for this area based upon fulfillment of the conditions outlined by the Planning Commission.

Conditional Use Permit  
for a Multiple Dwelling  
Case 4162

The Council was requested to consider granting a conditional use permit to erect a 10-unit multiple dwelling at 10130 Penn Avenue South in an R-2 zone. The Planning Commission at its meeting of October 8, 1963, recommended approval of the concept of multiple dwellings in this area subject to the following conditions: (1) Mr. Ogdie's submitting suitable building and site plans utilizing a better layout of this area; (2) incorporating the property immediately north into the apartment complex, as agreed to by the petitioner; (3) some plan be made for utilizing the landlocked narrow property between the double bungalow and the triangular piece next to the railroad tracks; (4) an investigation of the accessibility to the area immediately west of Nine Mile Creek. The Planning Commission also asked for an economic study of the buildings in this area.

The Planner was asked if the conditions specified by the Planning Commission had been met by the developer. Mr. Odegard said he understands that the petitioner is working on these recommendations and expects to comply with all conditions. Motion was made by Malone to uphold the recommendations of the Planning Commission and approve the concept of a multiple dwelling for this location subject to compliance with the requirements as set forth by the Planning Commission. Hoffman, in seconding the motion, asked if it would be agreeable to Malone to include as a part of the motion that there be a clarification of number four pertaining to accessibility to the area west of this property. He suggested that this study be completed and that the Traffic Engineer report to the Council on a plan for this access. The amendment was agreed to by Malone and all voted yea on the motion. Adams inquired before the voting took place, however, what Malone meant by approving the concept, whether it meant issuance of the conditional use permit, approval of the permit or if it was stating the Council's intention to look favorably upon such a request after all the conditions have been met. Malone said the last statement was what he meant by approval of the concept with which the remainder of the Council agreed.

Conditional Use Permit  
for Oversize Garage  
Case 4165

The Council was requested by Mr. Tom P. Young to consider approving a conditional use permit to erect an oversize garage (22 feet by 30 feet) at 10301 First Avenue South in an R-2 zone. The Planning Commission at its meeting of October 8, 1963, recommended approval on the basis that neither this garage or any part of it be converted to another use by this owner or any subsequent owner. The garage is to be located at a 40-foot setback from 103rd Street to match the house and five feet west of the rear property line.

Motion was made by Viitala, seconded by Knudsen, and all voting yea, to uphold the recommendation of the Planning Commission and approve the conditional use permit based upon the same conditions specified by that group.

Assessment Hearing -  
1963 Weed Cutting  
and Spraying

A hearing was scheduled at 8 p.m. for the proposed 1963 weed cutting and spraying special assessment roll. Proper legal notice was published and affected property owners were notified. Appearing at the meeting were the following persons:

William Pearson, 7881 East Bush Lake Road, who said he was charged \$5 for spraying weeds and that he couldn't see where they had been sprayed. He said he has maintained his yard for five years and doesn't need help