
The meeting was held in-person, participation via Zoom was not available.

1
2
3
4
5
6 **1. CALL TO ORDER** – Chair Kris Kopitzke called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

7
8 **2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

9
10 **3. ROLL CALL** – Present: Doug Parker, Justin Sykora, Kris Kopitzke, Kate McGinn, Kuchen Hale, Christian
11 Dawson. Absent was Chris Bursack and Sally Doherty. A quorum was present.

12 **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE** – City Administrator Ron Moorsee, Council Member Stan Ross, City Planner
13 Emily Herald.

14
15 **4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA** –

16 **Motion/Second Hale/McGinn to approve the agenda for the May 4, 2026 Planning Commission**
17 **meeting. Passed 6-0.**

18
19 **5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –

20 **Motion/Second Kopitzke/Parker to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2026 Planning Commission**
21 **meeting. Passed 6-0.**

22
23 **6. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

24 None

25
26 **7. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

27 A. Preliminary Plat for a 4-lot Subdivision of a 94.4 Acre Property at the East End of 10th Street, with
28 PID#s 05.028.20.44.0004, 05.028.20.43.0001, 08.028.20.11.0001 and 08.028.20.12.0002, and a
29 Conditional Use Permit for Shared Driveways

30 Chair Kopitzke opened the public hearing at 7:03 PM.

31 Emily Herold, City Planner, provided a summary of the application: The subject area consists of four
32 parcels in north-central Afton all zoned Agricultural and totaling 94.4 acres in size. All four lots are
33 currently used as agricultural fields that are accessible from an informal driveway extending east from the
34 10th St S cul-de-sac, over which the City has a public use easement, though the cul-de-sac is entirely
35 contained within the two abutting residential properties. As a result, the parcels are functionally landlocked
36 with no direct frontage on a public street. The applicant is proposing to develop these four subject parcels
37 into four homesites/farms that are accessible to the 10th St S cul-de-sac via two shared driveways (one
38 connecting the two northern parcels and one connecting the two southern parcels). The lot lines would be
39 adjusted and the development would also contain walking trails, significant swaths of restored meadow,
40 and retention of the area's existing mature tree coverage.

41
42 Richard Bend, 1002 Stagecoach, stated that the fact that these four parcels cannot be subdivided in the
43 future is a great benefit in the long term as it preserves habitat. The conservation easement should require
44 landscaping plans for native vegetation and have maintenance requirements. He recommends walking trails
45 not be included.

46
47 Jeff Walker, 1022 Indian Trail, lives east of the property and stated he is opposed to having walking trails.

48
49 Joe Geiser, 764 Indian Trail S, stated he is against walking trails. His property is on the north side of
50 proposed site, wants to be sure homes are not too close to property line.

51
52 Lauren & Zachary Froelich, 703 Falstrom Place, abuts property. General questions about the plan and
53 wanted to clarify that it is 4 lots total and zoning is starting agricultural (yes). Asked about screening
54 requirements.
55

56 Greg Aber, 752 Indian Tr, asked about setbacks

57
58 No other comments

59 **Motion/Second Sykora/Hale to close public hearing. Passed 6-0.**

60 Hearing closed at 7:28 pm

61 Sykora asked about walking trails.

62 Administrator Moose stated that the Parks committee had discussed.

63 Dawson clarified that these are shared private driveways (yes)

64 Discussion was held on having a conservation easement or deed restrictions and the importance of having a
65 conservation easement be held by multiple entities.

66 Before recording the final plat the conservation easement would have to be in place.

67 **Motion/Second Hale/Dawson to recommend approval of the proposed preliminary plat with
68 conditions listed in staff memo, as the development appears to align with the intentions of the
69 Agriculture zoning district and standards for shared driveways. With additional finding #9 that
70 there will be two driveways each serving 2 houses.**

71 **Hale friendly amendment that they do not include trail easements for the public. (accepted)**

72 **Passed 6-0.**

73

74

75 **8. NEW BUSINESS**

76 A. Accessory Building Sizes On Lots Less Than 5 Acres

77 Administrator Moose stated that the Council, at its March 2 and March 30, 2026 work sessions discussed
78 options for providing more flexibility regarding the size and number of accessory buildings on lots of less
79 than 5 acres. For lots of five acres or more in the Ag and Rural Residential zones, the zoning code allows
80 up to two accessory buildings with up to a total of 2,000 sq. ft., along with a 160 sq. ft. storage shed. On
81 lots less than 5 acres, the zoning code allows one accessory structure with a maximum size of 1,000 sq. ft.,
82 along with a 160 sq. ft. storage shed. The Council was not supportive of providing additional flexibility
83 regarding number or size of accessory buildings, and was concerned that allowing some flexibility, for
84 example for lots between 4 acres and 5 acres would just create a new set of winners and losers. For
85 example, a property owner with a lot of 4 acres would be a winner and a property owner with a lot less than
86 4 acres would be a loser.

87 Also, a suggestion was made that, rather than generally providing for larger accessory buildings, it may be
88 sufficient to only increase the size of the currently allowed 160 sq. ft. storage shed. The Council is
89 requesting feedback from the Planning Commission regarding options for potential additional flexibility
90 regarding the size of detached accessory buildings allowed on lots less than 5 acres, including the “no
91 change” option.

92

93 Sykora felt that it would be good to get input from an architect on garage sizes that will accommodate
94 modern vehicles, as everything seems to be larger now. He would like to know what the square footage
95 numbers in the ordinance were based on.

96 The commission members discussed ideas including basing the size of allowed buildings on a percentage of
97 impervious surface; doubling the size of allowed storage sheds for everyone regardless of lot size; tying
98 accessory building size to house size. It was agreed that there needs to be an objective reason behind the
99 allowed sq footage numbers. They also asked how many residents were concerned about the current rules.

100

101 B. Council Chambers Audio/Visual System and Use of Microphones

102 Administrator Moose summarized the options that are being considered for upgraded microphones to
103 improve the sound quality.

104 The commission members briefly discussed and most stated they would be fine using whatever option is
105 best. Sykora asked if it would be possible to eliminate paper packets and move to an iPad or similar to
106 reduce paper use and shuffling.

107

108 **9. OLD BUSINESS -**

109 A. Planning Commission Response When New, Substantive Information is Provided by an Applicant at a
110 Planning Commission Meeting
111 Administrator Moorse provided the following update: The Council, at its April 21 meeting, discussed
112 the Planning Commission’s feedback and agreed that either the application should be denied or the
113 applicant should be given the opportunity to withdraw the application and submit a new application that
114 includes the new information. If the applicant withdraws the application, the application fee and the
115 escrow deposit could then be applied to the new application.
116

117 B. Update on City Council Actions
118 Council member Ross provided a summary of the April 21, 2026 Council meeting.
119

120 **10. ADJOURN –**
121 **Motion/Second Parker/Sykora to adjourn. Passed 7-0.**
122 Meeting adjourned at 9:02 PM.
123

124
125
126
127 Respectfully submitted by:

128
129 JY
130 Julie Yoho, City Clerk

131
132
133 To be approved on
134 June 1, 2026 as (check one): Presented: X or Amended: _____
135