

**PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 2021, 6:00 P.M.
VIA WEBEX SOFTWARE**

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Rennie Brantz-Mayor, Loretta Clawson-Mayor Pro Tem, Sam Furgiuele, Dustin Hicks, Nancy LaPlaca and Connie Ulmer

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: Elizabeth Shay-Chair, Eric Plaag-Vice Chair, Chris Behrend, John Tippet, Frank Venio, and Adam Zebzda

PLANNING STAFF PRESENT: Jane Shook-Director of Planning and Inspections, Christy Turner-Senior Planner, Brian Johnson-Urban Design Specialist, and Brenda Henson-Board Secretary

OTHER TOWN STAFF AND REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: John Ward-Town Manager, Allison Meade-Town Attorney, and Matt McGregor-Planning Intern

OTHER ATTENDEES/PARTICIPANTS VIA WEBEX: Tyler Moffatt, Joel Olsen, Michael Trew, Ole Christian Olsen, Olee Olsen, Sally Reynolds, Diane Blanks, Scott & Anne Peacock, Bill Aceto, and Adam Mancini

Call to Order

Mayor Brantz called the Town Council to order at 6:00 p.m. for the Public Hearing/Planning Commission meeting held via WebEx. He stated that Mayor Pro Tem Clawson wished to speak. Mayor Pro Tem Clawson then read her letter of resignation from Town Council. She stated she had enjoyed her time in Town government but due to health issues she felt it was time for her to retire effective January 31, 2021.

Mr. Ward stated the Town would advertise for interested parties to fill Mayor Pro Tem Clawson's unexpired term and Council would also need to select a new Mayor Pro Tem. Mr. Ward stated consideration of applicants and selection of Mayor Pro Tem would be placed on Council's agenda for February.

Chair Shay then called the Planning Commission to order at 6:12 p.m.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Council Member Ulmer made a motion to approve the November 23, 2020 Public Hearing minutes. The motion was seconded Mayor Pro Tem Clawson.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

Vice Chair Plaag made a motion to approve the November 23, 2020 Public Hearing minutes. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Behrend.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

Case PL04401-120920 – Lovill House Inn – Conditional District Zoning Map Amendment

Olee and Tonje Olsen have requested a Conditional District Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the Lovill House Inn and associated properties (Watauga County PINs: 2901-40-7729-000, 2901-41-9326-000, and 2901-50-0737-000) from Conditional Use R3 Multiple-Family Residential to Conditional District B3 General Business with a site-specific development plan for Use 3.05 Bed & Breakfast Category 2; Use 2.07 Boarding House; and Use 12.06 Event Venue Category 2.

Vice Chair Plaag wished to disclose that he had been contacted by Joel Olsen with a request for him to endorse this rezoning request as his role as historic preservation expert but he declined to provide an endorsement. He stated that he did not feel that Mr. Olsen knew he served on the Planning Commission at the time. Vice Chair Plaag noted that Mr. Olsen appeared before the Historic Preservation Commission to present his vision for the Lovill House. Vice Chair Plaag stated that he had not been hired or paid by Mr. Olsen to provide professional consultation on the Lovill House property and would decline if asked.

Council Members Furguele, Ulmer, and Clawson were in agreement that Vice Chair Plaag should not be recused from this case. Ms. Meade stated that Vice Chair Plaag had consulted her regarding this issue and she had advised him that she did not feel the situation was grounds for recusal.

There was consensus that Vice Chair Plaag should not be recused.

Ms. Turner presented the request as it was outlined in the meeting packet. She stated there was an error on the application that indicated the request for rezoning was for three parcels when it was only for the 3-acre parcel containing the Lovill House and supporting structures. Ms. Turner explained that 3-acre tract has a portion located in Watauga County's jurisdiction which would need to be annexed before a zoning classification could be applied.

Council Member Furguele noted there was reference in the meeting packet from the applicant about a mature stand of trees. He asked if the trees were on the 3-acre parcel or on the adjoining parcel that is not part of the application and if both parcels would be under the same ownership. Ms. Turner replied that the properties would have the same owner but the applicant would need to clarify which parcel the trees were located on.

Council Member Furguele stated that the narrative indicated the property had been used for years for short and long term stays, as well as events. He asked Ms. Turner if the Town had any proof that use violations had occurred. Ms. Turner replied that, to her knowledge, no applications had been received by Planning & Inspections in the past to change the use of the property to allow long term stays and events.

Council Member Furguele referred to the desire by Mr. Olsen to install micro-hydroelectric near the waterfall on the property as indicated in the narrative of uses. He asked Ms. Turner if the state allowed hydroelectric and she replied that she did not know.

Council Member Furguele questioned parking for the event venue. Ms. Turner stated that parking was discussed with the applicant and she thought the applicant would have that information in their presentation but she had not been given a copy of that information.

Vice Chair Plaag stated he was intrigued by the boarding house use and asked why that use was chosen. He noted there was no limit of rental time. Ms. Turner provided the following definitions:

Use 3.05 Bed and Breakfast. Category 2 Definition from UDO Article 34 Definitions:

A dwelling with more than three guest rooms within one or more structures where overnight accommodations and meals are provided daily or weekly for compensation.

Use 2.07 Boarding House Definition from UDO Article 34 Definitions:

A dwelling unit where three (3) or more rooms (not to exceed nine (9)) are provided for lodging for definite periods exceeding seven days. Meals may or may not be provided, but there is only one common kitchen facility and no meals are provided to outside guests.

Ms. Turner explained that the boarding house use was chosen because as described the applicant wished to have guests that stayed longer than daily or weekly/7 days which exceeded the length of time authorized under the bed and breakfast use. She noted that the next use that covered the type of stay requested by the applicant would fall under the description of the boarding house. She noted the

applicant was requesting that multiple rooms be allocated for longer term guests. Ms. Shook noted the applicant had indicated during preliminary meetings that they would not be providing meals to boarding house guests.

Ms. Meade agreed with Vice Chair Plaag that the UDO lacked clarity regarding the length of stays both long and short term. Vice Chair Plaag stated a boarding house use might not be the correct use needed.

Commission Member Zebzda referenced the event venue and asked if the new LGBTQ+ ordinance would have an impact on the proposed use. Ms. Meade replied that there was still a lot of work to be done on the ordinance and it would be premature for her to speak on it at this time.

Joel Olsen began his presentation by introducing the following:

Scott & Anne Peecook – owners of the Lovill House Inn for 19 years

Tyler Moffatt – attorney representing the Olsens

Michael Trew – engineer with Municipal Engineering

Bill Aceto – real estate agent with Blue Ridge Property Management

Mr. Peecook stated he and his wife had received a higher offer than Mr. Olsen's to purchase the property but they appreciated Mr. Olsen's desire to maintain the historic nature of the property.

Mr. Olsen shared a PowerPoint presentation (attached) and stated that the house was built in 1875 and the Lovill family lived in the house for almost 100 years. In 1993 a Conditional Use Permit was granted for the house to become a bed & breakfast. Mr. Olsen stated they would like to maintain the bed & breakfast and offer breakfast to guests. He felt that the longer people stayed, the less disruption and in and out there would be. Mr. Olsen stated it was his goal to be the first 100% clean energy, grid-independent property in Boone. He noted that he owned and operated a clean energy installation company. Mr. Olsen stated he would like to do some energy efficient upgrades to the house to include windows, doors, lighting, and other items that would not jeopardize the historic nature of the building. Mr. Olsen felt that his plans for hydroelectric would not require special permitting through the state. He noted he had spoken with New River Light & Power regarding his plan.

Vice Chair Plaag questioned the number of units proposed and how that would fit with the bed & breakfast and boarding house occupancy limit.

Council Member LaPlaca asked if a 66 kW battery and 30 kW solar would be enough to cover most of their needs and Mr. Olsen stated that it would.

Mr. Olsen supplied in his presentation a letter of support from the Chamber of Commerce and ASU. He also noted that he received support from the adjacent property owners to the east of property he is purchasing (Tazewell). He noted there would be 9 units and the barn might be used for additional rooms but that could be addressed at another time. Mr. Olsen stated he would like to have a mix of short and long term stays with 8 rooms for guests and the owner's cottage for the owners to stay. He stated the business would be professionally managed and would not be used as a frat house, party house, or dorm however students could stay if they met certain conditions. Mr. Olsen explained that the student receiving the Olsen Scholarship would get to stay in the house and his son would live in the owner's cottage.

Mr. Olsen stated that indoor event space would be the dining area and the parlor and there were two outdoor grassy areas that could be used for events. He stated he was unsure if events were prohibited at bed & breakfasts when the original Conditional Use Permit was approved but noted that bed & breakfasts across the state hold events and he did not feel that the Peecooks tried to violate any rules by hosting events.

Mr. Olsen noted he had checked with the Police Department and they had received no complaints on the Lovill House Inn. He stated that the trees and topography would help mitigate sound for outdoor events and longer term stays would decrease traffic flow from checking in and out of the house. Mr. Olsen stated a great deal of the trees on the larger piece of property were located in the viewshed and could not be cut.

Mr. Olsen noted that satellite parking would be allowed by the County at the Human Services Center and the Lovill House was also accessed by AppalCART. He stated they would limit the number of parking spaces renters would be allowed.

Commission Member Zebzda referred to the conditions students would have to meet in order to be allowed to rent a room and asked if it was allowable to place additional rental restrictions on students. Ms. Meade replied that students were not a protected class.

Mr. Olsen stated the Lovill House would offer a higher end stay and their primary goal was to have their boarders be from the university's sustainability staff or other professional level tenants.

Ms. Shook noted that the site plan indicated new construction of the barn building. Mr. Olsen stated he did not plan to construct the building right away but did not want to lose the option to construct it in the future. Ms. Shook stated that staff reviewed the project based on the site plan that was submitted and suggested a request to phase the project if the building would not be constructed for some time. She added that a site specific plan approval had a 2 year vesting period.

Council Member Furguele asked Mr. Olsen if he was planning to purchase the neighboring Tazewell property in order to better accommodate outdoor events. Mr. Olsen replied that he was not planning to purchase the Tazewell property and that outdoor events would be held at the 2 grassy areas on the Lovill House property.

Vice Chair Plaag asked how boarders would prepare their own meals after the breakfast meal was served. Mr. Olsen explained that the kitchen would be used for breakfast and none of the stayers would be allowed to use the kitchen. Remaining meals would require stayers to eat out.

Vice Chair Plaag expressed concern about the use of Lovill House spaces by the university. Mr. Olsen stated the university would reserve and rent space for meetings as needed. Vice Chair Plaag asked if any of the rented spaces would be used long term by ASU. Mr. Olsen replied that was not the intent.

Vice Chair Plaag asked where the line would be drawn for ASU to rent spaces in the zoning classification. Ms. Shook replied that the university could have occasional events but something more long term or permanent would warrant further review.

Commission Member Veno asked if the Lovill House was currently in use. Mr. Olsen replied that it had been unoccupied since COVID hit and was suffering from mold, mildew, and some degradation. Commission Member Veno asked if events would be catered off-premises. Mr. Peacock replied that in the past off-site catering was used for small weddings, reunions, etc.

Commission Member Veno asked if the hedge along the street was a hemlock hedge. Brian Johnson, Urban Design Specialist, replied that it was a hemlock hedge. Commission Member Veno expressed concern for the health of the hemlocks. Mr. Peacock stated that though the hemlocks were endangered, he had worked very hard to preserve the hedge with treatments to keep them healthy. He stated he had relayed to Mr. Olsen the importance of continued care for the trees.

Council Member Furguele asked if there was a size limitation for events. Ms. Meade replied that the event category did not limit the size of the events allowed. Ms. Shook noted that hosting events that were unrelated with the use of the Lovill House was discussed with the applicant.

Council Member Furguele asked if the applicant would be willing to accept a condition that no trees be removed unless they are confirmed by the Town arborist to be diseased and a condition that, should development occur on the wooded tract not part of the current application, the applicant would submit a petition for annexation for that parcel. Mr. Olsen stated he was not familiar with the requirements of the viewshed regarding the removal of trees. Ms. Shook explained that the viewshed overlay would limit land disturbing activity but not prohibit it. She noted that the majority of the viewshed overlay was located on the larger tract and not on the parcel subject to the rezoning request.

Vice Chair Plaag asked Mr. Olsen if he would accept a condition to annex the 3-acre parcel in question and Mr. Olsen replied that he would.

Vice Chair Plaag noted that ASU abandoned its conference center and he worried that the Lovill House would become ASU's conference center. He asked Mr. Olsen if he would accept a condition that Planning & Inspections be notified of any proposed use contracts with ASU so those could be evaluated for possible use violations. Mr. Olsen stated he would have to confer with his attorney, Mr. Moffatt. He stated he needed a sustainable revenue stream in order to maintain and improve the property and he did not want to hamstring himself unknowingly. Vice Chair Plaag expressed concern with possible scope creep with use by the university. Mr. Olsen replied that, as owner of the property, he struggled to see the issue but did not want to create problem situations and asked for an opportunity to consult with Mr. Moffatt.

Mayor Brantz called a break in the hearing from 8:20 p.m. until 8:34 p.m.

Mayor Brantz invited public comment. Ms. Shook noted that 3 individuals had signed up to speak.

Diane Blanks, a resident of Green Street, was having technical difficulties so Sally Reynolds was asked to speak first.

Sally Reynolds stated she was a past resident of Green Street and she had stayed at the Lovill House years ago. Ms. Reynolds read a prepared letter (attached) expressing her concern with the continued quality of service for the Lovill House property.

Ms. Blanks stated that both ends of her neighborhood had been eaten up by apartments and she wanted the Lovill House to stay a bed & breakfast although she was terrified it would turn into a mini dorm. She asked if the allowance for student boarders could be limited to 2 or 3. Ms. Blanks stated that events caused a lot of traffic and there was a concern with parking. She provided examples of nuisances she had suffered due to students in her neighborhood.

Ms. Shook then read a letter submitted by Diane Brown of Green Street (attached). The letter stated that Ms. Brown was concerned with increased traffic, parking, noise, and students and she was opposed to the rezoning.

There were no other individuals wishing to speak.

Mr. Olsen stated he was aware of the amount of care and dedication it took to run a bed & breakfast. He noted that public transportation, ride share, or public parking would be encouraged for all events. Mr. Olsen stated his son would be living on site and the business would be managed by Bill Aceto's firm, Blue Ridge Property Management.

Ole Christian Olsen, Joel Olsen's son, stated he moved here 3 years ago from Norway and he considered himself handy and loved to learn new things.

Ms. Blanks asked who would be running the business and doing the cooking. Mr. Olsen replied that he would hire someone to cook and clean.

Ms. Peacock stated she was extremely pleased with what Mr. Olsen had planned for the Lovill House and felt he would try to maintain the same level of service and care.

Vice Chair Plaag asked if Blue Ridge Property Management would be managing the rentals. Mr. Olsen replied that they would and they knew the area well.

Council Member Furgiuele asked Ms. Shook and Ms. Meade if it was correct that a zoning change went with the property and anyone who owned that property would be able to take advantage of that zoning, not just the Olsens. Ms. Meade confirmed that any approval ran with the property and not the property owner who sought the change.

Olee Olsen, Joel Olsen's father, stated that his son did not intend to ruin the property and it would be a good thing for Boone.

Commission Member Zebzda apologized to Ms. Blanks for the problems she had with students and offered to help with future student issues if possible. He offered to have Planning & Inspections supply Ms. Blanks with his contact information.

Ms. Meade referred to the barn construction and stated there may not be sufficient parking if the barn was converted to rooms. She suggested that the applicant return for board approval in the future when he was ready to address the use of the barn. Mr. Olsen stated he would like to proceed with the plan that was presented for the barn on their submittal.

Ms. Meade noted that a bed & breakfast was considered transient living and a boarding house was considered group living and noted that longer-term stays would not be consistent with the bed and breakfast use. She noted that the boarding house was restricted to a maximum of 9 rooms.

Ms. Shook asked the applicant to clarify the number of rooms, as there seemed to be confusion as to what was proposed. She asked if there were 9 rooms between the house and the barn. Michael Trew replied that the original Conditional Use Permit approved rooms in the barn but he was not sure if there was a certain number of rooms approved. He noted there was 6 rooms in the house, a room above the cellar, the caretaker's quarters, and enough space for one more room in the house.

Vice Chair Plaag referred to page 16 of the meeting packet that indicated there would be 9 bedrooms in the barn. Mr. Olsen replied he thought there would be 4 bedrooms in the barn. He also noted there was potential in the house for 2 more bedrooms instead of the one additional bedroom that Mr. Trew had mentioned. Mr. Olsen then clarified that the request was for 6 rooms in the house, 2 rooms in the owner's cottage, 4 rooms in the barn and 1 room in the spring house located behind the main house.

Vice Chair Plaag referred again to page 16 of the meeting packet that indicated an expansion of the barn from 1240 square feet to 3000 square feet and asked for clarification. Mr. Trew stated the original Conditional Use approval allowed a 40x45 building with 2 stories.

Ms. Shook stated that parking on-site was dictated by the number of rooms and that number would need to be specific about the number of rooms provided in order to calculate the number of required spaces. Mr. Olsen stated he intended to have 4 rooms in the barn. Mr. Trew calculated that 15 parking spaces would allow for 12 rooms.

Ms. Shook referenced events not associated with the Lovill House and asked how many vehicles could be accommodated during those events given the fact that the bed and breakfast and boarding house guests would be parked in the parking spaces. Mr. Olsen replied that they would encourage off-site parking and public transportation. Ms. Peecook stated that two cars could park on the gravel drive and cars could park in the circulation areas. She noted that they had used Sam Snyder's apartment parking lot sometimes in the past. Ms. Shook noted there was a 200' limitation of distance for satellite parking. Ms. Peecook replied that the Lovill House property was small and did not handle large venues. She noted they had never had a problem over the past 19 years with their events.

Ms. Shook wished to review the conditions that had been proposed so far. She presented the following:

1. When developing the adjacent parcel, a petition for annexation should be filed.
2. The 3-acre parcel must be annexed.
3. ASU contracts for rental of space must be reviewed by Planning & Inspections.

Council Member Furgiuele stated he had suggested the following condition:

4. Significant or historic trees may not be cut unless it is determined by the Town arborist that they are diseased.

Ms. Meade suggested consideration of the following:

- 9 rooms for boarding house use
- No kitchenettes
- Define boarding house
- Events associated with the bed & breakfast only

Council Member Furgiuele stated he was not comfortable approving something so fluid and he needed more certainty. He stated he was unsure what they would actually be approving.

Council Member LaPlaca stated she thought this was a great project, the applicant had done an exemplary job, and she would support the request as is.

Council Member Ulmer stated she thought it was a great project as well. However, she had some trepidation because some things were not clear.

Vice Chair Plaag stated he was supportive of the broad vision for the property but felt it put the Planning Commission in a difficult position to make recommendations of the project when there was not enough solid information. He suggested a continuation of the public hearing so the applicant could regroup.

Ms. Shook noted information has been provided by the applicant that indicated that there may be some time sensitivity on the part of the applicant and the Commission and Council may want to consult the applicant regarding the timing of any continuation.

Mr. Moffatt stated he disagreed that the applicant did not provide enough information and stated it was not necessary or appropriate to continue the hearing. He stated he could answer direct questions and provided the following responses to the suggested conditions:

1. Because the 8-acre tract was not part of the property in question and was basically undevelopable, they would not agree to annex.
2. They would agree to annex the subject property of 3 acres.
3. They would not agree to review of ASU rental contracts noting that, if the UDO were violated, Planning & Inspections could use enforcement action.
4. They would not agree to not cut trees on the adjacent 8-acre tract because that tract was not part of this request.

Vice Chair Plaag wished to clarify that he was concerned about long term rental agreements by ASU and would like to have those agreements be reviewed by Planning & Inspections so that they might provide feedback as to whether or not the use would be in violation of the UDO. Mr. Moffatt stated he would need much further detail as to how that would work but, as it stood, his answer was still no.

Chair Shay stated she liked the project but the concerns expressed by Vice-Chair Plaag about the lack of information and Mr. Moffatt's response to those concerns made her a little less certain about the request.

Ms. Meade counselled members that they could proceed with consideration of the request but should keep in mind the most intense uses that could be allowed in the requested zoning district.

Council Member Furguele noted if there were no limitations, they could have any size event they wanted as long as it was between the hours of 6 a.m. and 10 p.m. Ms. Meade offered that the event venue use could be dropped and the applicant would be allowed to have only events that were related to the Lovill House use.

Mr. Olsen stated he had contacted everyone he could that would be affected or provide input and he stated what was on his application was what should be voted on. He noted, however, that he may do less than what was being requested. Mr. Olsen stated he wanted to make space available for the community even if the event did not have guests staying at the Lovill House. He noted that he would accept reasonable conditions.

Chair Shay stated she liked the idea of the event venue space for everyone. She asked if the barn expansion was essential for the success of the project as a whole. Mr. Olsen replied that he hoped it would be successful without the barn expansion but would like to maintain the flexibility to have those rooms.

Ms. Shook wished to verify the room count. She stated her understanding was there would be 6 rooms in the Lovill House, 2 rooms in the owner's cottage, 1 over the spring house, and either 9 or 4 in the barn. She asked for clarification of the number of rooms for the barn. Mr. Olsen replied that he intended to have 4 units in the barn. Ms. Shook stated that would be a total of 13 rooms so an additional parking space would have to be provided.

Ms. Shook noted there would be a kitchen in the house and the owner's cottage and asked if there would be a kitchen in the barn. Mr. Trew replied that there would not be a kitchen in the barn.

Ms. Shook asked if the applicant had considered a limitation of the size of events. Mr. Olsen replied that he was open to suggestions. Ms. Shook noted that with parking for the rooms, there was no leftover parking for event attendees. Mr. Olsen suggested a size limitation of 50 guests.

Ms. Peacock stated they used to limit their event attendees to 25 and that number included guests that were staying at the Inn.

Mr. Olsen stated he may have classes come to observe the waterfall on the property as well. He felt 50 would be a good limitation between the indoor and outdoor visitors.

Council Member Hicks suggested the possibility of limiting the event length. He also suggested possibly limiting the number of vehicles that could attend the event.

Council Member Ulmer suggested wedding invitations include an RSVP for the number of vehicles.

Vice Chair Plaag stated he thought it would be appropriate to set a length of stay for bed & breakfast guests because the UDO was vague. He suggested bed & breakfast guests be allowed to stay for 2 weeks and anything beyond that would be considered a boarding house stay. Ms. Meade stated Vice Chair Plaag had a good suggestion. Mr. Olsen was in agreement with the suggested 2 week stay for bed & breakfast guests.

Ms. Meade asked Mr. Olsen if he would agree to a condition that the structures currently on the property were the only structures being approved under this requested rezoning. Mr. Olsen agreed to that condition. Ms. Shook pointed out that the current barn structure would be replaced with a newly constructed building in the same location, according to the plans that were submitted.

Vice Chair Plaag again asked about the condition that the Lovill House not engage in rental contracts with universities that would violate the UDO regarding university uses in a non-university district. Mr. Olsen replied that he hated to put restrictions on a credit-worthy client noting that it would make it difficult to sustain the business. Vice Chair Plaag stated the condition was not intended to discriminate against the

university but was an attempt to not create violations of the UDO. Ms. Meade stated she was uncomfortable with the condition as it was an implicit condition of all permits that the applicant comply with all requirements of the UDO.

Chair Shay noted that Planning Commission still had to consider the case and make recommendations. She asked what their options were given the late hour of the hearing. Ms. Shook explained that the UDO allowed the Planning Commission to remain after the hearing to make recommendations, table their meeting to a date certain, or delay their consideration of the case until their next regular meeting. Vice Chair Plaag expressed concern about Planning Commission's 30-day window to make recommendations to Council. Ms. Meade stated that the 30 days would not be up before Town Council met in February so Planning Commission should still have time to make recommendations within the allotted time frame.

Vice Chair Plaag made a motion that Planning Commission meet at 6 p.m. on Monday, February 1, 2021 to make recommendations on the Lovill House Inn Conditional District Zoning Map Amendment request. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Behrend.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

Ms. Shook wished to review the items suggested as possible conditions or items for clarification.

1. The applicant will petition for annexation the portion of the 3-acre parcel that is located within Watauga County's jurisdiction.
2. The applicant will utilize the existing structures on the site with the exception that the barn may be renovated/reconstructed with a maximum building footprint of 1,800 square feet and second story of 1,200 square feet.
3. The development is limited to 13 rooms. Of the 11 rooms for rent, the boarding house use would be limited to 9 at any given time. These rooms are to be located in the existing structures on the lot. The room and kitchen allocations for the development are as follows:
 - a. Lovill House Inn – 6 rooms and 1 kitchen
 - b. Spring House – 1 room and no kitchen
 - c. Barn – 4 rooms and no kitchen
 - d. Owner's Cottage – 2 rooms and 1 kitchen
4. Events will be limited to 50 attendees. Additional discussion is needed on possible limitation of event length and how many cars can park on-site.
5. A room rented for up to 2 weeks (14 days) will be classified as a bed and breakfast use and a room rented for longer than that (15 days+) will be classified as a boarding house use.

Mr. Olsen thanked everyone for their attention, advice, and suggestions. He stated he made the commitment to purchase the Lovill House property in September and due to COVID the property had been vacant. With mold and mildew growing, he would like to get into the house to begin repairs as soon as possible.

With no further questions or comments, Mayor Brantz closed the public hearing for this case at 10:52 p.m.

Adjournment of Town Council

Mayor Pro Tem Clawson made a motion for Town Council to adjourn at 10:52 p.m. The motion was seconded by Council Member Ulmer.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

Adjournment of Planning Commission

Vice Chair Plaag made a motion for Planning Commission to adjourn at 10:54 p.m. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Behrend.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None
The motion passed.

Rennie Brantz, Mayor

Brenda Henson, Board Secretary

Elizabeth Shay, Planning Commission Chair