

1 **WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **MEETING MINUTES**
3 **July 6, 2020**

4
5
6 **AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order**

7
8 Chair Plantan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

9
10 Chair Plantan read the following prepared statement:

11 Pursuant to Minnesota Statute Sec 13D.015 and because of the COVID-19 pandemic, this Planning
12 Commission Meeting is being held remotely by electronic means using the audio and video
13 conferencing platform, Zoom. Members of the Commission, City staff, and others that are a part
14 of the meeting will be participating by video or audio connections where we can all hear each other
15 and see the presentations being made. We have a public forum and public hearing this evening on
16 the agenda. If you'd like to speak during these portions of the meeting you may call 1 (312) 626-
17 6799, enter the Zoom meeting ID 961 7133 1425, and press 9 to speak. Callers will be placed on
18 hold and muted until the appropriate time of the meeting is reached. At that time, each caller will
19 be recognized in turn, and invited to speak. Public comments continue to be welcomed and
20 encouraged and we ask if possible, that comments of future agenda items be submitted in advance
21 by emailing PublicComment@wayzata.org. Please include "public comments" in the subject line,
22 your name and address, and the agenda item that you are speaking to. Comments can also be
23 submitted by calling City staff or mailing comments to Wayzata City Hall at 600 Rice St E,
24 Wayzata, MN 55391 (Attn: Public Comments). The meeting will be shown on Channel 8, WCTV,
25 and streamed on the City's website at www.wayzata.org/wctv.

26
27
28 **AGENDA ITEM 2. Roll Call**

29
30 Chair Plantan asked Interim Community Development Director Zweber to take roll call.

31
32 Present at roll call were Commissioners: Plantan, Douglas, Merriam, Parkhill, Bashioum, and
33 Flannigan. Interim Community Development Director Eric Zweber, Assistant Planner Nick
34 Kieser, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present. Commissioner Iverson joined the
35 meeting later at 6:52 p.m.

36
37 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda**

38
39 Chair Plantan asked for a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting.

40
41 Commissioner Douglas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Bashioum, to approve the July
42 6, 2020 agenda as presented.

43
44 Interim Development Director Zweber completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion
45 carried unanimously.

46

1
2 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda**

- 3
4 **a.) Approval of the June 15, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**
5 **b.) Approval of Report and Recommendation for a Preliminary and Final Plat at**
6 **15610 Holdridge Road**
7

8 Chair Plantan read the items on the consent agenda and asked if any Commissioner had questions
9 or wished to pull an item for further discussion.

10
11 Hearing no such request, Chair Plantan asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as
12 presented.

13
14 Commissioner Parkhill made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to approve the
15 Consent Agenda as presented.

16
17 Interim Community Development Director Zweber completed a roll call vote on the motion. Upon
18 a vote, the motion carried 5 ayes, 1 abstain (Merriam).

19
20 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Old Business Items**

21
22 Chair Plantan noted that there were no old business items on the agenda.

23
24 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Public Hearing Items**

- 25
26 **a) Development Application for an Impervious Surface Variance at 128 Broadway**
27 **Avenue North**
28

29 Assistant Planner, Nick Kieser, gave an overview of the application and noted the lot location and
30 its designation in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the variance request is to
31 exceed the impervious surface limit for the R-3A District. He gave an overview of the variance
32 for 38% impervious surface for the project that was approved in 2017, but never constructed. He
33 stated that the property was subsequently sold and the new owner submitted a new plan and was
34 approved for a building permit with 35% impervious surface that meet the Zoning Ordinance
35 standard in 2018. Mr. Kieser reviewed the plans for both the 2017 plans and the 2018 plans. He
36 noted that a portion of the 2018 plans were constructed, but the garage and the driveway were not
37 constructed. He stated that this property is once again under new ownership and new plans have
38 been submitted to the City. He gave an overview of the current plans, proposed driveway, rain
39 garden, and garage. He noted that the request is to go up to 49.6% impervious surface with a rain
40 garden mitigating about 15.94% of impervious surface. He explained that the applicant feels their
41 practical difficulties are that the existing home and narrow lot make a rear detached garage
42 practical; the previous variance request with additional paved driveway and turnaround area; and
43 the proposal is a similar configuration to surrounding neighborhood. He stated that the applicant
44 has indicated that they are willing to do more stormwater management techniques on the property
45 in addition to the rain garden that is already proposed. Mr. Kieser noted that two public comments
46 were received regarding this application.

1
2 Chair Plantan asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff.
3
4 Commissioner Bashioum asked if the applicant had considered pervious pavers or ecobloc.
5
6 Planner Kieser stated that he believes the applicant was leaning more towards installing an
7 underground water filtration system because there was a significant cost to putting in the
8 permeable pavers throughout the whole driveway.
9
10 Commissioner Bashioum stated that she would feel more comfortable approving this variance if
11 that information was included in their plan.
12
13 Commissioner Flannigan asked about plans that included a proposed deck and how that affected
14 the impervious surface calculation.
15
16 Planner Kieser stated this particular application does not include a proposed deck.
17
18 Commissioner Flannigan stated that any deck would require permitting, so they will not be able to
19 get around the hard cover issues by putting it in after the fact. He asked, from a City and water
20 treatment standpoint, what the implications would be of having the proposed underwater treatment
21 system versus just a system to move the water to the street.
22
23 Planner Kieser noted that would be something that would be thoroughly reviewed by Public Works
24 and Engineering.
25
26 Commissioner Flannigan asked if the City's standards were more to address a flooding issue or an
27 environmental issue.
28
29 Planner Kieser explained that it is a little bit of both and the main objective is to not allow more
30 stormwater runoff into the City's sewer system than what it would be with a 35% impervious
31 surface project.
32
33 Commissioner Flannigan asked if the application in 2018 was from the current property owner.
34
35 Planner Kieser explained that the original variance request came from the first owner in 2017, a
36 second owner had the building permit request in 2018 where they built the addition to the home.
37 He stated that the current owner is a new owner and was not involved in either of the other
38 applications in the past. He clarified that there have been three different owners with three
39 different plans.
40
41 Commissioner Flannigan stated that, in theory, the current owner knew what he was buying.
42
43 Planner Kieser stated that is correct, but wasn't sure if he had also reviewed the previously
44 submitted plans.
45

1 Commissioner Parkhill stated that it appears as though the water can be mitigated through various
2 means, so there may be a net zero effect. He asked why the City set the parameter of 35%
3 impervious surface, and if there were reasons other than water to consider in this situation.

4
5 Planner Kieser stated that the impervious surface relates to both stormwater as well as lot coverage
6 percentages so there are open or green spaces on lots.

7
8 Commissioner Parkhill asked about lot coverage and whether it was different than the impervious
9 coverage.

10
11 Planner Kieser stated that impervious coverage is different and that the maximum lot coverage is
12 30% maximum.

13
14 Commissioner Parkhill asked if that only applied to the house and the garage.

15
16 Planner Kieser stated that the lot coverage applies to anything with a foundation.

17
18 Commissioner Parkhill stated that, in his opinion, pavers would look nicer than concrete. He
19 suggested that they consider using some in the driveway and perhaps making a portion of the
20 driveway be the tire treads rather than a large concrete pad.

21
22 Interim Community Development Director Zweber stated that Commissioner Parkhill's first
23 statement, by Code, falls into the provisions of the Shoreland Ordinance. He stated that is not
24 what the City looks at that is outside the Shoreland District, but this area in the 2040
25 Comprehensive Plan has a new designation as part of the Central Core. He noted that one of the
26 tasks in the near future is to review this area and see what makes sense in terms of stormwater
27 management, and revisit the standards of this district. He stated that does not really apply to this
28 discussion, but would like the Commission to give staff direction for issues they would like
29 considered when this is reviewed.

30
31 Commissioner Merriam stated that it looks like the proposed garage in 2018 was more forward
32 than the current proposal.

33
34 Planner Kieser stated that in the 2018 building permit application there was a one car garage that
35 was pushed further forward than what is currently being proposed.

36
37 Commissioner Merriam stated that it looks like it was more in line with the neighbor to the north
38 and now it has been pushed to the back of the lot.

39
40 Planner Kieser stated that this was correct, and he believes it has been moved about 10 or 15 feet.

41
42 Commissioner Merriam stated that her concern is that they are asking for 49.6% and not 39.6%
43 which would be closer to the 35%. She stated that she can appreciate what they are offering to
44 help alleviate some of the concerns regarding water runoff, but is having a hard time grasping why
45 the garage needs to be moved further back. She stated that she also isn't sure about why the
46 walkway needs to be complete hard cover and not pervious pavers.

1
2 City Attorney Schelzel noted that Commissioner Iverson has joined the meeting, so the full
3 Commission is present.

4
5 There being no further questions for staff, Chair Plantan invited the applicant to speak, and asked
6 them to state their name and address for the record.

7
8 Applicant's representative, Paul Cameron, 11578 Chamberlain Court, Eden Prairie, stated that this
9 is a very difficult lot to have a two car garage on the property. He noted that the plans in 2017 had
10 a much larger garage because it was side loaded. He explained that the challenge was that plan
11 was never actually built and the 2018 plan was not well thought out. He stated that the tire track
12 design is very difficult for drivers to maintain without driving off of them. He stated that if you
13 pave the driveway from the street to the backline of the house, you meet the coverage ratio, but
14 there would be no garage and no place to turn or even get a second car in. He stated that he took
15 a look at the other houses in the area and practically all of the garages are located on the back lot
16 line. He gave examples of the difficulty of the lot and the ability to get a two car garage onto the
17 lot. He stated that pavers are very expensive and noted that he used a rain garden to try to mitigate
18 a portion of the storm water runoff. He stated that he is also proposing a system where the water
19 will be maintained under the driveway until it naturally percolates out.

20
21 At the conclusion of the Mr. Cameron's remarks, Chair Plantan asked if the Commission had any
22 questions for the applicant.

23
24 Commissioner Flannigan asked if this request ends up being approved by the City Council, how
25 long Mr. Cameron expects the remainder of the project to last.

26
27 Mr. Cameron stated that he hopes all the work can be completed by the end of August. He stated
28 that as soon as he has a definitive direction on the garage situation, he plans to put it on the market.

29
30 There being no other questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Plantan opened the
31 public hearing on the application at 7:06 pm.

32
33 Chair Plantan asked Planner Kieser to read into the record that letters than were submitted
34 regarding this application.

35
36 Planner Kieser read aloud the letter submitted by Sandy Harvey, 138 Broadway Avenue North
37 requesting that the variance be denied, as proposed. He also read aloud the letter submitted by
38 Tasha Winkels, 123 Broadway Avenue North.

39
40 Chair Plantan asked if there was anyone from the public on the phone or online that would like to
41 speak on this issue.

42
43 City Attorney Schelzel suggested that the numbers to participate in the public hearings be once
44 again shared in case someone missed them at the beginning of the meeting.
45

1 Chair Plantan stated that if any member of the public would like to speak during these portions of
2 the meeting they may call 1 (312) 626-6799, enter the Zoom meeting ID 961 7133 1425, and press
3 *9 to speak.

4
5 Interim Community Development Director Zweber stated that he has checked the public comment
6 e-mail address and there were no comments.

7
8 There being no one wishing to comment further on the application, Chair Plantan closed the public
9 hearing at 7:13 pm.

10
11 Chair Plantan asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

12
13 Commissioner Flannigan stated that he lives around the corner from this property and that it has
14 been very disappointing to see what has transpired on this parcel. He stated that, from a
15 neighborhood perspective, Ms. Winkel's comments could not be more accurate. He stated that
16 this property is blighted and has construction materials on it. He stated that there is also a dumpster
17 and a port-a-potty at the property, which he understands is required, and it has been like this for
18 years. He stated that although it is unfortunate, he feels that it will take a variance in order to have
19 a good-looking house that fits in with the neighborhood. He stated that he thinks that there needs
20 to be some changes in the approach and suggested that the hammerhead be taken away and the
21 driveway be reduced as much as possible. He stated that he would also like to see half of the
22 driveway become pervious pavers. He asked whether this property would be allowed to get credit
23 even though it is not close to the lake. He stated that the City has gotten themselves in a terrible
24 position with this situation, but reiterated that he would like the Commission to work towards a
25 way to allow for some additional hard cover.

26
27 Commissioner Bashoum stated that she would echo Commission Flannigan's statements. She
28 noted that she is inclined to approve a variance but would also like the applicant to reduce the hard
29 cover. She suggested that pervious pavers be used for the sidewalk and a portion of the driveway
30 as suggested by Commissioner Flannigan. She stated that perhaps they could look at adding the
31 ecobloc system as well in order to reduce the overall impervious surface amount because she thinks
32 49.6% is excessive.

33
34 Commissioner Douglas stated that she walked the property today and agrees with Commissioner
35 Flannigan that something needs to be done because this has been going on for too long. She stated
36 that she is concerned about impervious surface but has concerns about putting too many
37 restrictions on the development because financially he may not be able to get this done as quickly
38 as the City would like. She stated that she is also concerned about using impervious pavers because
39 of potential maintenance and plowing issues. She expressed concern that restrictions and requiring
40 impervious pavers will take finances away from other quality issues in the home. She stated that
41 she would also recommend taking away the hammerhead turnaround area to reduce some of the
42 impervious surface. She stated that the City will be running into this same type of issue more often
43 with the narrow lots in the areas and their new designation in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan as the
44 Central Core District. She stated that she thinks for a house to be marketable in today's market,
45 in the State of Minnesota, there needs to be a two car garage. She asked what percentage the
46 impervious surface would be reduced if the turnaround area was taken away.

1
2 Planner Kieser stated that he does not have any specific information about what could be done or
3 what the developer is willing to do to modify the variance request.
4

5 Commissioner Douglas stated that she likes the idea of the stormwater holding area that was
6 mentioned as part the next agenda item, and suggested that perhaps that could be considered.
7

8 Commissioner Iverson stated that she would like to ask the applicant to get a little bit more creative
9 with some other options to reduce the impervious surface. She stated that she thinks the City
10 should look at the inclusion of a tire track driveway. She stated that she has seen them popping
11 up more and more and feels they add a uniqueness to a property. She stated that she would also
12 like to see the turnaround taken out and increase the use of pavers in order to reduce the total
13 impervious surface amount. She asked if the applicant could come back to the Commission with
14 some proposed solutions because there seem to be a lot of concerns being raised about the same
15 issues. She stated that if the Commission feels it can get some clarity on these issues as a condition
16 of approval, she believes it can be moved forward, but if not, she believes it should come back
17 before the Commission again with revised plans. She stated that she would prefer revised plans
18 before the Commission makes a recommendation.
19

20 Commissioner Parkhill stated that he thinks the City would like to move this item along so this
21 house can be on the market by the fall. He asked if there could be a condition that says either the
22 impervious surface needs to be reduced by a certain percentage amount, such as 20%-25%, or be
23 replaced with pervious materials.
24

25 Commissioner Douglas asked if he would reduce the impervious surface of the total requested
26 49.6%.
27

28 Commissioner Parkhill suggested that Planner Kieser work with the applicant on a specific range
29 and work to get the impervious surface amount down to perhaps 45%.
30

31 Commissioner Iverson stated that she thinks that is a great suggestion and if the Commission is
32 going to talk about numbers, she would like to see the impervious surface amount be under 40%.
33 She reiterated that she would like to see the developer be as creative as they can in order to meet
34 the marketing needs to sell the property and comply with the City ordinances that are in place.
35

36 Planner Kieser stated that staff can work with the applicant on the issues brought forward by the
37 Commission. He stated that the application can either move forward with those conditions or be
38 tabled, whichever is the Commission's preference.
39

40 Commissioner Flannigan asked if the ordinances allow for reduction in coverage for permeable
41 surfaces in this area.
42

43 Planner Kieser stated that is an interesting point and noted that Public Works and the City Engineer
44 takes a look at this, but for the most part, staff wants the total impervious surface to be reflected in
45 the variance request, and then the City can look at what stormwater management techniques they
46 are using to minimize the impacts. He reiterated that for the variance, staff recommend that the

1 variance includes the total amount of impervious surface on site. The plans can show what the
2 mitigation amount would be with stormwater management techniques.

3
4 City Attorney Schelzel stated that this is a variance request, and some of the mitigation that has
5 been discussed would not change the percentage in the request. However, he thinks the
6 Commission can consider that mitigation as important because it goes to the reasonableness of the
7 request and the effect of the variance on the locality, which are both key factors in reviewing a
8 variance request. He stated that even though this parcel is not located in the Shoreland Overlay
9 District where it could get credits that reduce the amount of variance needed, the Commission
10 should consider how reasonable the request is. He stated that the application could be moved
11 forward with a recommendation that the applicant works with staff on ways to mitigate the impacts,
12 such as incorporating pervious pavers or the infiltration system that will be discussed in the next
13 agenda item, but also look at a redesign, such as removing the hammerhead, which will reduce the
14 percentage of the variance. He stated that if the Commission chooses this option, when it gets to
15 the Council level, the Council can make the call regarding whether the applicant did enough to
16 mitigate this situation and get the amount of impervious surface nearer to 40%.

17
18 Commissioner Parkhill stated that his issue is more of an aesthetic issue with all the concrete, as
19 proposed, versus the water run-off issue.

20
21 Commissioner Flannigan stated that he understands where Commissioner Parkhill is going with
22 that and the nice piece to this one is that it is a single car lane that is broken up by the portico. He
23 stated that in this neighborhood it will just look like it is a lot of driveway because of the nature of
24 the lots.

25
26 Commissioner Merriam stated that she also wants to move this forward so the house can be
27 finished. She stated that she thinks a two car garage is appropriate but would like to see this move
28 forward. She noted that she assumes it will be quicker to move it forward with the added condition
29 of working with staff to reduce the impervious surface amount and let Council make the
30 determination whether that is enough, rather than tabling it. She stated that she would like to see
31 the impervious surface reduced along with mitigation for anything over 35%.

32
33 Commissioner Douglas stated that currently the applicant is asking to be allowed 49.6%
34 impervious surface. She stated that the staff report states that the rain garden will account for
35 15.94% mitigation, and asked if that would bring it down to 33.68%.

36
37 Planner Kieser stated that those were the calculations presented.

38
39 Commissioner Douglas asked if a lot of maintenance was required in order to keep the rain garden
40 effective.

41
42 Planner Kieser stated that it does require maintenance but how much varies on a site by site basis.

43
44 There being no further discussion, Chair Plantan asked for a motion on the application.
45

1 Commissioner Douglas asked what would happen a few years down the road if the maintenance
2 was not being conducted on the rain garden. She asked if the City had any clout to oversee the
3 maintenance or require it.

4
5 Planner Kieser noted that this was a very good question and is something that the City has struggled
6 with in some situations. He explained that if approved, the property owner should be maintaining
7 any rain gardens or other stormwater management techniques on the site. He stated that the City
8 can leverage this in the future if they find that it is not being maintained properly.

9
10 Commissioner Bashoum stated that she isn't 100% sure that the rain garden will stand the test of
11 time. She stated that the house will be going on the market as soon as it is completed, and the City
12 will have no assurances from the new owner that the rain garden will be properly maintained. She
13 stated that it feels more like a wish and a prayer that the rain garden will sufficiently treat the
14 15.94% of the area. She stated that she would like to see the Commission add conditions, if this
15 moves forward, that the project include either pervious pavers, an ecobloc system or some
16 combination of them and removal of the hammerhead portion of the driveway.

17
18 Commissioner Iverson stated that she would echo the same concern and expressed additional
19 concern about putting the demand to keep an eye on this rain garden on City staff because they are
20 already overwhelmed. She stated that the Commission cannot lose sight of what will continue to
21 happen in this neighborhood. She stated that she doesn't want the City to be short-sighted in future
22 applications and wonders how many other homes will be asking for variances for impervious
23 surface in the future. She stated that the Commission needs to think long-term for the City and
24 she feels now is the time to do that with the applicant here and to really put strong conditions on
25 this project. She stated that this is a long-term decision. She stated that if the Commission truly
26 feels tire tracks and removing the hammerhead is what they want, then there needs to be truly
27 strong conditions because this is the first of many that will be coming before the Commission.

28
29 Commissioner Flannigan stated that he has a number of friends that have the tire tracks and they
30 do not like them and wish they didn't have them. He stated that he agrees with the concerns about
31 the rain garden, but would like it to remain in the plans. He stated that in order to get to a targeted
32 40%, the developer will need to take away about 800 square feet. He stated that if the hammerhead
33 is removed and the City asks for some mitigation on the driveway, such as pervious pavers, he
34 thinks that may be a potential solution. He stated that if the Commission wanted to reduce the
35 percentage, you could just do the calculation for how much more would need to be removed. He
36 noted that the Commission had approved 38% coverage a few years ago with the last plan that was
37 presented. He stated that he feels the Commission can ask for a few things and come up with
38 something that they feel comfortable with.

39
40 Chair Plantan stated that she agreed with Commissioner Flannigan. She stated that she likes the
41 idea of moving this forward with certain conditions that he will work on with staff.

42
43 Commissioner Douglas stated that she feels the Commission should present the applicant with a
44 certain goal and he can then work out how he will get there. She stated that she would be
45 comfortable with the applicant either working on it with staff, or bringing it back before the
46 Commission at the next meeting.

1
2 Commissioner Parkhill suggested a 50% reduction in the concrete material and the applicant can
3 decide how and where this can be done.

4
5 Commissioner Douglas stated that she feels it should be up to the applicant to figure out a
6 combination that will work.

7
8 Commissioner Flannigan asked what the total percentage of impervious surface would be in that
9 scenario. He reiterated that the Commission had previously approved 38%.

10
11 Commissioner Parkhill stated that he doesn't know what percentage the concrete is other than the
12 fact that it is 14.6% over and stated that Planner Kieser should be able to figure that out. He stated
13 that he thinks there can be a compromise with pavers and some texture that would enhance the
14 look that makes this more aesthetically pleasing as well as more responsible to the environment.

15
16 Commissioner Bashoum stated that she liked this solution because she is not comfortable at 40%
17 and because 38% was previously approved, she does not want to go over that number. She stated
18 that if the formula of reducing the concrete by 50% hardcover works, she would support that
19 solution.

20
21 Commissioner Merriam stated that she had a conversation with Planner Kieser earlier today about
22 the possibility of pervious pavers. She stated that her understanding is that the use of pervious
23 pavers does not reduce the impervious surface, so this parcel would still have 49.6% impervious
24 surface even if pavers are used. She noted that she would agree that it creates a better look and
25 does a lot in terms of water run off but the total amount would still be 49.6%.

26
27 Planner Kieser confirmed that this was correct.

28
29 Commissioner Merriam stated that in order to reduce the impervious surface, the size of the
30 driveway and walkway will need to be reduced.

31
32 Commissioner Flannigan stated that he thinks what he is suggesting is the effective percentage,
33 which will potentially include reduction of the driveway, garage and walkway as well as use of
34 different materials which will all be combined to get this project to 38% affective coverage. He
35 noted that he personally has a pervious paver deck that has been very effective.

36
37 Commissioner Parkhill asked City Attorney Schelzel if there was a way to allow the pervious
38 pavers to count in this situation.

39
40 City Attorney Schelzel stated that it would be acceptable from the standpoint that this is a request
41 for a variance to exceed the limit for impervious surface on the lot. He stated that from a legal
42 perspective, the Commission can factor in the stormwater management techniques, the use of
43 pervious pavers, and the systems for water filtration in determining whether the variance request
44 is reasonable, even though legally they are not receiving credits like they do in the Shoreland
45 Overlay District. He stated that based on the conversation, the Commission could direct staff to
46 prepare a draft report, and recommend approval with the condition that the applicant modify the

1 current plans so that enough redesign and mitigation is incorporated into the plans to mitigate the
2 impervious surface to bring it to an effective impervious surface of 35%.

3
4 Commissioner Parkhill stated that the current plans have it mitigated to 33.7% with the rain garden.

5
6 City Attorney Schelzel stated that the Commission could state that the percentage must be reached
7 without factoring in the rain garden. He stated that the Commission could also specify the
8 techniques that they would like to be considered. He noted that the Commission is making a
9 recommendation to the City Council and if they would like something done, they can either
10 encourage it or make it as a condition in the recommendation to Council.

11
12 Commissioner Douglas reiterated that she feels the Commission should pick a number the group
13 is comfortable with and let the applicant figure out the details. She expressed concern about the
14 Commission not picking this time because she only thinks about future applications that will be
15 coming into the City. She clarified that she thinks the Commission needs to be careful how this
16 application is driven because this may set a precedent for future applications.

17
18 Commissioner Iverson stated that Commissioner Flannigan made a valid point that the
19 Commission had already approved 38% in the past for this property. She suggested that the
20 Commission stick with that number and not over complicate the situation. She stated that the
21 discussion has surrounded removing the rain garden from the calculations and suggested that the
22 Commission to move forward and take a vote on this issue. She asked if the Commission was in
23 agreement on 38%.

24
25 Commissioner Flannigan asked if she was saying an unmitigated 38% or what he suggested with
26 an effective 38% that incorporates the mitigating factors.

27
28 Commissioner Iverson stated that she would support the effective 38% and the applicant that can
29 do whatever he needs to do, excluding the rain garden from the calculations to get down to 38%.

30
31 Commissioner Merriam asked if the 38% that was approved in the past was without mitigation.

32
33 Commissioner Flannigan stated that this was correct.

34
35 Commissioner Merriam stated that she would also like it on record that part of the problem with
36 this situation is that the house got built with a larger footprint than would have been approved in
37 the first place.

38
39 Commissioner Flannigan stated that he agrees that this is exactly the issue; however, that was
40 under a different owner and it was for an addition on the back of the home.

41
42 Commissioner Merriam stated that she does not want other people coming forward in the future
43 thinking that this is okay.

44
45 There being no further discussion, Chair Plantan once again asked for a motion on the application.

46

1 Commissioner Flannigan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Bashioum, to direct staff to
2 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings
3 reflecting a recommending approval for the impervious surface variance request at 128 Broadway
4 Avenue North, with the condition that the applicant work to incorporate mitigation and redesign
5 to bring the effective impervious surface percentage down to 38%, excluding the use of the rain
6 garden.

7
8 Commissioner Merriam stated that many on the Commission would like there to be pervious
9 pavers incorporated into the plans in order to get to the 38% and asked if that should be included
10 in the motion language.

11
12 Commissioner Flannigan stated that he thinks the motion can stand because City staff is in a better
13 position to understand what will work best and knows more than the Commission does about this
14 issue and what materials may work best. He stated that he believes City staff should work with
15 the applicant to come up with what will work best in this situation.

16
17 Commissioner Merriam stated that she thought the Commission was also concerned with the
18 aesthetics.

19
20 Commissioner Douglas stated that there was a motion on the floor and asked that the vote be called.

21
22 Commissioner Iverson stated that the Commission can still discuss this and asked Commissioner
23 Parkhill what he felt about this because he had shared his concerns about the aesthetics.

24
25 Commissioner Parkhill stated that he is concerned with aesthetics but is also concerned with
26 completely eliminating the use of mitigating things like rain gardens and other methods such as
27 the underground treatment. He stated that he doesn't want to set a precedent by not allowing rain
28 gardens and shared his concern that the Commission is not being consistent.

29
30 Commissioner Iverson stated that she believes the Commission needs to look at each application
31 as a unique application that will have unique circumstances.

32
33 City Attorney Schelzel stated that the Commission must be mindful of the effect that this
34 application may have perception wise on other applications, but agreed that with every request,
35 they must look at the particulars of the application itself. He noted that to speak to Commissioner
36 Parkhill's concern about eliminating the rain garden, the way he understands the motion is that it
37 is up to the applicant to do the changes to redesign the mitigation, however, the rain garden will
38 not be counted towards the reduction. He stated that he has heard all the Commissioners say that
39 they would like the applicant to keep the rain garden but, it will not count towards the mitigation
40 calculations.

41
42 Commissioner Parkhill stated that he doesn't feel any of this addresses the aesthetics. He stated
43 that if the motion is reducing impervious surface down to 38%, using less concrete and pavers are
44 acceptable to use in lieu of concrete, then he is fine with the motion.

45

1 Commissioner Douglas reiterated that she would like the Commission to vote on the motion that
2 is on the floor. She stated that she is not in favor of changing the motion.

3
4 Commissioner Parkhill asked for the motion to be repeated.

5
6 Chair Plantan read aloud the motion and City Attorney Schelzel clarified the language.

7
8 Interim Community Development Director Zweber completed a roll call vote on the motion. Upon
9 a vote the motion carried 5 ayes, 2 nays (Iverson and Merriam).

10
11 **b) Development Application for an Impervious Surface and a Rear Setback Variance**
12 **at 225 Manitoba Avenue South**

13
14 Planner Kieser, stated that the owners, Sara and David Frey have submitted a request for two
15 variances at 225 Manitoba Avenue South. He gave an overview of the current zoning in the area
16 and noted that in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan it is designated as Central Core Residential. He
17 stated that the applicant is requesting a rear yard accessory structure setback variance for a garage
18 to be a distance of 1.5 feet rather than five feet from the property line, and an impervious surface
19 variance to allow 47.4% coverage rather than 35%. He noted that this property is within the
20 Shoreland Overlay District which has a 25% requirement. He stated that the applicants are
21 proposing to tear down the existing home and detached garage, and build a new home and new
22 detached garage in similar locations. He reviewed the plans and the practical difficulties stated for
23 each variance request. He noted that the information presented by the applicant regarding the
24 impervious surface variance indicates that they will be getting it down to 38.9% with the planned
25 mitigation of permeable pavers, rain garden, and an underground filtration system. He gave an
26 overview of the items that the Commission should consider with this application. He noted that
27 the applicant is present on the conference call and noted that the City did not receive any public
28 comment prior to the meeting regarding this application.

29
30 Chair Plantan asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff.

31
32 Commissioner Parkhill asked if there was any idea of how much coverage would be saved if they
33 did not have the difficulty of having to move the garage back so the neighbor could get into their
34 garage.

35
36 Planner Kieser stated that if they were to move the proposed driveway up a bit, he thinks they
37 would be at around 38%. He asked for a few minutes to find the exact information.

38
39 Commissioner Douglas asked when the 25% for the Shoreland Overlay District comes into play,
40 and also how the shared driveway impacts the calculations.

41
42 Planner Kieser stated that for the shared driveway they are putting on around 1,000 square feet and
43 does not include the other half on the other driveway. He explained that any property within 1,000
44 feet of Lake Minnetonka is considered to be in the Shoreland Overlay District, which this property
45 falls into.

46

1 Commissioner Douglas asked if that meant this property needed to fall into the 25% impervious
2 surface requirement and not the 35%.

3
4 Planner Kieser stated that staff works with applicants if they can meet the 35% requirement but
5 not the 25%, and then will require them to do stormwater mitigation techniques as outlined in the
6 code.

7
8 Interim Community Development Director Zweber stated that he had an answer for Commissioner
9 Parkhill's question regarding how much coverage would be saved if the applicant did not have to
10 move the garage back in order for the neighbor to be able to access their garage. He stated that
11 the information can be found on pages 80 and 81 of the packet and explained it would result in a
12 difference of 70 square feet, which is the equivalent of .87% of the lot.

13
14 Commissioner Parkhill stated that if the garage had to be moved east towards Manitoba about 30
15 feet, it seems as though that would take out impervious surface of about 30x30.

16
17 Interim Development Director Zweber stated that this is correct; however moving it to the east
18 would occupy the easement for the garage to the south., which would prevent that person from
19 using their garage.

20
21 Commissioner Parkhill stated that if this property owner is limited in where they can put their
22 garage because the easement forces him to move it all the way back, he doesn't feel he should be
23 harmed by building a driveway to the garage.

24
25 Commissioner Flannigan stated that what many people do in this situation is put a side loading
26 garage behind the house and just keep it tight. He stated that the reason this applicant cannot do
27 that is because of the shared driveway which becomes sort of a practical difficulty. He asked if
28 the stairs depicted in the garage go down or up.

29
30 Planner Kieser stated that the stairs go down to a lower level.

31
32 Commissioner Iverson asked how much square footage is added to the garage because of the stairs.

33
34 Planner Kieser stated that he believes the garage is about 750 square feet total with the stairs and
35 about 580 square feet if they were removed. He noted that it is a non-living space and is intended
36 to be used as a work space.

37
38 Commissioner Merriam asked if there was another way to configure the steps so they would not
39 take up as much square footage.

40
41 Planner Kieser stated that is something that can be looked at.

42
43 Commissioner Flannigan asked if the applicant could address why they would like to build this
44 lower level work space and how it will be used.

45
46 Chair Plantan invited the applicant to speak about the application.

1
2 Applicant's architect and representative, Alissa Luepke Pier 1045 Washburn Avenue N.
3 Minneapolis, MN 55411, explained that she is the architect for this project and noted that the
4 landowners and the builders are also in on the call if the commissioners have questions for them.
5 She gave an overview of the plans and noted that the existing garage sits about 11 inches off the
6 rear property line. She explained that they are moving the garage to bring it further into
7 compliance to 18 inches and noted that the reason they are not moving it into full compliance is
8 that it would basically render the garage to the south unusable. She stated that they are just
9 trying to be good neighbors in this situation. She stated that the other practical difficulties for the
10 second variance request are the small size of the lot and the required easement. She assured the
11 Commission that they took into consideration all the possible places to move the garage
12 mentioned by the Commissioners and feel their proposal is the best. She reviewed the planned
13 building materials and extra foundational requirements for using brick and real stucco. She
14 noted that the property owners plan to live in this house until retirement age. She noted that the
15 design plans have what is now an extra storage area, but will be designed and engineering to hold
16 a future residential elevator so the home would still be accessible in their later years. She stated
17 that they have also designed some of the other features of the home to be able to utilize
18 wheelchairs, such as the bathrooms and widened hallways. She noted that this plan for life cycle
19 housing matches the Comprehensive Plan desire for residents to be able to age in place. She
20 explained that the land owner does woodworking as a hobby and plans to utilize the lower level
21 of the garage as his workshop. She explained some of the building code details that are
22 necessary to accommodate the garage parking space and the lower level workspace. She
23 explained where they are planning to use permeable pavers, rain water garden, and the
24 underground filtration system to mitigate the stormwater. She noted that they did not use the
25 filtration system in any of their calculations but are hoping to capture about 28% of the
26 stormwater run off from the roof. She stated that her clients cannot comply with the letter of the
27 law, but believe for both variances that they can comply with the spirit of the law.
28

29 Applicant David Frey, 240 Manitoba Avenue, stated that he has lived on Manitoba Avenue for the
30 last 10 years. He noted that his wife has lived here for 6 years. He explained that he had first lived
31 at 225 Manitoba Avenue, and then 6 years ago moved to 240 Manitoba Avenue. He stated that
32 they have had 4 children over the last 4 years and their needs have changed with the addition of
33 their new roommates. He explained that they have spent a lot of time designing a home that will
34 meet their current needs, as well as remain functional as they become empty nesters and beyond.
35 He stated that he also believes that their design is consistent with the charm of the City which was
36 what drew them to the area and also continues to keep them here. He stated that they attempted to
37 limit the size of the home, but wanted to be able to have all six of them sleep on the same level
38 which ended up driving much of the foot print for the house. He stated that they will do whatever
39 is necessary to mitigate the negative impact of this project on the environment.
40

41 There being no questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Plantan opened the public
42 hearing on the application at 8:38 pm.
43

44 Chair Plantan noted that those wishing to speak during these portions of the meeting may call 1-
45 (312) 626-6799, enter the Zoom meeting ID 961 7133 1425, and press *9 to speak.
46

1 Interim Community Development Director Zweber stated there were no people that called in to
2 the meeting that have asked to speak at the public hearing.

3
4 There being no one wishing to comment on the application, Chair Plantan closed the public hearing
5 at 8:39 pm.

6
7 Chair Plantan asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

8
9 Commissioner Flannigan asked if all the homes built to the north of this property had used pervious
10 pavers and asked if they got credit for those.

11
12 Planner Kieser stated that he did not review them specifically, but knows that they did. He noted
13 that most of them have shorter driveways and did receive credit for permeable pavers.

14
15 Commissioner Flannigan stated that he thinks there is a reason why the code allows for the
16 mitigation of hard cover through pervious pavers in this area. He stated that the lots are smaller,
17 and he thinks the practical difficulty that this property has is the shared driveway. He stated that
18 he really likes their proposal and feels that they are going above and beyond. He stated that he
19 appreciates that they are asking for a lot, but he thinks he can get behind recommending approval
20 of these variances because there are seemingly mitigating a lot of the issues that are out there.

21
22 Commissioner Douglas stated that she agreed with Commissioner Flannigan and thinks the
23 applicant put a lot of thought into their plans. She stated that she loves the era of the design and
24 feels as though it is a warm, solid looking, family home and reminds her of her grandpa's home.
25 She expressed her appreciation for the work that was put into the application because it was very
26 detailed. She stated that she thinks this home will be a great addition to the neighborhood.

27
28 Commissioner Bashoum stated that she also appreciated the proposal and the detailed report. She
29 noted that all of her questions were answered before she could even ask them. She stated that she
30 loves the fact that this is a family home, but that the applicants are also thinking forward to be able
31 to age in place with the spot for the elevator. She stated that she is in favor of the proposal.

32
33 Commissioner Parkhill stated that he thinks they have done a nice job with the aesthetics, and he
34 has no issue with the aesthetics and the placement of the garage. He stated that he understands the
35 placement of the garage and thinks they have mitigated the water issues successfully. He stated
36 that he is also in favor of approval.

37
38 Commissioner Merriam noted that the proposed site plan says "concrete" and asked if that had
39 been part of an earlier design. She asked about the area that will require pavers so the neighbor to
40 the south can access their driveway.

41
42 Ms. Luebke-Pier explained that they debated whether to pave the gap between the existing
43 driveway and the garage to the south. She stated that they were trying to be cognizant of the
44 amount of hard cover but could add that to the variance request. She noted that the proposed site
45 plan says "concrete" because they just did an overlay on top of the existing survey and assured the
46 Commission that this material will not be concrete.

1
2 Commissioner Merriam stated that she feels this home will be a really nice addition to the
3 neighborhood. She stated that she appreciates the use of permeable pavers on the driveway. She
4 stated that she wishes the impervious surface amount could be brought down, but feels they are
5 doing a lot of the right things in this situation.

6
7 Chair Plantan stated that she agrees that the applicant has done a beautiful job with the design of
8 the home and are looking to the future and planning for aging in place. She stated that she thinks
9 the quality of materials and design will fit nicely into the City. She stated that she is also a bit
10 uncomfortable about the amount of impervious surface but loves the application.

11
12 There being no further discussion, Chair Plantan asked for a motion on the application.

13
14 Commissioner Parkhill made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to direct staff to
15 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings
16 reflecting a recommending approval for 225 Manitoba Avenue South impervious surface variance
17 for the 47.4% mitigated down to 38.9%, with the opportunity to mitigate further with the
18 underground stormwater filtration system, and the rear yard setback variance from five feet to 1.5
19 feet for review and adoption at the next Planning Commission meeting.

20
21 Interim Development Director Zweber completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion
22 carried unanimously.

23
24 **c) Development Application for a Lakeshore Setback Variance at 578 Harrington**
25 **Road**

26
27 Assistant Planner, Nick Kieser, stated that the applicant, Murphy and Co. Design and
28 property owner Lookout Point, LLC have submitted a development application requesting
29 approval of a variance from the shoreland setback for the redevelopment and construction
30 of a home at 578 Harrington Road. He reviewed the current zoning and the 2040
31 Comprehensive Plan land use designation. He noted the location of this lot is out on a
32 point along the shoreline of the lake, between the two bays, which will factor into the
33 discussion. He stated that a past development application was approved for an impervious
34 surface variance, a shoreland setback variance, as well as a CUP for the chimney height.
35 He noted that the current application does not require new approvals for a CUP or an
36 impervious surface variance, but does require a change to the shoreland setback variance.
37 He stated that the house style and architecture remain the same as the previous application.
38 He gave an overview of the proposal to take down the existing home and build a new one,
39 but noted that the guest house on the north end of the property will remain intact. He
40 reviewed the proposed site plan details. He explained that just as the applicant was
41 planning to pursue a building permit, they found in the property records that there is a “no
42 build” clause on a portion of the property in the area around the existing guest house, which
43 is why the configuration has been changed to keep the existing driveway intact and push
44 the home further south into the lakeshore setback. He reviewed the lakeshore setback
45 details and explained the request for a ur.2 feet setback for the home and the limits related
46 to the no build clause. He stated that the practical difficulties presented are the same as

1 previously: shape of the lot; location of the property on the point; driveway easement on
2 the property; but also the no build area. He showed a rendering that depicted the proposed
3 house versus the existing house which is very similar, just a bit closer to the lakeshore. He
4 stated that the applicant and owner are present on the conference call if the Commission
5 has questions for them.
6

7 Chair Plantan asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff.
8

9 Commissioner Bashioum asked if staff has received any paperwork regarding title work being
10 done prior to the applicant purchasing the property. She stated that to her, it would seem quite
11 logical to have title work completed before a property is purchased.
12

13 Planner Kieser stated that staff does not receive any of the title or deed paperwork when a property
14 changes hands. He stated that when there will be a building permit, there is sometimes additional
15 research that needs to be put into the application. He stated that the no build area was not
16 discovered before because there have not been any plans to build in that area.
17

18 Interim Community Development Director Zweber suggested that the applicant may be able to
19 better address the process and how the encumbrance was discovered.
20

21 Commissioner Bashioum stated that she would appreciate knowing why the encumbrance was not
22 discovered earlier.
23

24 Commissioner Iverson asked if no build clauses were very common.
25

26 Planner Kieser stated that he has never seen one before nor has he heard of one.
27

28 Commissioner Iverson stated that it would be interesting if the applicant could provide some
29 explanation of why the clause was applied to the property.
30

31 Chair Plantan asked the applicant to speak to the Commission.
32

33 Applicant's representative, T.J. Majdecki 811 Glenwood Ave Suite 250 Minneapolis, MN 55405,
34 from Murphy and Co. Design stated that he cannot speak to what happened with the previous
35 property owners and the property to the north that predicated the no build clause. He stated that
36 its discovery was a surprise to everyone involved in the project. He noted that it was not discovered
37 in the usual title work process and was buried in the records of the Hennepin County website. He
38 stated that they found that the two previous owners spent a sum of \$1 to dedicate this no build
39 clause, but no reason was given.
40

41 Matthew Hemsley, 578 Harrington Road, the principal of the property owner, stated that this is a
42 complicated piece of property. He stated that that the title company would not provide title
43 insurance when they made the purchase because they could not reach a comfort level that they
44 could find everything that was sitting on the property. He stated that they did as much work as
45 they could to look into the paperwork and noted that, to Planner Kieser's point, nobody has really

1 seen a no build clause like this nor was there any logical reason to think it may exist. He stated
2 that he would describe it as a curve ball.

3
4 The representative for Murphy and Co. Design stated that the no build clause and the driveway
5 easement basically pinched the house location into the proposed location. He stated that the
6 existing house location makes the most sense for this site.

7
8 Commissioner Merriam stated that it appears as though the house could be moved about five feet
9 north to reduce the amount of variance being requested and asked why the applicant didn't choose
10 to do that.

11
12 The representative for Murphy and Co. Design stated that there is really only about two feet to the
13 north where they could fit the house. He stated that the legal easement for the driveway approach
14 does not match the existing conditions on the site. He stated that if the owner of the property to
15 the north ever enforced the actual easement, it would push the driveway further south so they want
16 to protect the house from being near that easement.

17
18 Commissioner Merriam stated that there is a pretty steep slope and asked how the slope will be
19 treated and whether it will be planted.

20
21 The Murphy and Co. Design representative stated that most of the slope will be left as it is and
22 they are not planning to do any grading. He explained that they do have a landscape plan with that
23 will take hard cover away and reiterated that there is not plan to change the grading of the slope.

24
25 There being no further questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Plantan opened the
26 public hearing on the application at 9:15 pm.

27
28 Chair Plantan noted that those wishing to speak during these portions of the meeting may call 1-
29 (312) 626-6799, enter the Zoom meeting ID 961 7133 1425, and press *9 to speak.

30
31 Interim Development Director Zweber stated there were no people that called in to the meeting or
32 that have asked to speak at the public hearing.

33
34 There being no one wishing to comment on the application, Chair Plantan closed the public hearing
35 at 9:16 pm.

36
37 Chair Plantan asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

38
39 Commissioner Bashioum stated that in her opinion, this doesn't meet the criteria for meeting
40 practical difficulty. She stated that she would think the person purchasing the property would
41 think long and hard about buying the property if the title company refused to issue title insurance.
42 She stated that the applicant is the cause of his own difficulty by not searching all the records and
43 seeking more information about the property prior to purchasing it. She stated that it is an unusual
44 situation with the no build, but she is having difficulty finding that this meets the criteria to grant
45 the variance.

46

1 Commissioner Parkhill stated that he understands Commissioner Bashioum's concerns but would
2 hate to render this beautiful lot as unbuildable. He stated that it looks like it will be a beautiful
3 house and stated that he believes it will be far enough up the hill and back to not create an issue.
4 He stated that it is also located on the point which also makes it very difficult to build on. He
5 stated that he supports the variance request.

6
7 Commissioner Douglas stated that her understanding is that Mr. Hemsley already owns the
8 property.

9
10 Mr. Hemsley stated that he has owned this property for about two years.

11
12 Commissioner Douglas stated that she didn't realize that the new plan is basically in the same
13 place as the current home and noted that she could support this request.

14
15 Commissioner Iverson stated that she would be really interested in knowing how the no build
16 clause came about for \$1. She stated that she is sure there is a good story to be told as to why this
17 was done. She stated that she likes the plans and will support the variance request.

18
19 Chair Plantan asked how close the new location is to the lake compared to the proposed new home.

20
21 The Murphy and Co. Design representative stated that the new home is at the same location as the
22 existing home.

23
24 Planner Kieser confirmed that it is in the same location, but noted it may be shifted a few inches
25 in either direction, but is essentially in the same location.

26
27 Commissioner Merriam stated that she understands Commissioner Bashioum's concerns but likes
28 that they are keeping the impervious surface down below 20% which is a positive change from the
29 original application and that they are keeping the home location in the same spot. She stated that
30 she can recommend approval.

31
32 Commissioner Flannigan stated that another reason to support this is to not impede the view of
33 their neighbors and doesn't see anything in the plans that will infringe on either properties in the
34 area. He stated that a lot of time has been spent on this and feels there are practical difficulties.
35 He noted that none of the professionals involved, including the Commission and staff have seen
36 something like the no build clause before. He stated that he will support this application.

37
38 Commissioner Merriam stated that looking at the criteria listed in the staff report she does believe
39 it is reasonable and due to the circumstances that are unique to the property, and does not alter the
40 essential character of the locality.

41
42 Commissioner Bashioum stated that she is a little unclear as to the variance request because the
43 house is in the same location, and asked if the variance was just for either end of the home.

44
45 Planner Kieser stated that the City does variance requests from the point of the house that is closest
46 to the lakeshore which is used as the setback marker.

1
2 There being no further discussion, Chair Plantan asked for a motion on the application.

3
4 Commissioner Parkhill made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flannigan, to direct staff to
5 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings
6 reflecting a recommending of approval for the development application for the lakeshore setback
7 variance at 578 Harrington Road for review and adoption at the next Planning Commission
8 meeting.

9
10 Interim Development Director Zweber completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion
11 carried unanimously.

12
13 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Other Items:**

14
15 **a) Review of Development Activities**

16
17 Planner Kieser stated that there are no new development applications scheduled for the next
18 meeting agenda. He stated that they will work with 128 Broadway on their plans. He stated that
19 there is a Council workshop coming up to discuss the zoning changes presented by staff and the
20 Commission. He noted that Community Development Director Goellner should be coming back
21 shortly after the next meeting.

22
23 Interim Development Director Zweber stated that at the next City Council meeting, they will look
24 at revising the schedule since Night to Unite will not be occurring. He stated that he believes it is
25 Commissioner Bashioum's responsibility for attendance at that meeting, so it if passes, the meeting
26 will be returned to Tuesday, August 4.

27
28 Commissioner Bashioum stated that she did not think she was on deck for that meeting.

29
30 Commissioner Parkhill noted that he is on deck for the July 7, 2020 Council meeting.

31
32 Planner Kieser noted that Chair Plantan is scheduled for the July 21, 2020 Council meeting.

33
34 Interim Development Director Zweber reiterated that the meeting he is referring to is currently on
35 the calendar for Wednesday, August 5, but he expects it to be changed back to Tuesday, August 4
36 and Commissioner Bashioum is listed as the Planning Commission member to be in attendance.

37
38 **b) Planning Commissioner Report for the June 16, 2020 City Council Meeting**

39
40 Commissioner Iverson stated that she was only able to attend a portion of the meeting and noted
41 that there was not much on the agenda. She asked staff to fill the Commission in on any pertinent
42 information from that meeting.

43
44 Interim Development Director Zweber gave a brief overview of the discussion at the June 16, 200
45 City Council meeting as reflected in the minutes.

46

1 **c) Planning Commissioner Liaison from the July 7, 2020 City Council Meeting**

2
3 It was noted that Commissioner Parkhill will be the liaison for the July 7, 2020 City Council
4 meeting.

5
6 Chair Plantan encouraged the Commissioners to read through the minutes of the Planning
7 Commission meetings to make sure that their voice and comments are accurately reflected because
8 sometimes it can be difficult during the Zoom meetings to make sure they are being heard.

9
10 **AGENDA ITEM 8. Adjournment.**

11
12 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Plantan asked for a motion to adjourn.

13
14 Commissioner Merriam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to adjourn the
15 Planning Commission meeting.

16
17 Interim Development Director Zweber completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion
18 carried unanimously.

19
20 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

21
22 Respectfully submitted,
23 Kayla Atkins Rokosz
24 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*