

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
CITY OF RAMSEY  
ANOKA COUNTY  
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, October 12, 2017, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present:                   Chairperson Randy Bauer  
  Commissioner Bruce Anderson  
  Commissioner Ralph Brauer  
  Commissioner Cheri Gengler  
  Commissioner Cindy Nosan  
  Commissioner Patrick Surma  
  Commissioner Gary VanScoy

Members Absent:                   None

Also Present:                       Community Development Director Timothy Gladhill  
  City Planner Chris Anderson  
  Assistant City Admin/Economic Development Manager Pat Brama  
  Planning Intern Henderson

**1.       CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Bauer called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2.       CITIZEN INPUT**

None.

**3.       APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, VanScoy, Brauer, Gengler, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

**4.       APPROVE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**4.01: Approve the Following Planning Commission Minutes:**

**4.01.1: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes Dated September 7, 2017**

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to approve the following minutes as presented: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated September 7, 2017.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

## **5. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS**

### **5.01: Public Hearing: Consider Request for a Variance to Construct a Detached Accessory Building Nearer the Front Property Line than the Home at 7155 160<sup>th</sup> Lane NW (Project No. 17-146); Case of Francis and Lorrie Kaas.**

#### **Public Hearing**

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:01 p.m.

#### **Presentation**

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating over the past few months, City Staff has been working with Francis and Lorrie Kaas regarding the possible location for a new, detached accessory building on the property located at 7155 160<sup>th</sup> Lane NW. Locations in the rear and side yards were considered but ultimately, the Applicant selected a location in front of the home on the Subject Property. Staff provided further comment on the request and recommended approval of the variance. It was noted the applicant had brought forward a sheet with signatures from their neighbors in support of the request.

#### **Citizen Input**

Francis Kaas, 7155 160<sup>th</sup> Lane NW, thanked staff for providing a thorough report on his request.

Chairperson Bauer questioned if any of the neighbors did not offer support to the variance request.

Mr. Kaas explained only two neighbors were unable to be reached for a signature.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Surma, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:08 p.m.

## **Commission Business**

Commissioner Anderson stated he drove by the property and believed the new garage would not be visible from the street as the property was heavily wooded.

Commissioner Brauer believed it made sense to combine recitals #4 and #5.

Chairperson Bauer supported this recommendation.

Commissioner Brauer suggested the following language be added to the findings: The proposed use is due to the following circumstances that are unique to the property, and were not caused by the owner.

The Commission supported the addition of this finding.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, adopt Resolution #17-10-249 granting a variance to construct a detached accessory building nearer the front lot line than the home on the property located at 7155 160th Lane NW, as amended.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

### **5.02: Public Hearing: Consider a Request for a Conditional Use Permit to Exceed Sign Size Restrictions on the Property located at 7435 Highway 10 (Project No. 17-148); Case of Anoka-Ramsey Farm & Garden.**

## **Public Hearing**

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:14 p.m.

## **Presentation**

Planning Intern Henderson presented the staff report stating the City has received an application from Tom Tidrick on behalf of Anoka-Ramsey Farm & Garden requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to exceed sign size restrictions for a ground sign on the parcel located at 7435 Highway 10. The Applicant applied for a sign permit to add an LED dynamic sign panel to the existing ground sign. Since this sign does not meet the City's definition of a temporary sign and exceeds maximum size for a permanent sign in the H-1 Highway 10 Business District, Staff finds that processing a Conditional Use Permit ensures equitable enforcement of sign regulations for parcels located in the H-1 District and removes any uncertainty on how this sign should be classified. Staff provided further comment on the request and recommended approval of the CUP.

## **Citizen Input**

Chairperson Bauer requested staff review photographs of the current and proposed signs. He asked if staff had received any complaints regarding the current sign.

Planning Intern Henderson provided the Commission with pictures of the signs and noted staff had not received any complaints.

Tom Tidrick, Anoka Ramsey Farm & Garden, 7435 Highway 10, thanked the Commission for their consideration.

Commissioner Surma believed that Tom and Tony Tidrick had been respectful business owners in the community and he supported their request.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Surma, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:22 p.m.

## **Commission Business**

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-10-245 approving the request for a conditional use permit to exceed sign size restrictions established in City Code for Anoka-Ramsey Farm & Garden.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Commissioner VanScoy requested the Commission review sign size restrictions at an upcoming meeting.

**5.03: Public Hearing: Consider Conditional Zoning Amendment to Planned Unit Development for proposed Plat known as Northfork Meadows located near Puma Street and Alpine Drive; Case of Paxmar (Project No. 17-126).**

## **Public Hearing**

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:24 p.m.

## **Presentation**

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to consider a recommendation on a Zoning Amendment for R-1 Residential (MUSA) to Planned Unit Development. The Planning Commission has reviewed this project on multiple occasions. The current proposal has been modified by the Developer in order to address comments received by the Public, Planning Commission, and City Council. Key issues at that time included, but were not limited to the following.

1. Density Transitioning
2. Reliability/Consistency of the Comprehensive Plan

Community Development Director Gladhill explained the original concept has undergone Sketch Plan Review with the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission outlined a number of concerns indicated in the attached minutes from June 13. The City then held a public workshop on August 3, 2017. A follow up workshop was scheduled to be held on Thursday, October 12.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported the original proposal was classified as a medium density residential development (4-7 units per acre). This area is guided as low density residential (2-4 units per acre) in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The original proposal would have required a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and a Zoning Amendment. There were subsequent revised concepts prepared and reviewed.

Community Development Director Gladhill indicated the current proposal has been modified in an attempt to remain in the low density residential category. This is the fifth revised concept prepared by the Developer. The gross density is 3.69 units per acre. However, the City (and Metropolitan Council) calculate Net Density, which would subtract wetlands from the net buildable area. Staff has requested this calculation, as the net density appears to be close to the maximum density allowed within the low density residential classification. Finally, the proposal still requires a Zoning Amendment to Planned Unit Development (PUD). While the density of the current concept is within the range of the Comprehensive Plan (planning/visionary document), the actual proposed lot sizes and lot widths are deficient of the minimums required by the Zoning Code (official controls/implementation tool) for the R-1 Residential (MUSA) District. Said Zoning District does allow density up to four (4) units per acre with the use of a PUD.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported the City has significant discretion in review of this project. Since the project requires a Zoning Amendment, the City is not obligated to approve and the Developer must demonstrate a compelling reason to approve the change. This results in a higher standard of review compared to projects that meet all minimum standards of their respective zoning district. Finally, since the concept has changed significantly from the original proposal when the current set of public comments were received, Staff has removed these comments from the agenda packet and is re-setting the public hearing and public comment period.

## **Citizen Input**

Chairperson Bauer commended the neighbors and developer for working together on this proposal.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the greenway could be marked on the site plan.

Community Development Director Gladhill reviewed the location of greenway on the site plan with the Commission noting it would continue to the south and east. Further discussion ensued regarding the trail within the proposed project and surrounding area. It was noted no dead-end trail segments would be created.

Commissioner Brauer questioned how many lots could be within this development if the developer followed the R-1 zoning requirements.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated this would be approximately 70 lots.

Commissioner Surma inquired if the proposed project layout was more acceptable to the adjacent homeowners than was previously discussed.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented he did not want to speak for the adjacent homeowners. He encouraged the Commission to take comments from the public. He stated it was his understanding that the neighbors have reached a compromise with the developer.

Commissioner Surma asked if the developer supported the 70 lot concept.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported the developer did not support this design.

Allen Roessler, Paxmar, thanked staff for the thorough presentation. He reviewed the steps that he had gone through to date and commented on how the project plans have changed from 150 units down to 97. He believed the trail corridor and landscape buffer was addressing the neighbors' concerns. He explained that if the project were only 70 units within the development, he would not be pursuing the project as it was not economically feasible.

Commissioner VanScoy requested further information regarding the landscaping buffer.

Mr. Roessler commented on the proposed landscaping berm and noted the property owner was proposing to donate the greenway to the City.

Commissioner Nosan asked if the properties on the north side would have a transition space.

Mr. Roessler explained the road would provide a natural buffer and no additional plantings were being proposed.

Commissioner Nosan stated she would like to see a row of trees along this roadway.

Val Kruger, 15210 Kangaroo Street, thanked the Commission for raising interesting questions. She commented on the process this development has taken and was pleased to learn that the City had a choice in the matter. She was pleased the neighbors would not have to compromise given the fact the property was zoned R-1. She fully supported the proposed development having 80-foot lots.

Leslie Clark, 15150 Kangaroo Street, stated she would prefer 80-foot lots. She stated she was willing to compromise with slightly smaller lots, but she wanted to see the greenway remain in place.

Michael Altimari, Hagman Holding (landowner), thanked staff for their work on this project. He stated he appreciated the collaboration efforts between the City, the developer and the neighbors. He explained the developer has made it clear this project would not work with only 70 lots. He reported he was willing to donate the greenway space to the City in order for the parkway to be completed. He encouraged the City to continue to work with the developer in order to reach a compromise for this property.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Surma, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:06 p.m.

### **Commission Business**

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to recommend that City Council approve the Conditional Zoning Amendment to Planned Unit Development, conditioned upon substantial compliance with the Sketch Plan dated September 18, 2017.

### **Further discussion**

Commissioner Brauer stated he was a person of principle and noted he was a first generation American. He explained his grandfather put together a coalition that opposed Hitler and was sentenced to death in 1933. He was told that was the best he could get. He expressed frustration that all he has heard from the developer were financial concerns and noted the Comprehensive Plan has never been changed in the past for this reason. He believed that this development was not the best it could be. He reported he has been on the Planning Commission for the past 16 years and he has made a promise that this property would remain R-1.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained the City does not have to amend the Comprehensive Plan for this development, however, a Zoning Amendment was required.

Commissioner Brauer thanked staff for their hard work on this development.

Commissioner VanScoy understood that a PUD was needed for this development and noted the greenway portion of the project would greatly benefit the City. However, believed the proposed transition was still inadequate. He recommended more be done for this portion of the project.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, Gengler, Nosan, Surma, and VanScoy. Voting No: Brauer. Absent: None.

## **6. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

### **6.01: Consider Multiple Actions Related to a Request to Install and Maintain a Ground-Mounted Solar Energy System on the Property Legally Described as Lot 3, Block 1 River Crossing Addition (Project No. 17-135); Case of Connexus Energy.**

- 1. Appeal for issuance of a Development Permit on an officially mapped parcel.**
- 2. Zoning Amendment to include Solar Energy Systems as a Principal Use with the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit in the Public/Quasi-Public District.**
- 3. Zoning Amendment to rezone a property from R-2 Residential to Public/Quasi Public.**
- 4. Conditional Use Permit to install and maintain a Solar Energy System.**

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to remove this item from the table.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

### **Presentation**

City Planner Anderson presented the Staff Report stating this case was originally reviewed by the Planning Commission at their September 7, 2017 meeting. A Public Hearing was held (and closed) that evening; however, the Planning Commission tabled action so that the Economic Development Authority (EDA) had an opportunity to review and provide feedback specifically on the potential use of the Connexus Energy campus for the proposed solar farm installation.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama reported the EDA reviewed this case at their September 14, 2017 meeting. Note that their review was specific to the potential use of the outlot owned by Connexus Energy that is part of Connexus' corporate campus. The outlot is essentially rectangular in shape and is approximately 17.5 acres in size. The EDA unanimously supported reserving this land for future economic growth opportunities (commercial/industrial development) rather than for the solar farm being considered. The EDA did not provide any input or feedback on the Anoka County-owned site that is currently being considered for the solar farm. Their motion specifically recommended to City Council that the existing Connexus Energy outlot be reserved for future commercial/industrial use rather than for a solar farm. Staff reported the Environmental Policy Board recommended approval of the Zoning

Amendments and Conditional Use Permit. City Staff also supports the recommended approvals as well as the appeal for the issuance of a development permit within an officially mapped area.

### **Commission Business**

Chairperson Bauer asked if this site were to not move forward if a solar farm would be located in another community.

Brian Burandt, Connexus Energy, explained the membership wanted more renewable energy within the cooperative. He explained three solar sites were being sought for Anoka County. He reported Connexus was pursuing Federal grant dollars for these solar farms that would sunset in 2019. He indicated the original vision was to place the solar farm on Connexus property.

Chairperson Bauer questioned if the solar farm energy would be used by Ramsey residents.

Mr. Burandt reported this was the case. He stated all energy gathered within a Ramsey solar farm would benefit and be used by Ramsey residents.

Commissioner VanScoy asked why Connexus decided to go elsewhere when they originally wanted to place the solar farm on their own property.

Mr. Burandt commented the EDA recommended the corner property and he was looking for a showcase parcel given the size and scale of this solar panel/solar collection project. He explained the Anoka County parcel would fit the needs of Connexus Energy.

Commissioner VanScoy inquired if the solar panels would create any glare.

Andrew Dallin, SilCore Energy, described the panels that would be used by Connexus Energy and noted they were covered with an anti-reflective coating meant to absorb as much sunlight as possible. He indicated there were several different technologies that used mirrors and this would not be used in Ramsey. He stated airports around the country were installing similar systems. He provided further comment on the initial glare study and the findings within this report.

Commissioner VanScoy expressed concern that the property surrounding the proposed solar farm was zoned R-2. He questioned how the solar farm would impact future development of the surrounding land.

Mr. Dallin reported the future homeowners would be going into their purchase with full knowledge of the solar farm. He reiterated that the glare study showed there would be no impacts on the surrounding properties, except from one receptor.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if Connexus would consider installing some sort of transitional space between the solar farm and the R-2 zoned properties.

Mr. Dallin deferred this question to Connexus Energy.

City Planner Anderson explained at the south side of the solar farm a double row of eight to ten-foot evergreen trees were in place along the property line. This would provide a buffer or transitional space. He stated it was his understanding the solar panels would not extend fully to the south property line.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented that additional plantings could be required, however staff believed the existing trees currently in place were adequate.

Mr. Burandt reported he could plant additional trees if required by the City.

Commissioner VanScoy explained he supported the solar farm concept, however, he wanted to be assured the solar farm was buffered from the surrounding properties.

Commissioner Brauer asked how Connexus would work to eliminate the potential glare that was discussed within the study that could occur three days out of the year.

Mr. Dallin stated any visual barrier (trees) would prevent the glare from occurring.

Commissioner Brauer questioned if trees could be planted around the solar farm or if this would hinder solar power collection.

Mr. Dallin explained how the trees would have to be planted around the solar farm in order to maximize solar power collection.

Commissioner Brauer supported the project having a natural prairie area surrounding the solar farm.

Mr. Burandt commented that all solar farms would have a pollinator friendly prairie area surrounding the project area.

Commissioner Gengler requested further information regarding the longevity of the solar panels and when potential development would occur in this area of the City.

Mr. Burandt reported the solar panels would have a life expectancy of 25 years. He explained Connexus would have a 20-year land lease with Anoka County with two five-year options.

Community Development Director Gladhill anticipated development would not occur in this portion of the City for another 10 to 15 years.

Rob Davis, Director of Center for Pollinators, reviewed a photograph with the Commission and commented on the proposed pollinator friendly solar garden.

Dave Nathe, 14453 Llama Street, explained he farmed vegetables in Ramsey. He explained he had his own bees to assist with his crops. He asked if anyone in Ramsey wanted to live adjacent

to a solar farm. He believed that living next to a solar farm would not be most people's choice. He stated he did not want to have a solar farm located adjacent to his farm. He feared his property value would decrease if a solar farm were to locate adjunct to his property.

Jeff Pengra, 8390 Highway 10, expressed concern with how the value of his property would be impacted if a solar farm were to locate within the River Crossing Addition. He questioned what would happen to the equipment after 25 years.

Mr. Burandt explained after 25 years all of the equipment would be removed, recycled and the property would be returned to its original state.

Jeff Nobbe, Shorewood RV, 8390 Highway 10, stated he liked the renewable component of this project and understood energy was an important thing. However, he suggested the solar farm be located on a Connexus property versus a parcel that wasn't zoned properly. He understood that Connexus had a shovel ready parcel available for a solar farm and recommended this be pursued.

Assistant City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Brama explained that the EDA recommends that the Connexus parcel be reserved for economic development purposes, but did not review the Subject Property.

Mr. Burandt commented Connexus Energy would like to pursue solar on another parcel, which was why the Anoka County site was proposed.

Mr. Nobbe questioned if the new solar farm would create new jobs.

Cara Bolton, Bolton Bees, explained the solar farm would create jobs for local beekeepers. She provided further comment on the importance of bees to the nation's agriculture. She believed the proposed prairie area was beautiful and would help farmers. She encouraged the Commissioner to offer their support for the proposed solar energy system.

Commissioner Brauer asked if the City would oppose another solar farm on the Connexus campus.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained this would be determined by the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Chairperson Bauer commented that it was City staff's idea to move the solar farm off the Connexus property and moved the project in a new direction.

Mr. Nobbe encouraged the City to stick with its original plan for the solar farm and recommend it be installed on the Connexus property.

Colleen Hollanger, Prairie Restoration, discussed with the Commission how the prairie land would be installed and cared for by her employees.

Travis Bolton, Bolton Bees, stated he was a farmer and beekeeper. He described how bees were struggling throughout the country due to pesticides and poor habitat. He explained that newly installed solar farms were creating healthy bee habitats. He thanked Connexus Energy for the positive impact they were having on the environment.

Commissioner Gengler asked what the output would be from the proposed solar farm.

Mr. Burandt explained the annual output from the proposed solar farm could power 620 homes in Ramsey each year.

Further discussion ensued regarding the complexity of the request, along with the items that need to be approved by the Commission.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinances #17-13 and #17-14 to rezone the Subject Property to Public/Quasi-Public and to amend Section 177-122 (Public/Quasi-Public) to identify solar energy systems as a principal use with the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.

### **Further discussion**

Commissioner Brauer expressed frustration with the way this item was brought to the City as it appeared to be a done deal. For this reason, he was not going to offer his support to the Ordinances.

Commissioner VanScoy withdrew his motion.

Community Development Director Gladhill asked if there was general consensus among the Commission regarding the request. By a show of hands three members supported the request, three members did not support the request, and one member was abstaining.

Chairperson Bauer questioned what would happen if the Planning Commission did not offer their support for the request.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented on the recommendations before the Planning Commission and explained if the rezoning was not approved by the Commission all other requests would be denied. He reported the item would still advance to the City Council, with a recommendation for denial. He explained Connexus could appeal the denial for the variance.

Commissioner Nosan stated she supported the solar farm, but had a hard time understanding why the solar farm was not being placed in an industrial area. She was bothered by the fact the solar farm was proposed for a residential area. For this reason, she did not know if she could support the request.

Commissioner Surma indicated he could not support the solar farm at the proposed location and believed the solar farm should be placed on Connexus property.

Motion by Commissioner Surma, seconded by Commissioner Brauer, to recommend that City Council deny Ordinances #17-13 and #17-14 to rezone the Subject Property to Public/Quasi-Public and to amend Section 177-122 (Public/Quasi-Public) to identify solar energy systems as a principal use with the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.

### **Further discussion**

Commissioner VanScoy stated he too struggled with this request. He wanted to see a solar farm in Ramsey, however, he did not believe it was proper to place this in the middle of a residential area. He explained this request became an issue when the request changed from being on Connexus property.

Commissioner Brauer commented the EDA was making policy for the Planning Commission, and this was the issue.

Commissioner VanScoy believed the most appropriate place for the solar farm was on Connexus property. He had concerns with what happened and how this request was handled by the City. While he did not want to support the solar farm in a residential area, he felt as if the Planning Commission had been backed into a corner. For this reason, he stated he could support the solar farm. He understood this was a good project for the community and the environment.

Commissioner Anderson agreed the Planning Commission had been backed into a corner, by no actions of their own. He explained he did not want the solar farm to go away. However, he too struggled with how the request was brought to the Commission.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Commissioners Surma, and Brauer. Voting No: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, Gengler, Nosan and VanScoy. Absent: None.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that City Council approve Ordinances #17-13 and #17-14 to rezone the Subject Property to Public/Quasi-Public and to amend Section 177-122 (Public/Quasi-Public) to identify solar energy systems as a principal use with the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Gengler, Anderson, and Nosan. Voting No: Brauer and Surma. Absent: None.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to adopt Resolution #17-09-211 approving an appeal for issuance of a development permit for the Subject Property for the installation of a solar energy system.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Gengler, Anderson, and Nosan. Voting No: Brauer and Surma. Absent: None.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-09-212 granting a Conditional Use Permit for the installation and

maintenance of solar energy system on the Subject Property contingent to review and approval as to legal form by the City Attorney.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Gengler, Anderson, and Nosan. Voting No: Brauer and Surma. Absent: None.

**7. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE ITEMS**

**7.01: Receive Update on The COR Interim Development Plan.**

Community Development Director Gladhill provided the Commission with an update on The COR Interim Development Plan.

**8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT**

**8.01: Receive Staff Update**

The Staff Update was noted.

**8.02: Zoning Bulletins**

Zoning Bulletins were noted.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, VanScoy, Brauer, Gengler, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: None.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Tim Gladhill  
Community Development Director

ATTEST:

---

JoAnn Shaw  
Community Development Assistant

Drafted by Heidi Guenther  
*TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

DRAFT