

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, September 29 2022, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present:                   Chairperson Randy Bauer  
  Commissioner Bruce Anderson  
  Commissioner Cheri Gengler  
  Commissioner Tom Hunt  
  Commissioner Gary VanScoy  
  Commissioner Brian Walker

Members Absent:                   Commissioner Eric Peters

Also Present:                       Planning Manager Todd Larson  
  City Planner Brian McCann  
  Senior Planner Chris Anderson  
  Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Craig Swalchick  
  City Council Liaison Debra Musgrove

**1.     CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2.     PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairperson Bauer led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3.     CITIZEN INPUT**

None.

**4.     APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, Gengler, Hunt, VanScoy, and Walker. Voting No: None. Absent: Commissioner Peters.

**5.     CONSENT AGENDA**

**5.01: Approve the August 25, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**

**5.02: Continue the Public Hearing for the Tom Dehn Subdivision Proposal to the October Planning Commission Meeting**

Commissioner Walker asked if it would be helpful to have input from the Commission on Item 5.02 rather than simply delaying it to the next meeting. He noted that perhaps if the Commission had consensus that it was not interested, it could save the applicant time and money developing the remainder of the plans.

Chairperson Bauer commented that all of the information has not yet been received and therefore staff is recommending that the item be tabled to the next meeting.

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Anderson, Gengler, and Hunt. Voting No: Commissioner Walker. Absent: Commissioner Peters.

**6. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS**

**6.01: Public Hearing: Consider a Code Amendment Pertaining to Mobile Food Units (Food Trucks)**

**Public Hearing**

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:04 p.m.

**Presentation**

Planning Manager Larson presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approval of the ordinance pertaining to mobile food units.

Chairperson Bauer asked for clarifications on what would qualify and what would not. He used the example of a church that uses food trucks for fundraising events.

Planning Manager Larson replied that the this would not change that scenario because that church is located in a business district. He noted that the food truck could use a special event permit for a fundraising event or if the truck were going to setup once a week for the general public, it would need the new mobile food truck license.

Commissioner VanScoy used the scenario that a church wants to have a food truck but is located in a residential area.

Planning Manager Larson replied that the church could still use a special event permit to cover the use of a food truck for an event. He noted that if the church were considering lease of a portion of the parking lot to a food truck, that scenario would not be covered under the proposed ordinance.

He noted that the Commission could make the recommendation to allow institutional uses in residential districts.

Commissioner Anderson stated that there is a food truck at Do All Printing and asked how this would affect that business. He asked if that business would be required to pack up and leave each night.

Planning Manager Larson confirmed that food truck would need to leave each night. He stated that the business owner is actually in the process of creating a permanent restaurant space in the multi-tenant building across the street.

Commissioner Gengler referenced the distance of 100 feet from a business and asked if that is done on a daily basis or whether that would have to be requested at the time of application.

Planning Manager Larson replied that the 100-foot distance would apply from a restaurant and not simply a business. He used the example of a restaurant that is closed on Mondays and therefore approves a food truck to be within 100 feet on Mondays. He noted that there would be flexibility in the approval that is provided. The restaurant could provide approval for one day or each Monday for a set period of time.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the vendor would be responsible for that action and whether the City would receive a copy of that approval from the restaurant.

Planning Manager Larson replied that the vendor would handle that privately with the restaurant. He noted that if there were a complaint, staff would go check and the vendor would have that written agreement to show staff.

### **Citizen Input**

No comments.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Hunt, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, Hunt, Gengler, VanScoy, and Walker. Voting No: None. Absent: Commissioner Peters.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:18 p.m.

### **Commission Business**

Commissioner Gengler recognized that the City would be providing the license and asked if Anoka County would be ensuring that the proper health requirements are met.

Planning Manager Larson confirmed that to be true. He stated that the Anoka County license must be shown in order to qualify for the City license. He stated that if the Anoka County license is revoked, the City license would be revoked as well.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Hunt, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #22-25 modifying City Code Pertaining to Mobile Food Units with the additional allowance for a BBQ trailer.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Anderson, Hunt, Gengler, VanScoy, and Walker. Voting No: None. Absent: Commissioner Peters.

## **7. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

### **7.01: Conditional Use Permit for iDigital for a Digital Billboard at the Northwest Corner of Riverdale Drive and Traprock Street NW**

#### **Presentation**

Planning Manager Larson presented the Staff Report stating that staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit for a digital billboard.

#### **Commission Business**

Chairperson Bauer commented that there would be a maximum of three signs with a specified distance between. He asked where other signs could be located if a sign is placed in this location.

Planning Manager Larson replied that a sign could be located towards the west, but staff does not believe another sign could be located to the east.

Commissioner Hunt stated that in the last discussion it was close to two miles from the proposed location. He noted that if the sign were moved to the west by 500 feet, in the alternate location, would a sign then be allowed to the east.

Planning Manager Larson believed it would be more likely, but it could still fall 200 feet short of the required distance. He stated that an official measurement would need to be done to be certain.

Commissioner VanScoy asked for input on the discussions staff had with the landowner that had concerns at the previous meeting.

Planning Manager Larson replied that staff met with Mr. Kuker and while he is not thrilled, he believes that this would be the best location of the available choices.

Commissioner Hunt asked if there has been an update on the possibility of Scheels coming to the PSD site as mentioned at the previous meeting by Mr. Kuker.

Planning Manager Larson did not believe there has been another meeting with Scheels but noted that he did not want to comment too much on that matter as Mr. Kuker is not present tonight.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the property owner believes that this location would be better for his potential business development.

Planning Manager Larson replied that Mr. Kuker was concerned that a sign would block visibility to his development site. He stated that Mr. Kuker still was not happy with this location but believed it to be better than the alternative site.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the distance between signs of two miles. She asked if a variance could be allowed to permit another sign to the east, even if that two-mile distance is not met.

Planning Manager Larson confirmed that someone could request a variance, but a hardship would need to be proven.

Chairperson Bauer noted that one of the variance criteria is that the problem is not created by the landowner and in this instance, it would be the distance of 200 feet and placement of the City sign, therefore it would seem to be permissible. He recognized that the full Planning Commission did not support the ordinance, but it was passed by the City Council and therefore the decision should be based upon whether this request meets the criteria and not based on whether a member likes the concept of a billboard.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he finds that the City finding a small sliver of land to place a sign in front of another property owner to be inappropriate. He stated that the City would be impacting a landowner and their potential use.

Commissioner Gengler stated that whether the Commission is in agreement with the concept of a sign or not, it does meet the criteria of the ordinance.

Motion by Commissioner Gengler, seconded by Commissioner Hunt, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #22-193 Approving a Conditional Use Permit for a Digital Billboard at 7559 Riverdale Drive NW with the tan and red stone.

### **Further discussion**

Commissioner Walker stated that he has been opposed to this concept since it began. He noted that the City has changed the rules to allow the placement of a sign. He stated that at the last meeting there was a discussion based on the arbitrary distance of two miles between signs. He agreed that placing this sign in front of a property where the owner has been in discussion with a major retailer is a mistake and therefore, he will continue not to support this.

Motion Failed. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners Gengler, and Hunt. Voting No: Commissioners Anderson, VanScoy, and Walker. Absent: Commissioner Peters.

## **7.02: Discuss Eliminating Zoning Permits**

### **Presentation**

City Planner McCann presented the Staff Report stating that based upon discussion staff could prepare and present an ordinance at the regular meeting of the Planning Commission on October 27, 2022 for the removal of zoning permits from the Zoning Code.

### **Commission Business**

Commissioner VanScoy asked and received confirmation that a swimming pool over 5,000 gallons would continue to require a building permit.

City Planner McCann confirmed that there is a building permit for a swimming pool over 5,000 gallons. He noted that currently there is a zoning permit for pools under that threshold.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if there are still the same requirements for fencing and safety.

City Planner McCann noted that if a pool is under that size, it would be above ground. He noted that a pool is required to have a fence surrounding the property or pool.

Senior Planner Anderson noted that above ground pools with a sidewall of four feet or higher would be exempt from the fencing requirement as it would be equivalent of having a four-foot fence. He provided additional clarity on the definition of pool, which would equate to a 16-foot diameter for an above ground pool. He noted that if a pool does not meet those criteria, it would not be considered a pool.

Commissioner Anderson asked how this would impact the case that was considered the previous month by the City Council (shed and patio being placed on an easement). He stated that his concern would be without checking to ensure the homeowner is doing things correctly, how would the City ever know. He stated that without checking, people will place things where they want.

Planning Manager Larson replied that this would not change that, as the shed and patio were placed in areas they should not be. He stated that most residents completing a project will call City staff to ask for input and staff provides that information. He noted that this would simply eliminate the requirement for a person to put that plan on paper, staff to review that and provide the permit. He noted that in either instance staff does not follow up to ensure the plans are followed, so this simply eliminates the delay a resident experiences from waiting for a permit and the cost of \$25.

Commissioner Anderson stated that tells him there is a problem as there have been a number of cases where the resident has put things where they feel and does not follow the rules. He stated that somehow the City needs to check on that and therefore he has issue with changing things.

Commissioner Gengler stated that she is amenable to this change as it would place less burden on staff and would not really change the outcome. She referenced the comment made by staff that Fridley was considering going back to zoning permits and asked if there was any information provided by that community as to why.

City Planner McCann stated that he did not initially take in that input and that staff member is no longer with the City. He stated that he could reach out to Fridley as he was unsure if that community previously had zoning permits or was simply thinking about adding them.

Commissioner Gengler stated that she would be interested in that thought process.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if there could be information from other communities that have followed a similar process and what has been gained or lost. She noted that it seems most communities still retained permits for fencing and asked why that remained.

City Planner McCann commented that he cannot speak for other communities, but his assumption would be that fencing is a more common improvement and perhaps that is desired to be regulated through permits without inspections.

Commissioner Hunt asked if Ramsey has always had zoning permits.

Senior Planner Anderson replied that zoning permits were enacted in 2006 or 2007.

Commissioner Hunt asked why the zoning permits were enacted.

Senior Planner Anderson replied that staff was receiving complaints and staff believed that zoning permits could perhaps allow the City to get ahead of that issue rather than responding to complaints. He believed that requiring a survey to be completed for property improvements, with the use of handouts, would be the most beneficial way to prevent issues rather than the use of zoning permits. He stated that fencing tends to be placed right at property lines and he would not be surprised if other communities require a survey to be filed with their permit to ensure the fence is placed where it should be.

Commissioner Hunt stated that it would seem that the zoning permits were enacted in attempt to prevent the situation where people are not doing things correctly and staff is addressing an issue after the fact, but the permits did not seem to prevent that issue. He stated that no matter what path is followed, it seems there will still be after the fact issues.

Senior Planner Anderson replied that most residents want to do the right thing and do call staff to ask for input on what is required. He stated that in the heat of the summer when staff is burdened with zoning permits and building permits, a resident may need to wait two to three weeks for their shed permit because of the delay which may miss the window of time that the resident intended to build their shed.

Commissioner Walker stated that he understands the reasoning to remove the zoning permits, recognizing that the cost does not equate to the staff time. He asked if it would make sense to increase the cost of the permit to cover the staff time and inspection and make everything a building permit.

Planning Manager Larson stated that State law dictates what cities can issue a building permit for. He stated that a building permit cannot be required for accessory structures under 200 feet. He

noted that the people that are doing it right are going to call and follow the proper steps. He stated that the people doing it wrong are not calling the City, are not getting a permit, and are just doing what they want, which would continue to be addressed by code enforcement. He stated that those that want to do things right, will continue to do so but without the delay of waiting for a permit and without the additional burden on staff.

Commissioner Hunt stated that his original thoughts supported this concept as it would reduce the cost for residents and would reduce the time of staff in reviewing the zoning permits. He used the scenario that a resident submits plans for a shed that does not meet requirements and asked if staff provides feedback on how to meet the requirements. He noted that would seem to be a benefit for residents to receive that input.

Planning Manager Larson replied that staff is not in the design business. He stated that the handouts do provide input on what requires building permits. He stated that staff is reviewing whether certain requirements are met (proper setbacks, matching color to the home, etc.). He stated that the process is not as friendly as it would seem noting that most plans are submitted online.

Commissioner VanScoy referenced the zoning permit research, specific to pools, and noted that many communities seem to have permitting required for different sized pools. He stated that he is concerned with the potential safety issue. He believed there should be some type of inspection process for a pool.

Commissioner Gengler asked for clarification on the desired inspection, whether that would apply to in-ground pools or the above ground pools that can be purchased from Costco.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he would be interested on the requirements from other cities. He stated that he does support the direction recommended by staff with the exception of pools.

Commissioner Gengler agreed that this change would be better for residents and staff, as issues would continue to be addressed through code enforcement. She did support the comments of Commissioner VanScoy related to pools and additional research on that topic.

Commissioner Anderson believed that things should continue to go along this path. He stated that he would encourage the City to hire an inspector to ensure things are being built properly and in the right place.

Chairperson Bauer asked the time that would be needed if an inspector were sent out for each zoning permit.

City Planner McCann stated that he would not expect a large amount of time for each inspection but noted that would accumulate based on the number of zoning permits received.

Senior Planner Anderson stated that if drive time is included, that inspection would be 45 minutes to one hour.

Chairperson Bauer noted that the \$25 does not cover the staff review time and certainly would not cover the time of inspections.

Commissioner Walker stated that he supports the comments of Commissioner Anderson, as he would like to see inspections for fencing or shed to prevent those structures from being placed too close to the property line or on easements. He stated that he would want to see the City being proactive to correct those mistakes before they happen.

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Swalchick stated that his concern would be verification of the easement and property line. He noted that the only way to do that would be to find the post or have a license surveyor mark the property line. He stated that it is great to have the lines marked, but that is a large expense to have a licensed surveyor involved and the inspector would not know that line without that service. He stated that property owners can still move pins or lines prior to staff's arrival. He noted that last month he had a complaint from a neighbor where someone put a pool in their townhome garage. He stated that just having an inspector onsite would have more cost than just showing up.

Commissioner Walker agreed but asked what would be cheaper for a resident, to have the inspection or rip a fence out.

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Swalchick agreed that it would be cheaper in that scenario to have the survey completed.

Commissioner Walker stated that he would support requiring a survey to be completed for a fence.

Senior Planner Anderson asked if there would be a threshold for distance to a property line.

Commissioner Walker stated that if a fence is going to be within five feet of a property line, he would suggest the survey but recognized that without the survey it would also be difficult to know if a fence is within five feet.

Senior Planner Anderson noted that there are some properties that just want to fence around a garden area but agreed that most fences go out to the property boundaries.

Commissioner Walker stated that when he installed the fence for his horses, he used a surveyor because he did not want to have to move the fence once installed.

Commissioner Gengler asked how many zoning permits lead to code enforcement, recognizing that staff may not have that data tonight.

Planning Manager Larson replied that the solution for the problem in the past was the zoning permit but that has not been the solution. He stated that the solution proposed now, instead of the zoning permits, would be education that staff is a resource to determine where things can be located on properties. He stated that most of the time, people do it right. He noted that there are also people that do it right but then have to be chased down to have a permit and then staff feels bad

for punishing someone for doing something right to begin with. He noted that they would focus on education through the newsletter, website, social media, handouts, etc.

Chairperson Bauer asked if it would be appropriate for staff to take this to the City Council to gauge their temperature because the Planning Commission continues its discussion, as the Commission is just a recommending body. He noted then an ordinance could be drafted that fits the discussion of both the Commission and Council.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that does make sense. She referenced additional information that would be helpful related to sheds, the number of sheds, and the number that require code enforcement. She stated that she would guess that more have been done right, regardless of whether a permit was pulled, than those that required code enforcement.

Chairperson Bauer stated that it appears 23 percent of the zoning permits relate to sheds while swimming pools account for half. He confirmed the consensus of the Commission to bring this forward to the Council for input before bringing this back to the Planning Commission.

### **7.03: Overview of Abatement Regulations and Process**

#### **Presentation**

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Swalchick introduced himself and reviewed his background and experience. He presented the Staff Report and requested feedback on the Code amendment. Chapter 2 is where the abatement procedures are found which is not a chapter under the Planning Commission's general purview. The City Council will hold a public hearing on the proposed Code amendment.

#### **Commission Business**

Chairperson Bauer asked for an example of something that might be seen by an inspector that the homeowner may appeal and that the ruling would fall in favor of the homeowner.

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Swalchick replied that everyone has the opportunity to have their opinions. He stated that the City has a maximum number of items that can be stored outdoors, and approval may be granted through permits for additional items. He noted that could be appealed. He recognized the outdoor nature of the community, and a homeowner may have multiple recreational items outdoors. He stated that the number of chickens allowed on a property could be another example. He stated that he does not want to write citations and abate properties and would prefer to resolve a situation without having to do so. He recognized the negative reactions that sometimes come from residents in a code enforcement situation and would like to provide better options to work through those issues. He stated that streamlining the appeal process would be another method of resolution.

Commissioner Walker stated that he loves the attitude of Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Swalchick and his proposed approach to work with residents. He hoped that this method would provide better cooperation with residents compared to the previous method of enforcement.

Commissioner VanScoy also appreciated the direction this is headed. He stated that rather than hitting someone with a \$250 fine, this would be working towards resolution. He stated that he was interested to see what Police Chief Katers would say about this but imagined that this would lead to less paperwork for that department as well.

Planning Manager Larson stated that staff will bring this forward to a Council worksession in the next few weeks to have this same conversation. He noted that the abatement procedures are found in Chapter 2, which are outside of the purview of the Commission and therefore the Council will make the decision, but staff still wanted the input of the Commission.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he liked the presentation. He stated that this falls in line with his comments from the previous case, where he explained that it would be helpful to have input from staff proactively and before there is an issue.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that it sounds like they are moving the abatement process away from being a criminal offense and more towards a civil offense.

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Swalchick replied that the ideal goal is to work with the residents before an abatement would be required. He stated that there are times abatement would be needed for public health and safety but there are times when a situation can be worked through without abatement.

Chairperson Bauer commented that the Commission appreciates this direction and hoped that the process moves smoothly through the Council for the benefit of the City and homeowners.

#### **7.04: Discuss the Relationship between the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use and the Zoning Code's Zoning Districts and Provide Direction on Zoning Code Districts**

##### **Presentation**

Planning Manager Larson presented the Staff Report asking the Commission for direction on the number and nature of the various zoning districts the Commission would like to see. Staff will go back and start to develop use tables based on the direction of the Commission. There is likely going to be follow up discussion on particular uses and where they should go as well as more discussion of mixed-use zoning districts.

##### **Commission Business**

Chairperson Bauer agreed this is a good task for staff to take on. He recognized that it would be helpful to clarify the districts and ensure there is consistency between the zoning code and Comprehensive Plan. He appreciated the work that has been done and encouraged staff to continue on.

Commissioner Anderson commented that he liked the table and code section that was inserted. He stated that there has been discussion of modifying this for years, but progress has not been made. He believed that the table would assist in making changes to the code.

Planning Manager Larson asked how many districts the Commission believes there should be for commercial, noting that they should also be set apart. He stated that there are good foundations where neighborhood business and B-1 could be morphed. He noted that neighborhood business is very restrictive, and properties are not really zoned as such. He stated that perhaps those districts are combined and some uses, such as gas stations, are moved out of B-1.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she would consider Bill's Superette as a neighborhood business but that could also be considered general business.

Senior Planner Anderson replied that Bill's Superette is zoned B-1 general business. He explained that the neighborhood business district was created in response to a request for a specific site about four to six years ago. He stated that he is unsure what happened with that request as the zoning map was never updated.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he is unsure why H-1 would be needed and believed that could fit within another business district. He stated that with the realignment of Highway 10, there will be fewer businesses on the north side. He agreed with moving neighborhood business into B-1.

Commissioner VanScoy agreed with combining neighborhood business and B-1 but noted that some uses should be conditional rather than permitted in order to protect more residential areas.

Planning Manager Larson stated that a conditional use would still be permitted, it simply allows conditions to be placed upon approval. He stated that staff could provide a mockup to better show certain areas.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that the neighborhood business district was intended to be allowed for a rezoning request along with a development request for something that would have minimal impact on residential, rather than actively rezoning property to that district. He noted that combining those would remove that ability.

Chairperson Bauer commented that creates a situation of spot zoning.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that it allowed a tool for a use within a residential area that could be requested.

Chairperson Bauer referenced a home occupation permit case that was recently considered and noted that could then have been rezoned as neighborhood business but that would create a situation where the single lot has that zoning.

Planning Manager Larson stated that staff is not combining B-1 and the neighborhood business district, but perhaps better determining the intent of those districts and moving the appropriate uses to the appropriate district.

Commissioner Gengler agreed that would make sense. She stated that in addition to solving the problem on the particular property, they did discuss potential business nodes that could serve communities and create a walkable feel and sense of community.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the Highway 10 business district has restrictions or permissions related to nonconformity that would not allow the City to eliminate that district until some of those businesses are gone.

Planning Manager Larson that the intent of the discussion is the use and not site improvements, architecture, etc.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the uses are listed in the information provided to the Commission or whether there are additional uses.

Planning Manager Larson stated that he did not add uses as the intent was to gauge the temperate of the Commission before working further on that.

Commissioner VanScoy recognized the desire for feedback but stated that he would be interested in seeing a proposal as that could be helpful in providing additional feedback.

Chairperson Bauer commended staff for being proactive and looking for ways to make things better, using this case and the last as examples.

Commissioner Walker asked how the use of an urban reserve district would impact the density calculations with the Metropolitan Council.

Planning Manager Larson displayed the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, which includes a staging plan. He stated that a property being included in the MUSA does not mean it is ready for development today. He explained that he would propose the urban reserve use to be for properties that are no where near getting utility service. He confirmed that would not impact the density calculations of the Metropolitan Council.

Councilmember Musgrove also commended staff for attempting to make things smoother and easier for residents and staff.

## **8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT**

Commissioner Anderson noted that he may be attending remotely for the next meeting.

Planning Manager Larson noted that there are not any development proposals at this time to be considered at the October meeting, therefore staff will continue to bring topics like the last two forward for continued discussion. He provided a brief update on the Lord of Life Church proposal that will come forward to the Commission in the future, perhaps in November, with a concept.

Chairperson Bauer stated that PACT will be doing their groundbreaking on October 6<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 p.m. He noted that now that the school owns the property, he and Commissioner VanScoy will no longer need to abstain should a future request come forward.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

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

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Bauer, Commissioners VanScoy, Anderson, Gengler, Hunt, and Walker. Voting No: None. Absent: Commissioner Peters.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 9:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Todd Larson  
Planning Manager

ATTEST:

---

Dana Verbeek  
Planning Administrative Assistant

Drafted by Amanda Staple  
*TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*