

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JULY 21, 2014**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order, Roll Call and Approval of Minutes.

Chair Gonzalez called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Vanderheyden, Pearson, Gonzalez, Tyacke, Gnos, Ramy and Iverson. City Planner Gadow was also present.

Chair Gonzalez stated the minutes to be reviewed are from July 7, 2014.

Commissioner Tyacke stated on page 3, line 40 the verb “indicated” should be inserted, on page 6, line 11 should read “Mrs. Richter stated she would not support...” and on page 10, lines 27 and 29 “Commissioner Iverson” should be changed to “Chair Gonzalez.”

Commissioner Pearson stated on page 7, lines 41 and 42 should be “private” street not “public” street.

Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on page 13, line 8, the word “order” should be changed to “odor”.

Commissioner Vanderheyden made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to approve the July 7, 2014 minutes as amended above. The motion carried 7-0.

AGENDA ITEM 2. REGULAR AGENDA PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

- a. 165 and 213 Central Avenue N – Property Resources Corporation**
 - i. Concurrent Preliminary/Final Plat for Five (5) Lot Subdivision**
 - ii. Subdivision Variance for a Private Roadway**
 - iii. Review of alternative seven (7) lot subdivision concepts**

City Planner Gadow stated at the July 7 Planning Commission meeting the Commission continued its review of an application from Property Resources Corporation for a concurrent preliminary and final plat approval of a five (5) lot subdivision at 165 & 213 Central Avenue North that would connect Cross Street and Byrondale Avenue through a private roadway. The Commission voted to continue discussions to the next available meeting and directed Staff and the Applicant to review and address the questions and concerns that were raised by the Commission during the meeting. The main question raised by the Commission was regarding Hennepin County’s view on potential access to the lots from an existing curb cut on Central Avenue. Staff and the Applicant met with officials from Hennepin County Transportation on July 14 and the County would not support any access to Central Avenue and this was provided in writing from the County. He reviewed the City’s Comprehensive Plan Transportation Plan Appendix A4.2 and the City’s Subdivision Ordinance Section 805.27.N regarding access to arterial streets.

1 Commissioner Tyacke asked if the City Attorney had provided any feedback regarding the letter
2 received from Hennepin County.

3
4 City Planner Gadow stated The City Attorney had not provided any feedback.

5
6 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Exhibit 7-5 of the County's letter, the first item under
7 definitions and notes, the second sentence states "There is recognition that non-conforming
8 driveways currently exist along the County's roadway system – these will be reviewed for
9 removal if/when redevelopment opportunities occur." He clarified this meant any driveways
10 with access to a County roadway system the County would prefer not to have this and if given
11 the opportunity they would preclude it.

12
13 City Planner Gadow stated this was correct. He clarified the County does not have the authority
14 to approve/deny plats but they do have authority over the access permits and the County has the
15 ability to deny an access permit.

16
17 Chair Gonzalez asked if the issue of access points being grandfathered in discussed with the
18 County.

19
20 City Planner Gadow stated access to Central Avenue was discussed and not just specific to
21 Commissioner Iverson's drawing. The County made it clear that they would like this access
22 removed when the opportunity occurs. They would not comment on Commissioner Iverson's
23 drawing specifically.

24
25 Chair Gonzalez stated she did not believe the County could deny the use of the two (2) existing
26 access point if the Applicant were to try and develop only two (2) lots using these access points.

27
28 City Planner Gadow stated the County indicated they would deny this permit because they have
29 a desire to remove these access points.

30
31 Commissioner Iverson clarified if a developer purchased these two (2) lots for two (2) single-
32 family homes they would not be able to use these access points and the property would then have
33 no value.

34
35 City Planner Gadow stated the County would not "draw a line in the sand" because there was no
36 formal application for them to review but the sense was the County has concerns about access to
37 Central Avenue and a permit would be highly unlikely.

38
39 Commissioner Iverson stated there were other driveways along Central Avenue. She asked if
40 these would need to be discussed as well.

41
42 City Planner Gadow stated the County has indicated they would like to look at closing those
43 accesses when the opportunities come available. He stated he did not know how the County
44 would view a change of ownership for closing an access. This would be something the City
45 would need to discuss with the County.

46

1 Commissioner Iverson stated the second bullet of the County's letter states a 2004 study had
2 been used. At that time, the Walgreens development had not been proposed and it states "these
3 properties were anticipated to be served by a new street opposite the medical clinic".
4

5 City Planner Gadow clarified there was a 2004 Access Management study done by the City and
6 as part of that study there was a map that showed the potential closure of access points along
7 Central Avenue and the creation of a new roadway internally.
8

9 Commissioner Iverson clarified the road referred to in this study was Colonial Square and this
10 road has been removed.
11

12 Ms. Jennifer Haskamp, 246 Albert Street S., St. Paul, stated the discussions with the County also
13 included what would trigger the requirement of an access permit and the County stated the
14 review would be the replatting or redevelopment of the property.
15

16 Commissioner Pearson stated he had asked previously about the unique circumstances that
17 would permit a variance to be granted. The discussions had been previously focused on the
18 access to Central Avenue. Having received input from the County, reviewed the City's
19 Comprehensive Plan and the City's Ordinance he stated he is convinced access to Central
20 Avenue would be a problem. He asked the Applicant to explain why a public street access
21 would deny or deprive the applicant from the reasonable use of the land.
22

23 Ms. Haskamp explained the process and due diligence the Applicant had gone through in
24 creating the development. The City had expressed an interested in a through access. In trying to
25 balance the concerns of the neighborhood regarding increased cut through traffic and speeds, the
26 City's interest in having through access and the County's desire to close the access on Central
27 Avenue the Applicant felt the private roadway would be the best compromise.
28

29 Commissioner Pearson stated this would be logical but the City's Ordinance states private
30 roadways are discouraged and need to meet a high standard. He asked how the Applicant would
31 be denied reasonable use of the land if a public street is required.
32

33 Ms. Haskamp stated this is not being presented as a private roadway because the Applicant does
34 not believe it would be a private roadway. The applicant believes it has met the definitions for
35 either two (2) private driveways that are not connected or a private alley, similar to the one
36 approved by the City Council for the properties to the south. The Planning Commission is
37 making the assumption that a hardship needs to be proved when the Applicant does not need to
38 meet this standard. She clarified the issue of public versus private is not the Applicants issue. If
39 the Planning Commission determines that a public road would best serve the neighborhood, the
40 Applicant would not have an issue with this but they do not believe this should be a 26-foot wide
41 road that connects two (2) 20-foot roadways.
42

43 Commissioner Pearson asked if the Applicant had any response to the neighborhood concerns of
44 visitor parking.
45

1 Ms. Haskamp stated all of the lots have driveways and parking for at least two (2) additional cars
2 along the access. The Applicant would be willing to dedicate one side of the access to “no
3 parking”. The Applicant would also be willing to designate a substraight area for visitors to
4 park. This substraight would be able to be plowed.

5
6 Chair Gonzalez stated the Planning Commission does not have the ability to pick and choose
7 what Ordinances they apply and follow and they expect Applicants to do the same. She stated
8 the Applicant has repeatedly stated the proposed access does not meet with definition of a
9 roadway but according to City Code 805.08 a private street is a street serving by vehicular access
10 for two (2) or more parcels of land. According to this definition what the Applicant is proposing
11 is a private street because it would not meet the requirements of the Code and a private street
12 required a variance. The Planning Commission needs to work within this definition to find a
13 reasonable solution.

14
15 Commissioner Iverson stated she has asked to see alternatives to how this property could be
16 developed differently and the Applicant has not done this. The neighborhood has made it clear
17 they do not want to see this access as a cut through and there have been opportunities for the
18 Applicant to look at getting 507 houses on these parcels without having a road connect
19 Byrondale and Cross Street.

20
21 Ms. Haskamp stated the geographic constraints of the property and matching this with the City’s
22 Ordinances and Codes, from a lot depth, frontage and lot area the constraints are such there not a
23 lot of options on how things could be orientated. The existing dead end street standards that are
24 in place would require variances as well and the Applicant would have difficulty with these due
25 to the location of current dead ends in the neighborhood. There are really only two (2)
26 orientations for the development and those are east/west and north/south. The north/south option
27 is not likely to be approved by Hennepin County. The Applicant is also trying to meet the safety
28 of these residents and the desire of the City’s Fire Marshal, the City Engineer, and the City’s
29 Comprehensive Plan of having a through access.

30
31 Commissioner Iverson stated she did not believe there was only one (1) option for this parcel and
32 it would have been helpful to her if the Applicant would have provided other layouts because
33 now she has no other visual proof that the Applicant has done their due diligence and looked at
34 other options. She is discouraged about only having one layout to review.

35
36 Chair Gonzalez opened the public hearing at 7:31 p.m.

37
38 Mr. Dave Larson 158 Benton Avenue, Wayzata, expressed concerns about the connection to
39 Benton. During the previous meeting the emergency vehicle access had been brought up but the
40 gate that was put up with the Anchor Bank project addresses this.

41
42 Ms. Pat Broyles, 212 Benton Avenue, Wayzata, stated Benton Avenue delivered Walgreens to
43 the City. The majority of the people on Benton Avenue wanted Elm Lane closed because they
44 did not want through traffic. Now the City is looking at adding an access that would bring more
45 traffic back into the neighborhood. She stated she did not want the neighborhood compromised
46 because of a land developer. There are too many houses planned in this area and the

1 neighborhood does not want anyone else coming down Benton Avenue and they do not want
2 anything that connects to Byrondale. She suggested the Planning Commission find a way to
3 have the Developer not have seven (7) houses and access to Byrondale. This would make the
4 neighborhood happy. She handed out a letter to the Planning Commission and she stated her
5 feeling from reading the County's letter regarding access to Central Avenue was that if the
6 Developer did not have an option for other access then the County would grant access to Central
7 Avenue. The Anchor Bank project closed two (2) access points on Central Avenue so the
8 County should be happy with that and allow this project to have access. She stated any parking
9 options would end up behind her house and her neighbor's house and she would not be happy
10 with this.

11
12 Chair Gonzalez closed the public hearing at 7:39 p.m.

13
14 Chair Gonzalez stated the five (5) lot proposal is what the Planning Commission needs to review
15 and discuss at this time.

16
17 City Planner Gadow stated the Planning Commission is requested to comment on the two (2)
18 seven (7) lot alternatives as well. He stated he had talked with the Fire Chief in regards to
19 emergency vehicle access. Their concern was that if there is not a through connection in this
20 area then an emergency vehicle would need to back completely out of the neighborhood which
21 would not be acceptable in an emergency situation.

22
23 Chair Gonzalez stated an option that had not been considered that may protect Benton Avenue, it
24 would burden another neighborhood, but people have the right to develop their property to a
25 reasonable extent, would be to access the site only from Byrondale and end in a cul-de-sac. The
26 City does not like cul-de-sacs but this may be an alternative. The Developer may not be able to
27 get seven (7) homes there. She stated she was going over the Wayzata Comp Plan and one of the
28 things that it talks about is traffic calming techniques. A cul-de-sac would address the
29 emergency vehicle access situation and it would alleviate the burden on Benton Avenue. She
30 stated this would make sense to her. She stated this same scheme would work for Lots 6 and 7
31 as well. She commented that one of the lots was non-conforming and the Applicant is proposing
32 another non-conforming lot from Byrondale. This would require another variance. She stated
33 she did not think the Subdivision Ordinance should be used to create non-conformities but to
34 correct them.

35
36 City Planner Gadow stated the Applicant is not proposing this.

37
38 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he had measured nine (9) different points in this
39 neighborhood to get an idea on street width. The newest drive, that supports the three (3) new
40 single family homes, is 18-feet wide, Byrondale is 20-feet wide. He asked if there were other
41 areas in the City where a 26-foot road was added among older/narrower streets.

42
43 City Planner Gadow stated he could not recall any similar situation in the City. He stated there
44 are incidents of 20-foot driveways access homes.

45

1 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated this is Zoned R3A and he is struggling with the City has to
2 allow reasonable use as zoned and balancing the variances needed to achieve this.

3
4 Chair Gonzalez stated if the Applicant developed to the Code then they would have to agree to a
5 public street built to public standards and they would not be able to put the number of homes in
6 the development they want. She stated four (4) lots instead of five (5) is a reasonable use of the
7 property and this would address some of the concerns of the neighborhood and the City.

8
9 Commissioner Pearson stated he liked the plan and it was one he would approve but for the high
10 standard for approval of a variance for a private street. He stated this meets the criteria of a
11 private street but the Applicant has not provided the grounds for justifying a private street by the
12 standards. Under the standard he would not be able to approve it. He does not like the idea of a
13 public street because this would make cut through traffic worse. He stated he is satisfied that
14 access on Central Avenue is not a viable option.

15
16 Commissioner Tyacke stated there is a section in the City's Ordinance that sets the criteria for
17 the Planning Commission to follow. The Planning Commission does need to consider the
18 possible adverse affects on the surrounding neighborhoods. The County's letter is helpful and
19 the City's options are limited because the County would have to sign off on any access to
20 Central Avenue and they are not open to this. The neighborhood is concerned about the
21 increased traffic and potential issues with parking and these are important factors. The Fire
22 Marshal would like to have a 20-foot road put in. To manage the traffic and avoid any cut
23 through traffic there needs to be a separation of the entry way off Byrondale and the one off
24 Cross. Looking at the drawing for the five (5) lot subdivision that is being proposed the only
25 way to accomplish this would be to do an extension on Byrondale and put in a cul-de-sac on Lot
26 7 and an extension on Cross and put in a cul-de-sac on Lot 6 to serve Lots 3,4, and 5. With these
27 modifications he would consider approving this development.

28
29 Commissioner Iverson agreed with Commissioner Tyacke and she clarified she had asked the
30 developer to look at other options and this has not been done. The modifications brought up by
31 Commissioner Tyacke would eliminate the cut through traffic on Benton Avenue.

32
33 Commissioner Pearson asked if these were cul-de-sacs if they would be constructed as public
34 streets.

35
36 Commissioner Iverson stated she would be agreeable to 20-foot roadways in this scenario.

37
38 Commissioner Pearson states if these were constructed as 20-foot roadways they would be
39 private streets and the Planning Commission would still have to consider the criteria for a private
40 street and this has been the stumbling block for him personally.

41
42 Commissioner Tyacke stated the existing public streets would just be extended into a cul-de-sac.

43
44 Commissioner Iverson stated she does support developing the property but would like to find a
45 solution that meets everyone's needs.

46

1 Commissioner Gnos stated he does support the idea of the development. He asked if the City
2 would be willing to look at creating some sort of gated community concept in order to
3 compromise with the Developer and the concerns of the neighborhood regarding cut through
4 traffic.

5
6 Commissioner Ramy asked Commissioner Tyacke how many buildable lots would be created
7 with his proposal.

8
9 Commissioner Tyacke explained the Developer could use the newly acquired Lots 6 and 7 to
10 create the cul-de-sacs and build on the original Lots 1-5.

11
12 Commissioner Ramy stated he would agree with this to minimize the traffic and eliminate the cut
13 through traffic. He stated he would like to see a solution that is a win-win for everyone.

14
15 Chair Gonzalez stated the proposal is keeping with the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning
16 Ordinance and she is in favor of developing this as residential. The problem is access this
17 property without causing undue hardship on the two (2) existing neighborhoods. She would not
18 agree with building two (2) entrances and cul-de-sacs. The Developer may be able to find a way
19 to create only one entrance from Byrondale with a cul-de-sac at the end, and Lot 5 can be
20 accessed from Wooddale. The Developer may need to give up one lot in order to develop the
21 other six (6) properties with acceptable entrances. She stated it is unreasonable to expect the
22 Applicant to force the County to accept the access points on Central Avenue due to the existing
23 safety issues.

24
25 City Planner Gadow clarified the Commission needs to base their decision on the application that
26 is brought forward at this time. All of the concerns of the Planning Commission will be
27 presented to the City Council.

28
29 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he would find the proposed five (5) lot subdivision with the
30 roadway interrupted by some type of material acceptable.

31
32 Commissioner Pearson stated in theory he is in favor of the development but the Applicant has
33 not met the criteria for a variance. He would vote to deny and let the City Council decide.

34
35 Commissioner Tyacke stated he would not approve it as it is presented but he would with
36 modifications on a preliminary plat.

37
38 Commissioner Iverson stated she would not approve this and would not recommend sending this
39 to the City Council but would prefer to have the Applicant come back with new options
40 including those that were discussed by the Planning Commission.

41
42 Commissioner Gnos stated if additional bollards were added he would approve the five (5) lot
43 subdivision being presented.

44
45 Commissioner Ramy stated he would not approve this at this time but would move it to the City
46 Council for their consideration.

1
2 Chair Gonzalez stated as proposed she would not recommend approval of this proposal and she
3 has not seen that this meets the criteria of the Subdivision Ordinance. She would consider
4 approval if there was only one access on Byrondale and no access to Cross or Benton Avenue.
5

6 City Planner Gadow stated the proposal should be sent to the City Council.
7

8 Commissioner Iverson asked if they could require the Applicant to have different alternatives
9 available when it is presented to the City Council.
10

11 Chair Gonzalez clarified the Commission needs to vote on the application that is being presented
12 at this time.
13

14 Commissioner Pearson made a motion to find the proposal presented by the Applicant is a
15 private street as defined by the City Ordinances and not something that takes it out of the scope
16 of the Ordinances and deny approval of a variance for the private street and since this is a
17 prerequisite of approving the entire application have Staff prepare a report with those findings
18 for denial.
19

20 Commissioner Iverson expressed concerns about the density that seven (7) lots would create
21 regardless of the configuration of the access. She also recommended the City Council look at the
22 removal of trees. She does not want to see these parcels cleared of trees for development.
23

24 Commissioner Tyacke agreed with Commissioner Iverson on the seven (7) lot alternative and
25 this is over crowded and does not fit with the character of the neighborhood. The Planning
26 Commission had asked for the lots to be marked off and this has not been done.
27

28 Chair Gonzalez stated her concern with Lot (7) the Ordinance states the hardship cannot be
29 created by the Applicant but in this application the Applicant creating another non-conforming
30 lot drives the hardship.
31

32 Commissioner Pearson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Iverson for the Planning
33 Commission to find the proposed road is a private street as defined by the City Ordinance and
34 the Applicant has not established the criteria for a variance for a private street and therefore deny
35 the application and request Staff to prepare findings consistent with the denial of the project for
36 review at the next Planning Commission Meeting.
37

38 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated the Applicant is proposing to increase the proposed
39 development by one lot because there is an existing home already there. He stated repurposing
40 this lot and creating a neighborhood feel with the development does have a benefit given the
41 layout of the existing home. All of these lots meet the Zoning requirements as far as square
42 footage and this may "feel" like it is high density but it has been made clear the Planning
43 Commission can only interpret and follow the Ordinances and feelings need to be put aside.
44

45 Chair Gonzalez clarified if the Applicant was held to the strict letter of the law and required to
46 build a 26-foot public street then they would not be able to have seven (7) lots that meet the

1 square footage requirement for the Zoning District. She stated this application does not meet all
2 of the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance including the trees, and provide a balanced
3 housing supply available to all people regardless of income.

4
5 The motion was called to a vote. The motion passed 5-2 (Vanderheyden, Gnos).

6
7 City Planner Gadow stated this would be presented to the City Council at one of their August
8 meetings.

9
10 **b. 310 & 324 Bushaway Road – Charles Cudd, Co.**

11 **i. Review of Residential Building Plans**

12 City Planner Gadow stated the Applicant has requested the review be tabled until the August 4,
13 2014 Planning Commission meeting.

14
15 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Other Items.**

16 **a. Review and adoption of Planning Commission Report and Recommendation on**
17 **Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Micro-production Facilities and**
18 **Taproom/Tasting Rooms.**

19 City Planner Gadow stated on March 20, 2014, the City of Wayzata received a written request as
20 part of a development application from Wayzata Brew Works, LLC to amend the City's
21 Ordinances to allow micro-breweries and associated taprooms with the City. In response to the
22 Applicant's request and the information gathered at a City Council workshop and two (2)
23 Planning Commission workshops, Staff prepared a draft ordinance amendment to allow micro-
24 breweries and other similar micro-production facilities and taprooms/tasting rooms through a
25 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process in business and commercial districts. In addition to the
26 proposed amendment, the City will also review a proposed amendment to the City's Liquor
27 Ordinance to establish a licensing process for regulating micro-production facilities and
28 taprooms within the City.

29
30 Commissioner Tyacke stated the City Council had brought up additional concerns including
31 limiting the number of districts these facilities could be located in. The Council requested Staff
32 to prepare a more narrow amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for their consideration as well as
33 the more expansive amendment being considered by the Planning Commission.

34
35 City Planner Gadow suggested not narrowing the districts that allowed these facilities at this
36 time because there may be areas the City could allow them and because they are CUP the City
37 has flexibility on location. The Liquor Ordinance could be used to limit the number of licenses
38 the City allows. This would be a policy question for the Council.

39
40 Chair Gonzalez stated she thought the Commission had changed the definition of winery and
41 distillery to not include the facility be operated by the owner of a Minnesota farm.

42
43 City Planner Gadow stated he has not found anything in the State statute that allows these
44 definitions to not read the way they are proposed. There may be additional language that needs
45 to be added to malt liquor that includes cider not being done in a winery.

46

1 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on Item 11 should read "...designed in such a way...".

2
3 Commissioner Tyacke asked if the comments from the Planning Commission had been included
4 such as referencing the Federal and State statutes.

5
6 City Planner Gadow stated these were incorporated and the City Attorney included language in
7 the definitions reference Federal and State regulations.

8
9 Chair Gonzalez asked if there was a limitation on the amount of product these facilities could
10 produce in a year.

11
12 City Planner Gadow stated State Statute limits what a winery and distillery can produce and for a
13 micro-brewery the City has written the production to align with the limitations for a micro-
14 production brewery with a taproom. If you operate a taproom, State Statute limits the production
15 to 5,000 barrels and only 500 barrel can be sold as off-sale growlers.

16
17 Commissioner Vanderheyden expressed concerns with drawing distinctions between one form of
18 liquor versus another in production. He stated if the City limited the licensing of micro-
19 production to only one within the City this would create a competitive advantage for this facility.

20
21 Commissioner Tyacke made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Vanderheyden to approve the
22 report as prepared by Staff and recommend approval of the draft ordinance No 746, an
23 Ordinance amending Wayzata's Zoning Ordinance to allow micro-production facilities and
24 taprooms/tasting rooms as Conditional Uses and be forwarded to the City Council. The motion
25 carried unanimously.

26
27 **a. Review and adoption of Planning Commission Report and Recommendation on**
28 **Amendment to PUD/CUP to allow microbrewery/taproom at 294 Grove Lane.**

29 City Planner Gadow stated Boatworks II LLC and Wayzata Brew Works LLC have submitted an
30 application for approval of an amendment to an existing Planned Unit Development (PUD)
31 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow operation of a micro-brewery and taproom facility. The
32 Planning Commission did review the application and directed Staff to prepare a report and
33 findings supporting the approval of the application.

34
35 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he would like to have the language for the last sentence in
36 Item 4.1.B to be changed to read more positively and he requested similar landscaping to 6
37 Smith restaurant be added between the patio and the sidewalk to Item 4.1.C.

38
39 Chair Gonzalez stated Item 4.1.A should include the City Council.

40
41 Commissioner Tyacke made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ramy to accept the Staff
42 report and recommend approval with conditions for the PUD/CUP amendment and site plan for
43 294 Grove Lane as amended above and be forwarded to the City Council. The motion carried
44 unanimously.

45
46 **b. Review of Development Activities**

1 City Planner Gadow stated the other items for upcoming Planning Commission meetings would
2 be the Staff report for the Central Avenue project, the design plans for the project on Bushaway
3 Road and the application for a CUP amendment for an outside sidewalk café at McCormick's
4 Restaurant.

5
6 **c. Other Items**

7 Commissioner Pearson stated he had attended the last Heritage Preservation meeting. There was
8 no business conducted related to the Planning Commission at this meeting.

9
10 City Planner Gadow stated he would attend the next daytime meeting and the next evening
11 meeting was the second Tuesday in August.

12
13 Commissioner Ramy volunteered to attend the next Heritage Preservation meeting.

14
15 Chair Gonzalez stated the project on Central Avenue has highlighted some problems with the
16 City's definitions and these could be reviewed during a workshop.

17
18 City Planner Gadow stated there were several developments that would be reviewed prior to
19 being able to review these definitions.

20
21 Commissioner Tyacke suggested having applicants or developers present to the Commission
22 during a workshop prior to the meeting in order to eliminate some of the problems that were
23 encountered with the Central Avenue project.

24
25 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Adjournment.**

26 There being no further business, Commissioner Vanderheyden made a motion, seconded by
27 Commissioner Pearson, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

28
29 The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

30
31 Respectfully submitted,

32
33 Tina Borg, *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*