

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
MAY 20, 2013**

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: Cooper, Gonzalez, Iverson, Ramy Jr., and Vanderheyden. Absent and excused: Commissioner Crowder and Pearson. City Planner Gadow, Council Member Mullin, and Paul Kaminski, Best & Flanagan, were also present.

Commissioner Vanderheyden made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, to approve the May 6, 2013 meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed 4/0/1 (Iverson).

AGENDA ITEM 2. Workshop Items:

a. Discussion of Telecommunications Ordinance

City Planner Gadow stated he incorporated the Planning Commission's comments into the most recent version, noting one document annotates the changes and the other document incorporates those revisions. He suggested once the document is finalized, staff schedule a joint Workshop with the City Council in June and then schedule it for public hearing.

Commissioner Vanderheyden suggested a revision to Page 1, Line 29, to indicate: "...to accommodate the growth of wireless communication systems..."

Commissioner Vanderheyden suggested a revision to Page 1, Line 36, to indicate: "Specify the approved locations of commercial Telecommunication Facilities and Towers in the City, ~~and to establish transitional processes of relocation of facilities from the City's water tower to other designated sites as defined in this Ordinance;~~ He stated the Purpose and Intent statement feels activist but it is not the intent of the ordinance to establish transitional processes specific to the current, though that may be the intent in the future.

City Planner Gadow concurred the intent of the ordinance is to set legal direction not a City Council determined policy on the relocation process.

Chair Gonzalez asked if the ordinance should indicate: "...relocate existing facilities..."

Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he does not support this ordinance relocating anything.

Paul Kaminski, Best & Flanagan, advised that the ordinance should steer away from specific situations being faced today as this document will be in use for many years.

Commissioner Vanderheyden stated his suggested language is: "Specify approved locations of commercial Telecommunication Facilities and Towers in the City."

1
2 Chair Gonzalez asked about use of the word “approved,” since the Planning Commission wants
3 to specify where commercial telecommunication facilities and towers could go.

4
5 Commissioner Iverson asked if the language should remain generic.

6
7 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he is not “hung up” on the word “approved” but now it is a
8 singular location. City Planner Gadow stated this ordinance sets parameters if there are future
9 locations and where they could or could not go.

10
11 Commissioner Vanderheyden suggested the language indicate: “Specify locations of
12 commercial Telecommunication Facilities and Towers in the City.

13
14 The Planning Commission supported this revision.

15
16 Chair Gonzalez noted the word “facilities” is used on Lines 36, 37, 41, and 43, but it is not
17 defined. City Planner Gadow noted it is defined on Page 3, Line 32.

18
19 Chair Gonzalez asked what “single-use” means as used on Page 2, Line 1, Section 1D. City
20 Planner Gadow stated it means a single vendor.

21
22 On Page 2, Chair Gonzalez asked whether Section 1H is needed as it refers to providing
23 development standards for Wireless Telecommunication Facilities that are consistent with the
24 requirements of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. City Planner Gadow stated it was
25 included since it was in other model ordinances and acknowledges the federal statute dictates.
26 Chair Gonzalez asked if the ordinance then needs to warn them to comply with other federal
27 statutes, not only this one.

28
29 Commissioner Iverson asked whether the ordinance should address future statutes. City
30 Attorney Kaminski stated this language could indicate: “Provide development standards for
31 Wireless Telecommunication Facilities that are consistent with the requirements of the Federal
32 Telecommunications Act of 1996 or other applicable laws.”

33
34 The Planning Commission supported this revision.

35
36 Chair Gonzalez asked about Page 2, Line 23, Section 2A, Definitions, which indicates:
37 “Accessory equipment means the wires, cables, generators, air conditioning units, and other
38 equipment or facilities that are used with antennas.” City Planner Gadow stated “facilities” is
39 intended to be an all-encompassing term and “accessory equipment” is a subset.

40
41 Chair Gonzalez asked about Page 2, Line 29, Section 2, Definitions, B. Applicant, and asked
42 whether language should be added indicating: “and/or its successor.” City Planner Gadow
43 stated the term “Successors and Assigns” was included on Page 12, Line 6, and does not need to
44 be added to the applicant definition.

45

1 City Attorney Kaminski recommended capitalizing all defined terms throughout the document.
2 The Planning Commission supported this revision.

3
4 Chair Gonzalez stated the entire document goes from “must” to “shall” and suggested a uniform
5 term be used throughout the entire document.

6
7 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on Page 4, Line 20, the word “section” should be the word
8 “ordinance.” City Planner Gadow stated he will double check that word.

9
10 Chair Gonzalez stated Page 4, Line 18, indicates: “Telecommunications facilities are permitted
11 only with completion of a permit application and approval of the City Council, and must be in
12 compliance with the provisions of this ordinance.” She stated it does not make reference to
13 having public hearings or obtaining public input.

14
15 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if that statement does not imply Council process of which
16 the Planning Commission would be a step.

17
18 City Planner Gadow stated ordinance language is included relating to the process to construct a
19 tower and design review but if it is just a lease application, it would not necessarily need to go
20 before the Planning Commission. He stated “facilities” also includes mechanical equipment.

21
22 Chair Gonzalez stated Page 4, Line 27, indicates: “The antennas or tower will not interfere with
23 the purpose for which the property is intended;” She stated this and every other subsection on
24 Page 4 uses the word “will” and it should be the word “shall.” City Planner Gadow stated that
25 change will be made.

26
27 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Page 4, Line 35, indicates: “...antenna or tower’s removal.”
28 He asked whether the language should indicate “...antenna and/or tower’s removal” or if the
29 words “or tower’s” should be removed.

30
31 On Page 4, Chair Gonzalez asked whether Subsection vi., Lines 43-46, are needed. It indicates:
32 “Upon a reasonable notice as defined in the lease agreement, the Telecommunications facilities,
33 antennas, or towers may be required to be removed at the applicant’s/lessee’s expense, if found
34 to be in violation of any portion of this Ordinance by the City; and.” City Planner Gadow stated
35 it is good to establish in the base of the ordinance that there is a process for violation.

36
37 Commissioner Iverson stated Page 5, Line 2-3, indicates: “...because of the presence of the
38 applicant’s Telecommunications facilities, antennas, or towers.” She stated the word “presence”
39 is assumed, not needed, and the language could indicate: “because of the applicant’s
40 Telecommunications facilities, antennas, or towers.” City Planner Gadow stated that change will
41 be made.

42
43 Chair Gonzalez stated Page 5, Line 2, uses the word “must” but it should be the word “shall.”

44
45 Commissioner Vanderheyden read Page 5, Lines 2-3 indicating: “The applicant shall reimburse
46 the City for any costs because of the applicant’s Telecommunications facilities, antennas, or

1 towers.” He asked if the Planning Commission really means that. He asked about the use of the
2 word “any” in that section, noting that further in the ordinance it defines where the City is likely
3 to incur costs, such as engineering. He stated the language used in Lines 2-3 gives the City
4 latitude for over reaching.

5
6 City Planner Gadow stated Commissioner Vanderheyden is correct that the City cannot charge a
7 fee if it has not established policy. He suggested the language indicate: “The applicant shall
8 reimburse the City for any defined costs because of the applicant’s Telecommunications
9 facilities, antennas, or towers.”

10
11 On Page 5, Chair Gonzalez asked that the word “must” be replaced with the word “shall” to be
12 uniform throughout. City Planner Gadow stated he will conduct a word search for the entire
13 document to assure consistent use of the word “shall.”

14
15 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on Page 5, Section 6. Towers and Commercial
16 Telecommunication Facilities Building and Design Standards, A. Existing Telecommunication
17 Facilities, Lines 13-17, indicates: “...Once the leases for existing Telecommunication Facilities
18 expire or are otherwise terminated, existing Telecommunications Facilities shall be required to
19 conform to all Ordinance Requirements for New Telecommunications Facilities including, but
20 not limited to...” City Planner Gadow stated existing leases are grandfathered but once the
21 leases expire, the new ordinance requirements will become effective on those new leases.

22
23 Chair Gonzalez stated she supports this language because the neighborhoods need to be
24 protected.

25
26 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated his intent was to question the use of language addressing
27 prior termination and post termination to conform, which it clearly would not. City Planner
28 Gadow asked if he had concern with the language as drafted. Commissioner Vanderheyden read
29 Section 6 and stated his concern was with the use of the phrasing.

30
31 Commissioner Iverson asked if the Section should be reworded. City Planner Gadow suggested
32 it be revised to indicate: “...Once the leases for existing Telecommunication Facilities expire or
33 are otherwise terminated, those existing Telecommunications Facilities shall be required to
34 conform to all Ordinance Requirements for New Telecommunications Facilities including, but
35 not limited to...”

36
37 The Planning Commission supported this revision.

38
39 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on Page 5, Lines 28-29, it lists only one site, the City of
40 Wayzata Public Works Facility. City Planner Gadow stated the language indicates that the City
41 Council could approve a new Telecommunications Tower to be located at the City’s Public
42 Works Facility. If not, the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process outlined on Pages 6-8 would
43 come into play. Commissioner Vanderheyden stated if that is the intent of the language, he is
44 comfortable with it.

1 Chair Gonzalez asked about the language on Page 5, Line 40, indicating: "...The applicant shall
2 also pay the reasonable expenses of a radio or electrical engineer retained by the City..." She
3 asked who determines what is reasonable. City Attorney Kaminski stated "reasonable" is a legal
4 term that is often used and he agreed it can sometimes lead to arguments or law suits but in this
5 case he found it to be reasonable to use that term as it is an intent to indicate the City will not
6 over reach.

7
8 Commissioner Ramy stated on Page 5, Line 32, it should indicate: "...location in 6.B.i..." City
9 Planner Gadow agreed and stated he will modify all such references in the document.

10
11 Chair Gonzalez stated on Page 7, Line 8, the word "must" should be changed to the word
12 "shall."

13
14 Chair Gonzalez stated on Page 8, Line 14, the words "may not" should be changed to the words
15 "shall not." City Planner Gadow stated he will make this change (must to shall/must not to shall
16 not) throughout the document.

17
18 Chair Gonzalez stated on Page 8, Lines 35-38, the word "may" is used. She stated the language
19 of Subsection C.iii. seems to imply a variance or it could be a CUP process. City Attorney
20 Kaminski stated it is a policy choice.

21
22 Chair Gonzalez stated Page 9, Line 9, uses the word "unfeasible" yet Line 14 uses the word
23 "infeasible." City Planner Gadow stated he will look up the word and determine which is
24 correct.

25
26 Chair Gonzalez stated on Page 9, Line 24, City staff is included in site plan review but she
27 questioned why that needed to be in the ordinance since City staff always has first review. City
28 Planner Gadow stated it needs to be spelled out, the same as with other processes that City staff
29 has the first meeting with the applicant and informs the applicant of the steps and process.

30
31 Commissioner Iverson stated on Page 9, Line 27, it indicates: "...maintaining the structure in
32 good condition." She asked if the ordinance should define "good condition" as it could be open
33 ended. City Planner Gadow stated it is similar to the term "reasonable" and means it can not be
34 failing or in disrepair and asked if she had a better word to use.

35
36 Chair Gonzalez stated on Page 9, she would like to add a word to the end of Line 29 to indicate:
37 "...expense, at the discretion of the City Council."

38
39 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on Page 9, Line 2, it indicates: "...painted a non-contrasting
40 color consistent with the surrounding area such as: blue, gray, brown, or silver, or have a
41 galvanized finish..." He asked if the City really wants to be selecting the colors. City Planner
42 Gadow stated the likelihood a cellular tower is painted bright pink is slight, but the language
43 assures the color choices.

44
45 Commissioner Iverson stated support to leave the language as is.
46

1 Chair Gonzalez agreed, noting it has been part of the City's ordinance for a long time and at one
2 time, the City used to dictate the color of bricks.

3
4 City Planner Gadow suggested the color green be added in case the tower is adjacent to trees so
5 it would be more camouflaged.

6
7 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Page 9, Lines 33-35 indicate: "...shall be designed and
8 certified by a licensed structural engineer, approved or hired by the City, to be structurally
9 sound..." He asked if that is the intent, for the structural engineer to be approved by the City,
10 because the telecommunications provider would probably hire their own structural engineer and
11 may not want the City to have the ability to approve. City Planner Gadow stated so long as that
12 engineer's license is not an issue, the City may not have much to say as it does not have a stable
13 of knowledge relating to structural engineering. City Planner Gadow suggested the language be
14 changed to indicate: "...shall be designed and certified by a licensed structural engineer to be
15 structurally sound..."

16
17 The Planning Commission supported this revision.

18
19 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Page 10, Line 6 indicates: "shall be enclosed by security
20 fencing not less than six (6) feet in height..." He stated he looked at the tower to get a sense of
21 the dimension and found the equipment shells are 8-12 feet tall. He asked if there should be
22 flexibility in the ordinance to match equipment height, if desired. The Planning Commissioners
23 agreed. City Planner Gadow stated he would revise that language.

24
25 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Page 10, Line 19, indicates: "...causes significant increased
26 sound levels..." He asked whether the word "increased" should be removed, noting if the tower
27 is located near a road there would be an expected level of sound that would change in the
28 evening. City Planner Gadow stated that is a good point since the City does not have a base
29 sound for the community and there is nothing to compare it with.

30
31 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Page 10, Line 40, indicates: "No telecommunication
32 facility shall be permitted that causes any interference..." He asked about the use of the word
33 "any" and suggested it be removed so there is some latitude with respect to "any," "some," or "a
34 lot."

35
36 Chair Gonzalez asked about Page 10, Line 45, that requires the applicant to furnish a "state
37 registered engineer's certification." City Planner Gadow stated if someone brings in a structural
38 engineer, they will have to provide the engineer's licensing paperwork so the City is assured
39 they are properly licensed in the State.

40
41 Chair Gonzalez noted a typo on Page 11, Line 1, the word "identity" should be the word
42 "identify."

43
44 Commissioner Cooper asked for an explanation of the paragraph on Page 11 starting with Line
45 43, indicating: "All new towers and facilities owned by a telecommunications provider shall be
46 made available for use by the owner or initial user thereof, together with as many other licensed

1 carriers as can be technically located thereon;" City Planner Gadow explained that should a
2 company wish to construct a new telecommunication tower at an approved site, it would have to
3 be constructed so it had the ability to take on another vendor's equipment.

4
5 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Page 11, Line 40, indicates: "All proposed new towers shall
6 be designated to accommodate both the applicant's antennas and antennas for at least one
7 additional comparable user;" He noted it indicates "one additional" yet Line 45 indicates "with
8 as many other licensed carriers as can be technically located." Commissioner Vanderheyden
9 asked whether this language should be reconciled. City Planner Gadow stated it comes down to
10 technical ability and height of the tower as lower towers cannot handle as many vendors as taller
11 towers.

12
13 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated it appears Line 40 is the minimal requirement and Line 45 is
14 asking to do as best as you can. He asked if there is a way to tie in slightly more aggressive
15 language.

16
17 Commissioner Ramy asked if the phrase "as many other licensed carriers as can be technically
18 located" should be used in Line 40.

19
20 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the phrases in Lines 39-41 should be: "...or as many other
21 licensed carriers as can be technically located there on, not to be less than one additional." He
22 stated this would give the City more latitude should a structural engineer find that the tower can
23 accommodate three vendors.

24
25 Commissioner Iverson agreed this language revision would close any loopholes.

26
27 Chair Gonzalez stated on Page 11, Line 39, the word "designated" should be the word
28 "designed."

29
30 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Page 11, Lines 16-17, indicate: "...Maintenance of
31 equipment shall be scheduled for between 7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, unless
32 in case of emergency." He stated the balance of the paragraph should be reconciled with
33 existing City practice or policy. Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he knows this is a point of
34 concern for present residents as there is maintenance of equipment that is not related to
35 emergency and outside of the stated hours. He asked if the City is ready to stand behind the
36 language as stated.

37
38 City Planner Gadow stated those are the resident comments the City has heard and this language
39 is consistent with its construction policies and that of other communities. He stated when this
40 ordinance is adopted, this language will be made known to contractors that it must be emergency
41 maintenance, not scheduled standard maintenance, and within these timeframes.

42
43 Commissioner Ramy stated he had the same thought, that this becomes less important knowing
44 the site will be moved. He noted this ordinance addresses the new site after existing leases and
45 asked if it will matter what time the maintenance is conducted. City Planner Gadow stated it will
46 still matter when the site is moved to the City's Water Treatment Plant because there are

1 businesses and residences (non-Wayzata) in that area. In addition, that site is secured when the
2 City is not in operation.

3
4 Chair Gonzalez stated on Page 11, Lines 19-21 indicate: "...In the case of maintenance of
5 facilities on the City Water Tower, service vehicles shall park on the service entrance of the City
6 Water Treatment Plant, whenever possible." She stated that is a gravel shared driveway with an
7 existing home. City Planner Gadow stated the language addresses the paved driveway to the
8 City's Water Treatment Plant, not the current site.

9
10 Commissioner Iverson asked about enforcement. City Planner Gadow stated enforcement would
11 be complaint based and handled by the Police Department to issue a citation for violating City
12 ordinance.

13
14 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Commissioner Ramy had commented on timing and that
15 this would be if the equipment was located at the City's Water Treatment Plant. City Planner
16 Gadow stated the equipment could be located anywhere. Commissioner Vanderheyden stated if
17 this equipment was located "anywhere" it would have gone through the CUP process to grant the
18 site. City Planner Gadow stated the CUP would grant the site and process by which we would
19 come to decision points on locations. The new ordinance says new vendors have to go through a
20 public process and that public process will determine the locations.

21
22 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on Page 12, Lines 44-45, indicate: "...The City may assess
23 its costs of removal against the property." He stated this is the first time he noticed language
24 indicating the City can take action against the property or property owner versus the tower
25 owner. All other language relates to the applicant and/or vendor but this action of removal and
26 assessing costs goes against the property owner and not the lessee. City Planner Gadow stated
27 when assessing costs, it is against the property and the property owner can be different than the
28 vendee. He stated the property owner could charge those costs back to the vendee, or the City
29 could determine different language that was not attached to the property. But then the tax rolls
30 could not be used to make the collection. Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he is fine with the
31 process and his point was that this was the only reference to taking action against the property or
32 property owner.

33
34 Commissioner Iverson stated Line 32 indicates that obsolete telecommunications facilities shall
35 be removed within 90 days after cessation of use yet unused telecommunication facilities and all
36 related equipment is allowed one year for removal. She asked why there is such a large
37 discrepancy in time periods. City Planner Gadow stated that language came from model
38 ordinances and he was unsure of the thought process.

39
40 Commissioner Iverson stated she thinks the time periods should be the same and that one year is
41 too long and 90 days is too short, in her opinion. City Planner Gadow suggested six months.

42
43 The Planning Commission supported this revision to six months.

44
45 Chair Gonzalez stated on Page 12, Lines 6-7 indicate: "...Any approved lease for
46 telecommunications facilities shall run with the Property..." She stated if the approved lease

1 runs with the property, she would ask why Subsection W, Advances in Technology, references
2 five years. She stated the City should keep an “eye” on everything. City Planner Gadow stated
3 you need to keep in mind that technology in this field (towers) is on a longer time frame than
4 technology for cellular telephones, and vendors have indicated it is about a five-year time frame
5 for the market to use a new technology.

6
7 Chair Gonzalez stated an approved lease runs with the property and asked about the process
8 when it expires. City Planner Gadow stated when the lease expires, the City would begin
9 negotiations with the vendor and record the new lease against the property as well.

10
11 Commissioner Ramy stated he supports including this language, noting the site may not be a
12 City lease so it makes sense to have the approved lease run with the property. He stated he
13 would support removing reference to “five years” so Lines 26-27 would indicate: “The City may
14 review existing structures and compare the visual impact...” Commissioner Ramy stated the
15 City should have the right at any time to review the existing structure and not be limited to doing
16 so only once in five years.

17
18 The Planning Commission agreed with this language revision.

19
20 Chair Gonzalez stated on Page 13, Line 33 should indicate: “A report from a qualified and
21 licensed...”

22
23 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on Page 13, Line 43 indicates: “v. A network map.” He
24 stated right now the City is in a disadvantaged position with respect to understanding the current
25 carriers and their coverage in the City. He stated he respects that in some cases they consider it
26 to be competitive information; however, from the highest policy level of the City it is not a fair
27 position for the City to be in, to not understand the coverage or its impact. Commissioner
28 Vanderheyden stated it is his understanding that “A network map” relates to the honeycomb
29 covering the City. If that is the case, he would like this language expanded to include precisely
30 what is meant, not just coverage of the facilities in discussion but coverage of the vendor’s
31 equipment within the City’s limits. That would impact towers outside of the City’s boundary.
32 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated the City should have access to information on wherever the
33 vendor has equipment that reaches the City’s boundaries.

34
35 City Planner Gadow agreed.

36
37 Commissioner Ramy stated on Page 13, Line 33 should indicate: “A report from a qualified and
38 licensed professional engineer which includes.” The Planning Commission supported this
39 revision.

40
41 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Line 43 should indicate: “A network map describing all
42 applicant’s telecommunications facilities which provide any coverage within the City’s limits.”
43 He noted when he constructed an addition to his home, he was required to provide a survey so
44 the City was able to grandfather in the data and this language revision would do the same.

45
46 The Planning Commission supported this revision.

1
2 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on Page 14, Line 36 indicates: "...which have not been used
3 for one (1) year shall be..." but the Planning Commission had already addressed the time limit as
4 being 180 days.

5
6 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated on Page 14, Line 41 indicates: "...are the sole
7 responsibility of the applicant and/or current lessee, and not the responsibility of the City of
8 Wayzata." He stated he was trying to reconcile versus the property owner, noting Page 14 refers
9 to "applicant and/or current lessee" and on Page 12, it refers to "property owner."
10 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Page 14 relates to the applicant and/or current lessee signing
11 an affidavit to remove the unused, abandoned or unsafe facilities, which is the intent and
12 correctly stated.

13
14 Chair Gonzalez asked if the lease agreement requires a bond or letter of credit to cover possible
15 costs. City Planner Gadow stated this is different than a road project where there is a known end
16 date when the letter of credit would be released. He stated with building a tower and using it for
17 20 years, a bank would probably not consider issuing a letter of credit for 20 years. Chair
18 Gonzalez stated she would be interested in learning whether it would be reasonable to require a
19 bond.

20
21 Commissioner Ramy asked if a five business day notice is a reasonable time to make inspection,
22 as indicated on Page 14, Line 31. City Planner Gadow stated it is reasonable.

23
24 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Page 15, Line 7, relates to reason for denial of any
25 application. He stated the intent is probably the reason for acceptance or denial of any
26 application. Commissioner Vanderheyden noted that in the acceptance process, we do so by
27 findings of fact and it should be no different in the denial process. City Planner Gadow agreed
28 with the language revision and explained that by federal law, the only way to deny is to provide
29 written findings.

30
31 Chair Gonzalez stated this is the end of review for the draft Telecommunications Ordinance.

32
33 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he felt good with this draft and that a lot of progress has
34 been made. He thanked City Planner Gadow for his fine work on this document.

35
36 City Planner Gadow stated he will make the revisions requested and schedule it for review at a
37 Joint City Council/Planning Commission Workshop in mid-June.

38
39 City Attorney Kaminski complimented the Planning Commission on doing a good job to balance
40 the needs of vendors and assure appropriate zoning regulation. He stated he thinks this
41 document can withstand a lot of new technology in the future.

42
43 Chair Gonzalez asked if the language is too restrictive on allowable sites. City Attorney
44 Kaminski stated this is based on technology and there is currently only one location and that is
45 what has to be monitored. If limited to one new location in the future, it will have to be
46 addressed if vendors say the new location will not work for their coverage. City Attorney

1 Kaminski stated in a city the size of Wayzata, it is reasonable to have one telecommunication
2 site.

3
4 City Planner Gadow stated the City Council directed staff to send a letter to all vendors to
5 request their honeycomb map and the response from the vendors has been underwhelming. In
6 addition, the Verizon subcontractor asked about another location on private land but staff told
7 them that the City was modifying its ordinance and having a policy discussion about the current
8 site. That subcontractor mentioned they would help to get the honeycomb map from Verizon
9 and staff will follow up with other vendors as well. He commented on the impact of moving
10 equipment and possibility that both an east and west site may be needed.

11
12 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Other Items**

13
14 **a. Review of Development Activities**

15 City Planner Gadow stated the June agenda may include a new home construction application for
16 410 Ferndale and sidewalk café expansion for Caribou.

17
18 **b. Other Items**

19 Chair Gonzalez reported on action taken at the May 7, 2013, City Council meeting.

20
21 City Planner Gadow and Council Member Mullin provided an update on the public art
22 installation at the Depot lawn.

23
24 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Adjournment.**

25
26 There being no further business, Commissioner Vanderheyden made a motion, seconded by
27 Commissioner Cooper, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

28
29 The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

30
31 Respectfully submitted,

32 Carla Wirth

33 Recording Secretary

34 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*