

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 17, 2023**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order

Chair Stockton called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Chair Stockton read a prepared statement outlining multiple options for joining remotely or submitting comments and questions.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Roll Call

Chair Stockton asked Community Development Director Goellner to take roll call.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Douglas, Stockton, Sorensen, Schwalbe, and Severson. Community Development Director Emily Goellner, Assistant Planner Valerie Quarles, Parks Planner Nick Kieser, City Forester Bennett Myhran, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Absent at roll call were Commissioners: Merriam and Elg

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda

Chair Stockton asked for a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting.

Commissioner Douglas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Severson, to approve the April 17, 2023 agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the April 3, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

b.) Approval of Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for Approval of Zoning Text Amendments to Definitions and Performance Requirements Chapters

Chair Stockton read the items on the consent agenda and asked if any Commissioner wished to pull an item for further discussion.

Hearing no such request, Chair Stockton asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Commissioner Sorensen made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

1 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Hearing Items**

2
3 **a) Consider Application for Design Deviations for Rooftop Mechanical Equipment**
4 **at 900 Wayzata Boulevard E**
5

6 Assistant Planner, Valerie Quarles, gave an overview of the Wayzata Gateway project at 900
7 Wayzata Boulevard E that had received land use approvals last year and the current application
8 for additional design deviations for rooftop mechanical equipment. She gave an overview of the
9 background of the project, the zoning and land use for the surrounding neighborhood, and site plan
10 details for the application requests. She reviewed the design standards for rooftop mechanical
11 equipment and the questions the Commission should be considering when looking at this request.
12

13 At the conclusion of Planner Quarles's remarks, Chair Stockton asked if the Commission had any
14 questions for Staff.
15

16 Commissioner Sorensen asked about the footprint requirement of no more than 9 square feet and
17 how that was determined.
18

19 Planner Quarles stated that she was not present for the original Design Standards discussions, but
20 from her understanding, this type of unit is about the size of a typical residential HVAC unit. She
21 stated that she believes it made sense to have some sort of alleviation for these small, fairly non-
22 obtrusive units. She explained that the idea was that if you have substantial mechanical equipment,
23 you should be tucking it into the building as much as possible or getting it out of view as much as
24 possible.
25

26 Commissioner Douglas asked about the height of the current Wells Fargo building from Wayzata
27 Boulevard and the drive-thru.
28

29 Planner Quarles noted that she would have to dig for that information because it was contained in
30 a previous meeting packet.
31

32 Commissioner Schwalbe asked where the mechanical equipment was located in the current
33 building.
34

35 Planner Quarles stated that she does not know.
36

37 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if staff had been surprised when this request came in, and explained
38 that she was a bit surprised because she thought they had pretty much gone through everything
39 before. She stated that this feels like a last minute change that is kind of a big deal.
40

41 Commissioner Severson asked if there was a height variance given when the City saw the initial
42 proposal last fall.
43

44 Planner Quarles stated that the height variance for the original proposal was just for the residential
45 building, which is the one building of the three associated with the project that is not being
46 discussed tonight. She noted that one of the conditions of the approval resolution for the project

1 was that there should not be anything else that comes above the height allowed under the approved
2 variance for that building. She further noted that she believes that there are not any future
3 deviations anticipated for that residential building, but that it is also part of a later phase of this
4 project.

5
6 Commissioner Severson asked why the mechanical equipment would not have been factored into
7 the original proposal.

8
9 Planner Quarles stated that at the time there were a lot of requests and that she believes that part
10 of the conversation at that time was that there were a lot of architectural details that still needed to
11 be worked out. She explained that staff's understanding, at the time, was that whatever mechanical
12 equipment would be proposed would comply with the City's standards.

13
14 There being no further questions for staff, Chair Stockton invited the applicant to address the
15 Commission.

16
17 Matt Mithun, 465 Bovey Road, stated that he is part of the development team for this project. He
18 stated that language was added to the City Code about 2 years ago that restricted rooftop units to
19 9 square feet, 3 feet in height, and no more than 25% of the total surface area of the roof. He stated
20 that they appear to be the first applicable project proposed on Wayzata Boulevard since this
21 language change. He stated that he believes that everyone at the June and July meetings either
22 was not aware of the specifics of the new language or did not know the requirements of the
23 language would be impossible to achieve. He stated that as of this summer, they will have been
24 working on this plan for 3 years. He stated that a few months ago, while working toward final
25 permit, their commercial architect saw this language in the code and realized the impracticability
26 of the height and square feet limitations. He stated that they have researched all available units
27 and there are none that can comply for a commercial structure of this size. He stated that they
28 easily can comply with the percentages of rooftop coverage at only 3% of the allowed 25%. He
29 stated that when their commercial architect noticed this language, they immediately raised this
30 issue with the City and were hopeful that they would be able to move forward with an
31 administrative amendment because their plan was to break ground on April 3, 2023. He stated that
32 they were told that they would need to move through the City approval process again. He noted
33 that their office building does not require any other deviations or flexibility from the Code. He
34 stated that pedestrians and drivers will not see the rooftop units because of the parapet on the
35 buildings, and the only people who will have a view would be the residents of this development.
36 He stated that they are also planning to provide a screen around the units that shields them as well.
37 He stated that the other alternative is to have units at ground level, but that would mean that
38 everyone could both see and hear them rather than the beautiful landscaping that they have
39 planned. He stated that the only path forward for this project is with the rooftop units as they have
40 presented. He urged the Commission to support this request for the project so it can continue to
41 move forward.

42
43 Nat Shea, Tanek Architects, architect for the Applicant, explained that their initial design concept
44 always called for a 42 inch parapet that would screen everything on the rooftop. He stated that
45 they had not seen this language in the Design Standards that conflicted with other parts of the code
46 that allowed for their building height. He stated that they had always maintained a height for the

1 overall building that was below the building height limit and reviewed the plans for additional
2 screening with the 42 inch parapet. He explained that all along, their vision has been to keep the
3 ground plane clear and address many of the other design standards. He noted that those things
4 would be jeopardized with other mechanical solutions. He further noted that the current building
5 has big, giant, compressors outside which if put on the ground for this new building, would destroy
6 everything they have worked towards in terms of creating a great outdoor space. He stated that
7 their site is unique because they have created a 4-sided building that engages pedestrians from
8 every angle, which means any place this equipment would be put would take away from the overall
9 goal within the Design Standards of making these spaces engaging to the neighborhood and doing
10 things like allowing pathways through their property to the waterway. He asked the Commission
11 to see the overall vision of the project and understand the scale of what they are asking for on the
12 roof, and that it will be hidden from every possible view on the top of the hill.
13

14 Megan Rogers, Larkin Hoffman, stated that she would like to address some of the findings that
15 staff has asked the Commission to make. She stated that deviations from the City's Design
16 Standards are appropriate when they can find that the negative impact of the deviations is
17 outweighed by one or more of the factors outlined in the ordinance. She explained that she believes
18 that they have shown the Commission that there will be no negative impacts with the proposed
19 deviations. She referenced the Comprehensive Plan and the survey of the residents that was
20 conducted regarding 'charm'. She stated that she believes their application provides strong ground
21 floor design, and stated that their request to shield the large and bulky equipment on the rooftop
22 from public view lends itself to strong ground floor design. She reviewed their project and
23 explained the ways that they feel it met the objectives of the City to do things like enhance an
24 underutilized pedestrian corridor connecting Wayzata Boulevard to Lake Street, and working to
25 build a City free of visual and noise pollution. She asked that the Commission recommend
26 approval of the deviations request to allow for the proposed rooftop HVAC units.
27

28 Commissioner Schwalbe asked the applicant that if they had read the Code ahead of time whether
29 they would have been able to design this project in a way that would meet the standards and locate
30 the equipment elsewhere.
31

32 Mr. Mithun stated that he did not think there would have been an alternative for the bank building
33 because there is no basement or extra space. He stated that it may have been possible for the office
34 building, but noted that the condenser would still be outside. He stated that one of the
35 Commissioners had asked a question earlier about the existing equipment, and he explained that
36 there is a big chiller outside so if you are on Superior and you pull into the back parking area, it is
37 located between the drive-thru and the building. He stated that it would have completely disrupted
38 the landscaping plans as well.
39

40 Mr. Shea stated that he would say that doing another system would have been possible but he did
41 not think it would be as beautiful of a project as what they are currently proposing. He stated that
42 the type of big chillers that Mr. Mithun referenced are very large and that they blast, non-stop. He
43 explained that they have always imagined the equipment on the roof because of aesthetics and the
44 frontage of this property. He reiterated that he feels that they have put together a very beautiful
45 project and any other solution, mechanically, would dramatically take away from that fact.
46

1 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that in the presentation from staff there was mention of a few
2 buildings around the area that would have a view of the rooftop if this is approved. She asked if
3 they saw that as an issue.
4

5 Mr. Shea stated that he feels that is where they went above and beyond what Code required by
6 screening the equipment. He noted that he felt it would basically need to be a 10 story building in
7 order to see down into the equipment. He stated that if they are level with it or just above them,
8 they will see finished metal material that looks very similar to the rest of the building.
9

10 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that in looking at the renderings of the rooftops and screening, the
11 footprint looks like it is a lot more than 3%.
12

13 Mr. Shay stated that it is exactly 3% and noted that the code, as it is written, would allow them to
14 do five hundred thirteen 3 x 3 units, without any screening, on the roof top, which he felt does not
15 make any sense and that there may be some unintended consequences to this code language.
16

17 Commissioner Douglas asked what the height was of the current Wells Fargo building and the
18 height of the drive-thru.
19

20 Mr. Shay stated that he does not know the height information off the top of his head because of
21 the grade plane. He stated that they did have this information the last time they presented to the
22 Commission, so he can access that the information but would need time to dig it up. He noted that
23 in addition to the 42 inch parapet that will screen the units, they have also chosen to place them in
24 the middle of the building rather than on the edge, which will also help screen them.
25

26 Mr. Mithun stated that Commissioner Schwalbe had asked if they had known about this code
27 language if they would be gone ahead with the project, and he answered that he did not think he
28 would have. He stated that he did not want to cut corners with this project and have large units
29 outside making noise and being visible. He reiterated that he probably would not have proceeded
30 with the project if he knew about the design code language for the rooftop mechanical equipment.
31

32 Commissioner Severson asked where the mechanical equipment was originally supposed to go.
33

34 Mr. Shay stated that they have planned since day one that it would be placed on the roof, which
35 was why they had planned for the 42 inch parapet.
36

37 There being no questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Stockton opened the public
38 hearing on the application at 7:14 pm.
39

40 Henry Miles, 746 Widsten Circle, thanked City staff and Mr. Mithun for answering some of his
41 questions prior to this meeting. He stated that they have a direct line of sight to this project from
42 approximately the same elevation. He stated that he is here in support of the requested variance
43 but would also like to share some observations about the process, the Building Code, and
44 precedent. He noted that the last time this development came up for public comment, a few
45 individuals from Widsten Circle were present and spoke in favor of the project believing they were
46 looking at the final plans. He stated that they then found out that the plans were not final because

1 they did not account for the rooftop HVAC equipment. He noted that he had also learned that the
2 City desires that such units be located at ground level, inside the building, or designed within the
3 massing of the building rather than being placed on the rooftop. He stated that he can understand
4 why a developer would prefer to put such equipment on the rooftop and not give up valuable
5 footprint space below or within the building. He stated that based on the information that has been
6 reported, rooftop equipment of the scale required for this project is not available on the market
7 with the dimensions prescribed by what is in the City's building code. He stated that if that is the
8 case, the City should modify its building code or make it more flexible. He stated that rather than
9 focusing on dimensions perhaps the code could focus on aesthetics and making the equipment not
10 be visible from the hills or building tops surrounding the proposed development. He explained
11 that he had received an e-mail from Mr. Mithun that indicated this would be the case with this
12 project. He stated that the City has approved a CUP at 800 Wayzata Boulevard E which has a
13 large, boxy, rooftop private cell tower that was not needed, given that there is one available at
14 Wayzata Junior High. He stated that if the City can permit what he considers to be an ugly
15 carbuncle at that location, it can certainly approve this request that includes an elegant design
16 nearby. He stated that this has shown a suboptimal process, an illogical building code, that a
17 precedent was established, but also has the promise for an impressive project that he is an advocate
18 for. He asked City staff to submit his comments into the record and that they be forwarded to the
19 City Council. He noted that the City has four cell towers that he knows of for the population of
20 5,000 people, which is over twice as many towers, per capita, as in the United States, overall.

21
22 Community Development Director Goellner stated there were no people that called in to the
23 meeting that have asked to speak at the public hearing.

24
25 There being no additional public comments on the application, Chair Stockton closed the public
26 hearing at 7:20 pm.

27
28 Chair Stockton asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

29
30 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if staff thinks the City may need to take a look at the code language
31 on dimensions of roof top units for future developments.

32
33 Community Development Director Goellner stated that she thinks it is possible that the City would
34 see requests from other applicants of commercial buildings in the corridor due to these restrictions.
35 She stated that they are difficult to meet in the marketplace and stated that she believes that they
36 will see alternatives presented that really are not very good alternatives and would impede on the
37 pedestrian environment. She noted that this particular site is difficult because it has so many 'front'
38 yards, but noted that it may be more straightforward for other properties on Wayzata Boulevard.
39 She stated that there is no doubt that the existing language is very restrictive.

40
41 Commissioner Severson stated that the language is very restrictive and asked if that meant that the
42 intent was to have fewer buildings with rooftop equipment along Wayzata Boulevard.

43
44 Community Development Director Goellner stated that was the intent at the time the Design
45 Standards were written. She read aloud the standards that existed before the new Design Standards
46 were written, and explained that they basically said that all mechanical equipment shall be

1 completely screened behind a parapet wall and not visible to adjacent properties. She explained
2 that the City had made it more stringent by adding the size requirements.

3
4 Commissioner Douglas stated that when she saw this report she thought to her self that a 3 x 3 unit
5 is what she has in her back yard which is a small townhome. She stated that the size dimension
6 does not make any sense, and noted that she does not recall those discussions that called for a 3 x
7 3 unit for a commercial building. She stated that she believes this is something that the City needs
8 to address.

9
10 Community Development Director Goellner stated that if other Commissioners have similar
11 comments that this piece of code needs another look, she can take that to the Council for
12 consideration.

13
14 Commissioner Douglas stated that she feels this is a wonderful project, and she likes the screening
15 materials that they are proposing. She explained that she would have no hesitation in
16 recommending approval.

17
18 Commissioner Schwalbe explained that she liked this project a lot when it was first presented and
19 she still does. She stated that she sees a lot of value in having the mechanicals on the rooftop, and
20 noted that she has always liked all of the green space that they have incorporated into their design.

21
22 Commissioner Sorensen stated that in this case, he thinks the City has a Design Standard that is
23 extremely restrictive and almost necessitates a deviation. He stated that rooftop units for a building
24 of this size are extremely common and standard. He stated that he feels it is reasonable to assume
25 that there are rooftop units for this building, and noted that he believes it does make a difference.
26 He stated that he feels that this site is probably at or near the highest elevation of all of Wayzata
27 Boulevard, and he believes the real issue comes down to visibility and how impactful that is to
28 neighbors, pedestrians, and people who live nearby. He stated that he thinks the team and staff
29 have done a really good job explaining the options and why, if this equipment is placed on the
30 ground, that it will cause more issues than approving a deviation. He stated that he believed
31 approving a deviation will comply with the Comprehensive Plan, and he would support that action.

32
33 Chair Stockton stated that she was a member of the Design Standards Committee and she recalls
34 addressing the mechanicals. She stated that it is an interesting design standard because it is an
35 inherently functional item that the City is trying to make comply with design. She stated that it
36 was looked at primarily by the consulting team that they had worked with. She stated that the
37 ways these units are proposed are very concise and neatly done, and if they actually met the design
38 code there would be a much broader array of units across the roof. She stated that because of this,
39 she would not hesitate to recommend approval.

40
41 There being no further discussion, Chair Stockton asked for a motion on the application.

42
43 Commissioner Douglas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to direct staff to
44 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings,
45 reflecting a recommendation of approval for the Design Deviations request for rooftop mechanical

1 equipment at 900 Wayzata Boulevard E for review and adoption at the next Planning Commission
2 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.
3

4 **b) Consider Application for Zoning Text Amendments for Chapter 936 – Tree**
5 **Preservation Ordinance and Chapter 918 – Fencing/Screening**
6

7 Parks Planner Kieser and City Forester Bennett Myhran, on behalf of the City as applicant, gave
8 an overview of the proposed Zoning Text Amendments for Chapter 936 – Tree Preservation
9 Ordinance and Fencing/Screening - Chapter 918. He shared background, and reviewed the
10 rationale for the proposed changes. He noted that based on staff's implementation and
11 administration of recent changes to the Tree Preservation Ordinance, Staff recommends approval
12 of the amendments.
13

14 Commissioner Douglas asked about the definition of critical root zones, and if it applied to both
15 coniferous and deciduous trees.
16

17 City Forester Myhran stated that the critical and structural root zones apply to both types of trees,
18 and is a uniform formula regardless of species.
19

20 Commissioner Severson asked what the general feedback has been with the tree removal permit
21 applications that have come in.
22

23 City Forester Myhran stated that the feedback has been mixed, and noted that they have had to
24 make some tweaks to the application process. He explained that their hope is to make it as easy as
25 possible. He stated that his goal would be for it to take just 5 minutes of time to complete an
26 application, and noted that the City values the information that they are able to get from the permit
27 applications because it helps them maintain their own trees. He stated that they have gotten some
28 good, helpful feedback, and noted that overall people seem to be willing to participate, which is
29 encouraging.
30

31 There being no questions from the Commission for staff, Chair Stockton opened the public hearing
32 on the application at 7:44 pm.
33

34 Community Development Director Goellner stated there were no people that called in to the
35 meeting that have asked to speak at the public hearing, and Chair Stockton noted there was no one
36 at the meeting in person that wished to speak.
37

38 There being no one wishing to comment on the application, Chair Stockton closed the public
39 hearing at 7:45 pm.
40

41 Chair Stockton asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.
42

43 Commissioner Severson stated that she thinks the proposed changes are reasonable.
44

1 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she would agree, and feels the proposed steps are appropriate
2 for what the City is trying to do in the City with its canopy to preserve and protect the trees that
3 they have.

4
5 There being no further discussion, Chair Stockton asked for a motion on the application.
6

7 Commissioner Schwalbe made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to direct staff to
8 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings
9 reflecting a recommendation of approval for the Zoning Text Amendments to Chapter 936 Tree
10 Preservation Ordinance and Chapter 918 Fencing/Screening for review and adoption at the next
11 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.
12

13 **c) Consider Application for Conditional Use Permits for Municipal Solar at 600 Rice**
14 **Street East and 747 Mill Street East**
15

16 Parks Planner Kieser gave an overview of the City's application for Conditional Use Permits for
17 the planned Municipal Solar project for City buildings at 600 Rice Street East and 747 Mill Street
18 East. He reviewed zoning and land use for City Hall, Fire Station, and the Library buildings at
19 600 Rice Street East and the Municipal Grill and Bar/Wine and Spirits building at 747 Mill Street
20 East. He reviewed the applicable design district, discussion and recommendations from the Energy
21 and Environment Committee, project details, including cost of installation, and solar system
22 designs for the various buildings. He noted that there have been no public comments received on
23 this proposed project, and that staff recommends approval.
24

25 At the conclusion of Parks Planner Kieser's remarks, Chair Stockton asked if the Commission had
26 any questions for Staff.
27

28 Commissioner Douglas asked for details on the proposed design for the project at City Hall, and
29 asked about the mention in the packet materials of a transformer. She asked if a transformer would
30 be loud, and expressed concern about the neighbors across the street.
31

32 Parks Planner Kieser stated that staff has done some walk-throughs of the building with the
33 electrical engineers, and noted that pretty much all of the connections would be inside the building.
34 He stated that what will be outside are essentially 'turn-off' switches. He stated that there may be
35 other components that are placed outside, but they would be put where the existing electrical is
36 located, which is more or less hidden. He confirmed that transformers do not create a lot of noise.
37

38 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she was a bit surprised when looking at the pictures of the
39 City of Morris Liquor Store because it has a pitch on it similar to The Muni. She stated that it
40 really stands out in the pictures. She stated that she does not have any issues with the panels on
41 flat surfaces, but The Muni is part of the Lake Street area that has a lot more people going past.
42 She suggested that the City install that part of the project last, and reiterated that she had not
43 expected it to be so dramatically visible.
44

45 Parks Planner Kieser stated that this idea started with the Energy and Environment Committee,
46 and their idea was to try to get as much traction with this as possible, and create the most energy

1 as possible. He stated that he believes part of their thought process in pursuing the pitched roof
2 solar panels was to make the project more visible.

3
4 Commissioner Schwalbe reiterated her question about whether it would be possible to start
5 construction in certain areas before others.

6
7 Parks Planner Kieser stated that if there was consensus, they could take a look at putting in certain
8 installations before others.

9
10 There being no additional questions for staff, Chair Stockton opened the public hearing on the
11 application at 8:04 pm.

12
13 Community Development Director Goellner stated there were no people that called in to the
14 meeting that have asked to speak at the public hearing, and Chair Stockton noted there was no one
15 at the meeting in person that wished to speak.

16
17 There being no one wishing to comment on the application, Chair Stockton closed the public
18 hearing at 8:04 pm.

19
20 Chair Stockton asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

21
22 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if anyone else on the Commission had noticed the example pictures
23 from Morris on the pitched roof that is similar to The Muni, and how dramatic it looked.

24
25 Commissioner Douglas stated that when the City started down this road a few months ago, she
26 would have had the same feeling. She explained that when she started looking into it, she noticed
27 how many had solar on the beautiful homes throughout the City, and noted that she had also seen
28 it when she was visiting Florida. She explained that as time goes along, she has been getting more
29 and more concerned about the environment. She stated that she thinks it may be time for the City
30 to set the example for what the community should look at, and noted that her church is even looking
31 into solar panels.

32
33 Commissioner Sorensen asked if municipal buildings were treated any differently than private
34 buildings under the Solar Ordinance.

35
36 Parks Planner Kieser stated that they were not, and explained that they had combined institutional
37 and commercial in recent zoning ordinance updates.

38
39 Commissioner Sorensen noted that late last year, the City entered into an agreement with Blue
40 Horizon to purchase and install this equipment. He stated that the new Solar Ordinance came
41 about earlier this year that said that in the Bluff District, you need a CUP to install rooftop solar.

42
43 Parks Planner Kieser explained that essentially the City has not yet approved a building permit to
44 put this equipment on the buildings because a CUP is required under the Solar Ordinance.

45

1 Commissioner Sorensen stated that he thinks the only possible adverse effect could be the visual
2 impact on The Muni. He stated that the City does not allow solar energy systems on Lake Street,
3 and while it is not on Lake Street, it is right across the parking lot. He cautioned that the City
4 should be careful with that installation, and noted that he was personally not too enthused about
5 having the panels on The Muni.

6
7 Commissioner Severson stated that she thinks making this decision is a move in the right direction.
8 She stated that more and more homes are installing solar panels, and she believes that was
9 something that you will just continue to see more of as time goes on.

10
11 There being no further discussion, Chair Stockton asked for a motion on the application.

12
13 Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to direct staff to
14 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings
15 reflecting a recommendation of approval of Conditional Use Permits for Solar Energy Systems at
16 600 Rice Street East and 747 Mill Street East for review and adoption at the next Planning
17 Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

18
19 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Other Items:**

20
21 **a) Review of Development Activities**

22
23 Community Development Director Goellner stated that there will be a Public Hearing on May 1,
24 2023 for an application for a Mixed Use Development project at 200 Lake Street (TCF Building).
25 She noted that the project plans are available for viewing on the City's website. She stated that
26 there will be a neighborhood meeting for this project on April 24, 2023 at 5:15 p.m. at City Hall
27 that will be hosted by the applicant.

28
29 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

30
31 Community Development Director Goellner stated that there are no new changes to the Planning
32 Commission meeting schedule.

33
34 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.**

35
36 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Stockton asked for a motion to adjourn.

37
38 Commissioner Douglas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Severson, to adjourn the
39 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

40
41 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

42
43 Respectfully submitted,
44 Kayla Atkins Rokosz
45 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*