

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 6, 2024**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order

Chair Stockton called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

Chair Stockton noted the untimely passing of Commissioner and friend Peggy Douglas, praising her extensive contributions to the City as a Planning Commissioner, longtime Chamber of Commerce President, and engaged community member. Chair Stockton recognized Commissioner Douglas as a truly special person who was a joy to work with and that she will be deeply missed. She noted that other Commissioners were welcome to speak at this time if they would like. Hearing no statements, Chair Stockton provided the Commission with options to table all items, approve an amended agenda, or approve the agenda as is. The Commission agreed to move forward with the agenda as-is.

Chair Stockton read a prepared statement outlining multiple options for joining the meeting 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: Stockton, Sorensen, Schwalbe, Severson, Elg, and Plantan. Community Development Director Emily Goellner, Assistant Planner Valerie Quarles, Parks and Environment Planner Nick Kieser, City Forester Bennett Myhran, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Absent at roll call were Commissioner: Douglas

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda

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

Commissioner Sorensen made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe to approve the May 6, 2024 agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

- a.) Approval of the April 22, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
- b.) Acknowledgement of Withdrawal of Development Application at 163 Wayzata Boulevard West – Moments of Wayzata

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

3
4 Chair Stockton asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

5
6 Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Severson to approve the
7 Consent Agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

8
9 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Hearing Items**

10
11 Chair Stockton noted that the video monitors on the dais were not working and explained that staff
12 had distributed hard copies of the information that would be presented.

13
14 Commissioner Elg suggested that the order of the public hearing items be changed so that item c.
15 could take place first.

16
17 Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe to move Public Hearing
18 item c. to become item a., and renumber the subsequent items accordingly. The motion carried
19 unanimously.

20
21 **a) Consider Development Application for Front Yard Setback Variance at 425**
22 **Highcroft Road**

23
24 Assistant Planner, Valerie Quarles, stated that the applicant had submitted a request for a front
25 yard setback variance at 425 Highcroft Road and reviewed the project location, surrounding land
26 use and zoning, original conditions, permitting history, and details from the application. She
27 shared photos that show the existing views of the home that was already under construction. She
28 reviewed the notification process and explained that the City had received 3 positive comments in
29 favor of the request from neighbors. She noted that the general sentiment is that the neighbors do
30 not feel that this request is highly impactful and also had stated that the original home was closer
31 than the new home will be.

32
33 Chair Stockton asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff.

34
35 Commissioner Schwalbe asked what the responsibility would be for the architect and the builder
36 when a change is made in where a building is positioned to make sure it meets all the requirements.
37 She asked if this was a situation where everybody had just missed this detail.

38
39 Planner Quarles stated that she believes that would be a fair characterization and explained that
40 one of the root issues with the review was that the front yard setback was depicted incorrectly on
41 the original survey. She stated that in her original review, the thought was that the house was 50
42 feet away so the side yard setback depiction was less important, as long as the home was compliant,
43 but noted that this had made review later a bit tougher once the home moved.

44
45 Bill Costello, Streeter Custom Builders, 18312 Minnetonka Boulevard, expressed his condolences
46 on the loss of Commissioner Douglas. He stated that while the current situation was unfortunate,

1 they do believe that granting this request would have little to no consequence for the neighborhood.
2 He outlined some of the potential consequences and expense should the City decide not to grant
3 the variance request.
4

5 There being no questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Stockton opened the public
6 hearing on the application at 6:45 pm.
7

8 Jeannie Hamm, 445 Highcroft Road, stated that she does not know the owners of this home or
9 anyone from Streeter Custom Homes. She stated that she has lived next door to the construction
10 for a long time and believes that this request is minimal and the cost to fix it would be burdensome
11 for the property owner. She stated that the house that used to be on this property was much closer
12 and explained that she would like to see the project completed and the homeowners be able to get
13 into their new home.
14

15 Community Development Director Goellner stated there were no people that called in to the
16 meeting that have asked to speak at the public hearing.
17

18 There being no additional comments on the application, Chair Stockton closed the public hearing
19 at 6:48 pm.
20

21 Chair Stockton asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.
22

23 Commissioner Elg stated that he would like to move this along and would recommend approval
24 of the request.
25

26 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she agreed and noted that she did not think this had been done
27 on purpose and was simply an oversight that will have minimal impact on anyone else.
28

29 There being no further discussion, Chair Stockton asked for a motion on the application.
30

31 Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to direct staff to prepare
32 a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings reflecting a
33 recommendation of approval for a Front Yard Setback Variance at 425 Highcroft Road, for review
34 and adoption at the next Planning Commission meeting.
35

36 Chair Stockton stated that she also felt this was a reasonable request and felt that the home was in
37 character with the area.
38

39 Commissioner Plantan stated that she would agree and was pleased that the neighbors have made
40 statements on behalf of the applicant.
41

42 The motion carried unanimously.
43

44 **b) Consider Zoning Text Amendments to Chapter 930 (Animals) to Allow for the**
45 **Keeping of Chickens on Single Family Residential Properties**
46

1 Parks and Environment Planner Kieser, reviewed the proposed text amendments to Chapter 930
2 to allow for keeping of chickens on single family residential properties. He reviewed background
3 of this issue, past discussions at the City Council and Energy and Environment Committee,
4 proposed changes, and the staff recommendation for approval. He explained that no public
5 comments had been received regarding the proposed changes.
6

7 Commissioner Sorensen stated that he appreciated all the time and effort that has gone into the
8 chicken conversation. He stated that it appears as though there has been a large amount of
9 discussion, but perhaps not a consensus on this issue.
10

11 Parks and Environment Planner Kieser stated that was a good point and noted that it was brought
12 forward three years ago and they could not come to a consensus at that time either which was why
13 they had brought it to a recent City Council Workshop meeting. He explained that what came out
14 of that meeting was direction to keep the code language as simple as possible in order to come to
15 a resolution and not keep on churning. He stated that their direction was to find a balance between
16 all the comments that were heard three years ago and incorporate all the research they did from
17 other communities in order to find a solution.
18

19 Commissioner Sorensen stated that at one point in time there was discussion about this being
20 restricted to larger lots but the current proposal was for any single family residential lot and asked
21 for how that came about.
22

23 Parks and Environment Planner Kieser explained that when this was brought forward three years
24 ago, there was a minimum lot size of 40,000 sq. ft. He stated that when this went before the
25 Council it was a large part of their discussion and noted that he felt it was one of the biggest reasons
26 that they did not come up with a solution at that time. He stated that the current proposal went back
27 to being as simple as possible and making it as accessible as possible for everyone in the City,
28 while still meeting the restrictions and regulations.
29

30 Commissioner Sorensen asked about the restrictions related to the location of the coops and the
31 run areas.
32

33 Parks and Environment Planner Kieser explained that they would need to be in the rear yard and
34 would need to meet the accessory structure setbacks. He noted that the accessory structure
35 setbacks vary within the different zoning districts and explained that the smallest setback from the
36 property line would be 5 feet which would mainly be in the R-3A properties and the highest is
37 around 15-20 feet.
38

39 Commissioner Sorensen stated that it is a bit difficult for him to get his head around what would
40 be appropriate in this situation because he doesn't have a lot of experience with chickens. He
41 referenced the portion of the presentation related to proposed changes and noted that there are
42 many lots in the City that are R-3 or R-3A some of which are less than 9,000 sq. ft. which means
43 that they could have a coop and run within 5 feet of their property line in multiple places which
44 was his only concern. He stated that he questioned what the neighbors would think and stated that
45 he was not overly familiar with the noise issues or the visual impact this may have. He stated that

1 his overall sense was that this was a good idea, but was not sure it was a good idea for the smaller
2 lots.

3
4 Commissioner Elg stated that property owners are only allowed one coop per property and there
5 is a limit to 4 chickens.

6
7 Commissioner Sorensen clarified that he did not mean that there would be multiple coops on the
8 property, but that each neighbor could have a coop which would mean that they would be
9 surrounded by coops.

10
11 Commissioner Plantan asked if there was a limit to how many coops per property and how many
12 accessory units they could have on the property. She gave the example of having a shed, a detached
13 garage, and asked whether they could have 1 or 2 chicken coops.

14
15 Park and Environment Planner Kieser clarified that they would only be allowed 1 chicken coop
16 and chicken run on each property with a maximum of 4 hens. He noted that it was interesting how
17 the City Code lays out the number of accessory structures and explained that essentially, anything
18 under 200 sq. ft.. does not require a building permit.

19
20 Commissioner Schwalbe asked how many people in the City have expressed interest in having
21 chickens.

22
23 Park and Environment Planner Kieser stated that he would say 'a few' but noted that when they
24 did their community engagement they got a good number of people who expressed an interest in
25 keeping chickens.

26
27 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she was surprised that this keeps coming up because she does
28 not know a single person who wants to keep chickens. She stated that she agreed with the
29 comments made by Commissioner Sorensen regarding his concerns about making this open to
30 every single home no matter the size of the lot and feels that decision would be a mistake. She
31 stated that she would like to see this changed to have some sort of a minimum lot size in order to
32 have chickens. She stated that she cannot think of a single chicken coop in the City.

33
34 Commissioner Elg clarified that she had not seen one because they are currently not allowed
35 without a CUP, which takes time and money.

36
37 Commissioner Schwalbe asked how much it would cost to get a CUP.

38
39 Community Development Director Goellner stated that a CUP can cost hundreds, and usually
40 thousands of dollars. She noted that it also takes about 3-6 months to complete the process. She
41 explained that because the CUP process was fairly intense, she did not believe it was the proper fit
42 for this type of use.

43
44 Chair Stockton clarified that currently people cannot have chickens in the City unless they go
45 through a lengthy and costly process through something that would essentially be unfamiliar to a
46 resident

1
2 Community Development Director Goellner stated that was correct and would not be something
3 that a typical resident would be able to immediately understand and would need quite a bit of
4 coaching to get through this process. She stated that they would also most likely incur thousands
5 of dollars throughout this process.
6

7 Commissioner Elg asked how the recommendation came up with the limitation of 4 chickens, a
8 50 sq. ft. structure, and a 100 sq. ft. run. He asked if someone had told them that this was the ideal
9 living space for chickens.
10

11 Park and Environment Planner Kieser stated that the number of hens was based on looking at what
12 other communities currently have and explained that the range they saw was 4-8 hens. He
13 explained that, based on this information, they went down to the most conservative option in order
14 to find a balance and would fit the City. He stated that related to the size of the coop and run, they
15 researched the minimum size recommendations and made sure that they were above those
16 numbers. He explained that what they are proposing is right in the middle of what other
17 communities have in place for sizing.
18

19 Chair Stockton asked what reasons there may be for denying a permit request.
20

21 Park and Environment Planner Kieser stated that if the permit application meets all the restrictions
22 and code requirements the City would essentially have to approve the request. He stated that if
23 there are issues later on with code enforcement items, it could potentially be revoked.
24

25 Chair Stockton asked if the permit fee would provide the funding for following up on these things.
26

27 Park and Environment Planner Kieser stated that was correct and explained that they would make
28 the fees equate to the necessary staff time.
29

30 Commissioner Plantan stated that the recommendation is that they would need to be located in the
31 rear yard and asked if it was correct that if they were not in a run that the rear yard would have to
32 be fenced.
33

34 Park and Environment Planner Kieser stated that was correct and would need to be entirely fenced
35 so the chickens would not be allowed out.
36

37 Commissioner Plantan asked if those fencing requirements would be similar to that of a swimming
38 pool with relation to height regulations.
39

40 Park and Environment Planner Kieser explained that in the code language, they set a minimum of
41 4 feet for the fencing and that the chickens cannot get outside of the fencing.
42

43 Commissioner Severson asked about the feedback from residents and neighbors of people in other
44 communities, especially those on the smaller lots about whether it has been a problem or not.
45

1 Park and Environment Planner Kieser stated that he had not spoken with staff at the other cities
2 and explained that he had just looked at their code language. He stated that he thinks it is a good
3 suggestion for him to try to touch base with some of the staff in the other communities in order to
4 get a bit more insight.

5
6 Commissioner Severson noted that she had done a quick Google search and found that chickens
7 can fly about 10 feet in the air so a 4 foot high fence may not be tall enough to keep them in.

8
9 Community Development Director Goellner noted that if the City had a complaint received about
10 that issue, they would address it at that time. She stated that it is not very common and explained
11 that there are chickens throughout her neighborhood in St. Paul, and noted that the lot sizes are
12 about 4,000 sq. ft. She explained that she does not really hear or see the chickens unless there is a
13 chain link fence that they can see through. She stated that she believed that it was not common to
14 see neglectful owners of chickens and noted that she had been involved in a chicken keeping
15 ordinance when she was in Golden Valley and felt it went pretty well.

16
17 There being no additional questions from the Commission, Chair Stockton opened the public
18 hearing on the application at 7:30 pm.

19
20 Community Development Director Goellner stated there were no people that called in to the
21 meeting that have asked to speak at the public hearing.

22
23 There being no one wishing to comment on the application, Chair Stockton closed the public
24 hearing at 7:30 pm.

25
26 Chair Stockton asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

27
28 Commissioner Elg stated that he was excited that this proposal has come forward. He stated that
29 their neighbors in Deephaven, Minnetonka, and Plymouth currently allow chickens. He explained
30 that having your own chickens allows for greater sustainability and allows people the option to not
31 have to purchase their eggs from someone like a factory farm producer which he felt could be
32 cruel to the chickens. He stated that he was completely in favor of this proposal and has also liked
33 the educational piece of this for people to learn about raising chickens. He stated that he would
34 support the removal of the restriction for the size of lot and thanked staff for their work on this
35 proposal.

36
37 Commissioner Sorensen stated that he was in favor of finding a process that is more simple than a
38 CUP process. He stated that for the most part, he felt this proposed amendment was positive but
39 feels that there are still some 'unknowns' on how this may play out and reiterated that his concern
40 was for allowing this on the smaller lots and would prefer to proceed with caution, especially given
41 the lack of interest from the community.

42
43 Commissioner Plantan stated that she also has some concerns and felt that 5 feet off the property
44 line was not enough. She stated that she feels that this is a unique ordinance with live animals
45 versus other accessory structures like a shed or gazebo. She stated that she feels that it needs a bit
46 more work but loves the idea of keeping it simple. She referenced details from nearby

1 communities related to chickens and noted that she would support there being some kind of checks
2 and balances in place for things like keeping the areas clean so there is not an odor. She reiterated
3 that she felt that there needed to be a few more regulations or discussions and not just a blanket
4 option to apply once and then have it for life unless somebody complains.

5
6 Commissioner Severson stated that a few years ago she was in favor of this until she talked to
7 people that were also in favor of it, but did not want to be neighbors to the chickens. She stated
8 that she believes that, in theory, this sounds really good, but she does not know if there are a lot of
9 people who will want this in their neighborhood. She stated that she also wondered if they should
10 require a fenced in rear yard regardless of whether they have a coop or a run. She noted that
11 because they have heard that there is not a whole lot of interest in this, she was not really sure if
12 this was the right time to make this change.

13
14 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she knows two people who have had chickens and both only
15 ended up keeping them for 1-2 years. She stated that she also has concerns with the size of the lot
16 and the setbacks proposed and would not vote in support of this, as presented.

17
18 Commissioner Elg stated that he appreciated anecdotes, but does not feel that they should have
19 any bearing on the conversation because the Commission should be looking at facts. He stated
20 that he also did not feel that hypotheticals were a good way to make judgements. He noted that
21 he felt that the language amendments have been pretty well thought out by staff and expressed the
22 desire for the conversation to stick to facts.

23
24 Chair Stockton stated the City currently doesn't have anything like this right now so this would be
25 going from one extreme to another by allowing it everywhere. She explained that she was not
26 opposed to that idea but feels that she was hearing that this may be of interest to some but perhaps
27 there has not been enough thought that has done into the remedial circumstances due to going from
28 one extreme to the other. She stated that in order to make people comfortable with it, there would
29 need to be some type of restriction or spending additional time to take a look at what actions would
30 cause a permit to be denied. She stated that she feels that the City needs to start somewhere and
31 noted that there has been a lot of thought put into this issue. She explained that she would be in
32 favor of some compromises in the wording that would allow the City to look into how things would
33 be handled in an extreme situation, for example, smells or dogs going crazy. She stated that she
34 would be in favor of moving this forward with some additional details.

35
36 Commissioner Schwalbe noted that she liked the suggestions made by Commissioner Plantan
37 related to the requirement being more than a 5 foot setback and that it be allowed on larger lots
38 only. She asked Commissioner Plantan to repeat some of her suggestions.

39
40 Commissioner Plantan stated that she would like to see there be more than a 5 foot setback from
41 the property line. She stated that she liked the idea of people being able to have chickens, but felt
42 that the City needed to have additional conversations about some of the details. She asked if the
43 Commission could move this forward to the Council but continue to have those conversations.

44
45 Community Development Director Goellner noted that she believed that it would be acceptable
46 for the Commission to amend the language and information that had been included in the packet.

1
2 City Attorney Schelzel stated that the Commission could move this forward, but ask the Council
3 to consider some modifications, as they have been discussing, if there was general consensus
4 among the Commission that they wanted to allow chickens within the City.

5
6 Commissioner Plantan stated that she felt that the Commission could also have consensus to deny
7 this proposal and have it come back for further discussion.

8
9 City Attorney Schelzel noted that this item will move onto the Council whether the Commission
10 recommends approval or denial. He noted that what he heard from the Commission was that they
11 felt there were a few parts of the ordinance, as drafted, that they would like to fill in a bit more
12 regulation.

13
14 Commissioner Elg stated that he would like the Commission to work on this a bit tonight and make
15 some actual recommendations to the Council in order to keep this moving forward. He stated that
16 he would agree that a larger setback is probably a good idea and that having a fenced in yard may
17 also be okay. He stated that while the chickens 'can' fly up to 10 feet high, many times chickens
18 for this purpose have their wings clipped so that would not be an issue. He reiterated that he would
19 like the Commission to identify a few of the things that they would want to recommended be added
20 rather than just passing it on and having staff simply bring back something else.

21
22 Commissioner Sorensen stated that the Council will be able to read the minutes and know some
23 of their discussion points.

24
25 City Attorney Schelzel confirmed that their discussion would be reflected in the minutes in
26 addition to whatever has consensus for inclusion in the report and recommendation.

27
28 Commissioner Sorensen stated that for some of the things that they discussed, he was not sure the
29 Commission was in the position to know exactly what it should be changed to, for example, the
30 height of the fencing, lot size, or setbacks. He stated that if the Council has access to their
31 discussion it would give them some time to think about those issues prior to their meeting.

32
33 City Attorney Schelzel stated he did not feel the Commission needed to come up with specifics,
34 but could send the message to the Council that the Commission, for example, felt the fence height
35 should simply be higher than what is proposed and that the setback should be greater than 5 feet.
36 He noted that staff has spent a lot of time working on this and believes that they will be able to
37 recommend some changes based on the feedback from the Commission.

38
39 Commissioner Plantan suggested that the Commission identify the things that they are concerned
40 about such as setbacks, and communicate that they would like the Council to consider some
41 additional requirements. She stated that she would like the Council to consider the height of the
42 fencing, and the possibility for a two year application in order to be able to check and see how it
43 is going rather than going from 0 to 100 mph. She reviewed the items she had concerns with
44 including, duration of permit, height of fencing, and side yard setbacks.

45

1 Commissioner Sorensen that he would also like to note a concern with lot sizes and noted that it
2 may be more of an issue of defining it by specific zoning district, rather than by square footage.

3
4 Commissioner Elg explained that he would like it to be on the record that he would never be in
5 favor of that, because it would exclude people.

6
7 Community Development Director Goellner stated that she believes she has heard that the
8 Commission has consensus that they recommend approval, but would recommend modifications
9 for review by the Council. She stated that the areas of concern would be: consideration of larger
10 setback requirements for the coop and run, that included discussion about possibly 10 feet or larger;
11 interest in establishing a minimum lot size; interest in seeing more investigation of the property
12 fence height in the rear yard; and duration of the permit and the potential renewal process.

13
14 Commissioner Severson confirmed that the way this is written would not allow downtown
15 businesses to have chicken coops on their properties.

16
17 Community Development Director Goellner confirmed that the way the ordinance was proposed
18 was only for single family residential properties and would not be for commercial use.

19
20 Commissioner Severson asked about townhomes or apartments.

21
22 Community Development Director Goellner noted that those would be considered multi-family
23 properties.

24
25 There being no further discussion, Chair Stockton asked for a motion on the application.

26
27 Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to approve the Draft
28 Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with the following four conditions and that
29 the City Council consider: a larger setback requirement; a minimum lot size; a larger fence height
30 in the rear yard; and the duration of the permit and renewal based on compliance.

31
32 Commissioner Elg reiterated that he would not be in favor of limiting the size of the property and
33 making any stipulation that would omit one property over another. He stated that he could support
34 the other three conditions, but would like to eliminate the condition related to property size. He
35 stated that staff has looked closely at what other communities were doing and he was not aware
36 that they were having a lot of issues with chickens. He stated that he feels the motion proposed
37 would be micromanaging the situation.

38
39 Chair Stockton suggested that, in lieu of micromanaging and eliminating a section of the residents,
40 that there could also be consideration given to capping a section to a quantity of chickens for the
41 small lots, for a particular zone.

42
43 Upon a vote, the motion carried 4 ayes and 2 nays (Commissioners Sorensen and Elg).

44
45 **c) Consider Zoning Text Amendments to Chapter 936 on Tree Preservation**
46

1 City Forester Myhran reviewed the proposed text amendments to Chapter 936 related to tree
2 preservation. He outlined the background of the Tree Preservation Ordinance, its impact on the
3 canopy, and discussion from a recent City Council Workshop. He briefly reviewed the objectives
4 of the proposed text amendments and outlined the next steps in the process.

5
6 Chair Stockton asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff.

7
8 Commissioner Plantan referenced point number three related to the definition of heritage trees to
9 better reflect relative species value. She noted that some neighborhoods are defined by, for
10 example, silver maples sweeping along the boulevards and explained that she was a bit concerned
11 that this language was saying that those would not be included for replacement.

12
13 City Forester Myhran explained that they would still be protected and explained that for a
14 significant tree, the replacement requirement is 1 inch for 1 inch. He noted that for a heritage tree,
15 there would actually be 2 inches of replacement required for each 1 inch and explained that the
16 thought behind that was the amount of environmental value that would be lost.

17
18 Commissioner Plantan referenced item number six and asked for additional explanation on setting
19 due dates for required tree replacements. She asked if the recommendation was for the
20 replacements to be staggered on a property in order to best suit the species and the site.

21
22 City Forester Myhran referenced 936.11b and read aloud the current language and the proposed
23 additional language.

24
25 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she felt that City Forester Myhran had done a very thorough
26 job.

27
28 There being no additional questions from the Commission, Chair Stockton opened the public
29 hearing on the application at 8:24 pm.

30
31 Community Development Director Goellner stated there were no people that called in to the
32 meeting that have asked to speak at the public hearing.

33
34 There being no one wishing to comment, Chair Stockton closed the public hearing at 8:24 pm.

35
36 Chair Stockton asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

37
38 Commissioner Severson stated that she also felt that City Forester Myhran did a great job of
39 incorporating some of the things that the City has learned over the last few years.

40
41 Commissioner Sorensen stated that he also felt that City Forester Myhran did a really nice job with
42 the proposed text amendments. He explained that he felt that they were reasonable and would
43 also make the criteria more objective and enforceable.

44
45 There being no further discussion, Chair Stockton asked for a motion on the application.

46

1 Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Plantan, to Adopt the Draft
2 Planning Commission Report and Recommendation reflecting a recommendation of approval of
3 the Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Chapter 936 – Tree Preservation.

4
5 The motion carried unanimously.

6
7 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Other Items:**

8
9 **a) Review of Development Activities**

10 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

11
12 Community Development Director Goellner noted that the next meeting will be May 20, 2024
13 which has one public hearing scheduled related to 565 Ferndale Road West. She stated that staff
14 anticipates that there will be one agenda item for the June 3, 2024 meeting and reminded the
15 Commission to let her know if there are meetings that they will need to miss.

16
17 Commissioner Severson stated that she felt that Commissioner Douglas' absence was felt tonight
18 and she will be missed.

19
20 Community Development Director Goellner stated that she would be sending the Commission
21 information on upcoming services in honor of Commissioner Douglas.

22
23 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.**

24
25 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Stockton asked for a motion to adjourn.

26
27 Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sorensen to adjourn the
28 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

29
30 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

31
32 Respectfully submitted,

33 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

34 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*