

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 16, 2025**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order

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

Chair Cameron read a prepared statement that outlined multiple options for joining remotely or submitting comments and questions.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Roll Call

Chair Cameron asked Community Development Director Sharpe to take roll call.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Plantan, Severson, Elg, Cameron, VanLoy, and Ankeny. Community Development Director Alex Sharpe, City Forester Bennett Myhran, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Absent at roll call was Commissioner: Schwalbe.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda

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

Commissioner VanLoy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ankeny, to approve the June 16, 2025, agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approve Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for 1022 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard East (Lamborghini) – PUD Concept Plan

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

Community Development Director Sharpe noted that two additional public comment items came in after the packet was published and noted that they had been left on the table in front of the Commission for their review and would be shared alongside the Commission's Report and Recommendation when this moves on to the City Council.

Chair Cameron stated that he would like to remove this item from the Consent Agenda and move it to the regular agenda as item 5.a.

1
2 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Old Business Items**

3
4 **a) Approve Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for 1022 and 1042**
5 **Wayzata Boulevard East (Lamborghini) – PUD Concept Plan**

6
7 Chair Cameron explained that he wanted to correct a statement he had made while summarizing
8 public comments. He stated that he had said that all of the public comments were positive when,
9 in fact, two were positive and two were negative.

10
11 City Attorney Schelzel stated that at the next meeting, they will be reviewing the draft minutes
12 from the meeting, and he can make sure that his comments are accurately reflected.

13
14 Chair Cameron asked for a motion. Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by
15 Commissioner Elg, to approve the Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for 1022
16 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard East (Lamborghini) – PUD Concept Plan, as amended. The motion
17 carried unanimously.

18
19 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Public Hearing Items**

20
21 **a) Chapter 936 – Tree Preservation Ordinance – Golf Courses**

22
23 Mr. Sharpe shared background on the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance, project history of the
24 Woodhill Country Club, draft ordinance provisions, and outlined the possible action steps for the
25 Commission to consider.

26
27 Chair Cameron asked if the Commission had any questions for staff.

28
29 Commissioner VanLoy referenced the slide, which it stated that Woodhill's concerns were project
30 costs, staff burden, tree risk, and tree planting, and asked if this would be part of tonight's
31 discussion so the Commission would be able to garner an understanding of their concerns about
32 this versus the current Tree Preservation Ordinance.

33
34 Mr. Sharpe noted that City Forester Bennet Myhran was present and could answer some of those
35 questions.

36
37 City Forester Myhran stated that the biggest obstacles that staff have discussed with Woodhill are
38 the project costs, like tree replacement escrow. He explained that the ordinance requires that, if
39 the tree removal described in a proposal crosses a certain threshold, then there is a certain amount
40 of replacement required on site, via formulas, which is also secured by a replacement escrow. He
41 explained that the escrow was released over a 3-year period, based on the condition of the newly
42 planted trees, with the goal of having them all become established and contribute to the canopy,
43 which can be expensive, especially with larger projects. He stated that currently, the fee schedule
44 is set at \$330/inch, which is a large financial commitment. He noted that Woodhill's concerns
45 about ordinance burdens are essentially a different kind of cost, and he was also concerned about
46 tree risk and what constituted a hazardous tree. He explained that hazardous trees are not subject

1 to many of the requirements in the ordinance, but if a tree didn't meet the standard for a hazardous
2 tree, it would be considered either a significant or heritage tree and would have to meet the
3 replacement requirements. He stated that the concerns about tree planting, for a larger project, can
4 be a challenge because they have to find a place for the trees, which requires significant land
5 available. He stated that those items were the main sticking points with Woodhill and noted that
6 there had been a lot of back and forth between them and staff on this issue.

7
8 Commissioner Severson asked if the Commission was being asked to amend the ordinance or to
9 grant a specific request to Woodhill Country Club.

10
11 Mr. Sharpe explained that the City Council had directed staff to prepare a study of an ordinance
12 that would exempt golf courses from the Tree Preservation Ordinance.

13
14 Commissioner Severson stated that there were currently 2 golf courses located in the City and
15 noted that she assumed that there was no available land for there to be another golf course, so the
16 request was really to exempt those 2 entities from the ordinance.

17
18 Chair Cameron stated that he did not see it as exempting them, but would give them a path.

19
20 Mr. Sharpe explained that it would not automatically exempt them, but would give them a path via
21 the two alternatives outlined in the presentation.

22
23 Mr. Schelzel stated that the actual proposed changes are pretty straightforward and simple and
24 could be found on page 19 of the packet. He noted that there would be 2 paths for a golf course to
25 request relief from some of the ordinance regulations and reviewed the proposed language.

26
27 Commissioner Severson noted that both courses adjoin the City of Orono and asked if this would
28 just apply to the portion of the parcel that was within Wayzata.

29
30 Mr. Sharpe noted that this was also a point raised during the City Council discussions and was a
31 point raised by Woodhill. He stated that because the golf courses fall under multiple jurisdictions,
32 that meant they were subject to Wayzata's Tree Preservation Ordinance as well as any that Orono
33 may have. He noted that those ordinances do not need to be the same, so that was one of the
34 encumbrances or burdens that Woodhill had attempted to express to the City.

35
36 Mr. Schelzel clarified that Wayzata did not have the authority to regulate property located in
37 Orono, so the City's ordinance would apply to the portion of the golf course that falls within their
38 jurisdiction. He stated that the larger point trying to be made was that if you are a golf course
39 located in two jurisdictions, it is more challenging and burdensome to handle because there would
40 be two sets of regulations.

41
42 Commissioner Van Loy asked if the City could see what Orono does and if there was a chance
43 from an operational standpoint where they could create a plan and bring it forth to both cities, or
44 if this would be proposing something that Orono was not doing.

45

1 Mr. Sharpe stated that he believed that Orono had looked at modeling some of their ordinance after
2 Wayzata, but less stringent. He explained that he was not sure they had completed their Tree
3 Preservation Ordinance.

4
5 Mr. Myhran noted that Orono had consulted him as they had been putting together their ordinance,
6 but was not sure where they were in the overall process, or how similar their standards would be.

7
8 Commissioner Severson asked if the Commission should have any concerns about exempting these
9 entities would mean that there aren't rules for them.

10
11 Mr. Sharpe stated that there could be some concerns about that, but explained that staff has taken
12 Council's direction for an exception and drafted language which would seek to address these
13 concerns. He stated that this item was a bit unique in the order in which it came to the Commission,
14 which was why he had tried to provide them with some of the history and context of the discussion.

15
16 Mr. Schelzel stated that the administrative path that was described in the staff report to work with
17 the forester would still require a lot of the same process, review, and plan that other landowners
18 would, but this would exempt them from the potential financial burden. He asked the Commission
19 to think about whether they were comfortable with having the discretion to make these kinds of
20 decisions on their own.

21
22 Mr. Myhran suggested that the language in B.7. be changed to Tree Management Plan.

23
24 Mr. Schelzel asked if 'management' was a defined term in the ordinance.

25
26 Mr. Myhran stated that he did not believe it was defined, but the Tree Preservation Plan was.

27
28 Chair Cameron asked Mr. Sharpe to do a bit of research on the definitions.

29
30 Mr. Schelzel clarified that there is a definition of Tree Preservation Plan, but not for a Tree
31 Management Plan, which he would like to see included.

32
33 Chair Cameron asked for an explanation of how the Tree Preservation Plan had been defined.

34
35 Mr. Myhran gave a general overview of the definition of a Tree Preservation Plan.

36
37 Mr. Sharpe stated that the definition could be found in Section 936.07.

38
39 Mr. Myhran stated that Woodhill has concerns about hazardous trees and the definition of how
40 those are managed. He stated that if a Tree Preservation Plan provided an exemption, specific to
41 a project, if felt a tree had become hazardous outside of the project scope, they would still be
42 subject to the other requirements and standards of the ordinance, and the Tree Management Plan
43 would speak to that situation.

44
45 Mr. Sharpe noted that they would rely heavily on City Attorney Schelzel.

46

1 There being no questions from the Commission for the staff, Chair Cameron opened the public
2 hearing on the application at 7:12 pm.

3
4 Brian Edmiston, Woodhill Country Club, explained that they were seeking this exemption because
5 of 3 issues: safety, administrative, and financial burdens. He noted that this exemption would not
6 just be for their course but also for other golf courses and large institutional land owners. He
7 explained that Woodhill had been around for 110 years and had been a responsible land steward,
8 and shared examples of their stewardship. He noted that when they remove trees, it is not in order
9 to put in large concrete buildings, but for safety purposes, and replace them with grass, which
10 makes it green space to green space. He shared examples where trees have caused safety concerns
11 on their course, and in one instance, a member was hit and passed away due to his injuries. He
12 shared examples of the challenges they face if they are not granted this exemption. He noted that
13 Edina has exempted golf courses from their tree preservation ordinance for many of the reasons
14 he outlined, and noted that other cities in the area have exemptions for situations where it was
15 green space to green space.

16
17 Mr. Sharpe stated that there were no people who called in to the meeting that have asked to speak
18 at the public hearing.

19
20 There being no one wishing to comment on the application, Chair Cameron closed the public
21 hearing at 7:18 pm.

22
23 Chair Cameron asked the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

24
25 Commissioner Severson stated that she thought there was already a portion of the ordinance that
26 diseased, dead, or dying trees do not count, and asked why it may matter how many trees walk
27 under it.

28
29 Mr. Sharpe stated that dead, diseased, and dying trees are exempt from tree replacement, but there
30 is some nuance in when they would meet the criteria.

31
32 Chair Cameron read aloud from the portion of the Tree Preservation Ordinance that referred to
33 dead, diseased, or dying trees and noted that it would require City Forest Myhran to go out and
34 deem it dead, diseased, or dying.

35
36 Mr. Myhran explained that every situation was different on whether it required inspection or just
37 a photograph. He stated that for the occupancy rate referenced by Commissioner Severson, the
38 City refers to a tree risk assessment, which is a standardized process used by the industry and
39 insurance companies. He stated that looking at the occupancy rate is just one piece of the matrix
40 used to assess the tree.

41
42 Mr. Sharpe explained that the City Council had only directed staff to bring forward an amendment
43 to the ordinance that would only apply to golf courses and would not apply, at the moment, to
44 other large landowners, but that may be considered in the future.

45

1 Chair Cameron asked if staff were aware of anything that the Wayzata Country Club may be doing
2 on their properties as part of their remodel.

3
4 Mr. Myhran stated that their timeline goes back a bit further, but much of what they can see is
5 located within Orono, and he has worked with them on some tree replacement and plantings in
6 areas located in Wayzata.

7
8 Chair Cameron asked Mr. Edmiston if the Woodhill Country Club was planning to do something
9 similar to the Wayzata Country Club and do some reprofiling of the course.

10
11 Mr. Edmiston answered that their long-range plan and intent were to bring the course back to the
12 original design drawings from the 1950s.

13
14 Chair Cameron asked about the timeframe associated with their long-term plans.

15
16 Mr. Edmiston stated that they were planning to begin this project in July of 2025, and the
17 restoration efforts should take about 1 year, but explained that the tree plan for the property would
18 be ongoing.

19
20 Chair Cameron asked how the Woodhill Country Club was navigating the relationship of having
21 cross-jurisdiction with Orono and Wayzata.

22
23 Mr. Edmiston stated that Orono did not currently have a tree management plan.

24
25 Commissioner Severson asked what the threshold would be and if it would be a certain number or
26 percentage of trees.

27
28 Mr. Myhran stated that there are different thresholds, and the City's involvement with tree removal
29 would begin at the permitting level for even just one tree, but when they get to replacement
30 requirements, there would be two scenarios to look at. He explained that the first would be if any
31 heritage tree was removed, and also for significant trees, because they require a certain amount of
32 replacement if the applicant crosses the removal allowance, which is a certain percentage of the
33 total tree inventory on the property.

34
35 Chair Cameron stated that his initial thought is that he was not sure he was totally comfortable
36 allowing the City Council to freely grant an exemption at their whim. He explained that he would
37 be much more comfortable if the City Forester were involved in any of the discussions, whether it
38 was a Tree Management Plan, which he considered long-term, or a Tree Preservation Plan, which
39 he considered a short-term plan. He stated that he was okay with the Council having the power
40 to grant an exemption, but felt it needed to be done in consultation with the City Forester, rather
41 than just blanket. He referenced Section 936.06, 7, Trees on Golf Courses, and stated that he
42 would change the language in this portion to say 'management' and agreed that they would need
43 to have an actual definition for what a Tree Management Plan was.

44
45 Commissioner Van Loy stated that he had somewhat of the same mindset, which was why he had
46 asked the question about variances as a way to mitigate issues and would also keep the City

1 Forester involved. He stated that he looked at golf courses very differently than most of the other
2 institutional landowners, because their job is to keep a very beautiful landscape, because that is
3 what they sell. He stated that when they look at this for golf courses, he thought it made a lot of
4 sense, but when they come up with the definition around a Tree Management Plan, he asked that
5 they consider tree removal situations where it did not meet the occupancy requirements or safety
6 of golfers as given in the examples shared by Mr. Edmiston. He stated that he would like to see
7 the Tree Management Plan defined to include some of those kinds of items for golf courses and
8 would strike the option that would simply go to the City Council without going through the other
9 process.

10
11 Commissioner Plantan stated that she likes having both of the exceptions included in this language
12 because it can serve as a bit of a check and balance. She referenced item #7 and stated that the
13 City heavily relied on staff and the ordinances, but also having the ability to go to the City Council
14 would give the chance for other considerations to be taken into account. She stated that she felt
15 this proposed amendment aligned with the goals and intentions of the City's tree preservation
16 ordinances and aligned with the Comprehensive Plan. She explained that she would support this,
17 but would like to see both exceptions included as options, with the additional language surrounding
18 the definition of Tree Management.

19
20 Commissioner Ankeny noted that she agreed with Commissioner Plantan. She stated that she felt
21 that Woodhill was proactive in working with City Forester Myhran and that it made sense to
22 include both options within the amendments.

23
24 Commissioner Severson stated that she was not thinking of this as an 'either or' situation and more
25 of a 'one of the other' option, and was leaning towards support of what was Section 7 under Section
26 936.06. She stated that she was trying to think of this related to the ease of it from an applicant's
27 standpoint, and also felt the more appropriate path would be to go to the City Forester and have a
28 Tree Management Plan rather than getting an exemption or approval from the City Council. She
29 stated that she did not believe the Council members were experts in tree management or what was
30 dead, diseased, or dying. She reiterated that she did not think this should be an 'either or' and
31 should for sure include Section 7, but noted that they could also add that they would also have to
32 get approval from the Council. She explained that she did not want to see there to be a path to just
33 go to the City Council, but if they were going to have them go to the City Council, she would
34 rather they not decide without the input of the City Forester.

35
36 Mr. Schelzel stated that there could be language changes made so staff would not be cut out of the
37 process if this goes before the City Council. He explained that staff would not make the actual
38 decision, like the administrative option, but the Council would get their input. He noted that he
39 suspected that the Council would be getting this kind of input from staff anyway.

40
41 Commissioner Plantan stated that she would support adding the language that the Council had to
42 consult with the City Forester.

43
44 There being no further discussion, Chair Cameron asked for a motion on the application.
45

1 Commissioner Cameron made a motion, to approve the draft Planning Commission Report and
2 Recommendation for Chapter 936 – Tree Preservation Ordinance – Golf Courses, as modified per
3 discussion, to create and define ‘Tree Management Plan’, change the language in number 7 to
4 replace ‘Tree Preservation Plan’ with ‘Tree Management Plan’, inclusion of the City Forester
5 within the City Council/administration approval option, with appropriate findings reflecting a
6 recommending Chapter 936 – Tree Preservation Ordinance – Golf Courses.

7
8 Mr. Schelzel and the Commission asked some clarifying questions and suggested wording changes
9 for the motion.

10
11 Commissioner Cameron withdrew his motion.

12
13 Chair Cameron asked if the Planning Commission wanted a Tree Management Plan to also be part
14 of the Council action option.

15
16 Commissioner Severson stated that her opinion is that there is just one path and suggested that
17 there be a Tree Management Plan done by the City Forester alone, or that, plus approval by the
18 City Council. She asked if anyone on the Commission would be comfortable with an option in
19 which the Council did not seek a Tree Management Plan and could just make the decision on their
20 own.

21
22 Commissioner Van Loy stated that he believed there should be a plan in place, independent of
23 whatever path is chosen for moving forward.

24
25 Commissioner Plantan stated that she thought the creation of the Tree Management Plan was part
26 of the application process.

27
28 Mr. Sharpe stated that the Tree Management Plan had not been defined yet, but noted that the Tree
29 Preservation Plan was already required. He noted that if the Council provided an exemption from
30 the entire Tree Preservation Ordinance for an entire site, that would exempt them from all of the
31 ordinance requirements. He stated that part of the discussion by the Commission tonight was
32 adding the consideration of the City Forester into the review process.

33
34 Commissioner Plantan stated that adding the Tree Management Plan language to the Council
35 option would just bring them back to number 7.

36
37 Mr. Schelzel stated that if they add a Tree Management Plan to the Council review option, it would
38 end up making it harder for an applicant. He explained that the original direction from the Council
39 was that they wanted applicants to be able to come straight to them to make their case, and if they
40 did, they would be exempt from all the financial and other administrative requirements within the
41 Tree Preservation Ordinance. He stated that the Council had also indicated that there could be an
42 administrative approach because it may be less burdensome if they present a plan, which from the
43 clarification given earlier in the meeting by City Forester Myhran would be a Tree Management
44 Plan, but they wouldn’t have to pay or provide the replacement requirements, but would have to
45 do other paperwork.

46

1 Commissioner Severson stated that she could be persuaded to cut the City Council out of the
2 process and just go to number 7 and remove the redlined section.
3

4 Mr. Schelzel explained that the Commission was in the uncomfortable position of having a Council
5 that had directed them to consider this option, but if the Commission feels that way, she believes
6 the Council will want to know why and what their concerns were with giving the Council that
7 authority and discretion.
8

9 Chair Cameron explained that his discomfort with the Council and not involving the City Forester
10 revolves around the fact that this was not the Council's job because their job was not to manage
11 trees and forests. He stated that he felt whatever approach they decided to take that it needed to
12 involve the City Forester because that was their profession and had a deep pool of knowledge on
13 this issue. He stated that he understood the potential burden this would put on the golf courses
14 because it was an additional step, but it sounded like there had already been a good partnership
15 established between the City and the golf courses.
16

17 Commissioner Van Loy stated that he believed it was a good policy for the golf courses to put
18 down a plan that indicates when and why they think a tree should come down, because of certain
19 criteria, which may be different than what was already in the Tree Preservation Ordinance
20 language. He noted that he did not think this needed to be burdensome and noted that if there was
21 not something that fit into the plan, the City still had a variance process that could be followed.
22

23 Commissioner Elg referenced the second sentence of the two-sentence paragraph on top of the
24 page they were looking at would be amended to say 'Council will acquire a Tree Management
25 Plan'.
26

27 Chair Cameron stated that if they made that change, it would become a circular reference and
28 asked if Commissioner Elg was suggesting that they remove number 7 to say that this has to go
29 through the City Council.
30

31 Commissioner Elg confirmed that it had been what he was suggesting.
32

33 Commissioner Severson asked if Commissioner Elg was saying that they would have to go to the
34 City Council with a Tree Management Plan.
35

36 Commissioner Elg explained that his thought was that the applicant would have the exemption,
37 but would have to go to the City Council with a Tree Management Plan. He stated that if they
38 didn't have this and they came for an exemption, it would mean that they could just strip the land
39 bare.
40

41 Chair Cameron stated that what he was describing would provide more of a checks and balances
42 system by involving the City Council and the City Forester, but noted that it would be more
43 burdensome on the applicant.
44

45 Commissioner Elg stated that he did not feel that this would be an unreasonable burden because
46 they were already being exempted from having a huge cash burden, and stated that he felt that the

1 golf courses would already have this information because they already know where they want to
2 move things or remove things.

3
4 Commissioner Severson stated that she thought that either way, there should be a Tree
5 Management Plan, whether it still requires City Council approval or not. She explained that she
6 did not think the option should be to either go to the City Council or to have a Tree Management
7 Plan, because either way, she would want to see some type of Tree Management Plan included.

8
9 Commissioner Plantan asked if there was a different way to write the exception on part A that
10 would include something like 'or as directed by the City Forester', and read aloud a portion of that
11 section of text.

12
13 Mr. Schelzel stated that to capture the earlier discussion, what he may do is add some language
14 such as, 'Council may grant, after consulting with the City Forester, an exemption for such
15 properties'.

16
17 Chair Cameron explained that one of the things he was thinking about was how the City could
18 make it so the golf courses would not need to come get a permit every winter, if they had dead or
19 dying trees.

20
21 Mr. Myhran stated that he felt that a very important piece of a Tree Management Plan would be
22 addressing the things they would normally be looking for through the permitting process, and
23 would essentially serve as a replacement for the permitting requirements.

24
25 Commissioner Severson stated that she agreed with the point made by Commissioner Elg that if
26 the City was going to give an exemption, asking for this was not an onerous burden.

27
28 Commissioner Van Loy stated that, given the size and scale of the golf course properties, he
29 believed that there should be a Tree Management Plan in place to consider relieving them of the
30 Tree Preservation Ordinance requirements.

31
32 Commissioner Severson suggested that if they add 'pursuant to a Tree Management Plan,' they
33 would not need to have a number 7 because it would be baked in that they would need to come to
34 the Council with the Tree Management Plan.

35
36 Mr. Schelzel stated that if the Commission kept the Council pathway and added a Tree
37 Management Plan, he was not sure what they would get with the second option. He stated that
38 leaving the administrative option would mean that they would potentially not have to go to the
39 Council.

40
41 Chair Cameron stated that he felt the Commission was saying that they did want this to go before
42 the Council, and that they should have a Tree Management Plan.

43
44 Commissioner VanLoy stated that he felt that they should have a Tree Management Plan that was
45 approved by the City Forester, but if the majority of the Commission felt that the Tree Management
46 Plan should also go in front of the Council, then he would be okay with that.

1
2 Commissioner Plantan stated that she felt the City should leave number 7 in, in case there was an
3 applicant who did not want to go in front of the Council, and would give the applicant two avenues
4 to get this done.

5
6 Commissioner Severson stated that she didn't think anyone would end up going before the
7 Council.

8
9 Commissioner Plantan stated that an applicant would still need to meet the obligations under
10 number 7.

11
12 Commissioner Elg, how it would be determined that they would go through the administrative
13 process or the Council approval process.

14
15 Mr. Schelzel stated that the way it was currently drafted, the applicant would have the choice to
16 comply with the Tree Preservation Ordinance requirements or choose the two approaches being
17 discussed.

18
19 There being no further discussion, Chair Cameron asked for a motion.

20
21 Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Elg, to approve the draft
22 Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for Chapter 936 – Tree Preservation
23 Ordinance – Golf Courses, as modified per discussion, for an applicant that wanted to not follow
24 the Tree Preservation Ordinance, they would have to bring forward a Tree Management Plan and
25 then approval by the City Council, and remove the proposed number 7.

26
27 Mr. Schelzel clarified that what would be changed is that they would strike the language in number
28 7 and add language to Section A, that the property owner must include a Tree Management Plan
29 that has been reviewed and approved by the City Forester.

30
31 Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried 4-2 (Plantan and Cameron opposed).

32
33 Mr. Schelzel noted that this item would come before the City Council at the July 1, 2025, meeting.

34
35 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Other Items:**

36
37 **a) Review of Development Activities**

38
39 Mr. Sharpe noted that the City had hit the traditional summer lull in activities and reviewed the
40 items that staff were working on.

41 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

42
43 Mr. Sharpe stated that the next scheduled meeting was on July 7, 2025, but at the moment, he did
44 not have set items for the meeting, so they may be able to cancel the meeting, if necessary.

45
46 **AGENDA ITEM 8. Adjournment.**

1
2 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Cameron asked for a motion to adjourn.

3
4 Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ankeny, to adjourn the
5 Planning Commission meeting.

6
7 The motion carried unanimously.

8
9 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

10
11 Respectfully submitted,

12 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

13 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

14