

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 18, 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, Schwalbe, Severson, Elg, Cameron, and VanLoy. Community Development Director Alex Sharpe, Planner Haily Hedblom, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Absent at roll call were: Commissioner Ankeny.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda

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

Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Severson, to approve the August 18, 2025, agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the June 9, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

b.) Approval of the June 16, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

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

Commissioner Severson noted a spot in the minutes where a name needed to be removed.

Chair Cameron asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended by Commissioner Severson.

Commissioner VanLoy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.

1 The motion carried unanimously.

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

4
5 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Public Hearing Items**

6
7 **a) 547 Harrington Road – Lake Shore Setback Variance**

8
9 Community Development Director Sharpe reviewed the variance request for the lake shore setback
10 at 547 Harrington Road. He reviewed the location, the Comprehensive Plan guidance, zoning, the
11 property's location within the Shoreland Overlay District, details of the application, and the
12 variance request.

13
14 Commissioner Severson asked if there would be a time limit attached if the City chose to grant the
15 variance request.

16
17 Mr. Sharpe stated that, typically, the City has included a condition that a variance be utilized within
18 a year of the resolution approval and noted that it would be reasonable if the Commission would
19 like to suggest some sort of time limit on this request.

20
21 City Attorney Schelzel explained that there is a code provision that sets a 1 year requirement,
22 which may be what Commissioner Severson was referencing. He noted that in this situation, it
23 can be a bit confusing because they are dealing with both the residential and the Shoreland Overlay
24 Districts, but the general conditions for a variance under Ch.905 include the requirement that the
25 applicant substantially start construction of any building, structure, or alteration within one year
26 of approval. He explained that in this case, if the applicant received approval of their variance
27 request, they would have to move on it within a year.

28
29 Mr. Sharpe explained further that there have been situations where applicants have sought
30 additional time beyond one year, which have typically been placed on the consent agenda, if they
31 were unable to meet the one-year timeframe. He noted that this was not uncommon and explained
32 that there have been 3 requests related to larger projects within the almost 6 months that he has
33 been with the City, but explained that it would be a bit less common for a single-family lot such
34 as the subject of this request.

35
36 Mr. Sharpe returned to his review of the application and outlined the existing conditions and
37 setback requirements for the R-1A District. He explained the additional lakeshore setback
38 requirements for properties within the Shoreland Overlay District, and the specific variance
39 request, reviewed the existing buildable area beyond the required setback, and the possible
40 buildable area if the variance was granted. He noted that there have been 4 public comments
41 received, which were included in the packet materials. He reviewed the general criteria for
42 evaluating a variance request under the Zoning Ordinance as well as the additional criteria for
43 granting a variance in the Shoreland Overlay District.

1 At the conclusion of Mr. Sharpe's presentation, Chair Cameron asked if there were any questions
2 from the Commission for staff.

3
4 Commissioner Schwalbe noted that the existing home was built in 1929 and the house to the north
5 was built in 1976, and the home to the south was built in 2016. She stated that she believed the
6 home to the north had quite a bit of influence on this because they had to be moved back about
7 300 feet to accommodate the fact that there was a marshy area in front of the lake. She stated that
8 the property to the south was setback 189 feet and asked if that home could have been built with a
9 75-foot setback.

10
11 Mr. Sharpe explained that the home to the south at 549 Harrington Road would be required to meet
12 the same provisions as 547 Harrington, so it would be subject to the greatest of the 3 setbacks.

13
14 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if the riparian issue came up at the time that 549 Harrington Road
15 was built.

16
17 Mr. Sharpe stated the property at 549 Harrington Road did not go through a variance process
18 related to the construction of the home in 2016, so it would have been reviewed by staff at the time
19 of the building permit.

20
21 Commissioner VanLoy asked if the City did not grant this variance, and somebody wanted to
22 remodel the existing home with an addition, would they also need a variance because of the City's
23 setback rules.

24
25 Mr. Sharpe stated that the existing home could be remodeled if there was not an increase in any of
26 the nonconformities; but if they put on an addition, that would trigger the need for a variance in
27 some regard, not necessarily related to the setback requirements.

28
29 Commissioner Schwalbe referenced the lines labeled 'sight' and 'closet point' in Mr. Sharpe's
30 presentation. She stated there would not be a lot of building area behind those lines, and asked if
31 staff had any thoughts about how big of a house could go there.

32
33 Mr. Sharpe stated that, based on some of the material submitted and inspection of the property,
34 there was a significant encumbrance to staying within the green shaded area on the graphic being
35 presented. He explained that from a staff perspective, it was difficult to say what an appropriate
36 variance may be.

37
38 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if the property owner to the north did not have an objection to the
39 proposed 108-foot setback, if that would change this request.

40
41 Mr. Sharpe stated that the Commission should consider comments from adjacent property owners,
42 but the decision was a judgment call for the Commission to make related to how they considered
43 the comments. He noted that one of the comments in the packet is from the property to the north.

44
45 Commissioner Severson asked if the 'closest point' setback was done for the sight lines and not
46 for being too close to the lake.

1
2 Mr. Sharpe explained that the intent of the standard was not specifically called out in the City
3 Code. He stated that all three possible setbacks outlined by City Code were called out on the plans
4 provided by the applicant with the intent of the Shoreland Overlay District, which is to, in part,
5 preserve the Lake Minnetonka shore line for sight line reasons. He noted that his reading of this
6 information was that it was in place largely to preserve sight lines, but that was only his
7 interpretation.

8
9 There being no further questions for staff, Chair Cameron invited the applicant to address the
10 Commission.

11 Applicant's representative, Kyle Hunt, Kyle Hunt and Partners, 18324 Minnetonka Blvd,
12 Deephaven, explained that he was a builder, but for this application was serving as a consultant
13 for the homeowners.

14
15 Commissioner Elg noted that he would like to pose a question to Mr. Hunt before he began his
16 presentation, and explained that he would like Mr. Hunt to address how they landed at a 108-foot
17 setback from the lake shore.

18
19 Mr. Hunt gave a presentation outlining details of the setback variance request, including survey
20 information and aerial photos. He explained that the 108 feet came from the family members'
21 thoughts about the home being here since before 1929, and the understanding that they were
22 improving on the existing setback, where they were likely not to remove significant trees, where
23 the topography would help them gain the best position, and where a new home would be out of
24 the lake shore sightline for the adjacent neighbors. He shared the background and context of their
25 request, the unique characteristics of the site, comparisons with similar lots in the area, and
26 described what they were looking for from their variance request. He explained the reasons that
27 they believe the variance request was in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the City
28 Ordinance, as well as the Comprehensive Plan, and described what they felt would be practical
29 difficulties in complying with the ordinance.

30
31 Mr. Hunt addressed public comments that had been received, and read aloud information related
32 to a reference made regarding the kitchen window view from 549 Harrington, the neighboring
33 property to the south. He explained that window to window, the distance to the house to the south
34 was 170 feet. He noted that the owners of 549 Harrington Road took advantage of the
35 nonconforming setback of the Swansons' home at 547 Harrington Road when constructing their
36 home in 2026 and felt it was bold of them to come forward and speak against this request by the
37 Swansons. He noted that the legal counsel for the owners at 549 Harrington Road made the
38 argument in their public comment letter that the general intent and purpose of Sections 991.01 and
39 901.03 was to retain and preserve property values. He stated that if this were true, it could not be
40 used in a manner that would not maintain or preserve the property values of the Swanson property,
41 and noted that he did not believe that this was intended when it was first written by the City and
42 was instead intended to help, not harm. He stated that in this unique situation, he felt it would be
43 inflicting harm. He asked the Commission to consider the points he had read from this statement
44 when they were reviewing this situation, and explained that they believed their request was
45 reasonable. He noted that the City had granted a variance at Lookout Point (578 Harrington Rd)
46 in a similar scenario.

1
2 At the conclusion of Mr. Hunt's presentation, Chair Cameron asked if the Commission had any
3 questions for the Applicant.
4

5 Commissioner VanLoy asked if the City granted this variance to allow a setback of 108 feet, if it
6 would put the home at 549 Harrington Road into a nonconforming status that would require them
7 to get a variance if they wanted to put on an addition to their home or if they ever had to rebuild.
8

9 Mr. Sharpe stated that the property at 549 Harrington Road was oriented from north to south at a
10 slight angle, with the closest point on the northern side. He explained that by dropping the line
11 back, there was the potential that a portion of that home could be nonconforming, but
12 acknowledged that he could not state that definitively. He reminded the Commission that the
13 homeowners at 549 Harrington Road would be able to remodel or undertake another home project
14 within their existing footprint without any issues if the City granted this variance request.
15

16 Mr. Hunt explained that he had a copy of the survey for 549 Harrington Road at his office, and
17 explained that they brought the home up to the line.
18

19 Mr. Sharpe displayed a more zoomed-in aerial photo that showed more clearly the orientation of
20 the home at 549 Harrington Road. He noted that the photo also shows why he did not want to
21 definitively answer Commissioner VanLoy's question, and would need to do a full site review and
22 see the survey.
23

24 Mr. Hunt stated that he felt that Commissioner VanLoy's question was a good example of what
25 would happen over time if this ordinance were kept in its current form, because the homes would
26 just keep marching back to the point where everyone would be pushed against the road.
27

28 There being no additional questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Cameron
29 opened the public hearing on the application at 7:33 pm.
30

31 Christopher Pierson, Attorney with Sanford, Pierson, Thone, Streat, explained that he was
32 representing Dan and Stacy Cosentino, who owned 549 Harrington Road. He noted that they had
33 already submitted extensive written materials for the Commission's consideration. He read aloud
34 a portion of Section 991.09 (D)(3) of the City Code, and noted that one of the conditions was that
35 the setback shall not adversely impact views of the shoreline or lake for adjacent neighboring
36 principal structures, and explained that he believed this required denial of the application. He
37 displayed a rendering and photo of the view from the Cosentino's property if the variance was
38 granted, which he believed showed that this would impact their view of the lake. He stated that
39 he felt that approving this variance would not be consistent with the general purpose and intent of
40 the City's ordinance by hurting the value of the Cosentino property and referenced various portions
41 of the code that he felt were relevant to his argument.
42

43 Chair Cameron interjected and explained that the purpose of the public hearing was not for rebuttal
44 of the presentation or comments made by Mr. Hunt, but is intended to provide commentary about
45 his client's concerns.
46

1 Mr. Pierson stated that the other point he wanted to touch on was related to the economic
2 consideration. He stated that the current property owners want to be able to market the property
3 to people who will want to tear down the existing home and build a new one, and having this
4 variance would make it easier to sell and make it sell for more money. He stated that this was an
5 economic consideration, and explained that he did not see any non-economic considerations in the
6 application. He noted that any prospective owner of this lot should go through the development
7 process, just like any other prospective owner of other properties in the City would have to do, and
8 did not think this lot should be treated differently. He reiterated that he believed the economic
9 considerations alone were what were driving this application. He noted that he did not believe that
10 there was a need to seek such a large variance and outlined their reasoning with the use of a
11 hypothetical buildable area diagram. He explained that development was a process, and handling
12 things the way this was being proposed was a variance from the City's usual process. He thanked
13 the Commission for their time and asked that his materials and presentation be part of the meeting
14 minutes.

15
16 Commissioner Schwalbe referenced rendering #5, and asked if he was suggesting a variance to
17 allow for a setback of 114 feet.

18
19 Mr. Pierson stated that it was not the job of Cosentino's to make a counteroffer to what has been
20 proposed, but they are just saying that this was a hypothetical line that is located further back,
21 which would accommodate a possible home.

22
23 Chair Cameron clarified that the Commission's job was to determine if they would recommend
24 approval or denial of what has been requested, and noted that there was no other measurement that
25 was under consideration tonight.

26
27 Mr. Pierson stated that his point was that they believe that there is something less than what has
28 been proposed that would suffice, and added that the Cosentinos were not out to make this lot
29 unbuildable, and believe that this particular variance request is a step too far. He explained that
30 they did not want to support a variance request without knowing what they would be agreeing to
31 or what would be built.

32
33 Dick Swanson, 547 Harrington Road, encouraged the Commission to come take a look at his
34 property in person because he didn't think they would be able to clearly understand what they were
35 talking about from just looking at a survey. He explained that they had staked out their proposed
36 variance line and did everything they could to make it as tight as possible in an effort to be a good
37 neighbor.

38
39 Mr. Sharpe stated there were no people who called in to the meeting that have asked to speak at
40 the public hearing.

41
42 There being no one else wishing to comment on the application, Chair Cameron closed the public
43 hearing at 7:50 pm.

44
45 Chair Cameron asked the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.
46

1 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if there would be another opportunity for the Cosentinos to see the
2 final plan drawings of what the new home would be like.

3
4 Mr. Sharpe stated that they would have that opportunity if they would like to come into City Hall
5 to view the plans during the building permit process, but noted that if the plans met all building
6 and zoning codes, the property owners would be able to move forward with a building permit and
7 no further public hearing. He explained that architectural plans were copyrighted materials, so
8 they could not be sent out and must be viewed on site.

9
10 Commissioner Severson gave the example of new property owners requesting additional variances
11 and stated that her understanding in that situation would be that the building plans would be
12 available.

13
14 Mr. Sharpe explained that if there were additional variance requests, they would need to be able
15 to provide the required plans for review, which would be public documents that could be shared
16 on the City's website.

17
18 Commissioner Plantan asked if there was a topography plan for this parcel so they could see where
19 the topography drops off.

20
21 Chair Cameron noted that one of the surveys included in the packet did have topographical
22 information.

23
24 Mr. Sharpe displayed the survey that had topographical information, and noted that they were also
25 working to display an aerial photograph from Hennepin County that also showed topographical
26 information.

27
28 Chair Cameron stated that he sees this situation as the applicant looking for a variance without a
29 building, and asked if this was something that the City had dealt with in the past.

30
31 Mr. Sharpe stated that, to his knowledge, the City had not had this kind of situation without
32 building plans, but noted that it was a valid application for the City to accept without those plans.

33
34 Mr. Schelzel explained that an analogous situation would be a subdivision application where the
35 City often did not have building plans, and noted that staff had deemed this application complete.

36
37 Mr. Sharpe displayed the aerial photograph from Hennepin County that he had described earlier
38 in the meeting, which showed topographical information.

39
40 Commissioner Elg stated that he believed that there was no question that this property, at some
41 point, would require a variance. He noted that the question he had asked earlier was about how
42 they had arrived at 108 feet because when he first looked at the table, he thought the variance was
43 for 108 feet and the setback was 158 feet, and noted that if those numbers had been flipped, he
44 thought they would be more reasonable. He explained that he was challenged by this process
45 because they don't know what a future project may look like and would rather have a plan in hand
46 when considering this type of request.

1
2 Commissioner Severson stated that she would say the same thing as Commissioner Elg. She noted
3 that the questions they were supposed to ask were things like whether the request was reasonable,
4 whether the plight was due to the landowner, and if it would alter the characteristics of the
5 neighborhood, and explained that she did not feel she had enough information to answer any of
6 those questions. She noted that she agreed that it was likely that a variance would be needed on
7 this property at some point. She stated that she believed it was unreasonable for the applicants to
8 come and ask for a variance without knowing what it would be used for or what the building would
9 look like.

10
11 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she had gone out to the property, and Mr. Swanson had given
12 her permission to walk around the property, and she was able to see the stakes that Mr. Swanson
13 referenced in his comments. She stated that when she stood at this location and looked towards
14 the Cosentino's all she was able to see was a portion of their patio. She noted that if someone was
15 going to start drawing up plans, she believed that they needed someplace to start. She stated that
16 it also seemed like the applicants were going out of their way to find a way to make this work, so
17 they can get to work on a plan or a sale of the property, because the existing house will come down.
18 She referenced the primary questions the Commission was supposed to consider for this request
19 and stated that she felt this request was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, very reasonable,
20 the plight of the landowner was due to circumstances unique to the property, would not alter the
21 essential character of the locality, and did not believe that this request was just about economics.
22 She reviewed the additional criteria that needed to be considered because this was located in the
23 Shoreland Overlay District, and noted that she would see this request being approved based on
24 items D and E from Section 905. She clarified that she was saying that she was in favor of granting
25 this variance request as long as Section 905 (D) was met, as outlined in the staff report.

26
27 Commissioner VanLoy stated that providing hypothetical plans would entail a lot of time and
28 effort, and granting this variance could help provide someone with an idea of what was in place.
29 He explained that from his standpoint, he was not sure why they went to the 108 feet, but because
30 their proposal had utilized the red portions on the diagrams that ensured the line of sight from the
31 existing properties would not be built on provided insight that the applicants were looking to ensure
32 that it meets the Comprehensive Plan guidance. He stated that he had also gone out and looked at
33 the site and noted that he did not believe they could go any further north because there is a large
34 drop off there, and also felt this was a reasonable request.

35
36 Commissioner Plantan stated that each property is unique, and agreed that this lot had a lot of
37 constraints. She noted that she has been to this property and knows the time and expense of
38 drawing up plans to see if something 'may' work. She stated that the proposed setback was further
39 back than the home that has been there for 40 to 100 years. She noted that the applicants were
40 long-time residents who had voluntarily added their own conditions to the application to preserve
41 sight lines for the neighboring properties. She also felt the request was consistent with the
42 Comprehensive Plan, the request was reasonable, that there was a plight that was unique to the
43 property and not created by the landowner, and that granting this variance would change the
44 character of the area. She explained that she was in favor of granting the variance, with the
45 conditions included in the staff report, including the voluntary restrictions offered by the applicant.
46

1 Chair Cameron stated that he has many of the same concerns as Commissioners Elg and Severson.
2 He explained that he felt needing a variance for this property was fully justified, but noted that he
3 had too many questions about granting a blanket variance. He stated that typically, when the City
4 grants a variance, there are conditions attached, but in this case, they don't know what conditions
5 to attach, which scares him a bit. He stated that there are some hardships associated with this
6 property, but he was uncomfortable allowing permission to use this vast space without attaching
7 any conditions to the use of the space.

8
9 Commissioner Plantan asked to see the slide that depicted the red triangles that showed the possible
10 buildable area if the variance was granted.

11
12 Chair Cameron stated that the building area within the setbacks was all hardwoods.

13
14 Commissioner Schwalbe asked what could be done that would not be a problem for the neighbors.

15
16 Chair Cameron stated that the Commission doesn't know the answer because nothing has been
17 proposed yet.

18
19 Commissioner Severson stated that the process was normally for there to be plans to consider, and
20 she did not think they should ask for the variance first before there were plans.

21
22 Commissioner Plantan explained that she disagreed because it would be difficult for an architect
23 to design a home without knowing where it would be able to sit on the lot. She asked if there was
24 something included in the staff report related to height restrictions or considerations.

25
26 Mr. Sharpe noted that, traditionally, when adopting or moving forward with a variance application,
27 the house plans presented are not part of the recorded materials, nor were they a condition of
28 approval, and explained that the variance runs with the land, not the plans, unless the plans were a
29 condition of approval.

30
31 Mr. Schelzel explained that the problem with tying a variance to a specific house plan was that the
32 variance would run with the land, and the house has a certain lifespan, which meant the new builder
33 would need to know what the setback was. He stated that what the Commission was deciding
34 would not just be for the next home that would be built after the existing home was demolished,
35 but would be indefinite until a different setback rule or variance was in place.

36
37 Commissioner VanLoy asked if that meant that even if something included building plans in a
38 variance request if they would have the opportunity to change the plans, because the variance goes
39 with the land.

40
41 Mr. Sharpe stated that the plans would be supplemental for the Commission's review and stated
42 that a design related to a variance would be able to change, subject to any conditions of the granted
43 variance.

44
45 Commissioner Elg asked how enforceable the red areas that were being self-regulated by the
46 applicant were.

1
2 Mr. Schelzel stated that if the Commission's findings include the significance of the red areas, they
3 would want to make them a condition of or part of the approval so the City would do what they
4 could to make sure this was legally binding as best as possible. He explained that he would consult
5 with his real estate team to find a way to record this and ensure this was an enforceable restriction,
6 but noted that it was only because the applicant was offering this, because this was not something
7 that would be required under City Code.

8
9 Commissioner Severson stated that it had been brought up that other communities on the lake do
10 not have the same riparian requirements and asked if that was something that would ever be
11 considered, so this point would sort of be moot.

12
13 Mr. Sharpe explained that one of the reasons staff had done this level of research about the number
14 of variances in a certain timeframe was to evaluate whether it may be time to review code to
15 determine whether an amendment would be warranted. He stated that in this instance, they have
16 evaluated 3 properties, and staff were not committed to bringing an amendment forward at this
17 point, but it was something the City could consider in the future. He noted that anecdotally, this
18 was out of the DNR's best practices and stated that most of the other communities around the lake
19 have or have had these provisions.

20
21 Mr. Schelzel cautioned the Commission that they were being asked to apply the ordinance as it
22 was today.

23
24 Commissioner Severson asked what would happen if the Commission were tied in a vote on the
25 application.

26
27 Mr. Schelzel explained that the Commission's charge was to provide the City Council with a report
28 and recommendation, and stated that if they cannot resolve a tied vote tonight, they could table it
29 until the next meeting when everyone may be present. He stated that staff's recommendation to
30 the Commission was always to try to build consensus, and explained that one of the nice things
31 about their proceedings is that Councilmembers often watch the Planning Commission meetings
32 and read the minutes which include the comments of all Commissioners.

33
34 Mr. Sharpe noted that they were not up against the 120-day clock, so there would be sufficient
35 time for them if they decided to table this item until a full Commission was present.

36
37 Commissioner Elg reiterated that this was challenging, and noted that the Commission's
38 interpretation of 'reasonable' could be different. He stated that what was reasonable to him may
39 be different than what is reasonable to another member of the Commission, and explained that he
40 was not going to stand in the way because there would need to be a variance on this parcel when
41 something was built, so why shouldn't they get something in place now. He noted that he wished
42 the proposed setback were 150 feet, but they were requesting 108 feet, which he could live with.

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

1 Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to direct staff to
2 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings
3 reflecting a recommendation of approval for a Lake Shore Setback Variance at 547 Harrington
4 Road, including conditions of the submittal of a shoreland impact plan as referenced in Ch.
5 991.09.D, and inclusion and definition of the red triangle areas as outlined for the non-buildable
6 area, for review and adoption at the next Planning Commission meeting.

7
8 The motion carried 5-1 (Cameron opposed).
9

10 Commissioner Severson explained that she had voted in favor of this, but wanted it on the record
11 that the Council should consider whether they felt the size of the setback was reasonable, and
12 wanted to communicate that this did make her a little nervous because they do not know exactly
13 what would be built there.

14
15 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Other Items:**

16
17 **a) Review of Development Activities**

18
19 Mr. Sharpe reviewed some of the recent applications that have recently come forward, reviewed
20 other projects that were still in a proposed state, and applicants that were continuing to work with
21 staff, and highlighted projects that would likely not be completed within the 2025 build season.

22
23 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

24
25 Mr. Sharpe stated that there are some training opportunities that he wanted to make available to
26 the Commission. He asked the Commission to contact him individually and let him know if they
27 were interested in attending training in person. He noted that he has also published materials that
28 he could provide to the Commission that have been endorsed by the National American Planning
29 Association, but explained that there were portions that did not apply to the City. He reiterated that
30 there were some training opportunities and noted that they do have some room within the 2025
31 budget and would like to be able to utilize those funds. He stated that regarding the proposed 2026
32 Planning Commission meeting dates, he would like the Commission to discuss whether they
33 wanted to hold their meetings on alternating weeks from the Council or continue to hold them
34 during the same week, and outlined the pros and cons.

35
36 Commissioner Severson stated that this decision sounded like it would be better made by staff.

37
38 Mr. Sharpe agreed that this was something within his purview, but was not something he should
39 do without consideration of what it may mean for the Commission and their ability to attend
40 meetings, video staff, or City Attorney Schelzel. He reiterated that he was trying to get some initial
41 thoughts from the Commission on what they would like to see for future meeting dates.

42
43 Chair Cameron stated that he did not have a preference on when the Commission met.

44
45 Commissioner Plantan stated that she would defer to staff on this decision.
46

1 Commissioner Severson stated that she would also defer to staff.

2
3 Commissioner Elg stated that he did not have a preference on when the Commission met.

4
5 Commissioner VanLoy stated that he would prefer the meetings remain back-to-back.

6
7 Commissioner Plantan expressed her appreciation to Commissioner Severson for making her
8 comment at the end of the discussion on the variance issue, because she felt having those comments
9 was helpful for residents and the Council to have along with the actual vote.

10
11 Chair Cameron explained that he firmly believed that the property would need a variance, but was
12 not sure that this was the right one to have.

13
14 **AGENDA ITEM 8. Adjournment.**

15
16 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Cameron asked for a motion to adjourn.

17
18 Commissioner VanLoy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Elg, to adjourn the Planning
19 Commission meeting.

20
21 The motion carried unanimously.

22
23 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

24
25 Respectfully submitted,

26 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

27 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*