

**MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**JANUARY 15, 2009**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners A. Thomas, Walker, Blatz, Lehman, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen were present. Adams was absent.

Staff members present: Development Director Julie Wischnack, City Planner Loren Gordon, Principal Planner Susan Thomas, Planner Jeff Thomson, Planning Technician Stephanie Scott-Sims, and Natural Resources Manager Jo Collieran.

- 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** The agenda was approved as submitted. Gordon noted the removal of the Morries Mazda Bentley application from the meeting's agenda in response to the applicant's request.

- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** December 4, 2008

*Lehman moved, second by Sjeklocha, to approve the December 4, 2008, meeting minutes as submitted.*

*A. Thomas, Walker, Blatz, Lehman, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen voted yes. Adams was absent. Motion carried.*

**5. REPORT FROM STAFF**

Gordon briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meetings of December 8, 2008, December 22, 2008, and January 5, 2009:

- Adopted a resolution approving items concerning a 3-lot subdivision of the existing property at 10001 Minnetonka Boulevard.
- Adopted a resolution approving a 12-month extension of multiple variances for construction of a new home at 2813 McKenzie Point Road.
- Denied items concerning a 2-lot subdivision of existing properties at 10323 34th Circle West.

- Adopted a resolution approving a 12-month extension of preliminary plat approval of Evergreen, a 2-lot subdivision at 15549 Ranchview Court.
- Adopted a resolution approving a 12-month extension of multiple variances for construction of a new home at 16930 Grays Bay Boulevard.
- Adopted a resolution approving a 12-month extension of the Schoen Addition final plat at 11405, 11413, and 11477 Fetterly Road.
- Adopted a resolution approving vacation of easements and final plat items concerning 5121 and 5125 Baker Road.
- Adopted a resolution approving an amendment of a condition of approval for FMHC/T-Mobile at 12201 Minnetonka Boulevard.
- Adopted a resolution approving a 12-month extension of final plat approval of the Helen Cooley Addition at 2202 Meeting Street.
- Introduced an ordinance and referred it to the planning commission concerning Morrie's Maserati Mazda Bentley located at 13708 and 13712 Wayzata Boulevard.
- Discussed Minnetonka Mills.

**6. REPORT FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:** None

**7. PUBLIC HEARINGS: CONSENT AGENDA:** None

**8. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. A conditional use permit for wireless telecommunications antennas on the existing building located at 2000 Plymouth Road. (88105.08a)**

Chair Cheleen introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Scott-Sims reported. She recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Kelly Swenseth, employed by FMHC Corporation as an agent for T-Mobile, applicant, thanked the commission for consideration of the application and was present to answer questions.

The public hearing was opened. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

***Sjeklocha moved, second by A. Thomas, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution on pages A35 – A41 of the staff report. This resolution approves a conditional use permit for wireless telecommunications antennas to be located on an existing office building at 2000 Plymouth Road. Approval is based on the following findings:***

- 1) The city code recognizes telecommunications facilities as valuable public resources.
- 2) The proposed telecommunications antennas meet the conditional use permit standards as outlined in city code.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The following must be submitted prior to issuance of building or electrical permits:
  - a. This resolution must be recorded with the county and a copy of the recorded resolution must be returned to the city.
  - b. The applicant must agree, in writing, to the conditions of this conditional use permit.
  - c. The property owner must agree, in writing, to the conditions of this conditional use permit. This includes agreeing to the removal of the telecommunication facilities when they are unused, obsolete, or become hazardous, and agreeing to the city's right to assess removal costs as outlined in city code.
- 2) The antennas and accessory equipment and associated landscaping must be installed in substantial conformance with the site plan and elevations date-stamped November 24, 2008.
- 3) The canisters in which the antennas are enclosed must be a color similar to the existing building.
- 4) No advertising message or identification sign larger than two square-feet may be affixed to the transmission towers or antennas.
- 5) The antennas may not be artificially illuminated unless required by law or by a governmental agency to protect the public's health and safety.

- 6) On-site, permanent employees associated with the telecommunications facilities are not allowed.
- 7) If rendered obsolete, the antennas must be removed in accordance with City Code 300.34.5.
- 8) The city council may reasonably add or revise conditions to address any future unforeseen problems.
- 9) Any change to the approved use that results in a significant increase in traffic or a significant change in character requires a revision of this conditional use permit.
- 10) Violation of any condition of this conditional use permit or city code requirement renders this permit null and void.

***A. Thomas, Walker, Blatz, Lehman, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen voted yes. Adams was absent. Motion carried.***

**B. Items concerning Terratonka, an 8-lot subdivision of existing properties at 3100 Forest Lane and 3218 and 3200 Eldorado Trail West. (92018.08a)**

Chair Cheleen introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

S. Thomas reported. She recommended denial of the application based on the findings listed in the staff report.

Blatz asked how many lots a private drive can provide access. S. Thomas responded that the city's ordinance allows up to three residences to access a private drive without a variance.

Blatz questioned what type of litigation could stem from the proposal. S. Thomas explained that current litigation is going on in cities due to the lack of maintenance of private streets. These situations occur when the homeowner's association has dissolved or the homeowner's association wants the city to take over maintenance of a private street.

Blatz recognized that the proposed road would bisect the core woodland preservation area. The applicant felt the core woodland area would be preserved. Blatz asked what access location staff preferred. S. Thomas explained that

access has been a focus of numerous discussions. Staff determined that access from Eldorado Trail West would provide the best access point to the site.

Chair Cheleen noted that a typical ½-acre lot is approximately 22,000 square feet. Of the proposed 8 lots, only 2 of them would be substantially less than a standard, ½-acre lot. Chair Cheleen questioned why the application was for a planned unit development when the proposal would be for 8-almost-half-acre lots on a 5-acre plat. S. Thomas stated that planned unit developments have been used in a variety of ways. Each is unique in what standards it deviates from. Substandard lot sizes are not a requirement of a planned unit development.

Ronald Campbell, 3100 Forest Lane, applicant, stated that:

- He purchased the property over 30 years ago. It was a remnant of a much larger estate.
- He is an avid conservationist. He described the site's trees and vegetation.
- He has bought into the vision of combining the three properties to create first-class, energy-efficient residences that complement the existing neighborhood and reflect the city's environmental values with property controls to ensure continued stewardship of the land and forest.
- He introduced his development team.

Curt Newcomb, 2565 Bayberry Avenue, Stillwater, represented the applicant. Mr. Newcomb stated that:

- He wanted to adhere to the spirit and intent of the tree preservation protection ordinance. The project focused on minimizing the impact on the existing neighborhood.
- One significant goal was to save all of the trees possible. The oak trees in particular. The initial plan included impervious pavers used for the street. This would minimize runoff. He learned that those pavers could not be used.
- The project would include a geothermal heating loop throughout the development.
- The issue of affordability would be looked at.
- The impact of soil and terrain would be benefited by the smaller building pads included in the previous plan. The applicant was told that there had to be larger building pads.

- The proposal intends to have one builder for the entire project and all of the residences would be custom designed and built. There would be smaller building pads than indicated on the plan and, therefore, a smaller footprint and less grading than depicted earlier.

Tom Goodrum, planner for the applicant, stated that:

- The plan has been worked on and revised for over a year. Dr. Campbell's goals have been combined with the city's requirements.
- The site would be bisected. The integrity of the woods would be impacted. The applicant did not disagree with staff's interpretation of how the plan looks. The proposal looks like a standard subdivision.
- The neighbors want a neighborhood that matches the existing character of the area consisting of single-family residences surrounded by trees. The applicant was pleased the final proposal looks like a standard subdivision.
- The site is currently zoned R-1 and would allow 5 lots. The woodland preservation area is an overlay district that goes over what would be allowed in an R-1 district. The applicant determined that the base number of lots allowed on the site would be 8 lots if reasonable steps are made to allow for the 8 lots. The R-1 district is the underlying district.
- Dr. Campbell has preserved the woods for 30 years. He is being denied the rights his neighbors have had. The ordinance allows a planned unit development for a site larger than 2 acres. The proposed site is 2.5 acres. The applicant's neighbors cut down trees to provide larger grass areas and swimming pools.
- The wetland preservation area is old and getting unhealthy. There is a large amount of secondary growth. Environmental staff did a tree survey and found buckthorn, garlic mustard, and 92 unhealthy trees. That equals 1 out of 7 trees are unhealthy. Deterioration of the site would continue. Dr. Campbell would put together a stewardship program to create a quality woods.
- The Fisher property has already been approved for development. The approved grading limits are included on the proposal. The west property is outside of the wetland preservation area and the south side includes a power-line easement with poles and lines. At any time, a utility company could cut down the trees in the easement. A trail runs underneath the power line right now. Part of Dr. Campbell's yard, a pond, and Dr. Campbell's driveway are part of the woodland preservation area.

- The red “x” marks unhealthy trees. The ordinance allows 25 percent impact to the woods. There would not be enough woods area to make a valid preservation attempt. Concentrating preservation on the knoll area and saving as many oaks as possible was the goal to save the essence of the woods. The goal was met. Seventy-five percent of the trees would be saved. That equals 560 trees out of 743 trees. Ninety-four percent of the oaks would be saved, equaling 83 oaks out of 87 oaks. Forty-eight percent of them would be in a conservation easement. Nine percent would be in an additional tree preservation area. The total would equal 57 percent of “the land being under protection.”
- There would be 2 ½ acres of continuous area around the knoll. It narrow downs, but continues through. The current driveway co-exists with the wetland preservation area.
- Dr. Campbell proposes that the homeowner’s association put money into a stewardship program to be used for removal of evasive species of vegetation.
- Outside of the grading limits, yards would be provided. The trees in the yards would be saved.
- When creating the plan, it was first determined that the pond would have to be located in the southeast corner of the site. The next priority would be to preserve the knoll. Location of the streets and residences was considered third. The residences were located where area was available. Several options were considered.
- Locating the street in the center of the site would save the most trees. A private road would reduce the size of the connection. The private road would be built to public road specifications. The private driveway, 13 feet wide, would serve 3 lots to the north. Construction of the street would cause the removal of 1 oak tree. Fifty-three additional trees would be removed, but they would be located outside of the preservation area.
- Access for the road from Forest Lane was ruled out. A public road off of a private drive would not work. A turn around would have to be located on top of the knoll.
- Access for the road from the east side would cause the removal of a nice clump of oak trees. The neighbors do not want to see a road on that side.
- Access for the road on the west side would cause the removal of trees that provide a buffer from the highway. It would create a runway between the neighborhood and Interstate 494.

- Access for the road from the east or west would push the lots to the center of the site. The road would have less impact than a residence.
- The drive would weave through the preservation area with minimum impact as the existing driveway does currently.
- The contour of the sites would minimize grading.
- The planned unit development steps are required because 42 percent would be impacted instead of 25 percent.
- No high-priority trees would be removed. Woolman Woods currently has 60 percent of its high-priority trees being removed.
- The first planned unit development steps were used for a creative design. Natural grades would be used, residences would be clustered around the knoll, and R-1 standard setbacks for the lots facing the neighbors would be met.
- Retaining walls and buffers would be used. The residence placement illustrates the maximum size allowed, but the applicant is encouraging eco-friendly residences.
- Any development done on the site would impact the continuity of the woods.
- There would not be enough woods to preserve the knoll and woodland preservation area.
- Fifty percent of the site would be under conservation. Fifty percent of the site would be continuous in its conservation easement.
- Dr. Campbell was a steward of his property for 30 years. Because he has ½ an acre with trees that he did not cut down, the proposal is being denied 3 lots. Dr. Campbell waited until the tree ordinance was approved so he could strive to meet it.
- The proposal would maintain the character of single-family residential, wooded lots.
- Dr. Campbell lives in the neighborhood. He purchased the two properties to provide the best development possible.
- Woolman Woods is no more special than the proposal. He compared the proposal with Woolman Woods. The developments are similar in scope and size and try to meet the intent of the city's ordinances.
- Construction and phasing could be timed to minimize disruption.

David Nash, engineer for the applicant, stated that:

- The ponds were located in order to match the natural drainage of the site. The majority of the site would have an infiltration system.

He would work with staff to adjust the amount of infiltration that he learned today was incorrect.

- Existing contours would be used to minimize tree removal and disruption of the site.
- He agreed with staff that 20 feet around a building pad would be the normal grading limits required for a site. This site would be custom graded to save trees possibly 10 feet from the building.
- Retaining wall heights would be 4 feet or lower. There would be no tie backs which would minimize disruption.
- Staff directed the applicant to include a hammer-head turnaround. He did not understand why the proposal's hammer-head turnaround would not be acceptable.

Mr. Newcomb thanked commissioners for the opportunity to explain the process used to create the proposal. He believed that Terratonka met the intent of the ordinances. The tree protection ordinance states that it should not interfere with how existing property owners use their property. The minutes of the August 25, 2008 city council meeting state that every councilmember expressed the importance of preserving the rights of the property owner to develop his or her property. Dr. Campbell has been a steward for over 30 years. Not allowing him to develop the property would infringe on his rights, penalize him for preserving the trees for over 30 years, and be inconsistent with the city council's intent.

A. Thomas noted that the report stated that the city engineer had not received calculations for the storm water plan. S. Thomas stated that the city engineer has received the calculations and that staff was comfortable that the city engineer and the applicant's engineer could work together to create a suitable infiltration and storm water treatment plan.

In response to A. Thomas' question, S. Thomas explained that 25 percent of high-priority trees would be removed from the site. Mr. Goodrum provided that when he mentioned 20 percent to 40 percent he was referring to the city council allowing 20 percent of impact for conservation developments. If the proposal was approved, then 40 percent would be considered. Less than an acre of land would still be a woodland preservation area. No high-impact trees would be removed. Woolman Woods had 60 percent of its high-impact trees removed. Mr. Goodrum explained that 40 percent could be expected to be approved for a planned unit development. It would be necessary for construction of the road and cul-de-sac.

Blatz asked if more grading would be needed to meet infiltration requirements. S. Thomas felt it was likely that the pond would need to be reconfigured so that a greater portion of the wetland preservation area would be impacted.

In response to Blatz's question regarding the hammerhead turnaround, S. Thomas stated that she would meet with the city engineer and fire marshal to determine what specifications need to be followed. The applicant did intend to meet ordinance requirements.

Walker asked if staff found the applicant's tree survey to be accurate. Colleran looked at the tree inventory. She disagreed with the ranking of the health of the trees. She and Emily Barbeau, city forester, visited the site in the summer.

Walker asked if the applicant submitted a plan with five lots. S. Thomas responded that staff has seen no plan that contains less than eight lots for the site.

Lehman asked for the distinction between a count of the trees removed and woodland preservation impact. Colleran explained the three tree categories provided in the tree ordinance. The total woodland preservation area is considered rather than each individual tree. The woodland preservation area must be looked at on a square footage or acreage removal basis and high-priority trees or significant trees on a tree by tree removal basis.

Chair Cheleen asked S. Thomas to explain how the number of lots works out for the 5 ½ acre site. S. Thomas agreed that the woodland preservation area is an overlay district. An overlay district may provide additional, stricter requirements for a property than its zoning requires. A property zoned R-1 in an overlay shoreland district has an additional requirement of limiting its impervious surface to 30 percent. A property in a woodland preservation area is limited to 1 lot per acre if more than 25 percent of the woodland preservation area would be removed. Greater density may be allowed if good preservation techniques offset the increase. Dr. Campbell's 3100 Forest Lane property may have 2 ½ acres of woodland preservation area. The entire site, 5.45 acres total, includes 4 acres of woodland preservation area. S. Thomas stressed that the entire site is reviewed as a whole. The entire woodland preservation area needs to be taken into account.

The public hearing was opened.

Mike Spillane, 13535 Wentworth Trail, stated that:

- He was not previously aware that the proposal would locate a mosquito pond in his backyard where it is low and tends to overflow into his yard.

- He appreciated the sugar coating on the loss of trees with the narrower road, but he knew that a 20-foot road would take a 30-foot gap to dig and make room for the water, sewer, and drainage. More loss of trees and disturbance to the grade is created.
- He would hate to see the trees lost from the wooded area.
- The number of proposed residences would be excessive and packed in the site.
- He appreciated not having the street located behind his property.
- The sewer and water hookups would be in his back yard with a manhole cover.
- The previous builder told him there would be 7 homes. He never would have sold off land to allow the proposal to proceed at the time if he had known.
- Eight residences would create too much traffic.

William Denton, 13531 Wentworth Trail, stated that:

- He was curious if a stop sign or stop light would be installed at Eldorado Trail West and Wentworth Trail.
- He attended a neighborhood meeting held by Dr. Campbell. At that time, directing residents to drive in two different directions from the site was discussed.
- Dr. Campbell currently resides on Forest Lane and would access Eldorado Trail West. The proposal would eliminate Forest Lane's turn around. There should be an emergency turn around.
- He was amazed that residents continue to want to have a private road in front of them on Forest Lane when the street is crumbling and this proposal would improve the street.
- Dividing the Terratonka development into three phases should be considered. The climate is so bad for building residences that the lots could remain vacant. One phase could be constructed at a time. Phase One could be next to Dr. Campbell's residence, off of a cul-de-sac. Phase Two could have a cul-de-sac accommodating four residences going south to Wentworth Trail on Eldorado Trail East. Phase Three could be the remaining lots strung along Eldorado Trail West.
- Construction would cause a real slimy mess. It could last four or five years. Thought should be given to concentrate the activity until part of it would be sold. The lots may not sell or they might not be very profitable.

- It is about time something is done to improve Forest Lane. Mr. Campbell no longer has a circular driveway.

John Loomis, 13615 Wentworth Trail, stated that:

- He understood Mr. Denton's concern regarding increased traffic near his residence.
- He spoke for the Forest Lane residents who like the small, rural road appeal. It is at their expense to maintain the road. It would be at the city's expense to develop it.
- He wanted to know the planning commission's take on the situation.
- If Mr. Campbell removed his financing for a private road, he questioned what impact that would have on the Forest Lane residents.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Sjeklocha requested Mr. Spillane's drainage concern be addressed. S. Thomas explained that the city engineer would review the proposal to ensure that there would be no increase in the rate or volume of water exiting the site. If those standards are met, then Mr. Spillane should see no change to the existing condition. If a current drainage problem exists, Mr. Spillane should contact the city engineer who would visit the site and determine if there is an opportunity to address the problem. Issues involving private property owners are dealt with by those property owners.

Sjeklocha asked if the city has a role regarding the quality of a private road. S. Thomas stated that the city has no obligation to improve a private road unless it is petitioned to do so by the property owners adjacent to the street. The property owners must fund the improvement.

Sjeklocha questioned if Forest Lane residents received notice of the public hearing. S. Thomas answered affirmatively. She had received telephone calls from residents of Forest Lane, but did not receive written comments.

Chair Cheleen asked if another turnaround would be needed if the Forest Lane turnaround would be eliminated. Gordon explained that it would depend on when the road was constructed and conditions of its approval. A turnaround would be required if the project would be proposed today, but he did not expect one would be required at the time the turnaround was created.

In response to Blatz' question, S. Thomas explained that 2 of the 3 lots were created in 2006. At the time of the subdivision of the plat, staff advocated that the Fisher subdivision include dedication of right-of-way or an outlot so that Dr. Campbell could access Eldorado Trail West at some point in the future. The owners of the Fisher property did not agree to that condition. The city council did not require that Mr. Fisher provide access. Dr. Campbell's only option was to go north to Forest Lane. Dr. Campbell, without the Fisher property, does not have access to a public street.

Lehman asked for clarification of the tree protection ordinance's standard of tree removal. S. Thomas responded that the standard is 25 percent. Anything above or beyond 25 percent is based on the unique characteristics of the planned unit development that is proposed. Both of the previous subdivisions have the 40 percent to 42 percent tree removal and include a full public street with a full public access and turnaround. In the case of Woolman Woods, the 42 percent to 44 percent also includes sport courts, swimming pools, and accessory structures. Some subdivisions have full roadways, cul-de-sacs, and accessory structures. The proposed Terratonka project includes only a portion of the road built to a standard width, a substandard drive, and no allowance for accessory structures.

Lehman felt that it should not be taken for granted that an approved variance would become a new standard. S. Thomas agreed. Each application is considered individually.

Lehman asked if the applicant was at a disadvantage compared to his neighbors by preserving trees when his neighbors did not. S. Thomas explained that different standards are applied to properties with overlay districts. Floodplain, wetland, shoreland, and woodland protection overlay districts add stricter requirements to R-1 zoned properties. The tree ordinance strives to allow development responsibly.

Mr. Goodrum addressed that overlay districts allow developments that adhere to R-1 standards. The proposal would provide the same width of its street as a public road. The turnaround would meet city standards and save trees. Dr. Campbell's property could be used to create a new turnaround. The applicant is willing to work with the city.

A. Thomas had concerns with the proposal including the private road width being 13 feet wide in some places; guaranteeing maintenance of a private road if one or more property owners does not pay; access for emergency vehicles; disturbance around the residence being limited to 10 feet; the grading impact; and the planned unit development would maximize density but did not provide a

benefit. He was not sure if the proposal would minimize impact to the landscape. He did not feel comfortable with the proposal. He supported staff's recommendation.

Sjeklocha agreed with A. Thomas. The tree ordinance is about area, not individual trees. The contiguousness of the woods is a factor. She viewed the three properties as very unique. She agreed with staff's recommendation.

Walker concurred. The neighbors' concerns held merit.

Lehman appreciated the applicant's past conservation efforts. The tree ordinance needs to be administered as it is written. He sympathized with the knowledge that a previous development had a higher percentage of tree removal, but that does not set a standard. Each case must be reviewed on its own merits. He supported staff's recommendation.

Blatz concurred. She appreciated the applicant's patience, diligence, and working with the neighbors. She supported staff's recommendation.

Chair Cheleen was concerned with using the planned unit development to allow eight lots. There are many options that could be used to save more contiguous areas of the woodland preservation area. The proposal would not allow for two years from now when sheds and swimming pools would be added. He agreed with commissioners.

***Walker moved, second by Blatz, to recommend the city council adopt the resolution on pages A37–A41 of the staff report, denying the requested rezoning and preliminary plat. Denial is based on the following findings:***

- 1) *Tree Protection Ordinance. The proposed rezoning and preliminary plat do not meet the requirements or intent of the Tree Protection Ordinance.*
  - a. Under the tree ordinance and traditional zoning, the subject site could be developed into no more than five single-family lots. The applicant is proposing eight single-family homes.
  - b. The proposal attempts to maximize development potential through the use of PUD zoning. However, the proposed PUD does not appropriately preserve the Woodland Preservation Area on the site:
    - (1) The proposed PUD does not include creative design. Similar to a typical single-family subdivision, a roadway bisects the

buildable area of the site and accesses buildable area on either side, also bisecting a remnant ecosystem protected by the city's Tree Protection Ordinance.

- (2) The proposal does not preserve the continuity of the WPA, through clustering for lots, reducing lot size, or other similar techniques.
  - (3) Proposed conservation easements would be of little value; as they would merely preserve wooded areas significantly degraded/impacted by development activities.
- c. The grading plans submitted with the proposal are unrealistic. A more realistic grading plan would result in disturbance of at least 42 percent of the WPA on the site.
- 2) *Access. The proposal does not provide appropriate access to the site.*
- a. The proposed turnaround would not meet minimum standards as required by the fire department or state building code.
  - b. The proposed separation of the roadway between public and private segments may result in technically awkward and, potentially, legally difficult future maintenance responsibilities.
- 3) *Stormwater. Specific stormwater calculations have not been submitted. Without more detailed information:*
- a. It is difficult to definitively determine that all stormwater management requirements would be met.
  - b. It is difficult to determine whether the submitted plans accurately represent the grading limits/site disturbance which would be associated with construction of the basin.

***A. Thomas, Walker, Blatz, Lehman, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen voted yes. Adams was absent. Motion carried.***

This item is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council at its February 9, 2009 meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

*A. Thomas moved, second by Walker, to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m.  
Motion carried unanimously.*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lois T. Mason  
Planning Secretary