

**MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

APRIL 23, 2009

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Staff members present: City Planner Loren Gordon, Planner Jeff Thomson, Planning Technician Stephanie Scott-Simms, and Natural Resources Manager Jo Colleran.

3. ELECTIONS

A. Election of Commission Chair and Vice Chair

Lehman moved, second by Walker, to elect John Cheleen to serve as chair of the Minnetonka Planning Commission for the remainder of 2009.

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

Lehman moved, second by Walker, to elect Steve Adams to serve as vice chair of the Minnetonka Planning Commission for the remainder of 2009.

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

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: The agenda was approved as submitted with modifications provided in the change memo dated April 23, 2009.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 2, 2009

Adams moved, second by Walker, to approve the April 2, 2009, meeting minutes as submitted.

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

6. REPORT FROM STAFF

Gordon briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meetings of April 6, 2009 and April 20, 2009:

- Adopted a resolution approving items pertaining to an existing master development plan for Sears Imported Autos located at 13500/13502 Wayzata Boulevard.
- Adopted a resolution approving a preliminary plat for Lake Rose Highlands, a 2-lot subdivision of the existing property at 15407 Lake Shore Avenue.
- Tabled action on items concerning Terratonka, a 7-lot subdivision of existing properties at 3100 Forest Lane and 3200 and 3218 Eldorado Trail West, to allow more time for additional work by the applicants.
- Adopted a resolution approving the planning commission's recommendation of the alternate plan concerning the existing Dairy Queen site at 5445 Eden Prairie Road.
- Adopted an ordinance amending architectural material standards in the Planned I-394 Zoning District.
- Adopted a resolution vacating portions of public right-of-way adjacent to 2608 Crosby Road.

The Eddie Merlot project has received approval from Hennepin County and it is anticipated that the developer will be applying for a building permit soon.

7. REPORT FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: None

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS: CONSENT AGENDA:

No item was removed from the consent agenda for discussion or separate action.

Adams moved, second by Walker, to approve the item listed on the consent agenda as recommended in the respective staff reports as follows:

A. A rear yard setback variance for deck expansion and porch addition in the rear of the barn at 5750 Shady Oak Road (09002.09a)

Adopt the resolution on pages A11–A14 of the staff report, which approves the proposed rear yard setback variance from 40 feet to 28 feet at 5750 Shady Oak Road. Approval is based on the following findings:

- 1) The proposal is reasonable and would meet the required standards for a variance, because:
 - a. **UNDUE HARDSHIP:** The proposed deck extension and porch addition are reasonable uses of the residential property.
 - b. **UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE:** The existing home is located 40 feet from the rear property line. The required rear yard setback is 40 feet, thus, any addition would require a variance.
 - c. **INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE:** The proposed deck extension and porch addition are consistent with the intent of the ordinance provisions for residential properties.
 - d. **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:** Given significant grade change and vegetation, the proposed deck extension and porch addition would not be seen by neighboring properties and are consistent with the character of the surrounding residential properties.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - a. A copy of this resolution must be recorded with the County and a copy of the recorded document returned to the city.
 - b. Install a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, tree protection and wetland protection fencing as required by natural resources staff for inspection and approval. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.
- 2) This variance will end on December 31, 2010, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

A. Thomas, Walker, Adams, Blatz, Lehman, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen voted yes. Motion carried and the item on the consent agenda was approved as submitted.

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Items concerning a 2-lot subdivision of existing properties at 4813 Williston Road (98023.09a)

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.

Sjeklocha asked how the tree ordinance would apply to significant trees located outside of the building area two or more years from now. Colleran explained that if the subdivision would be approved and the lot stayed vacant for two or more years, it would then be treated as a vacant parcel of land again. If there are conditions of approval regarding location of the building area on the property, the conditions would not apply until issuance of a building permit. The proposed plan would not be required to mitigate removed trees.

Sjeklocha was referring to the trees outside of the building pad. Colleran stated that the ordinance allows a property owner to remove trees from a vacant piece of land. A healthy, protected tree that is not a hazard to personal safety or property damage and was removed or otherwise destroyed by unnatural causes within three years before a development application would be regarded as present at the time of construction or submittal of the development application. This provision does not apply if the number of trees removed is less than five percent of the protected trees existing five years before the application. Seven years or ten years after submittal of the land use application, the property owner would be able to remove any or all trees without mitigation.

A. Thomas asked if the four accessory buildings are in compliance. Scott-Sims replied affirmatively. If the lot division would be approved, then the accessory buildings would no longer be in compliance since there would not be a principal structure on the vacant lot. A condition of approval requires the applicant to remove the accessory buildings.

In response to Lehman's question, Colleran explained the tree ordinance in regard to existing vacant parcels of land, redevelopment, and site improvements if those parcels are zoned R-1, single-family residential housing. For construction of a principal structure on a vacant R-1 lot or for redevelopment of an existing R-1 lot, protected trees may be removed with no mitigation only within the basic tree removal area. That is one part of the tree ordinance. Another part of the ordinances refers to when a piece of land is subdivided. If approval is given to subdivide a piece of land and nothing is done for seven years later and the lot is

sold, then the tree ordinance would be applied as if the property is a vacant parcel of land.

Lehman asked if a shed to store garden tools would be allowed. Scott-Sims answered that a garden shed is considered an accessory structure. In order to have an accessory structure, a principal use must exist on the property. Staff would not support a variance for an accessory structure if a principal structure did not exist on the property because of issues that can develop. Gordon agreed. A variance cannot be granted for use of a property in an R-1 district for something other than residential purposes.

Blatz understood that it may not be the applicant who will be applying for a building permit for the proposed lot. She asked if trees would be saved if the driveway would be shifted further west. Scott-Sims stated that staff would discuss the plan with the building permit applicant. The property owner is allowed to remove the trees in the tree removal area, but staff would meet with the applicant and suggest as many trees as possible be saved. One of the issues with moving the proposed driveway to the west is the grading. The proposal would require less grading. Scott-Sims noted that those are some of the nicest trees on the site. The applicants actually planted those trees. She hopes that they want to preserve as many of those trees as possible.

The applicants were present to answer questions.

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

Chair Cheleen asked if the accessory structure on Parcel 1 would have to be removed within a certain amount of time. Scott-Sims explained that the condition of approval would require the accessory structure to be removed prior to the issuance of a grading permit. Once the property would become two separate lots, the accessory building would no longer be in compliance with ordinance requirements.

Walker did not see any neighborhood comments. Scott-Sims confirmed none were received.

Adams moved, second by Sjeklocha, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution on pages A16–A22 of the staff report which approves a lot division at 4813 Williston Road, date stamped February 6, 2009, with the following variances: a lot width at the right of way variance from 80 feet to 25.5 feet for Lot 2 and a variance from the maximum number of lots

having access onto a private driveway from 3 to 4 lots. Approval is based on the following findings:

- 1) The proposal meets the required standards and ordinances for a subdivision.
- 2) The proposal meets the required standards for a lot width at right-of-way and private driveway access variance in Section 300.10, Subdivision 5(h)(2)(b).

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Prior to release of this resolution, complete the following:
 - a. Submit the following documents for review and approval of the city attorney. The documents must be prepared by an attorney knowledgeable in the area of real estate:
 - (1) Title evidence that is current within thirty days before release of the final plat.
 - (2) Updated Declaration of Easement dated October 1, 2003 to include a private driveway easement between the public right-of-way and Lots 1 and 2. The easement must state the maintenance responsibilities of each owner.
 - (3) Applicant's engineer must verify contours. If standing water exists, city will require a drainage and utility easement to the 100 year elevation.
 - (4) A minimum 10-foot wide drainage and utility easements adjacent to the public right-of-way(s) and minimum 7-foot wide drainage and utility easements along all other lot lines.
 - (5) Utility easements over existing or proposed public utilities, as determined by the city engineer.
 - (6) Restrictive covenants to be recorded against the individual lots with the plat. The covenants must include the conditions that have not been met as of the release of the plat.

These documents must be recorded with the final plat, and a drawing of any easement must be attached to the easement deed.

- b. Each lot is to be custom-graded after issuance of a building permit. Lot 1 cannot be graded until a building permit is issued. No simultaneous mass-grading of the lots can occur due to the steepness of the slope on lot 1.
 - c. Pay a park dedication fee of \$5,000.00.
 - d. If the developer is petitioning the city to construct the public improvements, the city council must order the improvements.
 - e. Submit an electronic CAD file of the final plat in microstation or DXF.
- 3) A grading permit is required. Unless authorized by appropriate staff, no site work may begin until a complete grading permit applicant has been submitted, reviewed by staff, and approved.
- a. The following must be submitted for the grading permit to be considered complete.
 - (1) A final grading, drainage, and tree preservation plan must be submitted for each lot subject to staff approval. Plans must:
 - a) Indicate temporary and permanent erosion control measures.
 - b) Trees proposed to be removed and protected. Tree protection fencing must be shown to prevent impacts within the critical root zone of trees to remain.
 - c) Incorporate techniques to control runoff in order to prevent short and long-term erosion of the slope on Lot 1.
 - d) Avoid or minimize grading and construction activity within the steepest portions of the slope on Lot 1.
 - e) Drainage from the proposed drive must be directed away from the home.

- f) Drainage must not be directed toward the adjacent properties.
 - g) Verify whether additional grading will be required where Lot 1 meets Lot 2 to eliminate the potential for standing water.
- (2) Submit cash escrow in the amount to be determined by city staff. This escrow must be accompanied by a document prepared by the city attorney and signed by the builder and property owner. Through this document the builder and property owner will acknowledge: (1) the property will be brought into compliance within 48 hours of notification of a violation of the construction management plan, other conditions of approval, or city code standards; and (2) if compliance is not achieved, the city will use any or all of the escrow dollars to correct any erosion and/or grading problems.
- (3) A construction management plan. The plan must be in a city approved format and must outline minimum site management practices and penalties for non-compliance.

- b. Prior to issuance of a grading permit:
 - (1) Runoff must be directed primarily toward the shared private drive and must be directed away from adjacent properties.
 - (2) Install a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, and tree and wetland protection fencing for staff inspection. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.
 - (3) The final plat must be released by the city and filed with Hennepin County for recording.
 - (4) The accessory structure located on Parcel 1 must be removed, or a cash deposit must be made to the city ensuring the removal of the accessory building within a time frame agreed upon by staff.

- 4) Prior to issuance of a building permit for any of the lots within the development:
 - a. Submit the following for items staff review and approval:
 - (1) A construction management plan. This plan must be in a city approved format and outline minimum site management practices and penalties for non-compliance.
 - (2) Final grading and tree preservation plan for the lot. The plan must:
 - (a) comply with the preliminary grading plan as depicted on the preliminary plat;
 - (b) must preserve trees designated for preservation at the time of preliminary plat approval; and
 - (c) show sewer and water services to minimize impact to any significant trees. No trees may be removed for installation of services. One set of new services must be installed.

 - b. Submit the following documents:

- (1) A recorded copy of the preliminary plat, all required easements, and restrictive covenants.
 - (2) A letter from the surveyor stating that boundary and lot stakes have been installed as required by ordinance.
 - (3) A letter of credit or cash escrow in the amount of 150% of an estimated cost or 125% of a bid cost to complete required tree mitigation. Individual letters of credit are required for each lot.
- c. Schedule and hold a preconstruction meeting with engineering, planning, and natural resources staff.
 - d. Install a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, tree protection and wetland protection fencing for each lot. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.
 - f. Pay a hookup fee for sanitary sewer and water.
- 5) Notwithstanding the requirements outlined above, all lots and structures within the development are subject to the all R-1 zoning standards. In addition:
- a. All portions of first-story walls as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the house must be within 150 feet of the street. If access requirements cannot be met, the house must be protected with 13D automatic fire sprinklers.
 - b. At the time a new home is built on Lot 2, the new home must either be protected with 13D automatic fire sprinklers, or, the private driveway must be reconfigured to a "fire access" road.
- 6) During construction, the streets must be kept free of debris and sediment.

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

Chair Cheleen stated that the item is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council at its May 4, 2009 meeting.

B. Site and building plan review for several site improvements at Scenic Heights Elementary School at 5650 Scenic Heights Drive (92014.09a)

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

Thomson reported. He recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Adams asked if the open water is a wetland. Thomson explained that the area that appears to be open water is pea gravel that serves as storm water treatment for the existing parking lot. It is not regulated as a wetland. The proposal would call for the area to be filled in and a new storm water treatment area would treat the impervious surface for all of the hard surface coverage.

A. Thomas assumed that the striping indicates a crosswalk to get from the right side over to the school. He asked if there would be a change in the flow of getting children from the east side of Scenic Heights to the west side if the children are walking through Scenic Heights. He wanted to know that there would be a safe way to get from one side to the other. Thomson stated that the city engineer, police chief, and planning staff have been working with the school district on the proposal. Staff had an opportunity to observe the site during peak hours. He observed that the north parking lot is full during peak drop off time. Parents who wish to park their vehicle and walk in the school are parking along the west side of Scenic Heights Drive and Scenic Drive. A condition of approval would require 58 additional parking stalls to try to relieve that parking issue. There would be no parking allowed on Scenic Heights Drive. Temporary "no parking" signs have been installed on the north side of Scenic Drive. That directs pedestrians to the crosswalk. That is the safest place for pedestrians to cross at the controlled intersection. Those are the general comments from the city engineer, police chief, and planning staff.

A. Thomas asked if there has been compliance with the stop signs. Thomson answered affirmatively. A. Thomas commented that sometimes drivers compensate for stopping at a stop sign by accelerating quickly.

Adams visited the site and was concerned with lack of safety when exiting. Thomson stated that it could be looked at again when plans would be submitted for the grading permit.

Sjeklocha read in the report that the school will be adding classrooms. Thomson explained that the proposed plan would be 3,500 square feet and house 4 additional classrooms. He suggested the applicant explain what the rooms would

be used for and if the rooms would allow for additional enrollment or to just separate existing school programs.

Sjeklocha asked how many students take the bus, walk, ride a bike, and are driven. Thomson referred the question to the applicant.

Walker confirmed with Thomson that a majority of the parking stalls would be nine feet wide. There are some wider than nine feet. Ordinance regulations require a parking stall at a right angle to be a minimum of eight and a half feet wide. Walker asked for the reason behind requiring a nine-foot width. Thomson said that the applicant's plan includes the stalls to be nine feet wide. Walker asked if the site would have enough parking. Thomson answered affirmatively. The proposal would meet the current demands of the use of the property. Intensification of the use in the future could require additional parking.

Walker thought the two-lane drive width on the north side would potentially encourage parallel parking. The edge may be moved down to save the existing spruce trees. He suggested "no parking" signs be considered if necessary. Walker asked if the two Americans with Disabilities Act compliant spaces would be enough to meet ordinance requirements. Thomson stated that the state building code would be enforced at the time of the building permit application.

Walker asked if yellow flashing lights would be located on Scenic Drive. Thomson responded that there are none at this time. Walker felt they are effective for West Junior High on Shady Oak Road.

Cliff Buhman, representing the Minnetonka School District, was present to answer questions.

Chair Cheleen visited the site at 3 p.m. It was busy. There were vehicles parked everywhere with parents waiting for kids. It needs to be changed. He noticed that if the parking lot is moved, then there would be a grade change. He asked if fill would be added to level the area. Chair Cheleen asked if the water storage tank would be located under the outdoor recreation area. Mr. Buhman described the layout. Chair Cheleen asked if there would be a fence where the additional parking would end. Mr. Buhman explained how the area tapered so the rest of the site is pretty uniform, but the northwest corner will be filled. There is a retaining wall on the north side of the play area. There would be a rain garden and fence. Chair Cheleen was comfortable with the plan.

In response to Sjeklocha's question, Mr. Buhman agreed with Thomson. The proposal would address the safety of the drop off area and provide parking stalls.

He did not have the numbers related to how each student is transported to and from school. Based on his observations, it seems like most of the traffic is dropped off and picked up by buses. He noticed a few kids walking. Moving a gate, with a homeowner's permission, to allow the kids to travel across the backyard was being considered.

The public hearing was opened.

Chris Geller, 16819 Sinclair North, stated that:

- He was not happy with the proposed addition. His lot overlooks the field in which the children play. Now he would be looking over a parking lot. He was worried how it would impact his property value.
- He leaves his residence at 3 p.m. each day. He does not take a right turn because the traffic is bad. During school events, motorists park in front of his residence.
- His residence has the cut-through fence. Usually 8 to 10 kids a day travel through his property.
- He spoke previously with Mr. Buhman and all of his concerns were answered. There is a good plan in place, although he is opposed to it.
- He was concerned with kids crossing the driveways. He requested that the sidewalk be extended and connect further up. It would be natural, otherwise, to cut across the parking lot.
- He was concerned with the grading causing additional water to flow onto his property. Mr. Newman assured him that would not happen.
- The eight spruces would block his view. He was concerned that the grading would be too low and he would have a view of the parking lot.
- His neighbors and residents on his street have been having ongoing construction. He wanted to be a good neighbor, but he wanted to be kept informed. His neighborhood experienced constant construction last summer.

Chair Cheleen asked Gordon to address that no variances would be needed for the project. Gordon referred to Thomson's report that described the two projects, the school addition that is allowed by ordinance requirements, and the site plan amendment for the parking lot expansion. The site plan amendment triggers a review and public hearing.

Chair Cheleen noted that he has not seen a decrease in property values caused by a change similar to the proposed site plan. It would cause a disruption for a

time and look different, but the experience generally is that the property value would not decrease.

Mr. Geller noted that sometimes things done for the good of all impact some more than others. Chair Cheleen agreed.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

A. Thomas wants to see the sidewalk extended. He described how the sidewalk stops and forces the pedestrian to cut across the grass or parking lot. There seems to be no pedestrian flow pattern.

Mr. Buhman provided that after a meeting with the neighbors last week, the school district has approved and authorized that the site plan would also include extending the sidewalk. He designated which trees would be removed and the area in which they would be relocated. Chair Cheleen commented that the trees are large, but it would be doable.

A. Thomas asked if the sidewalk could extend to the yellow line. If the concept would work on the north side, then the concept would work on the south side also. Mr. Buhman agreed it would be a possibility. He would bring that up to the school district.

Walker asked Mr. Buhman to address how the drainage would work. Mr. Buhman explained that an added benefit of the proposal would be to clean the area that is now a mess. The grade now allows the water to flow into other properties. The proposal's rain garden would capture everything including a 100-year rain fall. There would be no water escaping from the school district property. It will fix a lot of the grading issues that exist now.

Walker clarified that the spruce would be removed. Mr. Buhman was not sure, but felt the owner would not have a problem removing it if it interfered with sight lines.

Walker agreed with A. Thomas' thoughts on extending the sidewalk.

Sjeklocha moved, second by Adams, to adopt the resolution on pages A11-A15 of the staff report, which approves the final site and building plans for improvements to the site at 5650 Scenic Heights Drive with the modifications provided in the change memo dated April 23, 2009 and with an added condition to lengthen the sidewalks on the north and south and work with staff to review the need to remove the first tree as one enters the

parking lot. Approval is based on the finding that the proposal meets all required standards and ordinances. Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:
 - Site plan date-stamped March 20, 2009
 - Grading and drainage plan date-stamped March 20, 2009
- 2) A grading permit is required. Unless authorized by appropriate staff, no site work may begin until a complete grading permit application has been submitted, reviewed by staff, and approved.
 - a. The following must be submitted for the grading permit to be considered complete.
 - (1) Final site, grading, drainage, utility and erosion control plans must be submitted for staff approval.
 - (a) Final site plan must:
 - The property lines must be shown on the plan, and the access drive, parking lot and recreational area must meet all setback requirements.
 - Painted crosswalks or raised concrete sidewalks must be constructed to provide safe travel across the student drop off/pick up area to the parking lot.
 - The parking islands on the south half of the lot must have a minimum width of 9 feet, and must be constructed as raised-concrete islands with surmountable curbs. Additionally, the islands must be connected with painted crosswalks to provide an additional area for student loading and unloading.

- The new parking lot must not extend any closer to the north property line than the existing parking lot.
- (b) The grading and drainage plans must indicate trees that will be removed and trees that will be preserved. The site grading must minimize impacts to the evergreen trees along the north property line.
- (2) A landscaping and tree mitigation plan. The plan must meet minimum landscaping and mitigation requirements as outlined in the ordinance. The plan must include evergreen trees along the north and east sides of the parking lot to provide screening for the adjacent properties and replace any existing evergreen trees that are removed.
- (3) An illumination plan for the parking lot. The plan must meet minimum standards as outlined in ordinance.
- (4) Cash escrow in an amount to be determined by city staff. This escrow must be accompanied by a document prepared by the city attorney and signed by the builder and property owner. Through this document the builder and property owner will acknowledge:
- The property will be brought into compliance within 48 hours of notification of a violation of the construction management plan, other conditions of approval, or city code standards; and
 - If compliance is not achieved, the city will use any or all of the escrow dollars to correct any erosion and/or grading problems.
- (5) Individual letters of credit or cash escrow for 125% of a bid cost or 150% of an estimated cost to comply with grading permit, landscaping requirements, and to restore the site. The developer may submit one itemized letter of credit, if approved by staff. The city will not release or reduce the letters of credit or cash escrow until work has been completed according to the plans approved by the city.

- (6) A construction management plan. The plan must be in a city approved format and must outline minimum site management practices and penalties for non-compliance.
- b. Prior to issuance of a grading permit:
 - (1) Submit an electronic PDF copy of the plans and specifications.
 - (2) Submit two full size and three 11x17 sets of construction drawings and three sets of project specifications.
 - (3) Submit all required administration and engineering fees.
 - (4) Submit a SWPPP.
 - (5) Install a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, tree and wetland protection fencing for staff inspection. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.
 - (6) Permits may be required from other outside agencies including, but not limited to Hennepin County, the Riley-Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District, and the MPCA. It is the applicant's and/or property owner's responsibility to obtain any necessary permits. Copies of all required permits must be submitted to the city.
- 3) The applicant must install "No Parking" signs along the west side of Scenic Heights Drive and north side of Scenic Drive generally in conformance with attachment A10, and as approved by the city.
- 4) The property owner is responsible for replacing any required landscaping that dies.
- 5) All rooftop and ground-mounted mechanical equipment, and exterior trash and recycling storage areas, must be enclosed with materials compatible with the principal structure, subject to staff approval. Low profile, self-contained mechanical units that blend in with the building architecture are exempt from the screening requirement.

- 6) Construction must begin by December 31, 2010, unless the planning commission grants a time extension.

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

Chair Cheleen stated that an appeal of the planning commission's decision must be made in writing to the planning division within 10 days.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Review of the Planning Commission's Bylaws and Policies

Lehman moved, second by Walker, to approve the planning commission's bylaws and policies.

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

11. ADJOURNMENT

Lehman moved, second by Walker, to adjourn the meeting at 7:48 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

By: _____
Lois T. Mason
Planning Secretary