

**CITY OF MEDINA**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday December 12, 2017

1. **Call to Order:** Acting Chairperson Albers called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Planning Commissioners Todd Albers, Dino DesLauriers, Kim Murrin, Kerby Nester, and Robin Reid.

Absent: Planning Commissioners Aaron Amic and Janet White.

Also Present: City Planner Dusty Finke.

2. **Public Comments on Items not on the Agenda**

Ryan Lindell, 565 Hackamore Road, commented that there are a lot of drivers speeding between 116 and 101 on Hackamore. He asked if there are plans for more patrols or any other traffic activity planned. He noted that there are a lot of runners on the road during the other seasons and wanted to bring that to the attention of the City.

Finke stated that there are no changes to Hackamore, but there are planned pedestrian improvements for trails, along with road widening. He noted that widening the road can be a double-edged sword, as that can encourage higher speeds. He stated that he can speak with the police about adding additional patrols, and noted that the speed trailer can be placed upon request as well.

3. **Update from City Council Proceedings**

Anderson reported that the Council met the previous week and approved the CUP for the Crosbys and the ordinance regarding the introduction of small cell technology, both of which were recommended for approval by the Planning Commission. He noted that the bulk of the meeting was spent reviewing and approving the 2018 budget. He noted that the next tax statement for 2018 will show a three percent drop in the tax rate from the City, which is reflective of the good and mindful stewardship of funds from all parties involved.

4. **Planning Department Report**

Finke provided an update.

5. **Public Hearing – Mark of Excellence Homes – 1952 Chippewa Road and NE Corner of Hwy 55 and Mohawk Drive – PUD Concept Plans for 78 Lot Twinhome Subdivision on 79.82 Acres and 60 Lot Subdivision (36 single-family and 24 townhomes) on 52 Acres**

Finke presented the staff report for the PUD Concept Plan from Mark of Excellence Homes. He stated that the previous Comprehensive Plan amendment included in the previous request has been removed and therefore this is just a concept plan review and no change in guiding for the southern parcel. He reviewed the staff report including details on the zoning, proposed uses, and development. He stated that the request includes a PUD and described the criteria that must be considered when reviewing that type of request. He compared the

proposed development and density to what would be allowed with the underlying zoning. He noted that the City is currently operating under the existing Comprehensive Plan, while the draft Comprehensive Plan is expected to be adopted in the spring of 2018. He provided details on tree preservation, wetland, transportation and access, proposed road and water main extensions, and school district boundaries.

Reid asked for clarity on the timing and whether the preliminary plat request would have to come in before the draft Comprehensive Plan is adopted.

Finke stated that the request would have to be reviewed under whichever version of the Comprehensive Plan is active when the request is received.

DesLauriers asked if the Roy parcel would be fully compliant with the current Comprehensive Plan if submitted on its own.

Finke replied that both requests would be fully compliant with the existing Comprehensive Plan, but explained that both requests would require a PUD as the zoning. He stated that the applicant's position is that the Roy parcel would not be compliant with the Comprehensive Plan, as it would not be possible to come in with two units per acre. He noted that a few adjustments would be needed to the southern property, but noted that it is relatively compliant with the mixed-use zoning district regulations.

Mark Smith, Mark of Excellence Homes, stated that they have made changes since the last time these requests came before the Commission and City Council. He stated that they have concentrated on fewer homes and more open space and preservation of natural resources. He identified homes that have been removed from the plan that borders the rural residential area, noting that landscaping and shrubbery were added to provide a larger buffer. He noted that an additional buffer is provided adjacent to the Bridgewater development. He stated that they have reduced 25 percent of the bituminous surface to keep as much of the area green as possible, which would not be received in a typical development. He highlighted a creek that runs through the parcel and noted that there would be a walking bridge that crosses the creek to the park area. He noted that trails would run through and connect the developments to the park area. He stated that the density would conform as close as possible with the density requirements of the current Comprehensive Plan. He highlighted some of the features that would be included in the homes, noting that they have 30 years of experience. He stated that they have put a lot of time and thought into the development and there is pressure on the landowners to get this done before the Comprehensive Plan changes. He stated that waiting could end up costing the City more, as they may not get the same green space and benefits proposed in this plan. He noted that there is development all around this site and this is in essence a doughnut hole left for development. He believed that they are offering something great for the City and community

Reid asked the price ranges for the products.

Smith replied that the townhomes would range in \$550,000 to \$700,000 per unit, while the single-family homes would range from \$600,000 to \$750,000, and the row houses would range from \$300,000 to \$350,000. He stated that there would still be commercial space available.

Albers noted that it was mentioned that 300 trees would be saved, and asked for a comparison to the total amount of trees on the sites.

Smith replied that there are about 500 trees in total on the sites included on the last tree inventory. He estimated that about 150 trees would be lost, and the remainder would be saved.

Albers asked the vision from the park perspective, whether it would remain natural or whether the brush would be cleared.

Smith stated that he shows a trail through the area and would intend to leave the area natural, but stated that he would be open to suggestions from the Park Commission. He stated that he would attempt to integrate the playground equipment into an area without a concentration of trees.

Albers referenced the area proposed for future mixed use and asked how that size was determined.

Smith replied that the area would most likely be 5.5 acres, noting that they attempted to leave enough space for retail type buildings to fit into the space, while still leaving enough room for the park and required density.

Albers asked for clarification on the commercial buildings and how they would be orientated to Mohawk Drive.

Smith provided additional details on the proposed orientation of the future commercial buildings.

Albers asked the size of the treed area on the commercial space. He asked if there is an opportunity to save trees in that area as well.

Smith stated that he would want direction on that topic.

Albers stated that he would prefer to have as many of the mature trees preserved in that tree line as possible. He noted that could be tough financially.

Smith stated that the commercial part will be a harder sell because of the challenges of the site and he would be willing to save more of those trees if desired.

Murrin referenced the comment regarding keeping the park area natural and asked if the playground would be constructed initially or whether that would be delayed to keep the area natural.

Smith replied that he would look for input from the Park Commission.

Murrin asked if the intent is to construct the homes first and then delay commercial development.

Smith stated that his plan is to construct the homes first. He noted that if there is interest with the commercial, he would move forward with that, but noted that there will be challenges for the more inward commercial sites.

Murrin stated that her concern would be that if there was not interest, then the site would not truly be mixed-use and would not accomplish the goal of the Comprehensive Plan. She asked if the building would be constructed in hopes that someone wants to lease or whether the site would be built upon demand.

Smith replied that he would be comfortable building the first building, but explained that you do not build without knowing the demand. He stated that it would benefit everyone to have something in that location and therefore he believes there would be interest. He noted that although office space has been a slow market, there is increasing demand and that could also be a good fit for a portion of the site.

Murrin stated that the plan would include the watermain and road extension and asked if that would be funded by the applicant or whether that would be a cost-share.

Smith stated that he would be paying for the watermain and road extension, but would ask the City to assist with mitigation if that is needed. He stated that he has some land that could be used for mitigation, but did not believe he would have enough.

Murrin asked if Smith has looked into the cost of constructing the road.

Smith stated that he will provide financial assurance that would provide for the road to be built. He stated that if the costs exceeded his estimate, he would be responsible for that. Smith provided information on the bidding and research that would be done prior to moving forward.

Albers asked if there is an estimate of how much wetland mitigation would be necessary.

Smith stated that he estimated about 150,000 square feet in area and the question would be the rate of wetland mitigation that could range from 4.5 to 9 acres.

Finke stated that generally there is a two to one replacement, but estimated about \$750,000 or \$800,000 in wetland credits, noting that on-site wetland mitigation is being looked at as well. He also noted that floodplain impacts would need to be replaced onsite.

Murrin asked for additional input on mitigation credits and how that would impact the City.

Nester explained that when a wetland is filled, that must be replaced.

Murrin asked why the City would pay for that.

Finke stated that ultimately this would be a City road and therefore if benefit cannot be proven, that cost cannot be assessed.

Smith estimated that the cost of construction for the road would be between \$1,200,000 and \$1,800,000 and the wetland credits would be in addition to the road construction. He stated that the hump in the road, as proposed, would help to avoid the more pristine parts of the wetland.

DesLauriers asked if there is a rough estimate for the construction of the watermain.

Smith replied that the estimate is about \$350,000 to construct the watermain.

Murrin stated that it seems quite costly just to build the road and watermain and asked why the applicant is dedicated to this site.

Smith stated that both sites are very interesting with great topography with great views for the homes. He stated that because the properties are changing for staging, both the sellers are very motivated to get this project moving, which helps to create a better project for the

community and neighboring property owners. He stated that this would be a benefit to the City and the neighbors. He stated that eventually this property will develop, and this will provide a benefit for the community.

Albers opened the public hearing at 8:01 p.m.

Kate Nohre, 4412 Bluebell Trail South, stated that the developer has stated that this proposal would meet the goals and desires of the community, but she does not believe that to be true. She believes this to go against the slow growth desire of the community. She stated that the City and tax payers have spent a lot of time and effort developing the draft Comprehensive Plan and therefore she would ask the Commission to implement a moratorium to at the least do additional study on traffic and the environment. She felt that the project is trying to slip in before the draft Comprehensive Plan is adopted. She asked if this project were to be approved, how that would impact the other future development planned for the City.

Fernando Vivanco, 4508 Bluebell Trail South, stated that one of the key words he noted was complexity. He stated that the more questions that were asked, the more questions that seemed to be prompted. He stated that this seems to be the packaging of two properties for development, but then the properties would be decoupled for building. He stated that it seems that the developer will pay for these items, but then would ask for the City to pay for items such as mitigation. He asked what the \$400,000 mitigation costs would look like compared to the annual investment in infrastructure that the City makes. He stated that if that is a large cost, perhaps that is not where the City wants to put its infrastructure investment for the year. He asked if the developer were to go bankrupt, would the road still be built, or would that responsibility then go away. He stated that his main concern is the extension of Chippewa regarding traffic and the environmental impact. He stated that a lot of time has been spent on the draft Comprehensive Plan, which has been accelerated to slow down the rate of growth. He asked the role the DNR would have in approving the road through the wetland and whether that would happen first or whether one would be contingent upon the other.

Albers closed the public hearing at 8:07 p.m.

DesLauriers stated that it is clear the applicant took the input from the Planning Commission and City Council and incorporated those changes. He stated that the willingness to pay for the road and watermain are great benefits. He stated that while he does not feel that the applicant has met all nine criteria for a PUD, he does feel that about six are met. He stated that the property is currently zoned for development, but acknowledged that the Steering Committee has delayed that development under the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Murrin stated that she does like the plan, but questions if this is the right timing and place, based on the draft Comprehensive Plan. She understands the plan for why the applicant likes this land, but noted that the Comprehensive Plan attempts to slow growth and change the guiding of the southern site to business. She stated that if the plan does move forward, there should be a condition that an office building be put on the commercial site right away to keep in line with the desire for business on that parcel. She questioned whether the City wants, or needs the road extension, although she understands the argument for the road extension. She noted that there was a comment on whether or not Arrowhead can handle additional traffic and therefore believed that a study should be done to ensure that roadway can handle the traffic. She stated that even though the City would not be paying for Chippewa Road, the City may have to pay funds for the mitigation and improvements to Arrowhead. She questioned the value the City would get in the Chippewa Road extension and whether that is a value the City needs. She referenced engineering comments regarding the desire to

preserve additional trees and possibly to provide a second entrance. She believed that additional discussion should occur on density if the project moves forward.

Reid stated that she likes the proposal and was surprised. She stated that the applicant did listen to the comments that were made and incorporated those changes. She stated that these are tricky properties and believed the City would have difficulty with the road in future development options. She stated that there is a need for the Chippewa Road extension as it has come up multiple times. She stated that this would also provide a variety of housing products, which is needed in Medina. She noted that it was explained that it would be hard to have the entire southern parcel as business because of the site challenges and believed that the mixed-use element would provide a good solution. She stated that this would solve a number of problems and the developer is willing to work with the City to reach the desired goals and maximize a tricky site. She stated that when the preliminary plat comes back she would like information on the materials to ensure there is variety in the color of the townhomes. She stated that she has a favorable impression of this proposal.

Nester stated that the timing seems rushed, noting that the intent of the draft Comprehensive Plan is to delay growth. She referenced the minimum lot size of the R-1 zoning district and stated that it seems that this would lower standards for the northern property, which goes against revision of the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that this would add additional homes that would go to the Wayzata School District, which is already full. She stated that while she appreciates the desire to develop the property, this would be contrary to the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Albers stated that a lot of the comments that have been made touch on the transition the City is in between the existing Comprehensive Plan and draft plan. He stated that within that transition the City had the opportunity to reduce the growth plan and the Steering Committee took the time to target properties that they want to target for residential and business development. He stated that they wanted to slow the development of residential along Highway 55 and that is why the southern property was guided for business. He stated that because they were able to reduce the number of properties for development, there were winners and losers in terms of staging. He asked if the Commission should consider a moratorium until the draft Comprehensive Plan is adopted.

Nester asked for information on the negatives of a moratorium.

Finke replied that the primary negative impact, from the perspective of staff, would be the timing of a moratorium. He noted that the maximum amount of time a moratorium can be enacted is one year. He stated that staff always suggests delaying that to the extent possible and provided additional details on the process for reviewing the draft plan and updating the controls. He stated that the positives of a moratorium would be that no one could question, it would be clear that the City is not going to take action until the new plan is in place and it would stop applications in the interim to allow the internal controls to be updated.

Murrin asked if the moratorium would be effective on all applications.

Finke stated that staff would need to determine the application of the moratorium. He stated that there would be huge implications on the type of development that the moratorium would apply to, as it could stop all new development. He noted that the moratorium could be narrowed to new construction that would have a change in land use. He noted that the moratorium would generally be recommended for the one-year period and then could be revoked at any time during the one-year period.

Murrin asked if there were comments from the property owners of these two parcels when the draft Comprehensive Plan was being developed.

Finke stated that both property owners provided substantial input during the process.

Murrin asked, and received confirmation, that both property owners expressed opposition to the changes, but were not listened to.

Albers explained that the Steering Committee had to look at the City as a whole to make the decisions and not everyone was going to be happy with those decisions. He stated that the Committee was thoughtful concerning how development should occur, how resources would be protected, and infrastructure that would be needed. He stated that the tricky thing is that the guiding is changed on the southern parcel between the existing and draft plans and therefore, in his mind, would support enacting a moratorium. He stated that they were not intending for these areas to develop so soon under the draft plan and therefore questioned why the City would allow for that development at this time. He stated that he understands why the property owners would want to develop the land now, but believes that the City as a whole needs to be considered.

Murrin stated that when the new Comprehensive Plan goes into place, the Commission could review the plan. She asked if the developer could present the request in 2018.

Reid stated that the property is not guided for development until 2025 under the draft plan and therefore the jump ahead would only allow for two years.

Finke noted that a Comprehensive Plan amendment could be requested.

Murrin stated that she likes the idea of a moratorium, as the Commission continues to receive applications that they continue to deny. She believed that additional input should be gained from the community to determine if the road extension is needed, and for a cost benefit analysis to be provided. She stated that she would not want to completely close the door on the proposal, but would want to have valid information supporting the request to make an informed decision.

Nester stated that the moratorium seems to be a courtesy so that applicants are not continually wasting their time if the City is not willing to accept applications at this time.

Finke stated that this is most likely the last application the City would consider before the adoption of the draft plan and therefore a moratorium may be a lost cause. He stated that the applicant is well aware of where the City is at in its process with the Comprehensive Plan.

Reid stated that if the applicant submits the preliminary plat before the adoption of the draft plan, it would then be reviewed under the existing plan.

Finke confirmed that the plan is generally compliant with the existing Comprehensive Plan.

Reid stated that she feels that whatever would come in the future, if these properties were to develop individually, would not be as good as this. She stated that the road is expensive and tax payers will not want to pay for that. She stated that while she was uncomfortable as first, she feels that the deal has been sweetened enough to garner support. She stated that while she feels the need to slow down development, she does not feel that this will be that many additional homes for the project the City will receive in return.

Finke stated that the discussion of moratorium is useful. He stated that the Commission can provide that type of feedback with comments and if a preliminary plat were to follow, it would be helpful to have that input now and save the applicant the money he would spend on that process.

Smith stated that there was a workshop on the road and cost of the road, which included the cost breakdown and was provided to the Council.

DesLauriers stated that this would provide the road extension, the watermain and the 5.5-acre park.

Reid stated that this would provide a lot of benefits to the community.

Nester stated that if the developer does not pay for the road, the construction would be assessed to the properties that would benefit.

DesLauriers stated that may be true for the road, but not the watermain.

Finke stated that from a priority standpoint, the watermain connection has been identified as the highest priority and therefore the City would initiate that project if this project did not move forward. He stated that the cost for that project would be bonded with water bonds and incorporated into connection fees for future development. He stated that there is some risk in that, as the City was close to needing to increase water fees to pay for bond payments for improvements that were made. He stated that this summer and more recently with Oakdale, the importance of the ability to loop water has been proven. He stated that there are various options for the road connection in which the City could initiate a 429 project and assess a portion of the cost to the benefiting properties. He noted that is unlikely because the road construction would most likely be linked to development. He stated that if only one of those properties develop, the City would then need to negotiate with the developer and most likely also complete an assessment for a portion of the cost. He noted that the Chippewa Road extension is identified as the main need in the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Murrin noted that is a big gray area, as the plan covers a 20-year period. She stated that when the comprehensive plan was developed there was input from the public, and she asked if feedback should be gained from the public on whether the Mark of Excellence proposal would change the mind of residents. She asked if a survey could be done online asking if residents would feel this is a good option for the benefit of a road that would be provided in return. She stated that she would love to gain that input.

Finke noted that the City could ask for collection of the \$1,000,000 that would be necessary to build the road for those that wish to delay the road.

Albers noted that this is a public hearing and the time for the public to provide that input is now. He stated that the people that are interested have voiced their input for the project. He noted that there would be another opportunity for the public to provide input at the City Council review.

Murrin noted that only two people voiced input and they were against the project.

Nester noted that there were also emails and a letter from the property owners who did not support the request.

Finke stated that this is a significant portion of the land slated for development that would drive the Chippewa Road extension.

Finke noted that the Council is scheduled to review this concept at their meeting the following week.

6. **Public Hearing – Ordinance Amendment – Chapter 8 Related to Keeping of Chickens and Keeping of Bees**

Finke presented a potential ordinance amendment to the ordinances related to the keeping of chickens and bees and reviewed the staff report. He reviewed the required setbacks and the requests the City has received for smaller lots. He provided a summary of what is allowed for chickens and bees in other metro communities. He noted that the proposed ordinance change would reduce the setback specifically for chickens and reviewed the other restrictions that would apply. He reviewed the proposed amendments related to the keeping of bees.

Reid asked if the permit would be a one-time requirement.

Finke stated that a permit would be required for location of a chicken coup.

Reid asked the recourse the neighbors would have if a problem arises.

Finke stated that the issue could be addressed through enforcement regarding the specific problem that may arise.

Reid stated that she would want to ensure that problems could be addressed if they arise, as she lives in a neighborhood where people live fairly close together and therefore there could be unintended consequences.

Nester asked if there is concern with fertilizer and runoff, and whether that would be a concern for the health of the animals.

Albers believed that would be a low risk.

Albers opened the public hearing at 8:55

Ryan Lindell, 565 Hackamore Road, stated that he is within rural residential. He asked for information on the setback for a rural residential yard and yard configuration.

Finke stated that if the setback requirement was met, a variance would not be needed. He noted that there would be a small permit fee if a permit was required. He stated that perhaps what Mr. Lindell is asking for is a lesser setback in the rural residential zoning. He stated that perhaps the structural setback of 20 feet would be used in the rural residential setback.

Nester noted that a lot of neighborhoods do not allow outbuildings.

Finke stated that there are covenants in place that would most likely prohibit the keeping of livestock and poultry within certain developments.

George Bernhardt, 3451 Elm Creek Drive, stated that a mistake that he made was hobby beekeeping. He stated that he has learned a lot recently about beekeeping and regulations. He stated that there is a lot more beekeeping that occurs than people realize. He stated that he did not understand the beekeeping regulations fully, which was his mistake. He stated that he

never would have had the bees on his yard if he knew it was not allowed. He stated that it is important to understand the difference between hornets, wasps, wild bees, and honeybees. He provided additional input on the habits of bees and the range that they cover. He stated that he had a problem, because he had a hive that died and since that time has gained a lot of knowledge on bees and splitting hives. He stated that a resident will most likely never be able to gain the support of all their neighbors. He thanked the Commission for having this conversation on a topic that is very important to him.

Reid asked if the resident had the chance to read the draft ordinance.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that he is against the concept of having to ask for a permit, as he views that as a slippery slope. He stated that he agrees with a distance and limit on quantity.

Albers closed the public hearing at 9:10 p.m.

Murrin asked and received confirmation that bees are allowed in the rural residential zoning district. She asked if beekeeping is allowed in the other non-rural residential zoning districts.

Finke stated that beekeeping is not allowed in other residential zoning districts at this time.

Murrin stated that she does not believe that chickens or bees should be allowed in non-rural areas. She stated that she would also be in favor of keeping the setbacks at 150 feet for chickens. She stated that she would like to keep the chicken ordinance as it currently exists. She stated that she would be fine with the beekeeping ordinance, so that there are regulations, but would like that to remain in rural residential as well.

DesLauriers stated that he does not have any issues with smaller lots. He stated that whether someone has four dogs, cats or chickens, the nuisance ordinance would apply for control. He stated that he would favor a one-time permit to ensure that the lot complies.

Nester stated that the scope is so limited, as this would not be allowed in her neighborhood because of the covenants that exist. She stated that this could create contention, as this would be allowed in some neighborhoods without HOA's and not allowed in neighborhoods with HOA's.

Reid stated that this would regulate no more than four colonies, but the input provided from the resident appears to state this would not be workable.

Finke stated that there is an allowance for nucleus colonies, which could then be given to another beekeeper to continue on.

Mr. Bernhardt provided additional input on how the transition and the different phases that occur. He provided information on what occurs during the winter months as well, noting that 30,000 bees will be reduced to 5,000 bees during the winter months.

Finke stated that effectively you could have eight hives to allow for the transitioning.

**Motion by DesLauriers, seconded by Reid**, to recommend approval of the ordinance regarding keeping chickens. Motion carries 3-2 (Nester and Murrin opposed). (Absent: Amic and White)

Murrin stated that she is opposed as she believes the 150 feet setback should be kept and that the keeping of chickens should be limited to rural residential lots.

Nester echoed the comments of Murrin.

**Motion by DesLauriers** to recommend approval of the ordinance regarding keeping of bees. Motion died for lack of a second.

Reid suggested tabling the ordinance regarding keeping of bees.

Murrin asked what additional information would be needed.

Reid stated that she would like information on what other communities allow.

Albers stated that his neighbor has an active hive and they are not a nuisance whatsoever. He stated that the bees are active when the temperature hits 40 degrees. He stated that he also receives honey from his neighbor.

Reid stated that there is a need for bees in the environment.

Murrin stated that she would support an ordinance if it was limited to rural residential.

Finke stated that activity is already allowed without restriction and therefore would not recommend that action.

Murrin stated that she would be comfortable with bees in the rural area and would be fine leaving the language as is, without the rules. She stated that she would be opposed to bees in the suburban area. She asked if there should be an ordinance with rules for the rural residential area.

Finke stated that there is not a recommendation to add additional requirements in the rural residential area.

**Motion by Murrin, seconded by Nester**, to recommend denial of the ordinance regarding keeping of bees. Motion failed 2-3 (Albers, DesLauriers, and Reid opposed). (Absent: Amic and White)

**Motion by DesLauriers, seconded by Albers**, to recommend approval of the ordinance regarding keeping of bees. Motion carries 3-2 (Nester and Murrin opposed). (Absent: Amic and White)

Murrin and Nester noted that they are opposed, as they do not believe beekeeping should be allowed in suburban areas.

7. **Public Hearing – Hennepin County Public Works – 1600 Prairie Drive – Amendment to Planned Unit Development for Installation of 2500 Square Foot Fabric Covered Storage Structure**

Finke presented a requested amendment to a PUD for the Hennepin County Public Works for a storage structure. He provided background information on the existing PUD. He stated that the site is very large and set back from other sites. He noted that fabric structures were not contemplated and therefore there is not an allowance for that type of structure within the current PUD. He stated that the City does have a fabric structure used for storage on its own public works campus. He stated that outdoor storage is already allowed on the proposed site and therefore this would simply move some of that equipment into the fabric structure. He stated that the impact would be limited. He recommended approval of the request.

Nester stated that she would prefer the material be covered and out of sight.

Albers opened the public hearing at 9:35 p.m.

Jerome Ryan, Hennepin County, stating that it took people in the public works department years to have the discussion on whether a storage would be needed. He stated that the need has been determined, and it would be helpful to have the equipment covered and ready for use, rather than covered with snow and ice. He noted that there is not sufficient space within the existing structures and therefore he did receive approval from Hennepin County to move forward on this purchase to cover additional equipment.

Albers closed the public hearing at 9:36 p.m.

DesLauriers stated that he believes the Commission should have a future discussion on the allowance of fabric structures as he would much rather have storage covered compared to outdoor storage.

**Motion by Reid, seconded by DesLauriers**, to recommend approval of the PUD Amendment based upon the findings noted in the staff report and subject to the conditions recommended by staff. Motion carries unanimously. (Absent: Amic and White)

8. **Approval of the November 14, 2017 Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.**

**Motion by Reid, seconded by DesLauriers**, to approve the November 14, 2017, Planning Commission minutes as presented. Motion carries unanimously. (Absent: Amic and White)

9. **Council Meeting Schedule**

Finke advised that the Council will be meeting the following Tuesday and Murrin volunteered to attend in representation of the Commission.

10. **Adjourn**

**Motion by DesLauriers, seconded by Nester**, to adjourn the meeting at 9:38 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.