

CITY OF MEDINA
PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday April 12, 2016

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

Present: Planning Commissioners Todd Albers, Chris Barry, Randy Foote, Kim Murrin, Robin Reid, Victoria Reid, and Janet White.

Absent: None.

Also Present: City Planner Dusty Finke

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

There were none.

3. **Update from City Council Proceedings**

Anderson reported that the City Council met the previous Tuesday to consider the Final Plat approval for Deerhill Preserve on ten of the lots, which the Council approved subject to the conditions recommended by staff and the signing of a Development Agreement and an agreement with the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District. He advised that the Council also considered a request to reduce sewer and water connection fees for the Wealshire of Medina applicant, noting that the Council approved extending the repayment period from three years to five years, but did not reduce the connection fees. He stated that the Council also approved the advertisement of bids for the updating of the City Hall, which will include additional restrooms, a conference room and expanded space for the planning department on the lower level, as well as an updating of paint on the upper level.

4. **Planning Department Report**

Finke provided an update.

5. **Approval of the March 8, 2016 Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.**

Motion by R. Reid, seconded by Barry, to approve the March 8, 2016, Planning Commission minutes as presented. Motion carries unanimously.

6. **Public Hearing – Dellcroft – PUD Concept Plan for a Subdivision of 131 Single Family Lots and 30 Townhomes West of Arrowhead Drive, North and South of Hamel Road**

Finke presented a request for the Commission to review a Concept Plan for Dellcroft, noting that the purpose is to provide input to the applicant prior to submission of a full application. He stated that this Concept Plan is for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a 22 home conservation design development on the 90 acres south of Hamel Road and 109 single family and 30 townhome standard developments on the 65 acres north of Hamel Road. He stated that both parcels are zoned rural residential in the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the conservation design PUD would provide additional flexibility in return for additional conservation efforts, noting that approximately 30 percent of the buildable land south of

Hamel Road would be placed in conservation easements. He noted that a Comprehensive Plan amendment would be needed for the parcel north of Hamel Road to allow for that increased density and extension of City water and sewer utilities into the area currently identified as rural residential. He provided additional details on the zoning and planned use of the adjacent parcels of land. He displayed the proposed Concept Plan and provided information on the proposed reguiding for the property, noting the items that the City should consider when reviewing a Comprehensive Plan amendment. He noted that the City is in the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan and advised of upcoming public meetings, May 14th and 16th, where the public can provide input on the process. He reviewed the details of the portion of development proposed to be north of Hamel Road, providing the proposed lot sizes for the single-family homes and noting that the homes would surround a central open space corridor of approximately 12 buildable acres which would include an active park. He stated that the applicant is requesting a PUD to allow the mix of housing styles proposed and to allow smaller lots within the property. He explained that the same number of homes allowed under the R-1 zoning district would be proposed, but with smaller lots which would help to create the 12 acres of open space. He stated that the net density proposed is 2.44, and would be 3 units per acre if the open space area is not considered. He advised that 22 lots are proposed for the parcel south of Hamel Road, but noted that if this moves forward, a wetland delineation would need to be completed. He stated that in a conservation design PUD the applicant would need to be protecting resources in return for increased flexibility and advised that the Commission would need to provide input on that factor. He stated that the purpose of this discussion is purely advisory to provide comments, as will the City Council at their meeting the following week.

Albers asked if there are similar PUDs in Medina that the Commission could use as a comparison.

Finke stated that perhaps the best comparison would be Wild Meadows but flipped. He noted that the northern lots in Wild Meadows are a bit smaller than the lots proposed in the conservation design PUD for this concept, and the southern portion of Wild Meadows has similar lot sizes to the northern portion of this concept. He stated that the Deerhill Preserve conservation design PUD is perhaps similar, as well, with the conservation design proposed here, although these lots are a bit smaller than the Deerhill Preserve lots.

V. Reid asked the density bonus allowed in the Deerhill Preserve development.

Finke replied that the Deerhill Preserve received a density bonus of almost 200 percent.

Murrin stated that the property is currently zoned rural residential and asked what the guiding of the property will be under the new version of the Comprehensive Plan that the City is currently working on.

Finke replied that the conceptual land use of the property thus far is to remain rural residential.

V. Reid stated that the goal is to have the update of the Comprehensive Plan completed in the next year and asked the timing for potential development.

Finke stated that he would leave that response for the applicant, but noted that the applicant fully recognizes that the City is in this process.

Paul Robinson, representing the applicant, provided background information on his experience with development and municipalities, noting that he previously worked for the

City of Medina. He provided photographs and highlighted accomplishments of developments that these partners have worked on in the City and surrounding communities, including Foxberry Farms, Wild Meadows, Locust Hills, and Woodland Cove. He stated that the common goal for these developments is to set aside as much open space as possible creating a community with trails and open space that can be enjoyed by the residents. He stated that they believe the majority of the traffic will come down Highway 55 and then Arrowhead which would not impact residential neighborhoods and would instead come through the commercial areas. He stated that they are requesting a Comprehensive Plan amendment to bring the northern area of the proposed development into the urban service area and are flexible with timing as they are aware that the City is currently updating that plan. He noted that the southern area of the proposed development does not require a Comprehensive Plan amendment and therefore they are simply requesting input on whether that would meet the conservation design PUD criteria. He stated that the open space proposed for the north would be 30 percent and 50 percent for the southern portion, for a total of 45 percent of the overall area. He stated that the open space would create a connective greenway corridor which would continue on to two open space areas considered significant by the City of Medina. He reviewed the conservation efforts which would include restoration of the wetland areas and establishment of buffers, which do not currently exist; the establishment of an oak savanna; restoration of the woodlands, to the extent possible; and incorporation of native themes into the landscaped areas. He stated that the conservation efforts would create a habitat for wildlife and pollinators, as well as additional treatment for stormwater. He provided details on the 2.8 miles of proposed trails and 1.5 miles of sidewalks, noting that the trails could also connect to neighboring developments, but stated that the Blackfoot development was not very excited about that potential connection. He noted that there would be a variation of five different home product types that would range in value from \$275,000 to \$1,500,000. He provided details on the proposed stormwater aspects, noting that many of the developments that they have constructed have won awards for their stormwater treatment. He provided details on the landscaping proposed, noting that there would be over 1,000 trees on this project. He stated that this would create a high quality community with low impact development and a variety of home products for buyers to choose from. He stated that they are known to create high quality developments and that is their intent for this development as well. He thanked the Commission for their time and welcomed their feedback. He noted that they met with 12 of the neighbors of these parcels and received a range of responses from supportive to non-supportive. He stated that they agree with the comments of staff that a better buffer should be created between the north side of the property and the property to the west.

R. Reid asked if the developer would be interested in doing the southern parcel of the property if the northern parcels were not approved.

Robinson replied that they would need to consider that option and advised that the current agreement with the property owner is for both parcels.

Murrin asked the reason for providing a wide range of home options and the large range of diversity.

Robinson replied that the northern portion of the site would range from \$270,000 to \$500,000 or \$600,000, while the southern portion of the development would have the higher range of prices, explaining that the diversity would be split by the north south division.

Murrin asked if there was a reason that the developer does not want to just follow the Wild Meadows model throughout the parcels. She also asked why the developer chose Medina.

Robinson stated that they were reading into the Comprehensive Plan to create some of the housing specified such as workforce housing. He stated that Medina is a great place to build because it has a great reputation with a great school district.

Albers stated that the developer went up to the limit of 100 percent density bonus and asked if there was a consideration to not push the limit of the bonus and instead ask for a smaller bonus.

Robinson explained that they are creating smaller lots in order to create a conservation easement where they would spend additional funds on restoration. He stated that they will take the input of the City to determine where the bonus could end up.

V. Reid stated that she has concern with the size of the park.

Robinson noted that there would be flexibility to change the size of the park.

V. Reid opened the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

Paul Ohnsorg, 1475 Blackfoot Trail, stated that the neighbors share a lot of the same concerns. He stated that they are concerned with the lighting in both developments, but specifically the lower development, as the lighting would go out and up and the neighbors value their view of the night sky. He was also concerned with traffic patterns on Hamel Road and Hunter Drive because even though the developer stated that most of the traffic would utilize Highway 55 and Arrowhead, some of the traffic would choose to use the other route. He was also concerned with the trail system, noting that they would not like to see the Blackfoot Trail connection as that would cause additional traffic into an area that is pretty rural at this time.

Jeff Evanson stated that the property is currently zoned rural residential and also expected to remain that way in the draft of the new Comprehensive Plan which extends to 2040. He stated that as citizens they view the Comprehensive Plan as a critical document that lays out the goals of the community and did not see a reason to review this Concept Plan while the Comprehensive Plan is being updated. He noted that while the proposed development complies with some elements of the Comprehensive Plan it does not comply with other elements and therefore asked the Commission not to consider this rezoning request. He noted that south of this property there is a concentration of over 30 herring nests and advised that this development would significantly impact the flight patterns of those birds.

Michael Mergens, representing Greenwood Stables 2, stated that he understands that this is a Concept Plan and his intent is to provide feedback to the developer. He stated that his clients have made substantial financial investments into their property based on the fact that their property is zoned rural residential and the property around them is zoned rural residential. He stated that under that zoning, the expectation is at least five acres per home and this development is not even close to meeting that specification of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the increased level of density is not compatible with a horse farm and each and every time he has seen that happen, the horse farm had to relocate. He stated that going from one house per five acres to one house per quarter acre directly abutting the horse farm is not appropriate. He stated that he was glad to see that the developer is open to creating a larger buffer between the developed property and the horse farm, but noted that buffer would need to be substantial and the lots would need to be larger. He stated that the proposed development in no way matches the Comprehensive Plan and the City should consider the intent of the Comprehensive Plan when reviewing requests.

John Turritin, 1525 Blackfoot Trail, stated that he met with the developers the previous week and had a nice conversation and appreciated the opportunity to provide direct input. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan should guide development, rather than development driving the Comprehensive Plan. He referenced the trail system to the southeast corner of the development leading to his driveway, which is in no way a trail and would not work. He wanted to ensure that there are adequate and significant buffers to properties adjoining this development, both on the north and south.

David Crosby, 2402 Hamel Road, stated that most of the points he was going to make have already been covered. He asked if there are any precedents for a development of this size within Medina that are/were in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan, not only as it exists, but as it is proposed to move forward. He noted that the traffic on Hamel Road would be significantly impacted.

V. Reid stated that there have been Comprehensive Plan amendments in the past few years, although not for a housing development.

Jim Lane, 2605 Hamel Road, stated that he knows the applicants to be great developers and is happy to welcome them back to Medina, but does not believe that this is the right location for this development. He noted that he had submitted a letter to the City stating that he is actively opposed to consideration of this project while the City is in the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan, as a development of this size could have an impact on the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan. He asked that the City ask the developer to withdraw their request until after such time when the Comprehensive Plan has been submitted to the Metropolitan Council. He stated that the north portion of this proposed development is not only inconsistent with the current Comprehensive Plan, but also with the draft Comprehensive Plan. He believed that the northern and southern portions of the project should be split up and considered separately. He was also concerned with the implications that could occur in regard to the Wayzata School District, as intense growth will have additional costs and growth needs for an already large school district.

V. Reid stated that as part of the Comprehensive Plan, Finke has met with the various school districts to determine their needs and be respectful of their needs.

Kristin Chapman, 1910 Iroquois Drive, echoed the comments of Mr. Lane and reminded the Commission about the density issues and quality of what is being conserved in the proposed conservation design PUD, noting that everything on this land is very low quality. She stated that the Deerhill Preserve development has high quality resources which are being preserved, and that is why the high-density bonus was provided. She commented that while the developer has done a nice job of thinking about what would be important to the people that would buy these homes; they did not do a good job of thinking about what is important to the existing Medina residents in this rural area and the rural character of Medina.

Dan Strand, 1985 Hamel Road, stated that his property would abut the east line of the south development. He pointed out that in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan under housing objectives; it states that lots in new subdivisions should have frontage roads with direct access to a local street and not a County road or State highway. He noted that 116 is a County road. He referenced the south properties and asked, and received confirmation that those lots would utilize septic systems and wells for sewer and water services. He had a safety concern with the pressure of water on a tightly built community, noting that in case of fire there may not be sufficient water pressure. He noted that with the homes tightly built, the fire could easily jump and spread. He stated that he attended the 2030 Comprehensive Plan process and that plan states that there will be no development for Hamel Road until sewer and water is

brought to the area, noting that there is no sewer and water for that area. He stated that the plan for this development would be to connect to Highway 55 sewer and water and during the 2030 Comprehensive Plan process it was specified that connection to the Highway 55 sewer and water would not be allowed. He stated that people invest in their property and with what is specified in the Comprehensive Plan, explaining that people have invested in their property with the understanding that this area will remain rural residential. He stated that the Commission and Council are the gatekeepers of the community and asked that they do what is right and stand up for what the people in the community want and have been told would be.

Beth Strand, 1985 Hamel Road, stated that they purchased their home in 1991 and moved to Medina to have space and the rural character. She stated that in the Medina City Code, Subdivision 5, Section 720, it states that two septic sites are required for new lots; she received confirmation that two sites have been platted for each lot. She asked if the sites would be a minimum of 75 feet away from the wetlands as specified; it was confirmed that the developer believes so, but would have to confirm that figure. She noted that the Comprehensive Plan specifies that the lots must be a minimum of five acres in the rural residential zoning district and felt that the water character of the area would be negatively impacted by this development.

Kristin Evanson, 3072 Willow Drive, stated that her biggest concerns are with the increased traffic, as traffic from the south would utilize Willow Drive. She stated that she lives on a horse farm and moved to this area because of the five-acre minimum lot size, with the belief that Medina stood behind that minimum lot size. She stated that this development would change the character of this area significantly, as people currently ride their horses and the traffic would impact that ability. She noted that the greenway corridor identified by the developer is not the path that the wildlife currently takes. She stated that she shudders at the development north of Highway 55 and does not want this area to become like that.

Betty Goodman, 2495 Willow Drive, echoed the comments of the residents thus far who view the project unfavorably. She stated that the traffic on Willow Drive is already stacked in the mornings at County Roads 6 and 24 and believed that those problems would become worse with this level of development. She stated that although the developer has stated that people will go north to Arrowhead and Highway 55, people will want to go south too and will take Willow Drive.

Chris Renier, 3392 Hamel Road, stated that she likes the comments thus far made by residents. She stated that while it is tempting to get distracted by conversations about traffic wildlife, or lot size, the bottom line is that this is in direct conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and should be rejected on that basis alone. She commented that this is a terrible position for the property owner of Greenwood Stables to be in as the only option would be for the horse farm to sell and therefore that would increase this type of development in the area.

Kent Williams agreed with the comments that were made tonight and believed that this development is a terrible idea for Medina. He stated that conceptually the Commission would have to consider what the developer could get without the conservation design, which would be 25 to 30 homes. He stated that then the Commission should consider what would be better for the environment, to have 30 homes or 160 homes. He stated that the rezoning and reasoning for that should be considered first, as the developer would be jumping from 30 homes to 160 which is far beyond the 200 percent density bonus allowed and the only way in which the developer is able to do that is by rezoning. He stated that the Commission should consider why the rezoning request for this property and whether that makes sense for the area itself and the surrounding residents. He stated that once you get past the rezoning and Comprehensive Plan amendment, the Commission would need to consider the conservation

design element, which would double the density to reach the overall number of houses, and determine what would be conserved. He noted that in a conservation design, the developer would be preserving an asset that exists on the lot and asked about the asset that is being conserved as he has not heard that. He stated that there are trees proposed to be planted and prairie grasses planted but noted that would be done with normal development. He stated that this request makes no sense. He referenced the first applicant that came in with a request to build three homes that was denied because it was not worth it and noted that this request is now to build 160 homes. He believed that this is the time for the City to draw the line and state that this rezoning does not make sense and this is not an appropriate use of the conservation design PUD.

V. Reid closed the public hearing at 8:25 p.m.

V. Reid stated that even though this is presented as one application, the Commission could consider the requests separately, as only one section would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment. She suggested reviewing the northern portion of the development first.

White stated that she appreciated the developer's ideas in regard to a variety of housing which appears to be laid out well. She noted that it is a bit too dense and does not have appropriate buffers. She stated that she would not support the rezoning of the parcel. She referenced the southern half of the development and would not support a conservation design because she did not feel that there were high quality views on the property and the best view in that area is when you are driving on Hamel Road, which would not be preserved.

Murrin commented that she likes the development but has concerns with the location within the City. She asked what the incentive was to change the zoning from rural residential and how the City would benefit from adding a large number of homes that would place burdens on the infrastructure and utilities which are already stressed. She stated that she has concerns with the number of lots and would like to see fewer houses with bigger lots. She asked what the City is getting in return for the conservation design density bonus and what is actually being conserved, as well as the amount of buildable land being conserved. She believed that the City should abide by the Comprehensive Plan and what has been guided for this area. She stated that while she does like the development she does not believe that this is the appropriate location, as it does not align with the goal and objectives for that rural residential area.

Albers believed that the City would be better served if that area were to continue with rural residential as zoned, which would allow 11 homes on the southern portion. He stated that in regard to the parcel to the north, he agrees that the development would not be happy with the neighboring horse farm and would complain and ultimately drive out that property owner. He stated that he would not support amendment of the Comprehensive Plan.

Barry stated that the updating of the Comprehensive Plan cannot be the trigger for this type of request. He stated that he would struggle to rezone this parcel as there are not new things needed. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan would remain consistent, as this area has been planned rural residential for the past 20 years and would continue. He noted that there is nothing being conserved on the southern portion that would justify a conservation design PUD and therefore that area should also remain under the current guiding for one home per five acres.

R. Reid commented that there is a larger issue with the Comprehensive Plan, as both the current and draft forms have an intent to preserve the rural character of the City, noting that Hamel Drive is the most rural route in the City and should be preserved as such. She stated

that if the City goal is to remain with the Comprehensive Plan, than the last thing the City should do is allow even low density residential into a rural residential area. She stated that it can be tempting to allow a nice development, but noted that once that door is opened more developers will come through. She noted that a lot of families have requested to develop their properties and have been told no and therefore the City should have the courage to say no. She stated that this is a test and the City needs to stand firm on their preservation of rural residential. She stated that the City does not need this and would be sacrificing too much to get this.

Foote stated that the northern portion is much too dense and the Comprehensive Plan process needs to be continued as is. He stated that he does like the southern portion of the development and noted that Wild Meadows is one of the best he has seen. He stated that he would not support the northern portion of the development at all. He agreed that the development would be a huge problem for the horse farm.

V. Reid stated that she agrees that the southern parcel of the development is separate. She noted that a 200 percent density bonus is too much, but prefers thoughtful development as opposed to sprawl. She stated that the northern parcel is tricky, as the City is updating the Comprehensive Plan and does not meet the requirements of the Plan. She agreed that the Comprehensive Plan should drive development and not vice versa. She stated that the reality is that the City will need to do development, including some high-density development, and acknowledged that the northern portion of the City has taken the brunt of that development. She stated that she would not support the northern portion of the development.

V. Reid asked if the northern portion of the development would meet the requirements of the Metropolitan Council.

Finke replied that the development would not fulfil the requirements of the Metropolitan Council.

Finke commented that the Concept Plan will be presented to the City Council the following Tuesday. He noted that this was the public hearing and although the Council may allow some comments, it would not be to this extent. He stated that he was pleased to hear the interest in the Comprehensive Plan and reminded residents of the public meetings that will occur on May 14th from 9:30 a.m. to Noon and May 16th from 5:30 to 8:00 p.m.

V. Reid briefly recessed the meeting at 8:41 p.m.

V. Reid reconvened the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

7. **Public Hearing – Clydesdale Market Place, LLC – Amendment to Planned Unit Development Adjacent to 345 Clydesdale Trail to Construct a Larger Replacement Monument Sign Closer to Highway 55**

Finke presented a request to amend the Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Clydesdale Market Place in regard to the signage, specifically to increase the size of the monument sign at the southwest corner of the development. He stated that the proposed sign would be a 30-foot tall sign with over 300 square feet in total size. He noted that the current sign is 87 square feet in size. He stated that within the PUD two monument signs were approved for the site and provided a photograph of the other approved sign which has a size of 120 square feet. He noted that was the extent of signage allowed for the development. He explained that the applicant is asking for the larger sign in order to provide additional visibility for the tenants which are not listed on the current monument signs and do not have visible signage from the

roadway. He stated that there are 13 different occupants to the development and only 4 have wall signage which is visible from the roadway. He noted that the terms of signage specified in the PUD is more restrictive than what would be allowed for the development otherwise, as each tenant could have an 80 square foot sign. He stated that this is a narrow amendment for the overall PUD. He stated that the staff report states that staff generally supports an increase in signage and concurs that the number of businesses is not supported by the current amount of signage. He noted that the question would be the amount of increase, noting that the maximum sign regulation allows for a 20-foot high sign and this request is for 30 feet. He stated that the panels requested are 31 inches tall and could be reduced in size to accommodate all the tenants within the maximum height limit. He stated that a reasonable amount of signage for this development would be three signs of 80 square feet for a total of 240 square feet. He stated that there are benefits to a coordinated commercial development such as this through PUD, as scattered development would have much more signage. He stated that perhaps this sign be allowed as a size of 20 feet by 12 feet, which when combined with the other sign would provide a total of 360 square feet of signage along Highway 55.

Footo asked if there is any sign similar to the proposed height of 30 feet outside of Medina in surrounding communities.

Finke stated that Lowes in Plymouth is about 30 to 35 feet while CVS is approximately 27 feet. He confirmed that all the signs in Medina are capped at 20 feet with the exception of the Medina ballroom which has a variance because of the grade, noting that the sign from highway grade does not exceed 20 feet.

Albers asked at what point drivers would start to see the sign if it is allowed at 30 feet.

Finke stated that the only item that would be visible at 30 feet would be the Target tenant.

Murrin asked if the other sign could be made to be the taller sign since that sign already sits up higher.

Finke stated that the applicant could speak to that more, but noted that sign would not be as visible to the eastbound traffic.

Albers referenced the property south of Wells Fargo that was approved as an Indian restaurant.

Finke stated that property has not been withdrawn.

Eric Olson, representing the applicant, provided pictures of the Lowes sign in Plymouth to provide a reference. He stated that when he started a few of the smaller, locally owned tenants commented that the largest marketing effort they have to bring in customers is signage which is how this process arose. He stated that the goal is to provide signage for the smaller locally owned tenants. He explained that the proposed size of the signage is meant to help increase visibility for drivers from the roadway. He stated that there is also a challenge for the site with being up on the hill and the current sign has zero visibility from the west. He stated that the current monument sign is only visible from traffic moving in one direction and does not have visibility for the other direction until drivers are past the sign. He stated that the liquor store tenant was going to attend, but runs the store himself and was unable to get away, noting that the liquor store tenant stated that he does get business from the smaller real estate type signs he places.

Finke stated why Target occupies 30 percent of the sign if the driver of this request is the other tenants.

Olson explained that the site is governed not only by the PUD, but also through an Operational Easement Agreement (OEA) which Target sets up when they build a site. He explained that the request would not only need to be approved by the City, but also by the members of the OEA; and Target would not approve the request without their inclusion. He noted that when the sign was originally proposed, it was smaller and Target had their own requirements in order to approve the request.

Foote asked if this would be approved by Target.

Olson stated that conceptually the sign has been approved, but would go back to Target for final approval. It was confirmed that Target would then have their name on two signs. He provided additional details on the requirements from Target regarding signage.

V. Reid asked if the applicant would be in agreement with a 20-foot sign.

Olson replied that this proposed size would be the smallest that they would like to go.

V. Reid referenced a nearby sign that lists multiple tenants off County Road 101 that is smaller. She stated that it is rare to allow signage closer to the highway rather than closer to the buildings and was concerned with site pollution.

Olson appreciated V. Reid's concern and noted that they would match the material of the sign to the nearby retaining wall. He confirmed that the existing sign would be removed. He did not believe the new sign would be taller than the top of the Caribou Coffee building. He stated that the current panels for the sign are 21.75 feet, while the new panels are proposed to be 31 feet.

Murrin asked how tall and wide the current panels are compared to the new panels.

Olson replied, providing the current panel and proposed panel dimensions.

Murrin asked if the applicant considered making the other existing sign taller.

R. Reid replied that sign is not visible from both directions of traffic.

Olson replied that the other sign is currently 20 or 21 feet high and did not consider that location because that is more of the Target sign. He noted that they would consider that if the same goals could be met and if Target would agree to that, but explained that their lot ends before that Target sign.

Murrin asked if the 30-foot sign would be higher than the Target sign, noting that she realizes that the grade is different.

Olson stated that he believed that the sign would be lower than the Target sign because of the change in topography.

Barry asked how the brushed aluminum finishing was chosen as compared to the brushed rock, which fits in with the surroundings.

Olson confirmed that the finish could be modified to better fit in with the surroundings as the brushed aluminum was just chosen as the sign was modeled from a sign at another property they own.

Drew Palmer, Wells Fargo Corporate Real Estate Group, stated that he is here in support of the sign request. He stated that Wells Fargo loves this community and would like to have increased visibility to service their customers. He noted that the business currently has a problem with signage issues as customers are not finding this location and therefore going to the Plymouth or even Buffalo locations. He believed that this would be a great opportunity for this location to thrive and alert customers to this location.

V. Reid opened the public hearing at 9:21 p.m.

No additional comments.

V. Reid closed the public hearing at 9:21 p.m.

Barry stated that he supports this proposed height, noting that the intent for this corridor is to support business and he would like to see the smaller businesses supported with increased visibility. He noted that his only comment would be for the aesthetic of the sign to blend into the surrounding aesthetics.

Foote echoed the comments of Barry in regard to the aesthetics and noted that he would support the 30 foot height, as he believed 20 feet would be too small.

R. Reid stated that this is a unique situation because the stores are up so high and are not visible from the roadway when driving by and therefore supported the 30 foot height for the sign.

Albers stated that he would support 30 feet, as it is important for both westbound and eastbound drivers to have visibility in time to make the turn into the development.

Murrin stated that she would be in favor of increased signage for the businesses in that area in order to help those businesses grow and be successful. She asked if the sign would be perpendicular to Highway 55 and would be lit from both sides.

Olson confirmed that the sign would be perpendicular to the roadway and would be lit to increase visibility.

Murrin asked if the 30 feet would be high enough to alert drivers, noting that she would support the sign as proposed.

White stated that she would also support this request, as this sign would be an improvement from the existing sign. She asked how this signage was a part of the original PUD and if there is background that should be considered.

Finke stated that the applicant did request larger signage, but the City did not approve the request at that time.

V. Reid stated that she believes that the sign is too big and that 20 feet would be sufficient. She believed that all the tenants should be able to list their names, but believed that this would be giving Target too much visibility. She did not want Medina to become Plymouth and noted that she will vote against the request.

Motion by Murrin, seconded by Foote, to recommend approval of the PUD Amendment based upon the findings noted in the staff report and subject to conditions recommended by staff, with the additional condition that the brushed aluminum be changed to match the nearby fence. Motion approved 6-1 (V. Reid opposed).

8. **Update on Comprehensive Plan Update Process**

Finke asked the Commission to speak to their friends and neighbors to check out the information on the website and provide any comments. He reminded everyone about the public meetings on Saturday, May 14th from 9:30 a.m. to Noon and then Monday, May 16th from 5:30 to 8:00 p.m. at City Hall. He noted that the Steering Committee will meet the following Thursday, April 26th. He noted that there was a lot of interest tonight and hoped that interest would continue to the public meetings.

R. Reid stated that she still has concern with the vision statement and wanted to ensure that does not fall between the cracks as the Plan moves forward, noting that is the one statement that everyone will read.

9. **Council Meeting Schedule**

Finke advised that the Council will be meeting the following Tuesday and Commissioner White volunteered.

10. **Adjourn**

Motion by Albers, seconded by R. Reid, to adjourn the meeting at 9:35 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.