



COTTAGE GROVE PLANNING COMMISSION

12800 Ravine Parkway South
Cottage Grove, MN 55016

April 22, 2024

COUNCIL CHAMBER – 7:00 P.M.

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held in the Council Chamber and telecast on Local Government Cable Channel 16.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Frazier called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Pradeep Bhat-Here; Ken Brittain-Here; Jessica Fisher-Here; Evan Frazier-Here; Eric Knable-Here; Derek Rasmussen-Here; Emily Stephens-Here

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Emily Schmitz, Community Development Director; Conner Jakes, Associate Planner; Mike Mroska, Senior Planner; Crystal Raleigh, Assistant City Engineer; Riley Rooney, Associate Planner; Tony Khambata, City Council Liaison.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Fisher made a motion to approve the agenda. Rasmussen seconded. The motion was approved unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

4. OPEN FORUM

Frazier opened the open forum and asked if anyone wished to address the Planning Commission on any non-agenda item.

Bonnie Matter, 6649 Inskip Avenue South, stated tonight there are public hearings, and that means that audience members can approach here and ask you questions, correct?

Frazier replied there are public hearings on the lot split at 9670 Kimbro, the School Bus Garage Fuel Tank, and the Zoning and Sign Code Update. Those will be public hearings that we will discuss when those come up.

Matter stated okay, so then my next question is on the zoning and code amendments; so, are you going to go through them one by one, or are you going to just like take them as a bundle.

Frazier replied well, it's one application, so they move as an application; Matter stated thank you.

As no one else wished to speak, Frazier closed the open forum.

5. CHAIR'S EXPLANATION OF THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS

Frazier explained the purpose of the Planning Commission, which serves in an advisory capacity to the City Council, and that the City Council makes all final decisions. In addition, he explained the process of conducting a public hearing and requested that any person wishing to speak should go to the microphone and state their full name and address for the public record.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPLICATIONS

6.1 LOT SPLIT AT 9670 KIMBRO - CASES MS2024-011 & V2024-011

Joshua John has applied for a minor subdivision to subdivide a 10.1720-acre parcel located at 9670 Kimbro Avenue South, previously known as the Brown Farm, into two separate parcels. The applicant has proposed to create a 4.086-acre parcel that would include the existing house and accessory structures, and a 6.086-acre buildable parcel that could support a new home; and a variance to the City's minimum lot width at the front property line for the newly created 6.086-acre parcel and a 6-foot setback for the existing driveway.

Rooney summarized the staff report and recommended approval based on the findings of fact and subject to the conditions stipulated in the staff report. Riley stated a representative of the applicant is here to answer any questions you may have.

Bhat asked when we subdivide this into two parcels, do the accesses have to be within the parcel; could this be planned so that the accesses are contained within a single parcel.

Riley clarified that the access would be on the 6-acre parcel itself, and then the accesses to the existing parcel would come down from here; the County wouldn't allow for another access. I don't know if that helps you.

Bhat stated I'm just curious why would access to Parcel 2D have to go through Parcel PC; I mean, can it be contained within one single parcel. Riley deferred to Schmitz to answer that question.

Schmitz stated they're proposing a shared access because they couldn't have a second access off of Kimbro Avenue, per the County. So, they had to find a way to access both of these new parcels with one access point. Therefore, that's why you're seeing that shared driveway, or that shared access. So, it's only on one parcel, technically, but it provides access to Parcel 2D. Schmitz asked if that helps clarify; Bhat replied that's fine, thank you.

Fisher stated to piggyback off of that, I'm assuming that an easement will need to be recorded for the existing parcel so that if some day the second parcel is sold, that there's still deeded access to the first parcel, correct? Is that part of the stipulations?

Riley replied that's correct; there would be a shared driveway access agreement between the two properties, and that would stay with the properties themselves; so, if people moved, that would still remain.

Frazier told Schmitz I just want to go back to what you just briefly mentioned. So, off of Kimbro Avenue, that's a County-controlled roadway, and so they've got policies about how many accesses can be onto that road, how close; so that's why there can only be one access onto these two pieces of property.

Schmitz replied that's correct.

Frazier asked if the applicant would like to approach and add anything.

Tim Freeman, land surveyor and land planner with Folz Freeman Surveying, 5770 Newgate Avenue North, Oak Park Heights, MN, stated I was involved in the platting of the two parcels in 2017. I was involved in a minor subdivision in 2018, and here I am again today. So, the variance for the 90 feet up there really was because it was the only viable place for that driveway. It used to come off right where the existing house was, and they had to vacate that; the County wouldn't allow it, as the spacing doesn't allow two driveways, it just allows one. So, the only way to really do it would be to move it up to the north there, and the parcel just isn't wide enough, so that's how that 90-foot piece got there. If you look on your screen, you'll see that there's kind of a green-looking tree there, right at the intersection of the first driveway going south, and that's really the reason why it got put there. The applicant hired an excavator to build the gravel driveway; the excavator went out there, looked at the property line, and said there's a five-foot easement there. Then he saw the tree and said, well, I'll go right between them, and that's where he built it. So, the staff report did a really good job of explaining all of the details; I don't have anything else to add unless you or the public have any questions.

Rasmussen stated, so, that existing driveway is about six feet from the property line, correct?
Freeman replied yes.

Rasmussen asked how is that land flow, how is the drainage there; are we draining off onto the neighbor's property, or is it coming toward the south?

Freeman replied no, it's coming toward the south. It's actually fairly flat through there; I included a couple of photographs that aren't in your packet, but it's basically wide open, and there's this great big maple tree, and it runs between the property line and a maple tree. We knew that the City staff was interested, as we were, to keep the trees; so, that's how it ended up there.

Frazier opened the public hearing. No one spoke. Frazier closed the public hearing.

Rasmussen stated I think their request makes sense, and it was approved last time, so I'm fine with it this time.

Fisher stated I'm just curious to know if there's any construction plans for the new parcel;
Freeman replied not yet.

Brittain made a motion to approve the minor subdivision and variance, based on the findings of fact and subject to the conditions stipulated in the staff report. Rasmussen seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

6.2 SCHOOL BUS GARAGE FUEL TANK - CASES PP2024-010 & SP2024-010

BKBM Engineers, on behalf of ISD #833, has applied for a preliminary plat to replat the property at 8587 West Point Douglas Road and to plat the property at 8585 West Point Douglas Road to combine the two existing parcels into one platted lot; and a site plan review for the installation of a new above-ground fuel tank and associated pumps/paving.

Jakes summarized the staff report and recommended approval subject to the conditions stipulated in the staff report.

Rasmussen asked Jakes to help him understand the difference between Metes & Bounds versus platted property.

Jakes replied before a property is platted, it's technically Metes & Bounds; that's a long legal description that's hard to understand, to kind of describe the boundary of that parcel. When a plat comes through, it converts it into Lot and Blocks, so that's typically what you see in residential or business development, where's it's Lot 1, Block 2 or Lot 2, Block 2, etc. So, as part of the platting of that parcel to the east, it was part of the Glengrove Business Addition, so that platted Lot 1, Block 1, which is this blue parcel. Lot 2, Block 2 was actually the business center, so it converts it really to Lot and Block.

Rasmussen stated so both are giving me the same information, it's just how it's organized here.

Jakes stated yes, that's correct. And then with the plat, it would also show the easements clearer, instead of paper easements, which don't show up on County GIS, for example.

Stephens asked can you explain, as it was kind of hard to tell on the plans, what all is being replaced or what's all being dug up, and are they redoing the pond? Maybe you could just talk about that, and then I'll probably have a follow-up question.

Jakes replied the fuel tanks are currently located here, so that would be dug up; those tanks would be removed or sealed, per Code requirements and MPCA standards. The disturbed area for the new tank would be outlined here; I believe it's currently a grass area shown, so that would be replaced with concrete for the fuel tanks, pumps, and related equipment. The applicant reconfigured the pond to account for the impervious increase, and has submitted the required modeling to show that reconfiguration is sufficient to also handle that increase in impervious.

Stephens stated I'm pretty sure the answer is no, but when you do something like this, if they were redeveloping it would they be required to test and see if there was contamination in the soils? Is that something that would be beneficial at this time with the underground tanks?

Jakes replied under a redevelopment scenario, that would be correct. Due to the application where they're removing and replacing, I don't believe we would require any contamination testing, but I'll defer to our Assistant City Engineer if she has anything to add. I don't believe, with a proposal like this, that would be required. I know the applicant will follow all MPCA standards, so if they do pull those tanks and there is contamination noted at the time they're pulling them, then they'll go in and do the sufficient testing that's required at that point.

Stephens stated okay, I was just curious. I was thinking if there was any testing and they were redoing the pond, if the pond wasn't lined, it might be a good time to line it to prevent further contamination. I guess that's all I was thinking.

Jakes stated I'll just add that they are proposing to line that pond and bring it to current-day standards. Stephens stated perfect, thank you.

Bhat stated I have a follow-up question. So, why is the underground fuel tank being replaced by an above-ground fuel tank? What is the necessity there?

Jakes replied I will defer to the applicant to answer that question. I believe it's probably just preference.

Knable asked are they just going to run new lines to gas pumps on Lot 1, or how are they providing access to the above-ground tank?

Jakes replied access now for the buses would come through here, in a direction to allow access for the buses. Those new pumps would be located next to the tank, and then the lines will be run from the tank to the pumps, so there will be circulation through the site with the two secure rolling-gate access points.

Knable stated okay, I just wasn't sure if they were going to run piping underneath there, to where the old pumps were. Jakes replied I don't believe so.

Frazier asked if the applicant would like to approach.

Kevin **Bull**, with **BKBM** Engineers, 11623 Fergus Street NE, Blaine, Minnesota, stated to answer your question about the replacements, the tanks are just getting old and near the end of their useful life. If you go out there, you can see that all the pumps and everything are just starting to get really rusted; overall, there's just concerns about the length that these tanks have been in the ground, trying to get them replaced, and new ones put in. It's just our preference.

Bhat asked why above-ground replacement instead of in the ground?

Bull replied above ground is cheaper, for one; it also provides them the ability to move them if they ever needed to in the future. There are also a lot of reasons just in case there's any leakage, you can see it easier vs. it being underground; not that we're expecting leakage, but it's just kind of easier to maintain and see it when it's above ground vs. below grade, like that.

Bull stated one last thing, for the contamination portion, as you'd mentioned, we do have unit pricing, it's already in the contract and everything; if we do encounter contamination, we'll mitigate that per the MPCA's requirements.

Frazier opened the public hearing.

Bonnie Matter, 6649 Inskip Avenue South, stated the only thing that I wondered about, when I was reading through this, is why an above-ground; but I was more concerned about how close is it to the railroad tracks. And is there a possibility of a derailment; probably not, but how close is it to the railroad tracks? Thank you.

As no one else wished to speak, Frazier closed the public hearing.

Frazier asked staff to talk about how close we are to the railway; I'm assuming there's a setback requirement from the railroad.

Jakes replied stated I don't have the exact measurement of how far that tank is from the railroad, but CP Rail was contacted and approved that location without worries. Staff also went through a derailment scenario, etc. to account for any possible scenarios in the City. So, we're aware of that, and we're working with CP Rail, and received their approval without any concerns or comments related to that.

Fisher stated so there's fencing that goes around the west side of that; is that going to be the picture of the fence that you showed because right now it's chain-link, right? So, is that going to be between the tank and the railroad track back there, too, as well?

Jakes replied yes, there's a fence proposed that would basically come through here and tie into that chain-link fence.

Fisher stated it has to be enclosed because obviously there's controlled gates and whatever, so it has to be completely enclosed.

Jakes stated that's correct.

Fisher made a motion to approve the preliminary plat and site plan review, subject to the conditions stipulated in the staff report. Brittain seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

6.3 ZONING AND SIGN CODE UPDATES - CASE TA2024-012

The City of Cottage Grove has applied for zoning text amendments to the City of Cottage Grove Zoning Code (Title 11) and Sign Code (Title 11-3-14).

Mroska summarized the staff report and recommended approval.

Stephens asked two questions about the impervious changes: You talked about updating the stormwater management plan, I'm just very curious if you applied these new, if you assume everybody maxes it out, did you get a lump sum; like what's the difference of new impervious, assuming it all develops out from the existing percentages to the proposed percentages, and like how big of a difference does that make in the City? Lastly, with the high-density residential, if you move it from 50 to 65, does that leave enough room, are there a lot of like tree and landscape plans, and how does that impact room for those? Like, you talk about the lots being thinner, then are you going to have room for trees on either side, if everybody's maximizing it out?

Mroska stated with the first question, I'll let our Assistant City Engineer, Crystal Raleigh, address that one. I think I have an understanding, but I'll let Crystal answer that.

Mroska stated on the second one, that 65% we actually could have gone a little higher than that; I think our storm and surface water management can allow us to go to 70 or 75, but we thought 65 was a good number to allow for landscaping and all those items to fit on that site nicely. We thought that would be a nice middle mix, but the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) allowed it to go up to 70 or 75; 65 is a little lower, leaves room for landscaping, etc.

Raleigh stated I understand the review of the SWMP that was done, I'm not positive that it went into the level of detail like you're asking: If everything was built out per the impervious percentages, how much do we have left to go? They did a very detailed review of how the curve numbers that are in the SWMP equate to these percent impervious numbers; as Mike just alluded to, there's room, there's a lot of fluff, especially in the high density. Our SWMP plans for quite a bit more impervious than what we're proposing here, so it would allow for more and we'd still be meeting our SWMP.

Stephens stated I'm not as concerned about the SWMP. I guess just in terms of new impervious, because it impacts everything, but I get what you're saying.

Raleigh stated we don't expect any ponds to blow up or any of our downstream infrastructure to be impacted by these changes.

Mroska added we shared these numbers with the South Washington Watershed District, too, to make sure they were comfortable with that as well. I just want to point that out.

Frazier opened the public hearing.

Bonnie Matter, 6649 Inskip Avenue South, stated on this I wrote down the majority of my questions to help you move this project up. She distributed her questions to the Planning Commissioners to help with the time because it's more than three minutes to ask all of that. I'm going to talk fast. I'm just going to start in on my questions: Item 2: I guess I'll go through it; I'm looking at a different document, it was the document that was in with the meeting materials. Item 2 will allow accessory structures to be constructed in front yards when adjacent to the Mississippi River and within the MRCCA. And I just would like to make sure that whenever that happens, that the name, title, and department of the authorizing DNR representative who said the MRCCA database update was not required is included. So, that's what I'd like to see happen there, and any time a name from the DNR is mentioned, I would appreciate the department, the title, the name because there's many different departments.

Item 3: Update impervious surface coverage percentages for R Districts and title the table line the same for all R Districts to be consistent. Staff is proposing to increase the impervious surface area amounts by 10-to-15%, depending on the Zoning District and lot sizes. Does the Mississippi Landing stormwater design account for the potential increase in impervious surfaces on individual lots under this ordinance change? That area down there is a different animal, and so I would like to make sure I understand that, thank you. And I'd like a copy of the Mississippi Landing stormwater design; I requested it on April 1st, I think, I might have requested it before then, but I still have not received it. I also, I had also called and I requested the SWPPP Plan for the City and the MS4; I was told it was being, I don't even know if I was told it was being updated. I think when I looked on the website it's not up to date, and I requested the current plan but I haven't received it. Item 6: Clarify the Site Plan Review procedure and submittal requirements. What does this clarification mean? Does this mean developers can decide to make Site Plan changes without coming back to the Planning Commission for review? How will this differ from what is done today? What are the boundaries for this type of decision? What would be considered minimal, what would be considered out of bounds? Provide some examples. How would this change affect the Mississippi Landing development? Is this request due, in part, to the Cottage Grove City Council Meeting and preliminary Development Agreement with Rachel Development on September 6, 2023? Confirm that the City of Cottage Grove has and will follow the 11.15.5H MRCCA Admin Ordinance; Cottage Grove has a different numbering system, theirs would be 11.13.5H, for notification requirements for developments in the area of or that may impact Grey Cloud Dunes Scientific and Natural Area (SNA) and the Grey Cloud slough Mississippi River. Item 8: Remove language stating that accessory structures cannot exceed the footprint of the principal structure. Please include language that all site structures cannot exceed maximum allowable impervious surface area for the lot size. Item 9: Reduce lot width standard in R-4, Transitional Residential Zoning District, to 45 feet. With the reduction of lot widths and increased density, what is the requirement for fire resistant barriers or walls between homes?

I just want to go back to this impervious surface thing. When they say an additional +10% or +15%, if you actually get into the acreage, it's a considerable amount, you know, it's a lot. Do you know what I'm saying? If you take 40% of 10,000 feet or 50% of 10,000 feet, you're at a different; it's a different percent when you get into actual physical acreage. That's it, thank you very much.

Frazier stated, Ms. Matter, we will accept the letter and put that in the record as well, as part of the public hearing.

As no one else spoke, Frazier closed the public hearing.

Frazier stated I don't know how staff wants to divide that up.

Schmitz replied there are several items in here that will require follow up in writing that we're not going to address right away this evening. We'll provide an update back to the Planning Commission next month and, of course, to Ms. Matter over the next month, as we provide some clarification to some of these detailed questions.

Frazier stated some of these we can probably deal with now; he asked Mrosia to come back up. I realize some requests from Ms. Matter are to provide some documentation, provide some information, so we're not going to do that tonight. So, Item 3, the Mississippi Landing stormwater design, account for the potential increase. I think during your presentation you had mentioned that City staff has looked at the stormwater design, the watershed design plans for the City, and accounting for this change, is that correct?

Mrosia replied that is correct.

Frazier stated okay, so that would include the Mississippi Landing plan.

Mroska stated as part of the review process, that has been reviewed by staff.

Frazier stated regarding Item 8, which is on Page 2, changing the language, specifically in that section, include that the total site structures can't exceed the maximum impervious surface area for lot size. There is already a separate part of the ordinance that requires all lots to stay under the maximum impervious surface.

Mroska replied that is correct, there are normal parameters that we use to make sure that the impervious coverage is met, there are setbacks, there is lot coverage, there are a number of items that we use. So, that's the way we keep our checks and balances.

Frazier stated okay, so builders and developers are required to follow all City Ordinances on building and setback structure ordinances and requirements.

Mroska replied yes. Even before today, I was working on a plan at my desk that was for an accessory garage, and I had to make sure that the plans had the appropriate coverage and make sure that they're meeting the ordinance standards.

Frazier stated okay, so making this change in the language would be duplicitous because it's already been covered somewhere else.

Mroska replied correct.

Frazier stated Item 9, on Page 3, I know we've talked about this before with these thinner lots, where we're getting down to 40, 45-foot-wide lots, and we talk about fire barriers; but maybe you can just talk briefly about the City's practice and experience with these thinner lots and the requirements that I think Public Safety has, as well as the builders have, for those.

Mroska replied correct; so, when we receive these applications, we forward them to our Fire Marshal for review and our Building Inspections team to review them. Generally, when the separation is less than 10 feet, there has to be a difference in material on those walls, fire-rated materials; especially on the eaves that overhang a bit closer, there are requirements for that to be fire rated, but usually it's under 10 feet. We try to work with our applicants to make sure they're 10 feet or more. A lot of builders try to keep that so they don't have to put that cost into it. So, that is something that they're aware of, usually before they apply for an application. If they do, we have the standards ready for that, just in case.

Frazier stated let's go back to Item 6; I kind of skipped that one because it's got a bunch of questions in there. Item 6 is essentially, my understanding, streamlining how a Site Plan Review comes before the Planning Commission and then City Council and how that gets funneled.

Mroska stated yes, it's partially that, and our part, as staff, is to know what triggers a Site Plan Review. The current language is very vague, so we want to add language in there, if the applicant, for example, is adding more than 10% of total square footage to the building, that triggers a Site Plan Review. Or if you're modifying the parking lot, that triggers it. So, we just want to make sure that when an application comes before us, we know what triggers that, and right now, the language is very vague. We had one earlier this year where we were like we don't know, so we had to ask our City Attorney; we want to provide great customer service, so the intent behind that is for staff more or less to have that checkbox saying does it meet one of these things? Yes, okay, Site Plan Review, instead of it being very vague, and then there's the process on how to streamline it through the Planning Commission and City Council.

Frazier stated okay, so the proposal before us, then, is to make these categories of what's a minimal vs. something that needs to come before Planning Commission and City Council more clear for staff and the applicants.

Mroska stated that is correct; it also helps with building permits.

Schmitz stated it looks like we made it through all of these, so we won't follow up in writing because I think we did a pretty good job of providing some detailed clarification. The one under #6 that I

would add, I want to make it very clear, we're talking about a Site Plan Review process, and what Mike's proposing is amended. The Mississippi Landing Project is a Preliminary Plat, so those are two different processes, so I just wanted to clarify that.

Frazier asked if anyone on the commission had questions for staff:

Bhat stated so this is regarding your proposal to separate out the Sign Code from the Zoning Code. I'm not very familiar with the Sign Code, what is a Sign Code; what kind of signs are we talking about here?

Mrosia replied with our Sign Code, we regulate all signs, not your Public Safety street signs, but signs on buildings, directional signs in parking lots. For example, if you go to McDonald's, we have standards for all the signs on that building and in the parking lot, for directional and where the drive-through goes. There are many board standards, and a lot of its very cut and dried. Like a menu board cannot exceed 10 square feet, and so we just go through there and it's a checklist, but this regulates all signs in the community. It also regulates yard signs, for example; right now, our Code is quiet on that, so we're allowing residents to have up to two yard signs in their yard, all the time. Right now, it's silent on the matter, so we put that in there, we clarified language on garage sale signs, it's just all about signs. The hard part about signs is it's a First Amendment, free speech, so we had to work very closely with our City Attorney on that because technically, as staff, we cannot read the sign; we have to enforce it by its location and size, etc. We can't go up to the sign and read it, per se. Many times it comes down to aesthetics, health, safety, and general welfare of the community on the sign ordinance.

Bhat said my follow-up question is by removing this Sign Code from 11 to 12, do we tend to lose something? Are we overlooking something? Why is it there in the first place, and by removing it, are we going to miss something?

Mrosia replied a lot of cities have their Sign Code in their Zoning Code. Our City Attorney historically has had it in the Zoning Code for other municipalities that she's worked for; however, the City of Cottage Grove historically has had it not in there. So, we're not really losing anything, we're just moving it out so in the event that a change had to occur, especially with First Amendment items, we sometimes have to make quick changes or modifications, and it will go straight to the City Council. The City Council can make that modification approval without delaying the process. So, a lot of those things happen very quickly, and we have to have like a severability clause or something else in there; so, we'd bring it right to our City Council then to get that amended due to the impact of the First Amendment.

Rasmussen made a motion to approve the amendments to the City Code Title 11, Zoning regulations, and relocate Section 11-3-14, Signs, to Title 12, subject to minor modifications by City Attorney. Knable seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

7. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MARCH 25, 2024

Fisher made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2024, Planning Commission meeting. Rasmussen seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

8. REPORTS

8.1 RECAP OF APRIL CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS

Schmitz provided a summary of actions taken at the April 3 and April 17, 2024, City Council meetings:

April 3: Schmitz stated she didn't have any items to note from that meeting.

April 17: Schmitz stated the Preliminary Plat of the Summer Valley residential subdivision that we presented before you in March was approved by the City Council for 71 single-family lots. Its the final square on the north side of Military, kind of in between Rolling Meadows and Parkview Pointe, if any of those names help orient you. We're now awaiting a Final Plat submittal for that.

Schmitz said Council Member Khambata is here to add anything additional or if commissioners have questions for him.

Khambata stated I don't have anything additional to add, but I'll make myself available for questions.

Frazier asked if there were any questions for Council Member Khambata, but none were asked.

8.2 RESPONSE TO PLANNING COMMISSION INQUIRIES

Response to Open Forum - Mississippi Landing Traffic and Roadways:

Schmitz stated if you recall, several members of the Grey Cloud Island Township Board provided some comment at last month's meeting, as it relates to the limited traffic from the construction that can go underneath the railroad bridge from the Mississippi Landing development. Yes, some of the equipment, of course, that is coming to the site is not able to make it underneath that bridge; therefore, they need to take the alternate route up Grey Cloud Island Trail, which extends of course through Cottage Grove, the township, and then into St. Paul Park. Recognizing there are four jurisdictions that are impacted by this potential construction traffic, we've coordinated a meeting with all of these jurisdictions to kind of talk through what that looks like; we have that scheduled for April 30 to sit down together to have a better understanding of any potential impacts.

8.3 PLANNING COMMISSION REQUESTS - None.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Rasmussen made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Brittain seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote). The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 p.m.