



COTTAGE GROVE PLANNING COMMISSION
12800 Ravine Parkway South
Cottage Grove, MN 55016

January 27, 2025

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; Samantha Pierret, Senior Planner; Max Erickson, Planner; Riley Rooney, Associate Planner; Crystal Raleigh, Assistant City Engineer; Justin Olsen, City Council Liaison

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Brittain made a motion to approve the agenda. Stephens 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. No one spoke. 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 podium and state their full name and address for the public record.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPLICATIONS

A. Holcim Mining Permit - MP2025-001

Holcim - MWR, Inc. has applied for their 2025 mining permit to continue mining operations at the Nelson Sand & Gravel Facility at 11250 Grey Cloud Trail South on Lower Grey Cloud Island.

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

Frazier asked if there were any questions for staff; none were asked.

Frazier asked if the applicant at this time would like to add anything.

Patty Bestler, Regional Manager with Holcim - MWR, 2815 Dodd Road, Eagan, MN, stated Riley summed up our application very well, it's status quo, operating as we have for the last many, many years. In 2023, we implemented a suction dredge, its fully electric, where we're trying to get overburden off of a previously mined area that was mined back in the 1950s and 1960s. We didn't have the capabilities at that time with the clamshell dredge that we have now; so, we're trying to go back, get that overburden and excess sand off, we're pushing it to other parts of the previously mined areas that we'll never go back to. Our reclamation plan is we are meeting the landowners, grades that they want for when they someday go to develop that property. The work that we're doing with Great River Greening, where we're establishing Oak Savanna areas and taking out invasive buckthorn and putting it in oak plantings, that is actually part of what the City agreed to, back in 2010, in lieu of us planting many, many trees down there that would not survive because of the dry conditions when we'd go through droughts and whatnot. So, in lieu of planting trees every single year, we are reestablishing big Oak Savannas right now; there is some on the eastern side that we're working on, and then along the water area, in the area where we cannot ever mine because of historical significance, there is beautiful oaks in an area down there, but it's being overtaken by buckthorn. So, we're working on that this year to get some of that buckthorn out again. We did work in there previously, but we're going back to that area now, too. I am here to answer any questions. I also have our Operations Manager, Michael Murphy, here if you have any operations questions, but pretty much it's what we've been doing for many years now. We're trying to eek every piece of sand and gravel out of that site, which is the purpose of the suction dredge.

Frazier said all right, thank you. Are there any questions for the applicant? None were asked.

Frazier asked Schmitz if this was a public hearing or not. Schmitz replied it's technically not a Public Hearing; however, the commission does need to take a vote.

Frazier said with the presentation by staff, as well as the applicant, he asked if there is any further discussion by the commission on the proposal.

Rasmussen said I'm just glad to see your operation is going as planned. It looks like you're increasing production, and the reclamation is appreciated, so thank you for your partnership. It's always nice to see things going well down there.

Fisher said I was just going to say along the same lines as that, it sounds like everything is going well, this seems status quo for several of these renewals that I've seen. I like that you're working on the invasive species and trying to really protect the nature that's down there, too.

Frazier asked if there were any further comments or discussion, but there were none. Frazier said otherwise, I'll look for a motion.

Fisher made a motion to approve Holcim's 2025 Mining Permit, subject to the conditions stipulated in the staff report. Knable seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

B. Lochridge - Cases ZA2025-004 & PP2025-004

Pulte Homes of Minnesota, LLC has applied for a zoning amendment to rezone approximately 88.6 acres of land located south of the Woodbury border, west of Jamaica Avenue, and north of The Waters at Michael's Pointe development for AG-2, Agriculture, to R-4, Transitional Residential District; and a preliminary plat to be called Lochridge, which would consist of 99 single family lots and 84 townhome lots.

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

Frazier asked if there were any questions for staff.

Rasmussen said if I'm reading this right, it appears that Ravine Parkway needs to be extended through this development, that portion's not there yet, is that correct? Pierret replied correct. Rasmussen asked is that something the City's handling or the developer handles that development? How does that come together? Pierret replied I'll invite Crystal Raleigh, with our Engineering staff, to come up and answer those questions; being new to the team, I don't know all of the answers quite yet. Raleigh stated the proposed Ravine Parkway would be designed and constructed by the development team; the City would cost share in that,

so the development team would be responsible for constructing our typical roadway section, and then the City would cost share for portions of the roadway above and beyond our standard section, so, the extra width, the medians, etc. Rasmussen asked so, would this extension just be completed until the end of this development right now, or? Raleigh replied that's correct, and then in the future, the Kemp property is to the west of this development, and then as that develops, Ravine would continue to be pushed through to the west. Rasmussen stated all right, thank you.

Bhat said as of now, Jamaica Avenue is only a single lane on either side, which is on the east of this property. How are you proposing to make that two lanes, going forward because of the anticipated increase in traffic. Raleigh replied Jamaica Avenue, I believe as is, is designed for that 15,000 vehicles per day. I am not sure what the County's project that's coming in 2028 would entail as far as if extra lanes are proposed on Jamaica. I think that's still to be determined with their upcoming project. Bhat said okay, thank you.

Brittain said if I recall correctly, Jamaica Avenue from 70th to Military was traditionally a four lane, two lanes in both directions. Because this property wasn't developable at the time, the curve of the road into the roundabout area that was desired couldn't take place yet. Instead of reconstructing Jamaica when we needed to, it went down to a single lane both ways, with the intent as far as I am understanding, it will be two lanes both ways in the future when it becomes appropriate to redo that road; which is not part of this development, but with respect to its history and its future, it is intended to be two lanes both ways eventually as well.

Fisher asked can you explain, so we were talking a little bit about this, the 2040 Comprehensive Plan says it is R-1, Low Density Residential, correct? But it's being rezoned to R-4, Transitional, but it's still meeting low-density requirements. I guess I'm feeling like there's some different things being used interchangeably, and I guess can you explain that a little bit better and help me understand why those two things are being used interchangeably? Pierret replied sure, I will do my best, and I may have to ask someone else. Fisher said I believe I know why you're doing it, but I also want to hear why you're doing it. Pierret replied all right, so the Low Density Residential classification on the slide that I just pulled up, it definitely has to do with that, the number of dwellings per acre and everything. It wasn't to give a specific zoning designation to the lots, it was just to say this area should have that specific number of dwellings per acre. So, the Low Density Residential that are for, like I mentioned, with the 2.9 units per acre still fits into the definition of Low Density Residential as it's defined in the Comprehensive Plan. Fisher replied okay, so when you're counting townhouse units, are those considered like if it's a four, side by side, are those considered four units or is that considered one unit? Pierret replied those are considered four individual dwelling units. Fisher stated I don't know if my math is just not mapping, but it just doesn't seem to fit the low-density number. I don't know, maybe it's just the way the drawing is and how it looks, like it feels really packed and dense to me, and I am not sure why that is. Schmitz replied so when we calculate density, we use net density, so we take out all areas of Right-of-Way, areas below high-water levels, and so, in our Comprehensive Plan, when we think about Low Density, it's two-to-four units per acre. So, we have a project that's proposed at 2.9, that fits right into that density that's outlined in our Comprehensive Plan. This particular Zoning District was created for the purpose of having that transition and that ability to have a variety of product types on perhaps a site that might have some unique challenges so that we could find that flexibility to allow for development, but also still meet that density standard. Fisher replied thank you.

Frazier asked if there were any further questions for staff.

Bhat asked so, it's proposed to be zoned as R-4 because of the townhome units. Otherwise, it should have been in R-3 if they were just single-family homes in that zone. Pierret replied that's correct; with those townhome units, that pushes it into the R-4 Transitional District with those differing densities of dwellings. Bhat replied okay, thank you.

Stephens said I'll try to keep this as far out of engineering as possible. I'm just wondering if you could talk about that stormwater that's coming underneath. There always seems to be just a pretty significant swale through that property, and I don't think the culvert's all that big, but is there plans to just reroute? I mean, is it going to be piped or is it going to be overland rerouted down? Has that been discussed at all? Raleigh replied that has been discussed; I'm assuming, are you talking more of the drainage coming from the west side of the property? Stephens replied from the north side; so, there's a culvert under Military. Raleigh replied okay, so, it will come into that basin in the northwest corner, and from there it would be piped down through the subdivision into the big Pond 3 that you're seeing there, up on the screen, and then it would discharge into Lake Robert. Stephens replied okay. So, it's going to go overland, behind the townhomes into Pond 2? Is that right? Raleigh replied I believe it's going to be piped. Rausch said it will ultimately be in the storm sewer, it's very hard bedrock there. Raleigh said so, it will be in the storm sewer, in the streets, to either Pond 1 or Pond 2. Rausch said that pipe is now in the watershed, the one in the northwest corner is much more steep. Stephens replied okay, I'm just curious about that, that's all. Thank you.

Frazier asked if there were any further questions for staff, none were asked. At this time, he asked if the applicant would like to approach the podium and add anything additional.

Good Evening, my name is Haley Daily, with Pulte Homes of Minnesota, 1650 West 82nd Street, Suite 300, Bloomington, MN. With me tonight is Dean Lotter, our Director of Land Planning and Entitlement, as well as Mark Rausch with Alliant, for any of the specific engineering questions, as well as a representative for Rachel Development. I'm here to just answer any questions you may or may not have; we're just excited to be in the City of Cottage Grove again. Frazier said all right, thank you. Any questions for the applicant?

Frazier said okay, I don't see anybody, but I am going to ask, I think you said it was Mark you said was your engineering person? Daily replied yes, Mark Rausch with Alliant. Frazier said I wonder if he would come up. Sorry, you had just given an answer from the back, and I wanted to make sure we had you up here so that people at home can hear and we have it on the record. So, if you'd just give your name. Mark Rausch with Alliant Engineering. Frazier said all right, thank you. And so, there was a question from Commissioner Stephens specifically about where the stormwater ponding or where the stormwater was going, whether it was going overland or whether it was being piped through. If you could just provide your kind of update on what that was. Rausch replied so there is a pipe, that is correct, that picks up on the north side of Military that dumps out here. You can see it, but there's a lot of riprap there, it's actually where bedrock is actually physically disposed there. That's, I think that's only 21, it's not as big a pipe; this side is what takes a significant amount of flow from Woodbury and more to the west of the site, northwest, so that is being captured in this basin, and there's a larger trunk pipe that will follow through to this pond here. So, we will be collecting this, but right now, it's just coming down the hill. We have multiple catch basin inlands back here to make sure we capture that with the swale easement. All this common area of the townhome area drains into a drainage and utility easement, so, and it's a managed property. So, I don't know if that answers the question. Stephens replied yeah, it does. Thank you.

Frazier said all right, are there any further questions for the applicant? None were asked. Frazier said all right, thank you very much.

Frazier opened the Public Hearing.

Good Evening, Mr. Chair, committee, my name is A.J. Ecker, I live at 8852 67th Street Bay South; we're in The Waters at Michael's Pointe development, and we're excited about this new plan and getting some more neighbors. We do have a concern, some of us that live at The Waters at Michael's Pointe, along Lake Robert there, that we kind of went through this process back in 2011 to develop The Waters at Michael's Pointe; when we were working with the City, we were assured that a walking path was not going to go around the south side of the lake. So, a lot of us that built there and bought there were under that premise that the walking path would not go around that side of the lake. In addition to just, you know, the commitment we had from the City, knowing how the lake floods, and I know we put in different drainage there to help that, but sometimes we've got water halfway up our back yards. We've got neighbors now that have fences there, some of our biggest, most mature trees are, there's not a lot of space between the property line of their back yards and the wetland. And, so, I know you talked about maybe an eight-foot wide trail going through that space, and in some of the back yards, I don't even know how that's possible to get eight feet of a managed trail through there without not cutting down some of the most beautiful, mature trees around that lake. So, I just wanted to voice our concern for those of us living on the lake now; we would really like the City to uphold their agreement with us to not put the walking trail around that lake. Thank you. Frazier said thank you. Mr. Ecker, can I just ask you, and you don't have to answer it if you don't want to, but other than the conversations that you had with the City back in 2011 about this path, is there a specific reason why you think that a walking path on the south side of the lake would not be appropriate? Mr. Ecker replied well, I mean, back when we were in negotiations with John and Jennifer and the City, we just thought that privacy is one issue, but now, after living there for the last ten years or however long we've been there, it doesn't seem like the space is there from the wetland buffer to our property line. There's just not that much space there for an eight-foot path to go through there, and some of the neighbors' fences I believe are rightfully in their spot, but it can't be more than 15 feet from the water. And then there's supposed to be the natural wetland buffer in there, and then you've got these big, beautiful trees. You know, somebody came out and just staked, and these stakes go right through our yards, and some of these huge trees are right in the middle of that. So, I would just hate to see, I mean, it's such a beautiful nature preserve back there, to see some of these really longstanding trees get cut down. And, you know, I think it's a beautiful place back there, and we're excited about the development, there's going to be areas to walk around and park dedications all over that you can still enjoy the lake without having, and I don't believe the trail can connect all the way around anyways because of the, somebody on the other side of the, the east side. But those are some of my thoughts, Mr. Chair. Frazier said all right, thank you.

Good Evening, I'm Kristel Rogers, I'm a neighbor of A.J.'s, a couple doors down, 8844 67th Street Bay South. Our home is on the end of the cul-de-sac, and our back yard would butt up right to where this walking path is proposed to be, literally within a few feet of the fence that we just put in around our swimming pool that we invested in the summer after we moved in, in 2021. So, my husband and I have been residents of Cottage Grove since 2011, lived in a different neighborhood, and then moved to this neighborhood, largely due to the privacy of the back yard and we were planning to do a swimming pool. In our previous location, which was also fairly private, but it had a huge hill, which was a problem for that. So, when we found this place, we fell in love, and we said, you know what, this is a really private area, which is kind of why we decided to move there. Doing some research at the time, we actually noticed that there was this proposed plan for a walking path, and we had called the City at the time to confirm if that was or wasn't going to happen. We were told, although on the phone, so I don't have it in writing, but it was on the phone I was told that that land was not conducive to a walking path, and it wouldn't be happening. So, we made the investment to move, and we've been very happy where we're at, and we're quite concerned about the potential walking path that would be literally within a few feet of our private oasis. We don't have another place that we go in the summer, like many Minnesotans do, to lake homes; this is our place, and being a business owner in Cottage Grove for ten years, and a practitioner in the area for ten years, we've made Cottage Grove our home and we really do like it here. We're pretty disappointed that this is potentially going to come into our back yard. So, I'm hoping I can speak on behalf of my other neighbors that we really would not like to have a walking path right in our back yard. I'm fine with the walking path to the west of our house, along our driveway, that has already started and going around the west side of the lake, but it really seems to be encroaching a lot of homes and privacy to be literally within feet of a back yard that's been private for that long for many. So, thank you. Frazier said thank you.

Jason Johnson, I live at 8714 67th Street Court South, just a few doors down from these guys, especially through the woods there. You know, we started, we moved into this neighborhood in 2017, we heard that there was a potential of a trail that would go through there as well. We looked into it, called the City, and they said it probably won't happen because the house across the lake there is bedrock, and will never really ever be developed, a trail would probably never happen, more like never was the big word that was used. So, we decided to move in there; with our back yard, we don't actually look at the lake very often, I mean, we can't see it, we've got some trees back there, so it's not so much the obstruction of the lake, it's people in the back yard. If you ever spent any time looking at this lake, do some aerial, go back in time and look at some aerial photos of this lake, it's not really even a lake. It's mostly just covered in seaweed, it's got yeast on it, it's not super beautiful. In front of their homes, they've got a nice little spot there where they can see the weeds kind of come back into the west, southwest corner of there; but it's not a, I just don't think it's a good investment for the City to even have around a lake that isn't a lake. When I came to the meeting, the original meeting with Pulte and stuff, I was told by one of the City people that were there, I hate to say this, but we kind of want to be like Woodbury, like Colby Lake. Well, my first thought is there, let's have a Colby Lake first. We don't have that there. So, also the water there; have we ever, has that water been tested of any sort? I only ask because our dog has gone back in there a couple times and come back, and he's a little loopy after he gets out of there. So, it's also just not, it's not super awesome. So, I just, I don't know, it just seems like not a real good use of money and privacy; you know, we paid to have that back there, and now we have people coming in from the other side, if there is a park across the way, coming into our back yards. Our neighborhood is a diamond in the rough, we have a lot of spots, there's not a lot of neighborhoods like ours, and a lot of us moved there and love it the way it is. I get that there is change to support the build across there. Jamaica is pretty busy, but I'm sure that the County and the City will work together to make the lanes a little bit bigger. But, it basically comes down to I would like to see the trail itself not constructed due to what we've put into purchasing this home and the rest of the neighbors, especially on the south side of 67th Street and then the 67th Street Bay. So, that's all I have. Frazier said, all right, thank you.

Mike Miller, 8860 67th Street Bay South, I live right on the south side of the lake, next to A.J. and all these guys. Our little neighborhood is, like people said, it's a gem here in Cottage Grove. It's very private, it's very small, we all know each other, and we bought there for the privacy. So, as far as the concern about how does it impact our community, there's probably what, 45 houses in there, or whatever, it impacts our privacy. We paid premium prices for our lots for that privacy. It also, where the trail goes through, that is a wetland, so I don't know if a study has been done, if permission's been allowed; I mean, that has to be approved with the Watershed District. It is very low lying, and when it rains, even though the drain has been put in, our back yard still floods over. So, I'm most concerned about the privacy that we paid a premium for; we chose to live in Cottage Grove, not to live in Woodbury, right? We have tons of walking paths already, I would prefer not to have a walking path pretty much right through my back yard. We can go around the other side, we can walk out, I mean, our whole neighborhood walks; we see these guys all the time out walking dogs, and we've walked out the beautiful path across Jamaica, it's awesome, and we walked the partway. So, there is lots of Woodbury-like amenities in our neighborhood already. We would, our whole neighborhood, would prefer that the path doesn't go behind our houses, it can go on the north side. They haven't bought into the community already that we've lived there for 12 years, living in the privacy and the beauty of nature, even though like they said, the lake really isn't that beautiful

because its covered with Lily Pads, like now is the most beautiful time and in spring, before the Lily Pads show up. So, that's all I have. Thank you. Frazier said thank you.

Chairman, Members of the Commission, Kevin Sommerland, I'm at 8710 67th Street Court South. Also, my property abuts the south side of Lake Robert if, in fact, you want to call it a lake; as has been mentioned, it's more of a swamp. You know, we bought in that neighborhood in 2013 from Pulte. The representative that convinced us to buy there was really selling the privacy aspect of that development. Back then, we were pre-Emerald Ash Borer infestation, and that area was certainly, I mean you couldn't even see the lake initially from where we were, our lots. Since then, we've had to remove a lot of trees, which has opened that area up a lot. Dodge Nature Center recently has gone in and done a fair amount of clearing, and so, our level of privacy has diminished considerably just in the last ten years. And, yeah, to now be subject to any foot trail that is going to potentially bring people in there at all hours, and right in our back yard, certainly there's some safety, security concerns that I would have. I think as a compromise, you know, if Pulte wants to have a trail on that north side of the lake and maybe circle around on the east and west with little roundabouts there, and just avoiding that southern side of the lake, I would have no problem with that. But I think, you know, just recognizing, as has been mentioned, our lots, we paid a premium for those lots for that privacy aspect, and now a decade or more after we closed on those deals, we're being asked to give up that privacy. I think it's just unreasonable. So, thank you. Frazier said thank you.

Hi there, commissioners, my name's Nathan Dean, I'm at 8715 67th Street Court South, Cottage Grove. One of the things I guess I'm challenged by as I take a look at the plans is, and I think some of the commissioners raised it up, is even the density that is being proposed. This is coming from an area that is very much single-family homes and a very tight area of which, you know, I'm raising four girls, and I can't express to you how much I appreciate the safety of being able to raise my four girls in that cul-de-sac and I don't have to worry because it is a very private, protected area. And Pulte did a phenomenal job of building that area at the time, and we are grateful for the privacy and the area that was created; but I'm a little shocked as we saw these proposals being put together at just how much density is being proposed, and I have to ask the question why? Like, is this the Cottage Grove that we understood, that was trying to develop all these single-family homes? I mean, the development that was just across Jamaica there, as it was being built out and had the single-family homes being built into it, that seemed reasonable, they did that in a way that seemed very much designed around the single-family home; and I guess I'm challenged as to well, about the walking path, and the walking path is a big issue in our neighborhood. But I'm more concerned about just the fact that this is being zoned at R-4 vs. R-2, that was part of that 2040 plan, I would respectfully request that that be reconsidered, even though I understand there are special circumstances of that land and the challenges to develop it. I think still having a lower density, single-family home mix would not only protect my home values, but it would also protect my neighborhood and keep it the private, safe neighborhood that I currently reside in. Thank you. Frazier said thank you.

Good Evening, commissioners, my name is Michael Goertel, I live at 8717 67th Street Court South, and first off, I'll say I definitely empathize with my neighbors and the concerns with the trail. It's not my scenario, or my situation, but I absolutely understand the situation with that. I think the reason I'm here is I just want to call out the concerns with the traffic that's on Jamaica, going southbound, especially southbound. So, as noted, probably five, or a little bit more, years ago, Jamaica was two lanes in each direction, and that was reconstructed when the roundabout on Jamaica and 70th was put in. For the most part, it's a single lane in each direction, some accommodations with the new Ravine Parkway going eastbound, as well as the development to the east of Jamaica. What that accounted for was some extra turn lanes and things of that sort, but where my concern comes in is ensuring that there's some sort of road reconstruction on Jamaica, at least in between Military and I'd say 67th Street Court; that's the area where what I experience is coming southbound from Military to 67th on Jamaica, there is not a turn lane for folks to go right, into 67th Street Court South. And that traffic comes up behind you quite quickly, and where my concern comes in is as there's more traffic and additional houses, naturally there'll come more cars and things of that sort. So, I'd be looking for additional, at least some road enhancements and things of that sort, so I don't get rear-ended, as I'm trying to slow down and take a right into 67th Street, or I start turning my blinker on, up on Military, just to make sure everyone knows I'm turning right a half mile down the road. So, just awareness on that with the way the road is currently constructed. Thank you. Frazier said thank you.

Frazier asked if anyone else wished to speak for or against the proposal.

No one else spoke. Frazier closed the Public Hearing.

Frazier said at this time, I will ask staff to kind of respond to some of the concerns and some of the things that I know they've had on their radar since the neighborhood meeting where specifically the trail has been brought up.

Pierret said thank you, Mr. Chair and Members of the Commission. So, yes, staff has definitely heard and understands the public's concerns regarding the privacy of the trail and everything. It was in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, as I noted, and also kind of speaking to those discussions, packets, approvals, things like that that went on around 2011 and 2007-ish, when these other developments to the south were put in. Nothing was put on the record as far as the conditions or things like that that would hold the City into saying that no trail would be put here. Staff did considerable amounts of research on that front, as far as verifying that that would or would not be the case. As far as mitigating any wetland impacts and things like that, it sounds like that of course appropriate permits, minimizing impacts to wetlands, are going to be required, very important things, permits through things like the DNR, things like that for trail construction; and staff is looking at varying ways of trail construction and things like that with the applicant's engineers as far as best practices, minimal impacts to those areas. Concerns regarding the density, kind of getting to Commissioner Fisher's question earlier about the net density of the area. As I mentioned, it was not said that this area would be zoned R-2, it's a density, it's an overall net density that the area is planned for; and this proposal does meet that request, using the townhome density and the single-family density on this acreage when we subtract the acreage of public Rights-of-Way and the wetland lake. Kind of going into the traffic concerns and everything, that was also kind of mentioned during the presentation as well about the proposed hopeful reconstruction in 2028. It was also noted in the packet that this is a County Road, and it was reconstructed as the neighbors had mentioned; it was reconstructed in a way that the County knew that they would need to be coming back here for reconstruction, sooner rather than later, as far as when new development came in and things like that. So, those will definitely be considerations as the County continues to go forward in their planning processes. Pierret said I'll kind of send it back to you unless there are any questions.

Fisher said I have a question. So, I'm empathizing with everybody on the trail, and something that was said really kind of struck me; like, it doesn't seem like a very good use of money or space. Another thing that was talked about was lots of big trees that were going to need to be mitigated; can you talk about how many trees you would have to take down and what that would look like back there? Because it doesn't seem, to me, that makes sense, that doesn't seem to be a great like use of money and space, you know, if you're taking down a bunch of big, mature trees and putting a path somewhere that floods all the time anyway. That made sense to me, so. Raleigh said Chair and Commissioner Fisher, I can speak to that. Some of the neighbors expressed concerns about the amount of space between the rear yards and the water's edge. Staff and developer went together out there, and the developer's engineer, to take a peek at those back yards and possible trail locations within that corridor. Back yard lot corners were staked, and in the narrowest location, there's approximately 50 feet between the back lot corner and the water's edge; that does allow some flexibility to avoid big back yard trees. So, the anticipation is that the trail can avoid some of those large trees that are in people's rear yards. Now, the trail does meander through the woods and then there are some larger trees in the woods that can't be avoided, but generally, those bigger trees through back yards would be avoided. Fisher said I was just going to say I feel like there should be some sort of compromise here with the trail. Like I understand, I don't know, I'm not one to like be swayed, but I feel like there's got to be some sort of, it sounds like consistently all of these people were told in the past by people that there was never going to be a trail there, which I know it's not in writing, but I mean, it's consistent that every single person has said that. The fact that just environmental, the fact that it floods, like I just don't see this being a hill to die on; there's got to be some way that we can make sort of a compromise on this piece of it because it doesn't really affect the homes going in, it doesn't affect the density, it doesn't affect the overall construction of the development. So, I guess I would like to see some sort of compromise here. Raleigh replied sure, understood. I think the intention with this was to follow that Comprehensive Plan that showed us having a trail all the way around Lake Robert; so, that does generate that trail on the south side there. Fisher said yeah, but the Comprehensive Plan does, though, show that this parcel should be zoned R-1 as well, and we're going R-4 because there's some similarities. So, I think the Comprehensive Plan is great, but there's some movement that can happen with it, and I think maybe we can consider that here, too. Raleigh said all right.

Frazier said so, I guess, and maybe I can because I'm confused now, too, I think. So, my understanding of the Comprehensive Plan is we don't talk about Zoning Districts R-1, AG, I-2, it's just in terms of density; and, so, the Comprehensive Plan right now in this area is saying it should be used as Low-Density Residential when it develops, correct? Schmitz replied Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, that's correct. Frazier said and Low Density Residential is according to the Comprehensive Plan definition is between two and four units per acre. Schmitz stated that's correct. Frazier said all right, and so, then we go separately to the Zoning, and Zoning can be R-1 through R-6, so we have six different residential zonings right now in the Zoning Code. Schmitz stated that's correct. Frazier stated and some of those fall within two-to-four units per acre, and some of them are higher than two-to-four units per acre. Schmitz stated that's correct. Frazier said and so, when looking at the Comprehensive Plan vs. the Zoning map, those two things are different, and the Low Density Residential guided use doesn't necessarily match up with R-1, R-2, it can fall within a couple different Zoning Districts. Schmitz stated that's correct; those Zoning Districts will have standards that have to be met as it relates to product type that's permitted within those Zoning Districts. Frazier stated okay. So, the R-4 zone falls in there. Fisher stated understood, I read it wrong. Frazier said okay, so I just wanted to make sure everyone understood

because there was a comment about the amount of density in this area, and it's kind of greater than what it is in the surrounding; but the R-4 is still going to fall within the City's definition of this is Low Density Residential. Fisher said right; Frazier said okay. Fisher said sorry, Frazier said no, that's all right, I just want to make sure we're all on the same page here.

Frazier said so, Crystal, I was going to ask you then if I can go back to, because I was going to have a similar question to Commissioner Fisher about where the trail was going to be in relation to the property lines for these homes that are on the south side. Because I understand that there's been no development to the north of these homes since these houses were put in, in 2011, and so, people may not know exactly where their property line is; they may think it goes all the way up to or close to the water edge, but it sounds like that's not necessarily the case, and it's between the back property line and the water is about 50 feet. Raleigh replied yes, that's correct, there is approximately 50 feet, but behind the actual lot corner to the water edge at the skinniest point, I mean that's the narrowest area. We found that mowed lawns and maintained lawns are happening past property lines back there, but the actual property that this Outlot A would be has approximately 50 feet at its narrowest point between those back corners and the water. Frazier said okay. And this may not be a question for you, it may be a question for one of the planners, but do we have a setback requirement for a trail when it's butting up to a residential property? I'm sorry, I'm not trying to play stump the planner because I know I'm not supposed to do that. Pierret replied good question, Mr. Chair. We do not have any sort of setback from property lines for a trail of that type. Frazier said all right. Do we know what the setback is that this plan is kind of setting to right now, how far away are we from the property line, just kind of an average? Raleigh replied, generally, I would say that it's 15 feet at the closest from, I'm just judging on some of these schematics that I see in the plan tonight. I don't have a scale with me to measure it off my plan sheet, but I would say there's 15 feet where we're the closest, but again, if we dug into the packet and pulled out a scale, we could get that a little more exact. Frazier said okay, and I'm not looking for you to be exact. My concern is this: These people have come tonight, and they're concerned about their privacy, you know, in these back yards. And as I said, I don't think it's uncommon or it would be unexpected for these people to believe that their property lines maybe went further back than they actually do, and the City's gone out there and staked them and said here's where the actual property line is. And, so, we are proposing to build this trail on what will be City property, and so, the City kind of gets to decide what it wants to do with its property, but we want to make sure we're not bothering the neighboring use. And, so, that's why I'm just kind of looking at, okay, how far away are we from the property? Is it going to injure their use to it within reason because it is City property that we're going to put this on, fair? Raleigh replied yes, Mr. Chair, that's fair.

Knable said I have a question, just kind of tapping into what Jessica had talked about, about kind of a compromise. I know there's area there like for boardwalks; would that be something the City and Pulte would be interested in like building a boardwalk through that area so it wouldn't go like around? Like out there, but just kind of on top of it? Raleigh replied yes, that is something that is being entertained is the potential for boardwalks as sections of this trail; that's still being talked about with those design decisions. Knable asked would it be a conversation to have the whole path like that? Raleigh replied that it could always be a conversation of that; the costs associated with boardwalks over water like that are typically pretty high in comparison to an asphalt trail, but that's not to say that it can't be done. But, yeah, those type of design decisions are still being considered. Knable replied thank you.

Bhat asked so the proposed trail is actually extending out of that Outlot A, right, I mean, if you look at the map of the proposed trail. Raleigh asked extending out of what? Bhat replied Outlot A of The Waters at Michael's Pointe. Raleigh replied that's correct. Bhat said so that area of the green Outlot A and the property line of the 67th Street Court area, is that City property, or what is that? Or is it Dodge Nature Center there? Raleigh replied that area that is proposed as Outlot A is currently owned by the Wolterstorffs, but when it becomes Outlot A, then it would then be owned by the City. Is that what you're asking? Bhat said my question is the south of Outlot A and the back of the property line there, the black line there, that small rectangular section. Schmitz replied Mr. Chair, Commissioner Bhat, so that sliver of property is already owned by the City; it was deeded as a part of previous development. Bhat replied thank you.

Brittain asked is there any efforts going into, you know, I'm assuming this is the Preliminary Plat, and you talked about boardwalks may go here or there, on different parts of the trail, so it's not a 100% plan that's finished. But in the event that this goes through here as you're proposing, is there going to be any mitigation in the landscaping plan for all of this, between the trail and the homes that currently exist there? Raleigh replied Mr. Chair, Commissioner Brittain, their landscaping plan again is something that is still under review and still being considered. I don't know, and maybe Sam, you know, if the trees are intended on both sides of the trail at this point through that area? Pierret replied not that I can recall; however, like Crystal mentioned, the plan is very much still in flux, as far as landscape, it's a big thing, and this, of course, does not show it. So, I would just say this landscaping is something that is very much still under discussions with the City and staff, as far as what is going to be done; and that's also something that could be, of course, subject to change, subject to discussions between staff, the developer, all of that lovely stuff.

Brittain said I would hope that the homeowners there would be involved in that discussion as well because this is a pretty drastic change to that area, and you know, the way that it's been for a long time. I know there's no guarantees when something's undeveloped at what's going to eventually happen there. I know that I don't recall a plan in the past where they were putting a trail through there, if there were challenges; but every time a new development comes through, the entire plan changes. So, you really can't look at a plan-by-plan basis and say, yes, that was going to happen or no, that wasn't. But I would hope that the homeowners would be involved in the placement of that trail, how close it is coming to the property lines, and what type of mitigation that can happen there with respect to landscaping or other aesthetics to help minimize that impact.

Frazier asked if there were any other questions for staff.

Stephens said I don't know if it's a question, per se, but just talking about the mitigation; so, I typically am a proponent of trails and connections and connectivity. However, I would say, so just reviewing all of this and the early, early plans, stormwater, I know nobody here is probably that excited about the stormwater, but this is a really large tributary area to that lake, and everybody here has mentioned the quality of the lake. And it also was in the report that this development is balancing that water level by half a foot in the lake, and that that needs to be I think brought back down so that it's not an issue for the residents. I think just in terms of the trail around the lake, it seems like they're; it's maybe kind of like piling, so you're increasing the water level of the lake, you're adding in a trail, you're adding all these homes. I think it would be really nice if instead it was just sort of a consideration that you're actually enhancing the quality of the lake, keeping that water level as it is; and if the trails are contributing negatively to that, then maybe that's something to consider as well, if there is a way around some of these other things that were in the report. That's all, it's just not a question, I guess, it's just my notes for the record. Frazier said all right, thank you.

Bhat asked so why did the proposal come with the townhomes? Does it make this plan viable only with the townhomes in the plan, in the development? I mean, my question is why not go with all single-family homes, why include townhomes? What sense does it, or what value does it add to that? Pierret replied so, I'll speak to that, just from kind of the City's overall house planning. I think Ms. Daily would be willing to come up and provide some statement from a developer side, of course, because we're kind of two separate entities. From the City's standpoint, you know, we do, Cottage Grove is looking for needs of diverse housing types, diverse housing of differing costs and affordability; you know, just the single-family homes in every single neighborhood isn't, you know, well, I could stand up here and talk for hours about the housing needs of the City of Cottage Grove and things like that. So, the townhomes are definitely providing a different type of product for a different homebuyer or someone who is looking for something different than just a traditional single-family home. But I will invite Ms. Daily up as well, to speak to you about things from the other side.

Daily said Mr. Chair and Commissioners, yes, as Sam mentioned, we, as Pulte, put in a lot of thought into what could potentially work on this site. As has been mentioned, we are following the R-4 Codes, but also there's a need for this type of housing product. We have a whole market research team that does a lot of analytics to determine what exactly we feel the market could support, and in this particular location, we determined that we feel that townhomes, as well as the single-family product that we have, could meet different buyers at different stages in their lifecycle within Cottage Grove. Bhat said thank you.

Frazier asked if there were any further questions for staff or the applicant; none were asked. He asked if there was any further discussion on the proposal; nobody spoke.

Frazier said if no one else wants to start, I can start. Okay, so first off, I want to thank everyone for coming tonight. I know most of you probably haven't been to one of these meetings before, so you haven't heard my spiel about how this is the most important form of government because this is the one that's going to directly impact your lives and you all talked about it. This is something that is potentially going to go right in your back yard, these are going to be your new neighbors, and so, you came out tonight to let us know your feelings about that, and I want to thank you for doing that. After tonight, please feel free to come back because every time we have people from the community, who are not involved in these projects, come and give their advice and give their feedback, we find something that all of us have missed, and that's what makes this process better is if people are willing to come out, help us look at things, and give their advice. So, first off, I want to say thank you for that. Second, so, I talked a little bit, and a couple of my questions were about where the property line is, whose property is this trail going to go on because that matters, right? If you bought a piece of property, you can't tell your neighbor what to do with their property, and that's kind of part of what's happening here; the City, under this proposal, is going to own this part of the lake, and so they get to kind of do what they want with their property, within reason. If you wanted to buy that property and do what you wanted to do with it, you have the option to do that, but you can't tell your neighbor what to do with that. Now, I think we're all cognizant that this is

the City doing it, and so, we want to make sure that it's fair to you, but I think the proposals are what we want, just the privacy that we bought back in 2011, nobody else gets that, right? Somebody else buys a home in a vacant farm lot, and they don't buy all the properties next to them, they can't control what's going to happen next to them, and that's what's happening here. So, I think we do want to be cognizant of the fact that this is the City that's going to put in a piece of trail because we should be held to a higher standard than just a normal property owner, but as you heard, the Comprehensive Plan says that's there a trail there; its been planned at least for the past, when did we do the 2040 Plan, it's five years ago, six years ago, nine years ago, ten years ago? So, at least ten years ago, this trail has been in the guiding document that's been approved by all of the other surrounding communities, has been approved by Met Council as this is the plan, it's what's going to happen with the City of Cottage Grove when this property gets developed. And we are bound by the Comprehensive Plan; we can't deviate from the Comprehensive Plan because it will be a violation of the law to do so. And, so, I think, you know, we have to honor that and what we've said, this is what's going to be the plan; but like I said, at the same time, we need to be cognizant of everyone who's here and saying can we change this, can we alter this, can we make sure it doesn't have a giant impact on our lives? It's going to impact you, but let's try to make it the best as we can. So, I guess that's where I'm coming from, that's why I wanted to know how far away we are from the property lines, that we're making sure we can give people who have their homes there, who haven't been planning on this going in there, so they don't have people just kind of waltzing through their back yards. I think that's kind of some of the thoughts that Commissioner Brittain and Commissioner Fisher were bringing up as well is let's look at the landscaping plan to maybe put, I don't know if you can put a berm in there or put some kind of extra landscaping in there to kind of separate the trail from the back yards. And, so, that's, I think, kind of where I am landing on this, is I'd like to see more work from the City and I think to the extent that Pulte's involved in the trail at all, some kind of more work on that kind of front to make this the least disruptive as possible, knowing that we're required to do this by the Comprehensive Plan.

Fisher said first of all, I'd like to apologize for misinterpreting the Zoning Codes, I apologize, I did not mean to be snarky. I agree with you in that this is City-owned property, and the City should be able to do what they want with it; however, this trail does not impact the development of these homes, this trail does not impact the rerouting of Ravine Parkway, this trail does not impact the meat and potatoes of this application. Like, we're talking about a trail on the very southern edge of a big, proud development, and it just is not; to me, it's not a hill to die on, I think we need to find a compromise because it's not, it's just not the meat of this application. I think there's been enough concern raised with what you said about the water level coming up because of where the development is and how the Watershed works, and I don't understand all that because I am a realtor, not an engineer, but there's real concern there. And just hearing these people say that they experience flooding all the time and that there are big trees back there, it just doesn't seem like an efficient use of City dollars to make a trail somewhere where there probably shouldn't be one. So, that's my opinion on it; I think that the development's great, I mean, I feel like it's a little more dense than it should be, but that's just me. I think it's great to have lifecycle housing, to have multiple options for people. I like that all of these people said that they are excited about new neighbors; to me, that says a lot about their community and that they're not against the development, which is really encouraging to me, but this trail is not the hill to die on with this application. Okay, bye. Frazier said thank you.

Brittain said yeah, I agree with, I mean to start with the density, if you take a look to the west, you've got quad homes, there's a lot of varying density out to the west of this, and then it leads into the single family, larger lots out to the east. So, you know, this is a natural transition, you know, from higher density to a little bit medium to low. So, that particular point of it is I see fitting within the Comprehensive Plan. You know, I know that you mentioned that the trail was in the Comprehensive Plan, and it may have been in the, I totally believe you, that you say that it's in there; I don't recall it from previous Comprehensive Plans, and I am concerned, especially with the comments from Commissioner Stephens and her knowledge in the South Washington County Watershed, and the neighbors comments on the water levels rising, we would want to make sure that if we did put a trail in here, that it wasn't affected by flooding or something that is going to compromise the trail over time because then it's just a waste of money. So, if we could do our due diligence there as well, I know you guys do a great job of digging into the details, but to make sure that we're not putting the trail right up next to the property owners' yards, just to get it away from the pond because we think its going to flood, because you can exit into the neighborhood, go through the street, and back in. There's already a planned trail excursion to get around those houses, so I really want to see that looked into hard, that this would be a sustainable thing; from the City's perspective, I'm sure there's some type of Parks and Rec component here that planning has gone into, whether they feel that we need a trail or something along those lines. So, I don't think this is, from the City's perspective, just based on this development, but from the total perspective of our parks and trail systems, but from the past, I know there was concerns about building something back there; so, we just need to be real careful that if we are going to build something, that it's something sustainable and it isn't going to cause problems. And if it does get built, that there should be some mitigation, you know, aesthetically wise, don't put it up right next to the property owners' homes. I know we've done it on lots of applications in the

past where there's screening, extra screening that's done in order to mitigate things along those lines so that there's a balance between the overall public at large and the homeowners that are living there, so. Frazier said all right, thank you.

Frazier asked if there were any further comments or discussion; there was none. Frazier said seeing none, I guess I'll look for someone to make a motion then.

Fisher asked how would we make a motion if we want it to be contingent on them figuring out a compromise on the trail? Like, how do we? Frazier replied here's, I guess, my thought on that is do you want to give, are you asking to give the City and Pulte more time to look at this before we decide on it, or? Fisher said I guess I was going back and referring to the conditions of approval, to see if there's one in particular we can strike or we can ask for; that's all, I'm just trying to rediscuss if they can. Can somebody help me like find where that trail is referenced in the conditions, or? Pierret said so, Commissioner Fisher, I do know the trail is referenced under Construction Agreement, it's Condition #11. Fisher replied okay. Pierret said it says that the Developer shall be responsible for constructing the trail segment around Lake Robert, then continues on regarding the personal property encroachments on Outlot A. Fisher said okay, so, I guess I don't know how to like word it with just striking that; I don't know, does anybody have, can somebody help me so I don't look so stupid? Frazier asked so, are you wanting to just get rid of the trail? Fisher replied well, so, there are pieces of the trail I think that are okay around the north part and around the maybe the east side, and then connecting to the sidewalk that's there. I mean, I don't know; I guess I don't know how to word it. I don't think that there should be a trail between the homes and the pond, whatever; like I just don't think it's efficient. Brittain said in your recommendation, you can recommend changing that particular recommendation with your recommendation. Fisher said right, that's what I'm trying to do. Brittain said exclude the trail going behind those homes, that is something that you can do, and you are the one making the motion, so you have to say that. Fisher said I understand that, I'm just trying to figure out how that's worded appropriately. Brittain said well, you could, as simple as you said, you could say approval subject to the conditions in the staff report, excluding, with the modification of Item #11, to exclude the trail going behind the homes on the north side of the property. Fisher said okay, what Ken said.

Fisher made a motion to approve the application for the Preliminary Plat and the Zoning Amendment, changing it from AG-2 to R-4, which is not R-1, for the proposed Lochridge subdivision, subject to stipulations in the staff report, amending Condition #11 to not allow the trail to run along the north side of the properties on the south side of Lake Robert on 67th Street Bay South and 67th Street Court South. Brittain seconded. Motion failed (3-to-4 vote); no votes from Knable, Frazier, Rasmussen, and Stephens.

Frazier asked if there was any further discussion on the motion.

Rasmussen stated I guess I just feel that this trail would be pretty beneficial to the community, including myself. I don't live in the area, but I'd love to take advantage of a trail around a nice lake, maybe not so nice through the woods, ride my bike on it. You know, if the trail is possible to be constructed there and it's not interfering with the water or the property lines, I just feel it would be a shame to bring it two-thirds of the way around the lake and then maybe just dead end it there or rerouting people now in front of your houses. Is that a better scenario to come take the sidewalk in front of the house, maybe, but I just think if it's possible and it makes sense and it can be done, I feel it would be a nice amenity for everybody in town, is my thought.

Stephens said I would just say that I agree; I think the trail's a great amenity, and this is an opportunity for the City to install the trail without, right, because the developer installs it, correct? I think that if it goes, I mean, it seems like a really good opportunity to just go in front of the homes and then connect back with the lake, but I do think that anybody who likes to go for a walk or a jog, you want a loop; you don't want to go halfway and then turn around and then go halfway again and keep bouncing back and forth until you hit your like 5K, right? So, I'm in favor of the connection, just not, to me, it's not like; I don't know, I don't think it should be removed, I think it should be a full connected loop, so that's just my two cents, I guess.

Knable said so, if we're doing that path, I think it needs to be a full path as well. I don't think you can just have it stop and go a different direction. I would just say, you know, with the City owning it, I think everything you said, but they will do a better job of working with, I think, the residents on what it looks like, so.

Bhat said yeah, I just think maybe we should explore the option of having a boardwalk or something along those lines, so that you can have a complete path; instead of being on an area that is going to be flood prone, maybe we should explore a boardwalk or something along those lines.

Stephens asked could we consider like modifying the motion so that it doesn't just cut out that piece, but it's just looking at alternatives? Frazier replied so, you can move amend her motion, and she can decide if she wants to agree to it or not.

Fisher said I appreciate the thought of having a loop, not being a runner myself, I wouldn't care if it wasn't a loop. I mean, there are lots of places that, you know, you have a trail. I think of one of my favorite spots in Hamlet Park that goes and there's a beautiful bench and it's a dead end; and you sit at that beautiful bench and I have one of my favorite pictures of my kids sitting on that bench, you know what I mean? Like, I think that there's opportunity to use this space without it going in between those houses right there. I don't know, I don't, if you guys want to do the loop, like fine, I'll amend the motion, then it needs to go in front of those houses, but I don't think; I mean, to me, it doesn't matter that much. Frazier said and this is the point I was going to want to clarify anyway, because my understanding of your motion was just that the trail wasn't going to go behind the houses. Fisher said right. Frazier said so, technically, that motion means the City could still build it up to the existing sidewalk and around; that's not precluded by your motion, your motion was just that the trail would not go in the back yards of these houses. Fisher replied correct. Frazier said so, that is the motion right now is that basically the City and the developer are not going to build the trail on the north edge of the property line of these 67th Street Bay South properties. So, they have other opportunities that are not precluded by Commissioner Fisher's motion, at least from my understanding. Fisher replied right, no. Frazier said it's just that they would not go to the north side of those properties. Is everyone clear on that? Fisher replied correct, yes. Frazier asked Stephens does that solve your concern, or do you still want to make an amendment? Stephens replied I think I'm good.

Frazier said okay. Any further discussion on the motion now that we had that clarification? There was none. Thank you for all of you for bearing with us while we do math at the table here. Fisher said sorry, I just didn't want to get it wrong. Frazier said okay; any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none, I will call for a vote on the motion.

After the vote, Frazier said that proposal fails; at this time, is there any further discussion? Otherwise, I'll look for another motion.

Bhat asked can we go with this motion, but the modification for Item #11 would be that the City would take a fresh look at it, and then come to a compromised solution, which would perhaps retain the trail but it won't be right behind the property line of the 67th Street Bay South. Frazier said okay, so I guess I'd be looking for kind of some more definite language then, because, ideally, what's going to happen is this language is going to go to City Council; they would take our recommendation and then City staff and the developer would have to put it into practice, and so, we have to have some definite language as to what we want this to look like, I guess. If your request is we just want you to go back to the drawing board, then I think that's a different discussion we can have; I don't know that staff loves that idea, but Emily, do you want to chime in?

Schmitz replied Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, I was just going to reference there's been some conversation about a boardwalk, and so we are entertaining boardwalk options in several segments of the trail to avoid impact where we can for that paved trail. I think it's very important to reference, you know, cost; I think there was one idea about is that whole southerly section a boardwalk that pushes the trail into the water. I would just caution on the cost associated with that type of trail as an option.

Frazier asked is there any further discussion? Knable said I just don't like the language of being stricken out completely; Frazier said okay. Fisher said it wasn't stricken out completely. Knable said well, I think the ask was that we, the City, doesn't do the trail at all, or they do the connections in the front and take out that part, but I think that part needs to stay in. Frazier said so you'd like to see it pass just as recommended, then? Knable replied as is and see the City stand up and do what they think is right with that piece. Frazier asked so, is that a motion, then, or are you just discussing?

Knable made a motion to approve the Zoning Amendment to change AG-2 to R-4 and the Preliminary Plat, subject to stipulations in the staff report as written. Rasmussen seconded. Motion passed (4-to-3 vote); no votes from Bhat, Brittain, and Fisher.

7. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF DECEMBER 16, 2024

Fisher made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 16, 2024, Planning Commission meeting. Stephens seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

8. REPORTS

A. RECAP OF JANUARY CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Schmitz summarized the actions taken at the January 8 and January 22, 2025, City Council meetings.

Council Member Olsen said first of all, I'm very grateful to be here with you all tonight; as you know, each year when the City Council is readjoined in January, the mayor makes recommendations on various liaisons for various commissions. This year, one of his recommendations was to have me work with the Planning Commission, and I haven't had that opportunity in a few years so I'm very excited for that. Thanks for having me. I also want to thank you all for your service. I know that for at least one, maybe, we're getting to the end of the term, is that right? So, who are we losing, anyone? Or are you all good until next year? Rasmussen indicated he was at the end of his term. Olsen stated so February is when terms kind of start and expire; so, there'll be a little bit of turnover on all of the various City commissions. If you have a desire to continue serving, and you've termed out, I think Ken's been through this about 12 times, something like that. If you term out, you wait for a year and then you can reapply for any commission, including the one that you currently serve on. So, please give that some thought because as a Council, we put a lot of faith in what you bring to us as advice on all of the various issues that you deal with, including challenging issues like the one you had to deal with this evening.

Olsen reported that the City Council held our annual Strategic Planning session; for those of you who don't know what that is, each year in January, the City Council and staff get together for a full day on Saturday, it's usually about 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., give or take, where we look at our strategic objectives for the past and decide if we want to carry those forward into current time and then into the future. We also look back at what have we accomplished tactically with respect to those objectives, and what do we want to do next, and how do we want to approach that? So, it's a really heavy mental-lifting day, but it's a fun day, it's a really good day to kind of dream a little bit, get some ideas out there, and I think you'll find that we have some really neat things on tap this year that we are going to be working towards. Of course, we're all very excited about access to the Mississippi River, down at the new park, that'll be something fun that we'll be working on. We've got the Kingston Park building and the electrical getting upgraded in the next couple of years, electrical this year, building next year. We also have all of our new Water Treatment Plants coming online, so the Low Zone plant is about done, and the High Zone plant will get started here this year. There are some things going on with Holcim that I'm sure you all know about and their desire to maybe expand their operation and do some things differently, so, we'll have to give that consideration. So, it's going to be a busy year, it always seems to go by so stinking fast, and of course, it all comes down to the budget; and it seems like we never stop talking about the budget. We do budget every two years, but even at the Strategic Planning session, everything has to tie back to is it in our Capital Improvement Plan? Is it something that we've been saving for, do we have funding, what kind of third-party funding can we find, etc.

One of the things I like to do as the liaison to whatever commission I'm working with is I like to be very transparent. I like to open up the floor for you to ask any questions you may have about anything that's going on in the City, and provided I'm not limited by an NDA or something like that, I'm always happy to share and try to answer questions to the best of my ability. Keep in mind I'm a Council Member, there's five of us, and you know, we act as a body; so, if there's something that you ask me and it's an opinion, I'll tell you it's an opinion because I can't speak for the body, but you know, I'm definitely very grateful to have been reelected this last year. I look forward to four more years of serving the citizens of Cottage Grove to the very best of my ability. With that, I'll turn it back to you if you have any questions for me.

Frazier said all right, thank you. Any questions for Council Member Olsen? Frazier said I don't see any, thank you very much for being here. Council Member Olsen replied thank you, and I'm always available. Please feel free to reach out any time.

B. RESPONSE TO PLANNING COMMISSION INQUIRIES

None.

C. PLANNING COMMISSION REQUESTS

Frazier asked if there were any requests for staff for our next meeting.

Bhat said so, during the discussions today, we have had several questions on the Jamaica renewal and improvement going from one lane to two lanes on either side. Can we get some more information on that? Is that something that was discussed in some

of those meetings or with the Council? Schmitz replied, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Bhat, we can follow up with some more details of the County's plan for 2028 and where they're at in their planning process. Bhat replied thank you.

Brittain said in regards to that, is Jamaica going to be a City road? Are they turning that over to us? I heard some rumblings. Olsen replied yes, the expectation is that once that road is fully reconstructed, the City will take ownership. Brittain said, so, it's just a matter of time; Olsen replied theoretically, yes.

Frazier said before I ask for a motion to adjourn, I do just want to thank everyone, staff and our commission tonight; I know these meetings are not easy, and I think this is probably one of the only meetings in a while, especially where we've had not unanimous decisions on a motion. So, I want to thank everyone for being cordial about it and being intentional about their discussion on it. Like I told everyone who was here tonight, it makes the decision better in the end if we all can have an honest opinion and respect what we're all saying. So, I want to thank everyone's who left in the room here tonight for working on this project, and hopefully, it will go very smoothly and everyone will be happy with it. With that being said, Item 9 is adjournment, so I'll look for a motion to adjourn.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Rasmussen made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Knable seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote). The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.