

**MINUTES
CITY OF EDINA, MINNESOTA
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
FEBRUARY 13, 2013
7:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Grabiell called the meeting of the Edina Planning Commission to order at 7:00 PM.

II. ROLL CALL

Answering the roll call were Commissioners Scherer, Forrest, Schroeder, Kilberg, Potts, Platteter, Cherkassky, Fischer, Staunton, Grabiell

Members absent: Carpenter

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Meeting Agenda was approved as submitted.

IV. ANNULA MEETING – ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND ADOPTION OF BYLAWS

Chair Grabiell addressed the Commission and informed them it is time to elect new officers. Chair Grabiell opened nominations for Chair.

Commissioner Platteter moved to nominate Commissioner Staunton to serve as Chair. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

No further nominations for Chair were moved.

Commissioner Scherer moved to close the nominations for Chair. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye; Chair nominations closed. Kevin Staunton was elected Chair of the Edina Planning Commission

Kevin Staunton took the Chair and asked for nominations for Vice-Chair.

Commissioner Potts moved to nominate Commissioner Platteter as Vice-Chair. Commissioner Grabiell seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried. No further nominations for Vice-Chair were moved. Nominations were closed. Chair Staunton welcomed Commissioner Platteter as Vice-Chair.

Chair Staunton asked for nominations for Secretary.

Commissioner Platteter moved to nominate Ken Potts for Secretary. Commissioner Scherer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried. No further nominations for Secretary were moved; being none Commissioner Potts was elected Edina Planning Commission Secretary.

V. APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS

Commissioner Platteter moved approval of the January 23, 2013, meeting minutes. Commissioner Grabiell seconded the motion. Commissioner Forrest pointed out on page 4 Commissioner Potts needed to be changed to Commissioner Platteter. All voted aye; motion carried.

VI. COMMUNITY COMMENT

No comment.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Lot Division. Maimares. 5809 and 5813 Tingdale Avenue, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague informed the Commission Thomas J. Maimares is requesting to shift the existing lot line that divides the two properties at 5809 and 5813 Tingdale Avenue. The purpose of the request is to slightly shift the side lot line between these two properties so that the each lot would have more area in the between the home and the side property line, and to eliminate the driveway encroachment at the front lot line.

Planner Teague concluded that staff recommends that the City Council approve the Lot Division of 5809 and 5813 Tingdale Avenue. Approval is based on the findings:

1. The proposed lot line adjustment does not create a new lot.
2. The purpose of the lot line adjustment is to provide additional side yard setback for each home and eliminate the driveway encroachment.
3. The resulting lot area, lot width and lot depth would not change.

Motion

Commissioner Platteter moved to recommend lot division approval based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions. Commissioner Grabiell seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

B. Variance – Kolles. 7380 France Avenue, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague reported that Marketplace Home Mortgage, 7380 France Avenue is requesting a variance to allow a 36 square foot wall sign on the south elevation of the building that does not face a street. Sign ordinance No. 460.05 Subd. 5, allows properties zoned Planned Office District to display one wall sign and one monument sign on street facing facades only.

Teague explained that the applicant recently purchased the subject office building which formerly housed multiple tenants, and is undertaking a considerable renovation project. Included in the renovation work is an improved sign plan. The applicant is in agreement with the size criteria set out for signs in the Planned Office District, however believes that the restriction of only allowing the signs to face a street frontage impedes the ability to identify his building to the same extent that surrounding properties are allowed.

Since the subject building's only street frontage is on France Avenue to the east, the property owner may display a wall sign and a monument sign, 50 square feet and 36 square feet in area, totaling 86 square feet in area abutting France Avenue. The subject request entails installation of a 50 square foot wall sign on the France Avenue elevation which is allowed; and removing the existing monument sign on France, to be replaced by a 36 square foot wall sign on the south elevation of the building, lacking street frontage, thus subject to the variance request.

Planner Teague concluded that staff recommends approval of the requested variance based on the following findings:

- a) The practical difficult is being only one of the three office zoned properties of 14 on the east side of France Avenue from the Crosstown Highway south to Minnesota Drive lacking side street frontage, thus unable to sign the north or south face of the building.
- b) The City has approved a relatively similar sign to be built at the Fidelity building at 7700 France. Fidelity was approved for a wall sign to face a non-street frontage area as part of the final development plan process. Said north elevation abuts an interior lot line, not street frontage.
- c) The request is reasonable in that the applicant is removing the allowed free standing sign on the site. Therefore, overall square footage of signage allowed in this zoning district (86 square feet) is what is being requested.

Approval of the variance is also subject to the following conditions:

1. The wall sign on the south elevation is limited to 36 square feet in area; and is subject to review and approval of a Sign Permit by the Planning Division.
2. Only one sign is allowed on the east elevation not to exceed 50 square feet in area. For a total signage allowed for the building of 86 square feet in area.

Appearing for the Applicant

Gregory Kolles

Discussion

A brief discussion ensued on the reason the sign was located on the south side of the building and removal of the monument sign as a condition of approval.

Mr. Kolles explained that the reason the sign was placed on the south side was due to sight lines. He added the sight lines are better traveling north because of the change in topography.

Motion

Commissioner Scherer moved variance approval based on staff findings 1. a, b, & c and the additional finding that the existing monument sign must be removed, prior to installment of the new sign. Approval is also subject to staff conditions. Commissioner Forrest commented that in her opinion finding 1.b. isn't a finding adding in her opinion previous variances granted shouldn't have a bearing on this variance. Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. Chair Staunton asked Commissioner Forrest if she would like her comment added as a condition of approval. Forrest agreed. Chair Staunton asked Commissioners Scherer and Grabiell if they would accept Commissioner Forrest's comment as a condition of approval; both agreed. All voted aye; motion carried.

C. Variance. Seward. 6937 Cornelia Drive, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planner Aaker informed the Board the subject property is an interior lot located east of Cornelia Drive consisting of a rambler with an attached two car garage. The addition will be a one story addition to the main floor with basement below. The plan is to maintain the existing rambler by adding living space behind the existing home.

The property is subjected to a minimum 5 foot setback for an attached garage and a 10 foot setback for living space. The existing garage on the south side of the home is located 7.9 feet from the south lot line. The existing living space on

the north side of the home is 6.8 feet from the north lot line or 3.2 feet closer than the 10 foot setback allowed.

The ordinance allows 200 square feet of additional encroachment per built floor at an existing nonconforming setback. Unfortunately the garage side conforms to the 5 foot minimum side yard setback at 7.9 feet from the side lot line but not the 10 foot side yard setback for living space. The owners assumed that the side wall of the garage could be extended into the rear yard for a living space addition, however, the addition for living space needs to be 10 feet from the side lot line. The side wall of the garage is also at an angle to the south lot line, so extending it farther into the rear yard brings the wall closer to the lot line as the wall is extended into the back yard.

The property is 9,839 square feet in area with the home and proposed additions occupying 25% of the lot area. The required setback from the side lot line limits the building area of the lot given the existing setback provided by the original home built in 1955. Staff believes it is reasonable to extend the living space behind the garage similar to the setback provided by the north wall of the home.

Planner Aaker concluded that staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the variance.

Approval is based on the following findings:

- 1) With the exception of the variance requested, the proposal would meet the required standards and ordinances for the R-1, Single Dwelling Unit District.
- 2) The proposal would meet the required standards for a variance, because:
 - a. The proposed use of the property is reasonable; as it is consistent with existing conditions and matches the nonconforming setback of the north side of the home.
- 3) The imposed setbacks severely limit design opportunity. The intent of the ordinance is to provide adequate spacing from the side lot line. The addition will provide a similar setback that exists throughout the neighborhood.

Approval of the variance is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions: Survey date stamped: January 28, 2013 and building plans and elevations date stamped: January 29, 2013.

Appearing for the Applicant

James Seward

Applicant Presentation

Chair Staunton acknowledged letters of support from neighbors within 200-feet.

Mr. Seward addressed the Commission and informed them he has lived in his home for seven years; loves the neighborhood, and needs additional space for their family to grow. Seward said their intent is for a modest addition (supported by neighbors) in keeping with the character of the rambler style home, noting the proposed addition is one story. Continuing Seward said one issue that was very important for them was to protect the large tree in the rear yard, adding that tree is a central character to the rear yard. Concluding, Seward said the front street façade will not change, reiterating their intent was to maintain the character of the rambler style home.

Chair Staunton asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak to this issue; being none, Commissioner Grabiell moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion to close public hearing carried.

Discussion

Commissioner Grabiell acknowledged letters of support from the neighbors and added in his opinion the applicant is maintaining the character of the existing home and making every effort to save the large tree in the rear yard. Grabiell concluded that he supports the variance request as submitted, adding it's a prime example of a good remodel.

Commissioner Platteter thanked the applicant for "looking out for the tree".

Motion

Commissioner Grabiell moved variance approval based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions. Commissioner Forrest seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

D. Variance. Einhorn. 6717 Rosemary Lane, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planner Aaker informed the Commission the subject property, is a corner lot located in the north east corner of Rosemary Lane and Valley View Road. The existing home on the property was built in 1967 and consists of a one story rambler with an attached two car garage. The property is subjected to two front yard setbacks, along Rosemary Lane

and Valley View Road. The homeowners would like to add a small mudroom north of their existing garage and add a third garage stall south of the existing garage.

The front yard setback required from Rosemary Lane is approximately 51 feet with the subject home providing a 30 foot setback. The setback required from Valley View Road is 39.7 feet with the subject home providing a setback from Valley View of 36.2 feet. The existing home is nonconforming regarding setbacks from both streets and while not in the area of proposed construction, the existing rear yard setback of 13.3 feet is also nonconforming regarding the required 25 foot rear yard setback.

The subject lot was subdivided off from the lot to the north in 1966, and received a depth variance to allow a lot depth of 110 feet instead of 120 feet and to allow the home to front Rosemary Lane with the side street along Valley View Road. Front yard setback variances were not required to locate the house at the time it was built, so it is presumed that the nonconforming setbacks from both streets must have complied with the ordinances at the time. The home is currently nonconforming along both street frontages and from the rear lot line. Based on buildable area, there is very little opportunity for expansion with the exception of perhaps adding a second floor. The homeowner desires to maintain the structure as a rambler and not alter the character of the neighborhood.

Planner Aaker concluded that staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the variance based on the following findings:

1. The proposed use of the property is reasonable; as it will allow slight modifications to an existing nonconforming structure and will have little if any impact on surrounding properties.
2. The practical difficulties in complying with the ordinances are the existing nonconforming setbacks of the current home and original orientation of the home on the lot with a nonconforming lot depth.

Approval of the variance is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions survey date stamped: December 27, 2012 and building plans and elevations date stamped: December 19, 2012.

Appearing for the Applicant

Mr. and Mrs. Einhorn, property owners and applicants.

Applicant Presentation

Mrs. Einhorn addressed the Commission and explained they have four boys and love

their community; however they need additional space for storage and the parking of future vehicles. Concluding, Einhorn asked the Commission for their support.

Discussion

Commissioner Grabiell stated he had no issue with the proposed mudroom; however, has an issue with the third garage stall.

Chair Staunton asked Commissioner Grabiell if he would feel differently if the proposed third garage stall was proposed as living space; not garage. Commissioner Grabiell responded he was unsure how he would feel about that. Grabiell noted the applicant currently meets the City's 2-stall garage minimum.

Chair Staunton asked Planner Aaker if the proposed additions create lot coverage issues. Planner Aaker responded lot coverage is not an issue.

Commissioner Platteter asked the applicant if they are planning to add additional landscaping to soften garage impact. Mrs. Einhorn explained that currently there is a fence and two large trees in that area, adding they also could do additional plantings in that area.

Commissioner Scherer said this is an unusual situation with very few opportunities for expansion, adding that personally she favors three stall garages; it gets equipment and vehicles off driveways and yards. Concluding, Scherer said she supports the request as submitted.

Commissioner Potts asked Mrs. Einhorn if any steps would be taken to save the trees. Mrs. Einhorn responded that she contacted an arborist who will work with them to implement measures to protect both trees.

Motion

Commissioner Scherer moved variance approval based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. Ayes; Scherer, Forrest, Schroeder, Potts, Platteter, and Staunton. Nay; Grabiell. Motion carried.

E. Subdivision. Kiser. 5633 Tracy Avenue, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague informed the Commission Rodney Helm on behalf of Miriam Kiser is proposing to subdivide the property at 5633 Tracy Avenue into two lots. To accommodate the request the following is required:

1. A subdivision; and
2. Lot width variances from 85 feet to 80 feet for each lot.

Teague explained that both lots would gain access off Tracy Avenue. Within this neighborhood, the median lot area is 12,090 square feet, median lot depth is 136 feet, and the median lot width is 85 feet. The new lots would meet the median area and depth, but would be just short of the median width.

The applicant is proposing to subdivide the property in the same manner as the adjacent property to the east. Teague noted the condition of this oversized lot is generally unique to the Tracy Avenue area.

Planner Teague concluded that staff recommends that the City Council approve the proposed two lot subdivision of 5633 Tracy Avenue and the lot width variances from 85 feet to 80 feet for each lot. Approval is based on the following findings:

1. Except for the variances, the proposal meets the required standards and ordinance for a subdivision.
2. The subdivision would meet the neighborhood medians for lot area and depth, and nearly meet the median width.
3. The proposal is consistent with the lots on this block of Tracy Avenue.
4. The 80-foot wide lot is wider than the general standard required width of 75 feet.
5. The proposal meets the required standards for a variance, because:
 - a. There is a unique hardship to the property caused by the existing size of the property which is two times the size of every lot on the block.
 - b. The requested variances are reasonable in the context of the immediate neighborhood. The existing lot is both larger and wider than most properties in the area, including nearly every lot on the block. The proposed subdivision would result in two lots more characteristic of the neighborhood.
 - c. The variances would meet the intent of the ordinance because the proposed lots are of similar size to others in the neighborhood.
 - d. If the variances were denied, the applicant would be denied a use of his property, an 80-foot wide lot, which is common to the area.

Approval is also subject to the following conditions:

1. The City must approve the final plat within one year of preliminary approval or receive a written application for a time extension or the preliminary approval will be void.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following items must be submitted:

- a. Submit evidence of a Nine Mile Creek Watershed District approval. The City may require revisions to the preliminary plat to meet the district's requirements.
- b. A curb-cut permit must be obtained from the Edina engineering department.
- c. A grading plan subject to review and approval of the city engineer.
- d. All storm water from the proposed homes, driveways, and westerly half of the lots shall drain to Tracy Avenue.
- e. Any disturbance to the roadway caused by the construction of the new homes must be repaired by replacing the asphalt pavement from curb-to-curb and from saw-cut to saw-cut.
- f. A construction management plan will be required for the construction of the new homes.
- g. Utility hook-ups are subject to review of the city engineer.

Appearing for the Applicant

Rodney Helm on behalf of Miriam Kiser and Miriam Kiser, property owner.

Discussion

Chair Staunton asked Planner Teague to clarify how lot sizes are determined; by the average or median. Planner Teague responded it's the median.

Commissioner Scherer commented that if she read the plans correctly the requested subdivision would mirror exactly the lots to its east. Planner Teague responded in the affirmative.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Helm addressed the Commission and introduced property owner and longtime Edina resident Miriam Kiser.

Mr. Helm noted that within the 500-foot neighborhood there are 77 data sets. 22 of the lots range between 80 – 81 feet in width and eleven are at 80 feet. Mr. Helm pointed out while lot width variances are required for each lot the lots will exceed the minimum lot width requirement of 75-feet. Mr. Helm informed Commissioners that Tracy is a State road and the State indicated they have no issues with the subdivision as proposed. Helm also noted both lots are stubbed for water. Concluding, Mr. Helm asked the Commission for their support. Mrs. Kiser echoed that statement.

Chair Staunton asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak to this issues; being none Commissioner Scherer moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Forrest seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Discussion

Commissioner Forrest said she doesn't agree with staff that one of the practical difficulties is the oversized lot. She added in her opinion practical difficulties exist because the median lot width gets skewed by the adjoining properties; however she pointed out lot area and depth exceed the median.

Motion

Commissioner Forrest moved to recommend preliminary plat approval with variances based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions. Commissioner Grabel seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

VIII. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Zoning Ordinance Update – Residential Development – Ken Potts, Arlene Forrest and Mike Platteter

Commissioner Platteter introduced Commissioners Potts and Forrest reporting the three (at the request of the Commission) volunteered late October early November to create a small "working group/subcommittee" to tackle the issues of residential redevelopment as it relates to Code issues and construction management. Platteter said their final goal would be to provide suggestions/recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Commissioners Platteter, Forrest and Potts gave a brief overview and with the aid of graphics indicated where "we" were and where "we" are going. The following points were highlighted:

- Held two public information gathering forums and evaluated input results.
- Presented to the Commission current zoning comparisons between Cities; noting that Edina "fell into" the more restrictive category.
- As mentioned at the last Planning Commission meeting the themes of "concern" appear to fall into two categories; new/remodel, home size and lot modification impacts; and new/remodel home construction project impacts; both fielded the following comments/concerns:
 1. Majority of concerns appeared to be with lots smaller than 75-feet in width.
 2. Concern expressed over the mass/height and setbacks of the new/remodeled properties.
 3. Grading and drainage appeared to be a real issue for many.
 4. Tree and landscaping loss and tree/landscape maintenance after construction.
 5. Access to rear yard. Maintain it.

6. Site debris/trash removal. Enforce newly enacted Construction Maintenance Plan.
7. Work hours/noise. Enforce Construction Maintenance Plan.
8. Parking/traffic. Enforce Construction Maintenance Plan.
9. Material staging. Enforce Construction Maintenance Plan.

The subcommittee stressed the issues are very complicated and there probably is no single solution. Difficulty was noted when balancing individual property rights with community rights and if changes are made the City doesn't want to create more issues than are solved. The following "solutions" evolved from the public input forums and past meetings of the "subcommittee":

- Should there be design review for a neighborhood "fit". Commissioner Forrest commented that would be a difficult and complex issue, adding who would review the designs of all new houses. Platteter agreed and commented that it would be difficult to establish guidelines because Edina has such a wide range of housing styles.
- Establish new zoning or overlay districts with varying requirements (setbacks, height) by lot size. Commissioner Potts noted that the current zoning ordinance requirements were mostly written for lots at or over 75-feet in width. Potts noted much of Edina (especially on the east side) lot widths are less than 75-feet.
- Establish new lot size requirements (setbacks, lot coverage) for the smaller lots.
- How does one maintain current lot size standards but allow subdivisions that create nonconforming lots in areas of nonconforming lots.
- Floor Area Ratio could be used as a tool to limit building mass.
- Garage size and placement of the garage. Reduce the percent of "garage door".
- Impermeable area – how to calculate lot coverage. What should be included, excluded.
- Increase accessory use setbacks (outbuildings, sheds). Three feet is too close in some areas.
- Prohibit egress windows in side yards – suggest staggering setbacks; 5-feet on one side, 10-feet on the other.
- Reconsider the way building height is measured.
- Consider allowing in the "small lot" neighborhoods single stall garages; not two as currently required. This would avoid overbuilding and the large front loading garages found in the smaller lot neighborhoods.

Platteter indicated that this evening no formal action would be taken; however, they would like feedback from the Commission on some of the ideas they outlined before the joint meeting of the Planning Commission and City Council on March 5th. Platteter said at that time the "subcommittee" would present their findings to the Planning Commission and Council. The subcommittee concluded their presentation.

Chair Staunton thanked the three for all their work and thanked them for reaching out not only to the residents of Edina but the business and building community as well. Staunton said the subcommittee opened up a great dialogue.

Discussion

Commissioner Grabiell noted the mention of design review. Commissioner Forrest said design review has been brought up a number of times and pointed out a form of design review is occurring in the Country Club District with strict guidelines; however; Forrest said the difficulty they identified was who would be the design “reviewer(s)”, adding that would be a very difficult element to establish. Platteter and Potts agreed with Forrest pointing out if one only focuses on Morningside that neighborhood is very eclectic and it would be difficult to develop guidelines in that neighborhood and in Edina at large because it’s a completely developed City. Design review can work in a new City, or new subdivision; however, there is difficulty in establishing a design review committee or review group committee in a community that’s completely developed, developed during different times and with differing lot sizes.. The question becomes “what would the guidelines be”?

Chair Staunton agreed and added it may be possible to establish a “general” set of standards that would encompass the entire City - such as roof pitch, garage size, etc.

Commissioner Grabiell asked what the reaction was from the builders/developers at their meeting. Platteter said that the builders expressed frustration with the current way the Ordinance determines building height by stepping back the building for each foot the building height exceeds 15-feet. Platteter said that this current formula (at least from the builder’s perspective) prohibits the construction of specific housing styles. Commissioner Potts said the builders welcomed the Construction Maintenance Plan.

Commissioner Scherer commented that she was intrigued with the findings presented by the subcommittee especially the “hot buttons”. She said with the Construction Maintenance Management plan it appears that staff would need to be even more involved with a project than at present. With regard to mass and lot coverage she said the City may need to reconsider what’s included and excluded in lot coverage. Scherer also agreed that the “outbuilding” question of size and setback may also need to be revisited. Continuing, Scherer stated she understands the aesthetic ramifications of front loading garages and that their appearance may be “too much” for some people; however, there are many Edina residents that don’t want to look at excess “stuff” and excess vehicles on driveways and believe a two and even three stall garage isn’t enough. She concluded she may have difficulty supporting the one stall garage option. Commissioner Platter responded that suggestion would only be for lots 50-feet or less.

Commissioner Grabiell said with regard to front loading garages that he was impressed with the suggestion of limiting the front loading garage to a percentage of the total façade.

A discussion ensued acknowledging the difficulties of a uniform code that applies City wide. It was also observed that the large amount of teardowns in specific

neighborhoods is a big stressor. It was also noted that banks may be more receptive to a teardown/rebuilt because of the uncertainty of the condition of the house, adding remodeling could be even more expensive and/or timely depending on what they find.

Chair Staunton said this dialogue would continue to March 5th with a joint meeting between the Planning Commission and City Council. Staunton said the Commission needs to think about how this is approached.

Commissioner Grabiell said one goal of the Construction Maintenance Management Plan would be to try to avoid situations where the City ends up in Court. Grabiell wondered if the City should develop a hearing or mitigation process if a complaint can't be resolved. Commissioner Platteter agreed, adding the subcommittee discussed creating a fine system for violators.

Planner Teague informed the Commission City Attorney Roger Knutson would be present at the joint meeting. Teague noted there's a lot to consider .

It was further suggested that if Commissioners have other ideas for the Construction Maintenance Management Plan to share their ideas with the subcommittee or City Staff prior to March 5th.

Commissioner Platteter reported that at this time the City of Minneapolis is conducting a small area plan for the Linden Hills neighborhood, adding that maybe the City could find out from Minneapolis more about that process. Planner Teague said he will find out if Minneapolis plans on any outreach with Edina.

Chair Staunton thanked the subcommittee for their work on this issue and reminded Commission of the joint Council and Planning Commission meeting on the 5th.

IX. CORRESPONDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chair Staunton acknowledged back of packet materials.

X. CHAIR AND COMMISSION COMMENTS

Chair Staunton mentioned that last evening the City Council hosted a ULI workshop that was very informative. He added there will be future workshops available for Commissioners to attend and Staff will let up know when those opportunities arise.

Chair Staunton reported that the City has received formal application from Byerly's on their redevelopment proposal and the Commission will hear their request at the next meeting.

XI. STAFF COMMENTS

None.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Grabiell moved for adjournment at 9:20 PM. Commissioner Forrest seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Jackie Hoogenakker

Respectfully submitted