

**MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF EDINA, MINNESOTA
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SEPTEMBER 11, 2013
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Answering the roll call were: Scherer, Schroeder, Potts, Fischer, Platteter, Forrest Grabiell
Absent from the roll: Carr, Kilberg

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Chair Staunton noted the change in Agenda order; Item VII. A. Lot Division will be heard first.

Commissioner Platteter moved approval of the meeting Agenda with the change. Commissioner Scherer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

IV. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Potts Moved approval of the August 28, 2013, meeting minutes. Commissioner Scherer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

Chair Staunton asked if anyone would like to speak; being none, Commissioner Potts moved to close community comment. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted aye; public comment closed.

VI. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Lot Division – 5100 Mirror Lakes Drive/Interlachen Country Club

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague reported that Michael Gorman is requesting to shift the existing lot line that divides his property at 5100 Mirror Lakes Drive and the Interlachen Country Club property. The purpose of the request is to shift the rear lot line of the Gorman property into the golf course property to match a fence line that was installed by the previous owner of 5100 Mirror Lakes Drive.

Teague concluded that staff recommends that the City Council approve the Lot Division of 5100 Mirror Lakes Drive and the Interlachen Golf Course subject to the following findings: The proposed lot line adjustment does not create a new lot; the division legally establishes the lot line that has been used in practice as a result of the previous property owner’s installation of a fence on the golf course property; and the resulting lots are still larger than most lots in the area.

Motion

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

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Variance. Casey Holley. 5616 Woodcrest Drive, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planner Aaker reported that the subject property is located on the west side of Woodcrest Drive consisting of a 2 story walk-out home with an attached two car garage. The home backs up to a pond and provides a 23 foot setback from the water body. The zoning ordinance requires a minimum 50 foot setback from naturally occurring lakes, ponds and streams. The existing home is nonconforming and is 27 feet into the required setback. Over three fourths of the home is within the nonconforming pond setback.

Continuing, Aaker explained that the property owners would like to expand the second floor to include two new Bedrooms. The second floor addition will match the existing nonconforming setback of the back wall of the home. There is no opportunity for a first floor expansion due to lot coverage requirements and the living room on the front side of the home has a vaulted ceiling and is not conducive to a second floor expansion. The zoning ordinance requires a minimum 50 foot setback for structures near a pond. The ordinance has been amended as required by the Department of Natural resources over the years with increased setbacks required from all water bodies, regardless of where the existing structure is located. The City of Edina retains the authority to process variances from water body setbacks.

Planner Aaker noted the proposed second story addition complies with all of the setback and height requirements with the exception of the existing nonconforming setback from the pond. The only opportunity for expansion of the home is to the second floor.

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

- The proposed use of the property is reasonable; as it slightly alters existing conditions without reducing setback or impacting the surrounding neighbors.
- The imposed setback and existing house location do not provide opportunity for an increase in second floor area
- The original placement of the home closer to the pond than currently allowed prohibits expansion on the second floor without the benefit of a variance

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

- 1) Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:

Appearing for the Applicant

Mr. and Mrs. Holley

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Holley addressed the Commission and informed them they purchased their home two years ago and at that time they weren't aware of the setback requirement from the pond and they were already non-conforming. Mrs. Holley noted that they are staying within the existing footprint.

Discussion

Commissioner Platteter asked the applicants if they "heard" any objections or concerns from immediate neighborhoods. Mrs. Holley responded that to date they haven't received any negative comments from neighbors.

Public Hearing

Chair Staunton asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak to the issue; being none Commissioner Scherer moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. All voted aye; public hearing closed.

Further Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Potts commented after reviewing the building plans and aerial it appears that the subject house is the same distance from the water as neighboring properties. Potts pointed out the applicant is building on top of the existing house, not adding to the footprint, concluding that he finds the request reasonable and can support the variance as presented.

Commissioner Fischer stated he agrees with Commissioners Potts comments, adding in his opinion the hardship is very clear. Without variance approval there would virtually be no

opportunity for the property owners to increase the square footage of their home without that approval.

Motion

Commissioner Fischer moved variance approval based on staff findings, subject to the staff conditions and noting without the aid of a variance there is no opportunity for the property owner to increase the size of their home. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

B. Preliminary Plat. Scott Busyn. 6609 Blackfoot Pass, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague informed the Commission Great Neighborhood Homes Inc. on behalf of Douglas Johnson is proposing to subdivide the property at 6609 Blackfoot Pass into two lots. The existing home would be torn down, and two new homes built on the new lots. The new home on Lot 1 would be located generally where the existing home is located. The home on Lot 2, would be located toward the street in an area away from the adjacent home to the south, to avoid large Oak trees and some of the steeper slopes on the site.

To accommodate the request the following is required:

- 1. A subdivision;
- 2. Front yard setback variance from 100 feet to 45 feet for proposed Lot 2.

Teague explained that both lots would gain access off Blackfoot Pass. Within this neighborhood, the median lot area is 27,131 square feet, median lot depth is 183 feet, and the median lot width is 146 feet. The new lots would meet the median width, depth, and lot size requirements. A new home could be built on Lot 2 without the need for a variance, however, in doing so some of the best trees on the site would be removed (large Oak trees); more slopes would be disturbed, and the home would be located much closer to the existing home at 6705 Cheyenne Trail.

Planner Teague concluded that staff recommends that the City Council approve the proposed two lot subdivision of 6609 Blackfoot Pass with a Front Yard Setback variance for Lot 2 from 100 feet to 45 feet from Blackfoot Pass and Cheyenne Trail based on the following findings:

- 1. The proposed Plat meets all required standards and ordinances for a subdivision.

2. The subdivision would meet the neighborhood medians for lot width and depth and area.
3. The proposal meets the required standards for a variance, because:
 - a. The practical difficult unique to the property is caused by the large mature Oak trees and slopes on the east half of Lot 2 where a code compliant building pad would be located. These are natural conditions, not caused by property owner.
 - b. The requested variances are reasonable in the context of the immediate neighborhood. There are two homes with similar front yard setbacks at 6621 and 6624 Cheyenne Trail.
 - c. There is 18-20 feet of green space in the right-of-way of Cheyenne Trail, which would result in a 65-foot setback from the edge of the paved roadway.
 - d. The variance results in the saving of mature Oak trees, protection of slopes, and moves the home further away from the existing home at 6705 Cheyenne Trail.

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. If required, submit evidence of Nine Mile 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. Utility hook-ups are subject to review of the city engineer.
 - d. Grading and drainage plans specific to any proposed house would be reviewed at the time of building permit, and shall be subject to review and approval of the city engineer. Drainage from any new home, garage or driveway would have to be directed to the street.
3. Any new home on Lot 2 would be limited to a ridge line height of 35 feet.
4. A 10-foot conservation easement must be established along the lot lines to preserve the vegetation areas along the streets and along the north and south lot lines.
5. A slope and tree conservation easement must be placed over the large Oak trees and slope areas to be preserved by moving the home toward the street.

Appearing for the Applicant

Scott Busyn, Great Neighborhood Homes

Discussion

Chair Grabiell asked if the proposed subdivision conforms to the subdivision ordinance. Planner Teague responded in the affirmative. Commissioner Grabiell pointed out the slopes on the property and asked if City ordinance addresses slopes. Planner Teague responded City ordinance addresses slopes in excess of 18%. Teague noted this site contains steep slopes; however, it meets the ordinance pertaining to slopes.

Commissioner Fischer stated he was struck by the diagram indicating the 500-foot neighborhood, adding in his opinion the “500-foot neighborhood” appears to contain two completely different neighborhoods. Fischer stated he struggles with the difference between these two different neighborhoods adding to him this subdivision feels wrong.

Applicant Presentation

Scott Busyn addressed the Commission acknowledging that Indian Hills is a very unique neighborhood. Busyn added he believes what he has presented works best with the sloped topography of the lot. Busyn explained that he sent a letter to all the homeowners within the 500-foot neighborhood informing them of the proposed subdivision and also held a neighborhood meeting at the site on August 8th. Busyn said the neighborhood meeting was attended by a number of the adjacent neighbors. Busyn reported as a result of that meeting he is proposing a 10-foot conservation easement to ensure that the wooded look of the property remains.

Concluding, Busyn said he was open to questions or any ideas the Commission may have on this proposal.

Discussion

Commissioner Forrest asked Mr. Busyn how he plans on implementing the conservation easement. Busyn responded he would work with the City Forrester on identifying the trees that need to be saved within the 10-foot conservation easement. Planner Teague added that the conservation easement could be handled similar to the easement that was placed on the Acres DuBois plat. If approved the easement would be recorded with the plat. Commissioner Forrest noted that this issue was previously tabled and questioned the reason. Mr. Busyn responded that he tabled the subdivision to work out and add the conservation easement to the proposal.

Commissioner Platteter referred to the grove of oak trees on Lot 2 and asked if the conservation easement would be expanded to capture those oaks. Mr. Busyn responded that Planner Teague suggested that the conservation easement includes those trees; however, much depends on final house placement; with or without variance. Neighbors also indicated they would like to retain the stone retaining wall on the south end of Blackfoot Pass and Cheyenne Trail.

Commissioner Scherer noted the Commission is in receipt of letters from neighbors opposing the project and asked Mr. Busyn if during the neighborhood meeting neighbors indicated which building pad location they preferred on Lot 2. Mr. Busyn responded that neighbors indicated they want the site to retain its forested look and maintain privacy. Busyn stated he is open to each option and would do whatever the Commission suggests with regard to Lot 2.

A discussion ensued on the sites steep slopes, grading, retaining walls and drainage with Commissioners acknowledging this site is unique because of the slopes and the natural wooded nature of the area. Commissioners stressed if approved careful attention needs to be paid to drainage to ensure site disruption doesn't negatively impact the site or the surrounding neighbors.

Chair Staunton opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing

The following residents addressed the Commission and spoke in opposition to the request by Great Neighborhood Homes to subdivide 6609 Blackfoot Pass into two (2) single dwelling unit lots.

T. Dev, 6804 Cheyenne Trail, Edina, MN

Charles and Liberta Ledder, 6709 Cheyenne Trail, Edina, MN

Tim Keane, attorney representing residents of Indian Hills

David Evinger, 4 Merilane, Edina, MN

James Schwender, 6700 Cheyenne Trail, Edina, MN

Pat Kreuziger, 6705 Cheyenne Trail, Edina, MN

William Lund, 6308 Indian Hills Road, Edina, MN

David Frauenshuh, 6401 Indian Hills Road, Edina, MN

Mary Swenson, 6617 Cheyenne Trail, Edina, MN

Residents that testified expressed the following:

- Residents indicated they purchased their homes in the Indian Hills neighborhood for the natural wooded nature of the area, its larger lots, winding roads and privacy.
- Residents of the area expressed the opinion that the “500-foot neighborhood” established by ordinance captures two completely different neighborhoods; and does not adhere to the original Indian Hills plat. The smaller residential suburban lots (east of the subject site) were included in the calculations skewing the outcome and negatively impacting the character of the area.
- The Planning Commission has the discretion to deny the preliminary plat based on character.
- The loss of existing vegetation and the disruption of the steep slopes would change the character of the lot and neighborhood even with the variance option on Lot 2.
- Residents acknowledged the two building pad options for Lot 2; one conforming and one requiring a variance, reiterating disruption would occur regardless.
- To provide new building pads there is the potential for construction of high retaining walls and also the potential for drainage problems as a result of building pad placement and grading of the site.
- Vehicle and pedestrian safety is important pointing out the streets in the area are winding and the street also curves along the subject site.
- Driveway placement is a concern; again because of the safety issue.

Chair Staunton asked if anyone else would like to speak to the issue; being none, Commissioner Potts moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion to close the public hearing approved.

Mr. Busyn addressed the Commission and explained in providing two building pad locations for Lot 2 they felt it would make things better and create a better plat. Busyn said their goal is to pull the building pads away from the lot lines to ensure privacy and accommodate the proposed conservation strip. Continuing, Busyn reported that extensive soil testing was done to ensure that any redevelopment would improve the site not negatively impact it. Concluding, Busyn stated all testing supported the position that the site can accommodate two building pads.

Commissioner Scherer asked Planner Teague to clarify the action for this proposal. Planner Teague responded the Commission can recommend denial or approval, adding if the Commission recommends approval they need to stipulate what option they want for Lot 2; variance or no variance.

Commissioner Potts stated in his opinion due to multiple factors the subject site should remain one lot. Potts agreed with the observation that the Indian Hills neighborhood is different from the neighborhood to its east. Potts noted to redevelop this site too much disruption would occur. Vegetation would be loss and the site would require extensive grading and retaining

walls. Potts concluded as previously mentioned if approved the change to neighborhood character would be dramatic.

Commissioner Grabiell pointed out the project as submitted meets subdivision ordinance requirements. Grabiell said he also understands the property owners desire to maximize the real estate value of his property. With respect to trees it is difficult because at this time the City of Edina doesn't have a tree ordinance. Continuing, Grabiell acknowledged that the character of the 500-foot neighborhood is varied. Concluding, Grabiell said from the plans presented it appears Mr. Busyn attempted to mitigate the issues of drainage, tree loss etc. Grabiell said he also appreciates Mr. Busyn limiting building height to 35-feet.

Commissioner Scherer stated this is a tough issue for the Commission; however, she continues to have concerns about drainage, tree loss, driveway safety, etc. Scherer said taking all things into consideration that she cannot support the request as submitted.

Commissioner Schroeder asked Planner Teague if the City defines neighborhood character. Planner Teague responded City ordinance doesn't define neighborhood character. Continuing, Schroeder said specific factors are unique to Indian Hills and if the Commission recommends approval of this request the essential character of Indian Hills would change.

Commissioner Forrest acknowledged she has been going back and forth with this proposal. She stated she agrees the City doesn't define neighborhood character; however, would the "sense" of place be compromised if approved. Forrest added she agrees that Mr. Busyn has given a lot of thought to this project; adding she could support the proposal with specific conditions. Concluding, Forrest said to would like to see more creativity in building plans.

Commissioner Fischer said when he views this project it appears to him that it's one lot for one structure. Fischer did acknowledge that neighborhood character can be changed one parcel at a time; however, the builder has an excellent reputation and he would hate to take a risk with another builder.

Motion

Commissioner Grabiell moved to recommend preliminary plat approval based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions.

Motion failed for lack of second.

Commissioner Schroeder moved to recommend denial of the preliminary plat based on the findings that if approved the subdivision would render the lot out of character with the neighborhood. Commissioner Scherer seconded the motion. Ayes; Scherer, Schroeder, Potts, Fischer, Platteter, Forrest. Nay, Grabiell, Staunton. Motion to deny carried 6-2.

C. Preliminary Plat. John Adams on behalf of Ted E. Warner, 5 Merilane, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planned Teague reported that John Adams, on behalf of property owner Ted Warner is proposing to subdivide the property at 5 Merilane into three lots. The existing home is located in the middle of the property, and would remain as proposed. A new driveway would be constructed to serve the existing home, as the current driveway would be located on proposed Lot 3. The existing driveway would be used for access to a new home on Lot 3. To accommodate the request the following is required: Preliminary & Final Plat.

Continuing, Teague explained that the proposal meets all minimum lot size requirements. Within this neighborhood, the median lot area is 48,249 square feet, median lot depth is 277 feet, and the median lot width is 192. All three lots would gain access off Merilane.

Planner Teague concluded that because the proposed subdivision meets all of Edina's Zoning Ordinance requirements; recommend that the City Council approve the proposed three lot subdivision of 5 Merilane.

Approval is based on the following findings:

1. The proposal meets all the required standards and ordinances for a subdivision.
2. The applicant has located the driveways and home to minimize tree and slope disturbance.

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. Park dedication fee of \$10,000 must be paid prior to release of the final plat.
3. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following items must be submitted:
 - a. Submit evidence of a Minnehaha Creek Watershed District approval. The City may require revisions to the preliminary plat to meet the district's requirements.
 - b. Curb-cut permits must be obtained from the Edina engineering department. Driveway plans must be consistent with the proposed grading plan to preserve as many trees as possible.
 - c. A grading plan subject to review and approval of the city engineer.

- d. A construction management plan will be required for the construction of the new homes.
- e. Utility hook-ups are subject to review of the city engineer.

Appearing for the Applicant

John Adams, Coldwell Banker

Applicant Presentation

John Adams introduced Ted Warner property owner and Mark Gronberg Engineer.

Mr. Adams informed the Commission the current Warner house will remain and the intent is to build new homes on Lots 1 and 3. Adams told the Commission the Warner family hired Kramer to custom design and build the new homes. Adams noted that as proposed the subdivision meets ordinance requirements. He also reported he met with adjoining neighbors to discuss the proposed plat. Continuing, Adams said to accommodate the new building pads little grading would occur, attention would be paid to driveway placement and the existing vegetation would be retained where possible. Concluding, Adams asked the Commission for their support.

Ted Warner addressed the Commission and explained that he grew up in the house, adding the family takes this subdivision very seriously and believes the layout of the proposed lots would work. This subdivision would also provide them the opportunity to remain in the neighborhood.

Chair Staunton opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing

The following residents addressed the Commission and spoke in opposition to the request by John Adams on behalf of Ted Warner to subdivide 5 Merilane into three (3) single dwelling unit lots.

Mark Genau, 6 Merilane, Edina, MN

Dave Evinger, 4 Merilane, Edina, MN

James Ganley, 4704 Merilane, Edina, MN

Mike Callan, 10 Merilane, Edina, MN

Mary Pohlada, 7 Merilane, Edina, MN

Sandy Genau, 6 Merilane, Edina, MN

Pat Maloney, 5804 Mait Lane, Edina, MN

Phil Broat, 4820 Rolling Green Parkway, Edina, MN

Tom Owens, representing Ms. Pohlad, 7 Merilane, Edina, MN

Residents that testified expressed the following:

- The plat as presented creates three lots; however, to comply with Zoning Ordinance requirements the three building pads have been clustered at the top of the hill virtually “cramming” the new homes on top of the existing homes at 6 and 7 Merilane.
- The proposal as submitted negatively impacts the character of the Rolling Green neighborhood. If subdivided to comply with the Zoning Ordinance there will be five homes in close proximity to each other. Rolling Green is not a “high-density” neighborhood.
- Residents purchased their homes in Rolling Green for the large lots and generous spacing between homes. This subdivision would compromise those standards.
- If approved to comply with the Zoning Ordinance these three new homes wouldn’t have rear yards.
- The Commission has the discretion to deny the plat based on character and symmetry of the neighborhood.
- There is the concern if the three lot subdivision is approved that slowly the neighborhood “average” will change piece by piece with lots becoming smaller and smaller over time.
- Consider a two lot subdivision; not three. Consider variance for house placement.
- There is an issue of vehicle and pedestrian safety. The subject lot is curved; a reversed pie and a traffic study should be conducted.

Charlie Carpenter, attorney representing the applicant addressed the Commission and stated the plat as depicted meets the subdivision ordinance requirements and in their opinion makes sense. Carpenter also noted that the applicant has indicated they would minimize any disruption to the site through driveway placement and the retention of existing vegetation.

Chair Staunton asked if anyone else would like to speak to the issue; being none Commissioner Platteter moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Discussion

Chair Staunton suggested that the Commission meet with the City Attorney regarding subdivisions to clarify what action the Commission can take when a plat technically meets Ordinance requirements. Planner Teague said he would speak with the City Attorney, Roger Knutson and set up a work session to discuss subdivision and other planning issues.

Commissioner Schroeder stated it appears to him that this subdivision feels more like in-fill development, adding if approved there will be a distinct change in this neighborhood.

Commissioner Grabiell said the applicant has indicated they would do their best to retain the vegetation along Merilane and minimize driveway placement, adding he can support the subdivision request as submitted.

Motion

Commissioner Grabiell moved to recommend preliminary plat approval for 5 Merilane based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions.

Motion failed for lack of second.

Discussion

Commissioner Scherer stated it's very obvious to her that the subdivision as presented creates three pie shaped lots that without the relief of a variance from the Zoning Ordinance would cluster three homes at the top of the hill. Scherer reiterated the clustering of homes bothers her; however, a variance may mitigate that issue.

Commissioner Fischer stated he struggles with this request, adding the plat as presented complies with the Ordinance and provides three buildable lots, adding the applicant has indicated from the street that they intend to minimize driveway placement and preserve trees and vegetation along the street. Fischer did acknowledge this would be a change.

Motion

Commissioner Schroeder moved to recommend denial of the preliminary plat for 5 Merilane based on the finding that the subdivision as proposed would change the character and symmetry of the Rolling Green neighborhood, and in particular denial is based on changes to the character and symmetry that would occur as the result of new house placement in close proximity to existing homes. Commissioner Scherer seconded the motion.

A discussion occurred on the character and symmetry of the Rolling Green neighborhood. It was pointed out that the lots on the west side of Merilane are platted completely different from the lots to the east. It was further noted that spacing between the homes on the west

side of Merilane is generous; however, if the subdivision is approved and house placement occurs as presented the new homes on the east side of Merilane would be clustered together at the top in close proximity to each other and the existing homes on Lots 6 and 7 Merilane- completely out of character with the neighborhood.

The discussion continued with Commissioners acknowledging that the presented preliminary plat meets Subdivision Ordinance requirements for area, width and depth and if the subdivision were approved it doesn't necessarily mean the houses would be built as depicted. The Zoning Ordinance provides the opportunity through the variance process to be flexible with house placement.

It was further noted that the applicant has the option of withdrawing the request to revise the plat to include front yard setback variance options or the Commission can vote on the motion.

Mr. Adams in response to the discussion on character and symmetry and front yard setback/house placement stated that the reason the new homes are positioned with such deep front yard setbacks is to match the front yard setbacks established by the neighboring properties. This is a requirement of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ayes; Scherer, Schroeder, Potts. Nays; Fischer, Platteter, Forrest, Grabiell, Staunton. Motion failed.5-3.

VIII. CORRESPONDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chair Staunton acknowledged back of packet materials.

IX. CHAIR AND COMMISSION COMMENTS

Chair Staunton welcomed Mike Fischer back to the Commission. Staunton explained the City Council appointed Mike Fischer to replace Commissioner Carpenter who recently resigned from the Commission.

Chair Staunton commented that staff is continuing their work on finalizing the Commissions 2014 Work Plan.

Continuing, Staunton reiterated that staff is also working on setting dates for a work session with Roger Knutson, City Attorney and Cindy Larson, Redevelopment Coordinator. Planner Teague responded he would work on scheduling work sessions; adding he believes October 9th would work well for Cindy Larson. Commissioner Fischer said in the work session with Roger Knutson he would like to discuss and ask for clarification on the 500-foot neighborhood requirement previously mentioned by Chair Staunton. Questioning if the 500-foot

neighborhood establishes the neighborhood or can the Commission rely solely on character and symmetry. Commissioner Potts said he would like Cindy Larson to provide the Commission with examples of what she's found in the field. Chair Staunton told Commissioners if they have any questions for Roger or Cindy to e-mail those questions to Planner Teague prior to the work sessions.

Commissioner Platteter informed the Commission he, along with Commissioner Carr attended their first Living Streets meeting.

Commissioner Grabiell commented in reference to the Commission's action on the previous subdivision that in his opinion the Commission didn't send a clear message to the Council on where the Commission stands.

Chair Staunton said the Commission could discuss subdivision at the work session with Roger Knutson.

X. STAFF COMMENTS

Planner Teague apprised the Commission that the City Council denied the two-lot subdivision request for the Shanight property at 5612 Tracy Avenue; however at their last meeting they referred the subdivision request back to the Commission for re-review. Council further directed the applicant to prepare another plat reflecting their objection of a shared driveway for both lots. Teague stated he believes the Commission will hear this request at their second meeting in October.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Scherer moved to adjourn; Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. All voted aye; meeting adjourned at 9:45 PM

JACKIE HOOGENAKKER

Respectfully submitted