

PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, April 18, 2018

#1 Call to Order

Planning Commission Chair Headley called the meeting of the Brainerd Planning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers.

Noted present were Commissioners Burslie, Gorham, Headley, Marohn, Wussow; and Council Liaison Lambert. Noted absent was Commissioner Antolak. Also present was City Planner Ostgarden, and Administrative Specialist Bestul.

#2 Approval of Agenda

MOTION AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONERS LAMBERT AND GORHAM, DULY CARRIED, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

#3 Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting held on March 21, 2018

MOTION AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONERS WUSSOW AND LAMBERT, DULY CARRIED, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING HELD ON MARCH 21, 2018.

#4 New Business

A. Public Hearing – Conditional Use Permit - Southeast Corner of Kingwood and North 2nd Street

City Planner Ostgarden stated everyone is familiar with this property as it was first presented as a rezoning request and then the amendment to the zoning ordinance was passed to allow parking lots as a conditional use in the B-1 (Residential Office) District. The application we are considering is the conditional use permit to allow the parking lot that abuts the property for Thrifty White in the B-6 (Washington Street Commercial) District.

City Planner Ostgarden reviewed photos of the neighborhood and the house that will be demolished to make room for the parking lot. The landscaping plan was displayed and used for a basis regarding the zoning ordinance.

City Planner Ostgarden indicated the first issue deals with meeting the setback requirements for the parking lot in the district which will be met. The applicant had submitted a lighting plan that meet the requirements at the property line on the north side, but there were questions about the east side of the property. A revised plan has been submitted that verifies the light coming from the site will not exceed the maximum amount of foot candles in accordance with the zoning ordinance. The lights that are being proposed are a full cutoff fixture which directs and cuts off light at an angle of 90° or less.

The special B-1 District standards for this class of conditional use are:

Parking Lots provided that:

- 1. The parking lot shall be adjacent to or across an alley from an allowed B-6 (Washington Street Commercial) District use.*
- 2. The parking lot parcel(s) shall be no wider than the boundary line of the primary parcel on which the associated B-6 use is located.*

3. *Overnight parking will be limited to vehicles owned and operated by the business associated with the B-6 site.*
4. *Alley improvements desired by the adjacent property owner shall be approved by the City of Brainerd and improved at the requesting party's expense.*

The parking lot location complies with #1 and #2 of the conditions. Number three will need to be monitored and the property owner will comply with #4.

City Planner Ostgarden stated trees will be planted on the site; five are required but six are being proposed. The total site is needed for open space and the green space on the east side of the parking lot far exceeds the 10% requirement.

City Planner Ostgarden explained stormwater removal will be an underground storage tank that will be located on the property to the south on the Thrifty White parcel with a catch basin line that will flow to the underground tank.

The parking lot will be designed with east/west parking spaces with the potential for headlights shining toward properties to the north, however the screening plan is intended to mitigate the issue.

City Planner Ostgarden displayed photos of two other parking lots in the vicinity that have already essentially changed the character of Kingwood Street. Access to the parking lot will be via an alley onto North 2nd Street with no other access to North 2nd or to Kingwood Streets. The east bound traffic leaving the parking lot may choose to use the light at North 4th Street rather than attempt a left turn from North 2nd Street onto Washington Street.

City Planner Ostgarden explained the intent and purposes of the zoning ordinance which would apply in this situation, along with the Comprehensive Plan goals and strategies as indicated below:

The objectives of the Zoning Ordinance are:

515-1-2: Intent and Purpose.

- A. *Protect the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community and its people through the establishment of minimum regulations governing development and use.*
- B. *This Ordinance shall divide the City into use districts and establish regulations in regard to location, erection, construction, reconstruction, alteration and use of structures and land.*
- C. *Protect neighborhoods.*
- D. *Promote orderly development and redevelopment of land for residential, commercial, industrial, recreational and public areas.*
- E. *Provide adequate light, air, and convenience of access to property.*
- F. *Prevent congestion in the public right-of-way.*
- G. *Prevent overcrowding of land and undue concentration of structures by regulating land, buildings, yards, and density of population.*
- H. *Protect and preserve the natural environment of the City.*
- I. *Encourage the protection of historic and aesthetic resources in the City.*
- J. *Conserve energy through the use of alternative energy systems and conservation through the encouragement of energy efficient structures for commercial, industrial and residential uses.*
- K. *Provide for compatibility of different land uses.*

The following Comprehensive Plan Goal and Strategy supports the proposal:

General Goal #3: Promote community spirit and unity and enhance Brainerd's character and identity.

Strategy

Support the redevelopment of vacant and abandoned sites within the urban core.

Whether the parking lot enhances Brainerd's character and identity is debatable. However, the parking lot is supported by the above strategy.

City Planner Ostgarden stated that the only issue worthy of discussion would be that the screening requirement meets our zoning ordinance minimum standards. The screening must accomplish the purpose of buffering the parking lot, provide visual appeal to the property and screen headlights by limiting the exposure to properties. The City Departments approve the application with no concerns or issues.

Commissioner Marohn questioned the height of the light fixtures being proposed, as the specification sheet indicates 7 ½' tall. City Planner Ostgarden replied he believes the lights are 25' tall but will confirm with the applicant.

Commissioner Marohn asked if the goal of the screening is to screen the parking lot property from the adjacent property. City Planner Ostgarden stated that is one of the goals. Commissioner Marohn asked if this was written in the plan, as he does not think this would be the goal of the screening. He stated his idea of the landscaping is to have it compatible with the neighborhood as an urban street and less about traditional screening.

City Planner Ostgarden stated when these plans were written, it was to ensure the screening being proposed is intended to buffer the headlights, noises and mitigate them. It was not discussed about the type of plants or materials that would be used to instill an "urban" feel to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Marohn asked if there is a plan or an ordinance that states this is the goal. City Planner Ostgarden replied he will research the statements made in the landscape section that were updated in 2009, and if it was not written in that form, he knows the intent of the ordinance in the traditional perspective of blocking the headlights. The property owner decides in what manner this will be accomplished as long as they meet our requirements.

The Chair opened the public hearing at 6:12 p.m.

The Chair welcomed Mr. John Fahning, representing Shingobee Builders and Thrifty White who stated the landscape plan was designed to meet the code requirements and improvements beyond that could be part of the landscape plan.

Commissioner Marohn asked the height of the lights proposed for the parking lot. Mr. Fahning stated he was not sure, but it will depend on the foot candles that are used. The fixture itself is 13" which does not include the pole. They will be close to the building height as a scale standpoint.

Commissioner Marohn stated that 25' in height is high for a residential neighborhood and stated as an urban design standpoint, 13' would be a compatible height with a suggestion of adding a light or two. Mr. Fahning stated that would have to be researched as we need to look at it as a vehicular standpoint. This would be a question for the electrical engineers. One of the things to look at is if the height of the pole

is lowered or if a different pole is used if the output of the fixtures can be scaled down; is the look and the feel appropriate for the project?

Commissioner Marohn asked if the lighting plan is open to suggestions. Mr. Fahning stated that the plan was designed to meet the zoning ordinance requirements for the Conditional Use Permit and further discussion can take place on the final plan.

Commissioner Marohn stated the trees that are in the landscape plan are not types that are planted along Kingwood Street. The types of trees, for example urban type trees, should be used to go along with Kingwood Street to be planted along the boulevard. A continuation of the same tree line should be used as this would be aesthetically pleasing and compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Fahning stated the challenge is that it is designed to code but the preferences of how to proceed with the plan are different to everyone. It's hard to come up with a perfect plan to start, and we are not opposed to suggestions and changes going forward.

Commissioner Burslie asked if they are willing to install some type of fencing along the east, north and west sides to separate the parking lot from the adjacent neighborhood. Mr. Fahning replied that what is gained by doing so; is it purely a separation that will be done with the landscaping or is it to screen the lot? Commissioner Burslie indicated the landscape plan shows short shrubs and flowers and the fence would visually separate the parking lot from the neighborhood. Mr. Fahning stated it gets into the design intent; do you want to separate the two or try to blend it in transition to the neighborhood? One perspective is by installing a fence, it draws a specific line in between two district types versus using landscaping to blend with the neighborhood so it transitions nicely without the "line drawn" on the property. These are issues that can be discussed and negotiated going forward to come up with an agreeable solution.

Commissioner Wussow stated the applicant has indicated that access to the parking lot will be to the alley – was that a requirement or the applicant's choice? City Planner Ostgarden said it is not a requirement. Commissioner Wussow thanked the applicant for doing so and he appreciates the landscaping plan. Mr. Fahning stated there were some legitimate comments and suggestions as this project has progressed and they listened to them and are trying to be a good neighbor.

The Chair closed the public hearing at 6:22 p.m.

City Planner Ostgarden confirmed the lighting poles are 25' in height.

Commissioner Marohn said the ordinance states the maximum light level is one-foot candle at the centerline of the public street. City Planner Ostgarden stated this will meet the standard requirement.

Commissioner Burslie questioned the curb cut for an old driveway on the north side and if it will be removed. City Planner Ostgarden indicated he did not believe it is in the applicants plan to remove but could be added as a condition to meet.

Commissioner Lambert asked where the dumpster will be located on the property. City Planner Ostgarden indicated the dumpster will be part of the development on the southside of the alley where the building is located along the northside of the building with the necessary screening.

Commissioner Marohn stated there are two things he would like to see and is not sure how others feel about it. The first is that the lighting not exceed 13' in height; 13' is a more neighborhood scale of lighting and will require a change to the plan but would like to offer the applicant flexibility in the number of lights in order to keep the height at 13'. Secondly, he recognizes the landscaping plan meets our zoning code requirements, but stated it is a sub-optimal plan in a sense that what we require in the code does not

make sense to him. Mr. Marohn stated he would rather have the vegetation be more conducive to streetscape and compatible to the neighborhood. He would like to see a change in the landscape plan that could be considered as an alternative to the plan as presented with the input from the neighbors.

City Planner Ostgarden stated it is possible to do so, however a plan that does not meet the obscuration requirement cannot be approved.

Commissioner Burslie stated the flowers and shrubs are no taller than 2-3' maybe a few 6' tall but what is the percentage that needs to be met? City Planner Ostgarden stated 50% on the northside and 80% on the east at 6' in height. If more information is desired to verify what is being proposed meets the standard, there is the option to require in the permit after planting the trees, further evaluation may be necessary to be sure it meets the obscuration requirements. This is an area that is important for the neighbors to have the ability to give input into the design. Although it is the responsibility of the city planner to ensure the requirements are met, it is not his responsibility to give an opinion on the aesthetics of the design.

Commissioner Marohn stated ideally there should be two trees on Kingwood, four or five trees along 2nd Street and a row of hedges slightly back from that to delineate the parking area from the walking area.

City Planner Ostgarden indicated the boulevard trees are a responsibility of the municipality to install, and many areas in the city are void of this which is disappointing.

Commissioner Marohn stated to fill a space, such as a parking lot area is by using a fence or a row of hedges. It appears that the ordinance is asking for a "hedge" which would work better in this area along with the trees that are city property.

City Planner Ostgarden stated if it is the desire of the commission that there be street trees along Kingwood and 2nd Streets, it can be requested of the city officials that trees be planted along the boulevard as part of the project and in accordance with the recommended placement. The City has a listing of acceptable trees to plant.

Commissioner Wussow asked if the applicant can answer these questions.

Mr. Fahning stated the ideas that are being discussed are all very acceptable ideas and a plan review will still need to be completed. These ideas and suggestions can be considered at a later date and what the issue tonight is essentially a Conditional Use Permit and if all the requirements have been met. If the plan review states some suggestions during the landscape, they can be addressed then.

Commissioner Marohn asked if the applicant would be comfortable with the Planning Commission approving the Conditional Use Permit with the condition on a final review of the landscape plan.

City Planner Ostgarden clarified that is not the way the application process goes. The plan review is going to be for the project south of the alley – what is being decided tonight is the look and the feel of the parking lot. This is the plan review for the parking lot topic at hand.

Mr. Fahning stated that the Conditional Use Permit was submitted with all the conditions being met as required and as requested. Above and beyond that can always be discussed and we can collaborate together on the details that are agreed upon by both parties which we are absolutely willing to do.

Commissioner Wussow questioned if the applicant would agree to the condition of meeting with the neighbors and staff to work together on the final plan if the commission would use this in the final approval. Mr. Fahning stated as long as it does not delay the process, as we are in a timeframe to complete the project. The challenges with that is everyone has a different opinion of the overall landscaping plan and what becomes the determining factor of what is acceptable.

Commissioner Burslie asked if the property owner directly to the east of the site has been notified of the plans, as they would be affected by headlights. City Planner Ostgarden did not believe so.

City Planner Ostgarden read from the zoning ordinance Section 515-5-2: The City Council must take action on the application after receiving the report of the Planning Commission and shall make a recorded and written Finding-of-Fact and provide the written finding to the applicant within sixty (60) days of receipt of a completed application. If it grants the Conditional Use Permit, the City Council may impose conditions it considers necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare.

Commissioner Lambert questioned since the street trees are the responsibility of the city if anything can be done on the motion. City Planner Ostgarden clarified that the commission may put a condition on the approval for boulevard trees and he will consult the city attorney for the validity of the request.

Commissioner Burslie would approve the application if a condition of a six-foot privacy fence be installed along the east property line with a row of hedges or fence along the north and west, as well as the other proposed vegetation. Commissioner Burslie stated he feels there needs to be a separation between the commercial property and the adjacent residential use.

Commissioner Marohn agrees with the fence suggestion on the east side, however the resident already has a chain-link fence. The resident should be contacted for their input on this concern as long as we follow the city code for fences.

City Planner Ostgarden stated that any condition that the commission desires to put on the application must be clear and not left for him to interpret.

Commissioner Marohn stated the commission does not want to delay the project and suggested the approval of the Conditional Use Permit with the condition that landscaping options be discussed at a later date.

Commissioner Gorham said once the application is approved and the project is moving forward, what happens if an agreement is not reached?

Commissioner Marohn stated the applicant has been working with the City and there is no reason that an agreement cannot be reached.

Commissioner Burslie questioned if the applicant can be asked to install a six-foot fence if the neighbor desires one.

City Planner Ostgarden stated no more questions – we are done with asking the applicant to do something. It is the prerogative of the Planning Commission to put in the conditions that the commission wants them to meet.

MOVED AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONERS WUSSOW AND LAMBERT TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT BASED ON THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS OF FACT AS PRESENTED.

Members Wussow and Lambert voted “aye”. Members Burslie, Headley, Gorham and Marohn voted “nay”. The Chair declared the motion failed.

MOVED AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONERS MAROHN AND WUSSOW, DULY CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT BASED ON THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONDITIONS:

1. The parking lot is part of a (re)development for a pharmacy store.
2. The site contains a vacant lot and a duplex building at the southeast corner of Kingwood Street and N. 2nd Street, on the north side of the alley.
3. The property is zoned a B-1 (Residential Office) District and the property south of the alley is zoned a B-6 (Washington Street Commercial) District, on which there is a vacant residential dwelling and a 5-unit apartment building.
4. The B-6 parcel is proposed for a Thrifty White Pharmacy which is a use permitted in the B-6 District.
5. Parking lots in B-1 Districts across an alley from a permitted B-6 (Washington Street Commercial) District are allowed by Conditional Use Permit.
6. The proposed rezoning area is approximately .33 acres.
7. Property to the west is off-street parking for a restaurant; property to the north is single family residential and property to the east is single family residential.
8. Zoning to the west and east is a B-1 (Residential Office) District and zoning to the north is an R-1 (Low to Medium Residential) District.
9. All applicable Zoning Ordinance requirements such as greenspace requirements, maximum light levels, required tree planting, setbacks, parking stall sizes and aisle widths have been met.
10. The proposed use shall organize vehicular access and parking to minimize traffic congestion in the neighborhood, as access to the parking lot will be via an alley onto North 2nd Street. No other access to North 2nd Street or to Kingwood Street are planned.
11. The proposed use shall be sited, oriented and landscaped to produce a harmonious relationship of buildings and grounds to adjacent buildings and properties. The parking lot has been designed so parking stalls are oriented in an east/west direction. At night, headlights from north bound vehicles entering the lot will be screened from the residential property across Kingwood Street.
 - Landscaping including a mixture of conifers, deciduous trees and shrubs will be installed along the west, east and south side of the parking lot.

12. The proposed use shall produce a total visual impression and environment which is consistent with the environment of the neighborhood. The parking lot will be consistent with the visual impression south of Kingwood Street and the neighborhood, as there are two parking lots within one block north of the alley along Kingwood Street.
13. The Conditional Use Permit approval is supported by the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and Strategies:
General Goal #3: Promote community spirit and unity and enhance Brainerd's character and identity.
Strategy
Support the redevelopment of vacant and abandoned sites within the urban core.

Granting the Conditional Use Permit will support the redevelopment of a vacant site and remove deteriorating residential property.

Conditions:

- The lighting shall be no greater than 13' in height.
- The applicant shall be allowed to increase the number of lights to ensure that the desired coverage is met.
- The landscaping plan be brought back for an alternate review at a subsequent meeting before landscaping is finalized.

In the absence of any type of agreement on an alternative plan, the submitted plan will govern.

Members Headley, Gorham, Marohn, Lambert and Wussow voted "aye". Member Burslie voted "nay". The Chair declared the motion carried.

B. Public Hearing – Noncommercial Greenhouses in Residential Zoning Districts

City Planner Ostgarden indicated the change to the definition in the Zoning Ordinance, Section 2 would be the following:

GREENHOUSE: A building or structure often on a metal or wooden frame constructed chiefly of glass, glasslike or translucent material, which is devoted to the protection or growing of flowers, shrubbery, vegetables, trees, or other horticultural and floricultural products

The following language would be added to Section 17 General Building, Use and Design Provisions:

- b. Number of Buildings. Total number of accessory buildings and garages shall be limited to one of the following:
 - 1) One (1) attached garage and one (1) detached accessory building.
 - 2) Two (2) detached accessory structures BUILDINGS.
 - 3) Should there be zero or one accessory building, a noncommercial greenhouse is permitted, provided the combination of accessory buildings and garages (attached and detached) per lot shall not exceed the maximum size for all accessory buildings on the lot.
 - 4) Should a lot have the maximum number of allowed accessory buildings, one noncommercial greenhouse up to 10' x 12' is permitted, provided the combination of accessory buildings and

garages (attached and detached) per lot shall not exceed the maximum size for all accessory buildings on the lot.

- 5) The following clear material is permitted for greenhouse construction to allow radiant heat from the sun:
- i. Glass
 - ii. Rigid Polycarbonate panels
 - iii. Semi rigid Polyethylene panels
 - iv. Rigid Fiberglass panels
 - v. Rigid Acrylic panels
 - vi. Vinyl

Flexible rolled material is not permitted.

- 6) One noncommercial greenhouse 3'W x 4'L x 5'T constructed with flexible rolled material is allowed in a rear yard.
- 7) Material permitted in this section can be used for parts of a greenhouse not allowing radiant heat.

Number six above has been added to address the concern for a property owner to have a small seasonal and portable greenhouse.

Commissioner Wussow stated a concern on number four with the size of 10' x 12' – this goes back to old language and suggests a change of up to 200 square feet, as it is with any other accessory structure.

Commissioner Marohn and Commissioner Burslie indicated the very first sentence is confusing with the numbering system. Commissioner Marohn suggested number three should be “c.”, number four “d.” and so on. The total number of accessory buildings and garages should state number one or two as the choices.

Commissioner Wussow and Commissioner Marohn both questioned if Section 17 can be revised in the suggested format as shown below:

- b. Number of Buildings. Total number of accessory buildings and garages shall be limited to one of the following:
- 1) One (1) attached garage and one (1) detached accessory building.
 - 2) Two (2) detached accessory ~~structures~~ BUILDINGS.
 - i. Should there be zero or one accessory building, a noncommercial greenhouse is permitted, provided the combination of accessory buildings and garages (attached and detached) per lot shall not exceed the maximum size for all accessory buildings on the lot.
 - ii. Should a lot have the maximum number of allowed accessory buildings, one noncommercial greenhouse up to 10' x 12' is permitted, provided the combination of accessory buildings and garages (attached and detached) per lot shall not exceed the maximum size for all accessory buildings on the lot.
 - iii. The following clear material is permitted for greenhouse construction to allow radiant heat from the sun:
 - a) Glass
 - b) Rigid Polycarbonate panels
 - c) Semi rigid Polyethylene panels
 - d) Rigid Fiberglass panels
 - e) Rigid Acrylic panels
 - f) Vinyl

Flexible rolled material is not permitted.

- iv. One noncommercial greenhouse 3'W x 4'L x 5'T constructed with flexible rolled material is allowed in a rear yard.
- v. Material permitted in this section can be used for parts of a greenhouse not allowing radiant heat.

Commissioner Burslie questioned if they are allowed in rear and side yards only.

City Planner Ostgarden indicated the greenhouses that are intended to be permanent may be built anywhere on the property, provided they meet the required setbacks.

Commissioner Lambert asked if the exclusion of the flexible rolled material is just for the permanent greenhouse, in which City Planner Ostgarden confirmed it is.

The Chair opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

No one came forward.

The Chair closed the public hearing at 7:06 p.m.

MOVED AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONERS LAMBERT AND BURSLIE, DULY CARRIED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE NONCOMMERCIAL GREENHOUSES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS WITH THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN FORMATTING AS PRESENTED.

#5 Public Forum

The Chair opened the public forum at 7:07 p.m.

No one came forward.

The Chair closed the public forum at 7:07 p.m.

#6 Old Business

A. Comprehensive Plan Update – Review of 2004 Comprehensive Plan Goals and Strategies

City Planner Ostgarden gave a brief update to the commission regarding the steering committee and some information that will be presented to them at the meeting on April 19th. In order to move forward with the new comprehensive plan, the committee needs to have information about the community to understand them in the best way possible. The current comprehensive plan, the results of the public outreach sessions and ideas and suggestions will be compiled so a clear understanding of the wants and needs of the community can be reviewed. One of the tasks is having to review the goals and strategies of the 2004 plan to see how well the plan was followed and implemented.

City Planner Ostgarden indicated he went through the 2004 plan and graded each strategy on a scale of zero to ten; zero being nothing was done to ten as fully implemented. It was somewhat difficult to assign points to some of the strategies because they were statements of desires and ideas rather than actual strategies.

City Planner Ostgarden invited the commission to the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee meeting taking place Thursday, April 19th at 4:00 p.m. at the Brainerd Industrial Center. There will be a tour of the center at 3:00 p.m. if anyone is interested.

Commissioner Lambert suggested that we consult with Andy Stone, Transit Coordinator about his ideas and input for the plan.

City Planner Ostgarden indicated he met with Mr. Tad Erickson and it was discussed that technical committees will be formed for the input of the various internal, as well as external departments.

City Planner Ostgarden stated that the American Planning Association has a different grading template on sustainability, which were graded on the 2004 plan. The rating results after using this guide were not very high.

Commissioner Gorham asked what letter grade the Planning Department would give to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan. City Planner Ostgarden replied his opinion would be a D-; some areas were near to approaching a C grade, with others that should not even be graded.

Commissioner Marohn asked what may have caused this low grade in the plan. City Ostgarden replied he feels the following reasons may have been a problem in the progression of the plan. 1) The implementation chapter in the plan was not strong enough to give the guidance that the community needed to proceed. 2) It may be that after the process, there was not enough emphasis given to the importance of having a Comprehensive Plan. 3) It is not the fault of any individual; employee or department, however there was a lack of understanding on the part of leadership in total in the community to complete what was said would be completed. The goals were average, but the methods of implementation and the strategies were weak with many being just ideas and not strategies.

Commissioner Lambert stated she was a part of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan and agrees with what City Planner Ostgarden said. There was not a clear understanding of the importance of the plan and the strategies were more ideas and suggestions.

Commissioner Marohn inquired about where the responsibility lies when it comes to implementation of a comprehensive plan. City Planner Ostgarden replied that the comprehensive plan is a policy document and as with any other policy, ordinance or strategic vision, it would rest with the elected officials. If the will, desire and understanding is not with the elected officials, others cannot be expected to work towards it. The City has some new vision in leadership and elected officials that do understand the importance of such a plan and the implementation of the plan should result in a much different result.

Commissioner Marohn asked if the Planning Commission serves a role in reviewing, implementing or advising council regularly on the implementation of the plan. City Planner Ostgarden replied that yes, the Planning Commission should be emphasizing the importance of the document for the community. The Planning Commission should set the precedence going forward.

#7 Commissioners' Questions/Comments

Commissioner Marohn apologized for not having the time to complete the request to gather information about Kingwood Street and parking concerns. He stated that he will try to get this completed for next months' meeting.

#8 City Planner's Report

City Planner Ostgarden thanked Commissioner Marohn for meeting with city staff recently to show his PowerPoint presentation regarding parking.

#9 Adjourn

The Chair adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

City Planner