

## **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES - CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS**

Tuesday, December 2, 2025 - 7:00 p.m.  
City Council Chambers - 8150 Barbara Avenue

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Weber called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### **2. ROLL CALL**

Commissioner(s) Present: Jonathan Weber (Chair)  
Scott Clancy (*Vice-Chair*)  
Lance Twedt (Secretary)  
Aida Schaefer  
Jason Teiken  
Connor Gosell  
Robert Heidenreich  
Amy Hunting  
Dennis Wippermann

Commissioner(s) Absent: None.

Staff Present: Kevin Shay, Planning Manager  
Ben Schneider, Senior Planner  
Stacy Bodsberg, Community Development Support Specialist

### **3. ADOPT AGENDA**

Motion by Wippermann, Second by Hunting, to Approve the Agenda as Published.

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0      Motion Carried.

### **4. CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **A. Minutes of the November 5, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting.**

Motion by Teiken, Second by Schaefer, to Approve the Minutes with the addition to Commissioner Schaefer's comment on the Culver's item (supporting the project specifically due to lack of interest in the site from a bank).

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0      Motion Carried.

### **5. PUBLIC HEARING**

**A.** Request for a Variance to allow a garage addition 20 feet from the front property line, whereas 30 feet is required, at 6802 Dawn Way.

Motion by Clancy, Second by Schaefer, to Adopt an Email into the Record.

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0      Motion Carried.

### **Reading of Public Notice**

Secretary Twedt read the Public Hearing Notice.

### **Presentation of Request**

Planning Manager Shay presented the staff report.

#### Background

Existing Zoning: R-2, Two-Family Residential  
Guided Land Use: LDR, Low Density Residential

There is a single-family home on the lot. The Variance request is a 10-foot encroachment into the front yard setback (20 feet rather than 30 feet).

This request was previously submitted in 2019 as part of the applicant's renovation of their bathroom for accessibility. Staff and Planning Commission recommended Denial of the Variance, but City Council approved it due to the 80-foot right-of-way on the adjacent street. Because the applicant did not enact the garage renovation part of the project within the two-year timeframe, the Variance expired.

#### Variance Criteria Evaluation

- Harmony with City Code and Comprehensive Plan: Not Met
  - The intent of setbacks is to create a uniform look. There are exceptions for uncovered access ramps and porches, but this request would set a precedent for others to request 20' setback, changing the character of the neighborhood.
- Use of the property in a reasonable manner: Met
  - Garage use is consistent with R-2.
- Circumstances are unique to the property and not created by the landowner: Not Met
  - In doing the bathroom renovation, the applicant created the issue with the garage.
- Alter the essential character of the locality: Not Met
  - Front yard setbacks are more impactful to the aesthetic and character of the neighborhood than rear or side setbacks.
- Does not rely on economic considerations alone: Met
  - Applicant is not making the request due to economic considerations alone.

#### Recommended Action

- Motion to recommend Denial of the Variance for a reduced front yard setback for a garage addition at 6802 Dawn Way.

### **Planning Commission Discussion**

Chair Weber stated that if the bathroom additions were undertaken due to getting the Variance from City Council, it would be understandable for the applicant to continue with the renovation as initially planned.

Planning Manager Shay stated that the bathroom renovation did not require a Variance. The Variance was granted in 2019, with a two-year time frame, and because the applicant did not request an extension before expiration, the approval lapsed.

Commissioner Schaefer inquired as to what has changed since prior approval of the Variance in 2019.

Planning Manager Shay stated that the 2019 Variance request was for both the bathroom renovation and the garage expansion (the bathroom now extends into the existing garage, so the 10' encroachment request would be used to make up for the lost garage space.)

Commissioner Schaefer confirmed with Planning Manager Shay that the initial Variance request was the same (a 10' encroachment into front setback).

### **Opening of Public Hearing**

Carol Wold Sindt, 6802 Dawn Way, Applicant, stated that she received the staff report, and understood it. She said that her family was unable to go forward with the garage expansion as planned due to the COVID-19 pandemic affecting contractor availability. She said that her husband made the initial request but then had to deal with some medical issues, and he passed away earlier this year. She said that she was not aware of the two-year time limit on the Variance. She asked the Commission to consider the difficulty of having a disability and getting out of the car onto an icy driveway.

Matthew Sindt, 3876 Raspberry Ridge Road, Prior Lake, is the son of the applicant and stated that he is present to support his mom.

Commissioner Wippermann said that he understands staff's assessments of the criteria and that there is no legal obligation to approve the Variance. However, since the Council approved the same request in 2019 due to finding practical difficulty (and that practical difficulty still existing), he said that he would not want to deny the Variance.

Chair Weber asked Planning Manager Shay to explain which properties are affected by the wider right of way (80 feet versus 60 feet).

Planning Manager Shay said that seven properties on Dawn Way are affected. When those properties were developed, the street was identified as a collector street, so a wider 80-foot right of way was provided, but subsequent planning changed that to the standard 60-foot right of way for the rest of the properties on Dawn Way.

Chair Weber asked whether, with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan now providing a 60-foot right of way on the rest of Dawn Way, those seven properties would get the 10 feet added back on.

Planning Manager Shay clarified that the original right of way would not be vacated due to existing utilities in the area.

Chair Weber closed the Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m.

### **Planning Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Hunting commented that she did not agree with City Council's finding that the wider right-of-way represented a practical difficulty; she visited the street, and the other properties affected all have garages set back at a consistent distance from the street. She agrees with staff's assessment of the criteria. Because this request does not meet three of those criteria, she is not in favor of approving the Variance.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, December 2, 2025

Commissioner Heidenreich said that it was important not only to follow the law but to have compassion and understanding; in this case, matters outside the family's control clearly affected their ability to complete the project before expiration.

Commissioner Twedt said that there were trees that could ameliorate issues with sight lines on this site. He said that given the circumstances, he is in favor of approving the Variance.

Commissioner Schaefer said that she is also in favor of approving the Variance due to its conformance with the initial request that was approved by Council, the pandemic as a factor, and the applicant's lack of knowledge that the Variance would expire.

Chair Weber asked whether the City typically provides notice for expiration of Variances.

Planning Manager Shay stated that this Variance expired before he came on staff, but typically, City Staff do notify applicants if the expiration date is approaching and work has not been enacted.

Motion by Heidenreich, Second by Clancy, to Approve the Variance as requested, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Ayes: 8

Nays: 1 (Hunting) Motion Carried.

This item is tentatively scheduled to go before the City Council on December 15, 2025.

**B.** Text Amendments to Zoning Ordinance Chapters 3, 14, and 15, and Changes to the Subdivision Ordinance for the Purpose of Updating Process and Requirements for certain Planning Applications.

**Reading of Public Notice**

Secretary Twedt read the Public Hearing Notice.

**Presentation of Request**

Planning Manager Shay presented the staff report.

Application Process Update Goals

- Eliminate application material checklists from code
  - These are already included in the policy documents; there, they can be updated as needed without needing to change City Code
- Comply with state statute
- Make the Code easier to understand and more user-friendly
- Eliminate duplicative processes
- Move to administrative reviews for situations when there is no discretion
  - If a project must be approved as long as it meets all code requirements, neither Planning Commission nor City Council has the authority to add conditions for approval, so it does not make sense to bring it before these bodies.

Review of Changes Made to Code Sections

- Variances

- Update “undue hardship” standard to “practical difficulty” standard to comply with state statute
- Determination of Substantially Similar Use
  - Remove from code
    - This is typically a staff decision that does not need to come before the Planning Commission.
    - Note that this only applies to Substantially Similar Use determinations. Someone seeking to add a new use to the table would still need to come before Planning Commission and City Council.
- Northwest Area Environmental Studies Fee
  - Remove from code
    - This was added in the early 2000s because of the volume of development in the Northwest Area at the time, but the fee has not been collected for many projects in the last ten years.
    - Typically, this document would be City-led and City-funded, as it is created to inform City staff in their comprehensive planning efforts.
- Conditional Use Permits (CUPs)
  - Change from a supermajority vote (4/5) to a simple majority vote (3/5) at City Council
    - This is for consistency with state statute (supermajorities are typically for comprehensive plan amendments or significant zoning changes, e.g., from residential to industrial).
  - Remove specific environmental review language for Conditional Use Permits (CUPs)
    - The right to request/require environmental and traffic studies as part of a CUP is already granted by state statute, so it is not needed in this section of the City Code.
  - Remove exemption for I-2 zoning district
    - With the changes to the Site Plan Review section, this exemption is no longer needed.
- Interim Use Permits (IUPs)
  - The first two Conditional Use changes above apply to this section as well. (The I-2 exemption is not applicable for IUPs.)
- Site Plan Review
  - Removes distinction between “minor” and “major” site plan reviews
    - This would put all site plan reviews under an administrative process. (In current code, only minor Site Plan Reviews, defined as those involving <10% expansion, are currently handled via administrative process; all other Site Plan Reviews are considered major and come before Planning Commission and City Council for approval.)
    - By nature, Site Plan Reviews should not have Variances, IUPs, CUPs, etc. If it is a permitted use in the zoning district, and they meet code standards, all that is needed is staff review to ensure code compliance; legally, additional conditions cannot be added by the Commission or Council.
  - Change threshold from 125% to 100% for financial guarantees for Site Improvement Performance Agreements (SIPAs)
    - The intent of the guarantee is to ensure that if a project is not completed, any grading, erosion control, and/or stormwater issues can be addressed,

not to ensure completion of the entire project as planned. Therefore, 100% is sufficient.

- Final Planned Unit Development (PUD)
  - No longer requires Planning Commission review before going to City Council (as long as the Final PUD complies with the Preliminary PUD)
    - Final Plats does not have to come before Planning Commission, so this change would create consistency in the processes
- Waiver of Platting
  - Remove from code
    - Because this process only applies in situations where no new easement is required, it is rarely used. There is already a Lot Line Adjustment section of the Subdivision Ordinance for handling this administratively.
    - Moreover, the preliminary and final platting processes are easier in terms of staff tracking.

Planning Manager Shay mentioned that a future draft could combine all the administrative processes for planning applications into one chapter, but that revision was not completed at this time due to the extensive restructuring it will require.

#### Recommended Action

- Motion to recommend approval of Ordinance Amendment to Title 10 (Zoning Regulations), Chapter 1, 3, 13, 14, and 15, and Title 11 (Subdivision Regulations), Chapter 1 and 2, relating to the zoning and subdivision application procedures and requirements.

#### **Opening of Public Hearing**

Commissioner Teiken said that all the changes proposed seem to be aligned with the larger project of making the Code easier for applicants to use. He asked for confirmation that the changes have been reviewed by the City Attorney.

Planning Manager Shay said that the City Attorney has received the draft but has not provided comments yet. He said that if the City Attorney does have comments or concerns, he would incorporate those changes before the draft went to City Council.

Commissioner Schaefer thanked Planning Manager Shay for his work cleaning up the Code. She asked that there be consistency with capitalization (e.g., uppercase for "City Council" and "Planning Commission" rather than lowercase) for clarity. She also asked for a thorough review of definitions of terms.

Planning Manager Shay said that style (capitalization) concerns would be addressed when the full zoning ordinance overhaul is done, and definitions would be addressed at the end of that overhaul process.

Commissioner Schaefer said that, as developers will no longer be required by code to pay the Northwest Area Environmental Studies Fee, it will be paid by taxpayers. She said she would prefer to collect the fee from developers due to the continued development happening in the area. She commented that the change from supermajority to simple majority for Conditional Use and Interim Use Permits would make it easier for those to get approved and asked what the rationale was for this change.

Planning Manager Shay said that Conditional Uses and Interim Uses are, by nature, not special exceptions (like Variances or adding uses). If the conditions are met, more conditions can be added for health, safety, and welfare considerations, but most conditions should already be specified in the Code for each Conditional/Interim Use. He said that supermajority votes, by state statute, are only required for significant changes. He said that only a simple majority vote is required under state statute for actions that do not affect the entire city in their implementation. The City can require a supermajority vote in these matters, but City staff does not recommend this.

Commissioner Schaefer said that when items come before Planning Commission and City Council, the public has a voice and can provide developers with their feedback/comments. While she understands that the Commission cannot legally add conditions to CUPs and IUPs, she stated that the proposed changes would reduce transparency. Regarding the proposed changes to the Site Plan Review section, she asked for more information about what the City is responsible for (that the current 125% financial guarantee would cover).

Planning Manager Shay said that the Site Plan Review financial guarantee allows the City to draw on the letter of credit for a Site Improvement Performance Agreement if the developer leaves a project unfinished to fix issues at the site --not to fully improve the site as planned. For example, if the full cost of improvements is \$1,000,000, the cost to address remaining issues (e.g., piles of dirt, grading work) might be \$50,000. Therefore, the City's risk exposure is low in these cases, and he said that 100% is sufficient to address it. (He noted that Developer Agreements, which involve road, sidewalk, or other public improvement construction projects that the City is responsible for completing if the developer leaves things unfinished, have higher risk exposure. Therefore, 125% will remain the financial guarantee for Developer Agreements.)

Commissioner Schaefer asked who initiated the request for the change in financial guarantee for Site Plan Reviews.

Planning Manager Shay said it was staff-led. He monitors what other cities are working on and the issues they are running into, and a number of cities have already lowered the threshold for Site Improvement Performance Agreements to 100% with no issues.

Commissioner Schaefer commented that she also has transparency concerns about the proposed changes to the Final Planned Unit Development section -- that is, when items do not come to the Commission and the Council, there are fewer opportunities for the public to provide input.

Planning Manager Shay said that the transparency concern would be met, in that he would provide regular updates on administrative staff approvals during Planning Commission meetings, but he affirmed that there would be fewer opportunities for public comment under the proposed changes.

Commissioner Schaefer commented that she understands the rationale for removing the application checklists from the City Code, but she suggested that the policy documents that the checklists appear in be regularly presented to the Commission so that they can stay apprised of changes. She also asked Planning Manager Shay to ensure that reference numeration stays accurate throughout updates.

Commissioner Wippermann said he is not in favor of removing the Northwest Area Environmental Studies Fee. He said that issues may still arise requiring further environmental analysis there, and if they do, the City should be able to get related costs reimbursed. He is not in favor of changing the supermajority vote to a simple majority vote for CUPs and IUPs. He said that although those decisions are classified as minor, they affect neighborhoods and set precedents. Due to this, he said there should be overwhelming support in those cases, not just a simple majority. He asked how simple majority works if only three Council members are present. Planning Manager Shay said that if only three Council members are present, two members would constitute a simple majority.

Commissioner Wippermann said that a CUP or IUP would then be able to pass with only two votes (versus four for a supermajority) in that situation. He is also not in favor of lowering the financial guarantee for SIPAs to 100%, and he does not see a reason to make that change given inflation and other unexpected costs that can arise. He is also not in favor of Final Planned Unit Developments not coming before the Planning Commission, due to potential disagreement on what constitutes a "significant change". He mentioned that sometimes the Waiver of Platting code section is used in rural areas. He asked how subdividing will work going forward for those cases.

Planning Manager Shay said that minor/administrative subdivisions would have two options. For currently-platted lots, there is an administrative process. For unplatted lots, the administrative Lot Line Adjustment section would cover subdivisions/lot splits (as long as the conditions for size are met). The Waiver of Platting section is only applicable if no Drainage and Utility or right of way easements are taken, which is very rare in Inver Grove Heights. He mentioned that this section of Code has only been used three times since it was adopted.

Commissioner Wippermann said that under 10-13A-12 (Standards and Criteria for Planning Commission and Council Action), he is not in favor of removing the sentence below: "The planning commission may recommend, and the council may act to approve, approve with conditions or deny a preliminary or final plan for a planned unit development." He asked what the rationale was for striking it.

Chair Weber asked what the criteria are for "significant change" in Final Planned Unit Developments.

Planning Manager Shay said the relevant language in City Code is whether changes are "substantially similar." He gave the example of a 100-unit subdivision -- if there are no changes in the number of units, setbacks, lot sizes, and there are no further requests on flexibility, and only design refinements like a storm sewer pipe increasing in size, that would not constitute "significant change". He clarified that at the Preliminary stage, only 60% of design work is complete; at the Final stage, the design is 90% complete. As an example of a significant change, he gave the example of going from 400 to 325 plantings. He said that if something fell under a PUD benefit, flexibility, or general criteria (major standards like number of homes, lot size, setbacks, etc.), then it would be brought back in front of the Commission for Final PUD review.

Commissioner Hunting asked why the Northwest Area Environmental Studies Fee has not been collected in recent years.

Planning Manager Shay said he did not know. He said it seems to have been applied intermittently.

Commissioner Hunting asked for that to be examined further. She said that if development is ongoing in that area, it would be prudent to keep it. She said that it seems like a lot of Planning Commission tasks are being eliminated with these proposed changes, and she would still want to see information about CUP, IUP, and Final PUD items as action items (rather than as staff updates). She is not in favor of the changes that would result in matters no longer coming before the Planning Commission. She mentioned that prior City Councils wanted everything to be reviewed, which can sometimes be overkill, but she feels like these changes would be a step too far in the other direction. She said that she needs more information to decide on whether the Northwest Area Environmental Studies Fee should be assessed or removed from the Code. She said that the Planning Commission is able to make better decisions when more information comes before them.

Chair Weber asked if CUP, IUP, and Final PUD items can be added to the Consent Agenda.

Planning Manager Shay said that adding them to the Consent Agenda would not be appropriate, as Consent Agenda items require action to be taken. He said that another type of agenda item could possibly be used.

Chair Weber said that Consent Agenda items in City Council meetings only get discussed if a member pulls one out to ask questions or raise concerns; otherwise, they are usually acted on as a package. He echoed the desire for more visibility/transparency. Separately, he mentioned that he wanted to paint his address on his curb for emergency services visibility, and this is currently not allowed by Code. He suggested adding something to the Code allowing this (where needed for visibility).

Chair Weber closed the Public Hearing at 8:10 p.m.

### **Planning Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Schaefer suggested breaking up Item 5B into multiple motions.

Planning Manager Shay said that it would be possible to make motions on the basis of changes to each section; staff would then make the approved changes.

Commissioner Schaefer said that having more time to review all changes would be better.

Commissioner Heidenreich said that he does not feel that he has enough information. He said he was in favor of denying all changes until the City Attorney has provided comments and questions that can be addressed. He said that it seems like the Planning Commission is being eliminated.

Commissioner Twedt clarified that the Planning Commission would still see the Preliminary PUD.

Chair Weber stated that the process currently involves the Preliminary PUD going to Planning Commission, then to City Council. The Final PUD then comes back to the Planning Commission before going to City Council for approval.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, December 2, 2025

Commissioner Twedt confirmed that with the proposed change, the Planning Commission would only see PUDs once, for preliminary PUD (unless there are substantial changes).

Commissioner Schaefer said "substantial change" would be interpreted by staff.

Planning Manager Shay said that the intent is to mirror the PUD process to preliminary/final platting under normal zoning, where the PC's role is at the preliminary stage, and final plat goes straight to Council.

Commissioner Twedt asked whether the goal is to streamline the process.

Planning Manager Shay said yes; the City has 60 days to act on both a final plat and a final PUD. He said that the same reasoning applies for Site Plan Reviews -- design issues, lot size, setbacks, etc. all get reviewed at the preliminary stage. Then the City Engineer works with the developer on grading, stormwater tweaks, etc., which are reviewed by City Council.

Commissioner Twedt asked whether City Council could send it back to the Planning Commission if they had concerns.

Planning Manager Shay confirmed that.

Chair Weber said that right now, the PUD side is different from preliminary/final plat process, and he is in favor of making those processes match.

Commissioners Schaefer and Hunting expressed opposition to the proposed changes to the Site Plan Review section.

Motion by Weber, Second by Clancy, to Recommend Approval to City Council of the proposed changes to the following sections of City Code: Variance, Determination of Substantially Similar Use, and Waiver of Platting (subject to the review of the City Attorney and any conditions ensuing).

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0      Motion Carried.

Chair Weber raised the issue of the Northwest Area Environmental Studies Fee for discussion.

Commissioner Hunting said she had two questions: why fees weren't collected and whether the fees are still needed because of ongoing development.

Commissioner Gosell commented that the total cost incurred by the City for the environmental study in the Northwest Area was \$300,000 -- not \$300,000 for each development; per the ordinance, the fee assessed to developers is \$80 per acre. He asked how many additional acres remain to be developed in the Northwest Area and how much of the \$300,000 has already been collected.

Planning Manager Shay estimated that 800 to 1,000 acres in the Northwest Area have not yet been developed and would incur that fee under the current ordinance, which was established to recoup the \$317,382 paid by the City in 2005-06. He said that typically, this kind of cost is not

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, November 5, 2025

charged to developers because the resulting information is used by the City for planning. Per this ordinance, the City expected to recoup that money gradually via the fee.

Chair Weber brought up the supermajority issue (for approval of CUP/IUP) for discussion.

Planning Manager Shay said that state statute requires a simple majority (3/5) for all items requiring a public hearing.

Commissioner Hunting confirmed that the City *can* require more than a simple majority.

Planning Manager Shay said that the City cannot require a unanimous vote, but it can require a supermajority vote.

Chair Weber said that the situation Commissioner Wippermann raised (where only two votes are needed to approve an item) was unlikely to occur, as Councilmembers can now participate virtually.

Planning Manager Shay confirmed that and added that typically, the City Administrator will reschedule items for a future meeting if multiple City Council members expect to be absent.

Some Commissioners expressed opposition to dropping the supermajority requirement.

Commissioner Heidenreich said that it appears that recommended changes can be attached to either an approval or a denial, and his preference is to attach the suggestions to a denial in order to send a clearer message to City Council.

Planning Manager Shay said that the message about recommended changes would get to City Council either way.

Motion by Weber, Second by Gosell, to Recommend Approval to City Council of the proposed changes to the following sections of City Code (except answering the question about remaining acreage of the Northwest Area and keeping the Planning Commission and City Council involved in Site Plan Reviews): Northwest Area Environmental Studies Fee, Final Planned Unit Development, and Site Plan Review

Ayes: 3 (Gosell, Twedt, Weber)

Nays: 6 (Heidenreich, Hunting, Wippermann, Schaefer, Clancy, Teiken) Motion Failed.

Commissioner Schaefer asked when the City Attorney would review the proposed changes.

Planning Manager Shay said that the City Attorney would review them after Planning Manager Shay makes any changes recommended by the Planning Commission and before final review by City Council. He offered the suggestion of tabling the items to a future meeting so that he could return with the City Attorney's comments on the staff-proposed changes.

Chair Weber asked if the sections mentioned in the earlier Approval motion would get the same treatment.

Planning Manager Shay said yes, as he plans to bring this to City Council as a package (rather than in bits and pieces).

Commissioner Twedt asked about recommending Denial versus tabling.

Planning Manager Shay said that if the desire of the Planning Commission is to get more information before making a decision, he suggested tabling rather than recommending Denial, as he would bring the recommendation of Denial to the City Council (rather than returning to the Planning Commission with information).

Commissioner Gosell said he was in agreement with tabling if there is a specific list of desired changes and questions. He said he was not in favor of a non-specific motion to table as it would not provide enough guidance to City staff.

Chair Weber said that the tabling motion would include something like “based on the questions brought up at the Planning Commission meeting” rather than including a list of specific questions.

Commissioner Heidenreich said that is why he would be in favor a motion to Deny all the proposed changes.

Commissioner Hunting said that she understood the rationale for recommending Denial of the changes to each section.

Chair Weber said that tabling made more sense to him so that the items would come back before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Schaefer mentioned that a work session could be held before January.

Planning Manager Shay commented that if a motion to table is made, specific information about what is being asked is very helpful.

Commissioner Hunting said that she only had questions about the Northwest Area section. She clarified that there are no questions about the proposed changes to the other sections. Rather, members of the Commission disagree with removing the supermajority requirement.

Commissioner Wippermann reiterated his positions at Chair Weber’s request.

Commissioner Teiken asked to table the Northwest Area section edit and deny the rest of the section edits.

Commissioner Heidenreich expressed support for a motion to table all section edits.

Commissioner Clancy said he agreed with Commissioner Heidenreich that more changes are needed, and tabling would be useful in order to make a more informed recommendation to City Council

Motion by Heidenreich, Second by Clancy, to Table Item 5.B. to the Next Planning Commission Meeting, January 6, 2026.

Ayes: 8

Nays: 1 (Twedt) Motion Carried.

## **6. REGULAR BUSINESS**

### **A. Approval of the 2026 Planning Commission Work Plan.**

#### **Presentation of Request**

Planning Manager Shay presented the staff report.

Many of the City's commissions adopt work plans that outline their duties, priorities, and planned projects for the next year.

He presented an overview of the draft 2026 Planning Commission work plan, including:

1. Review and provide recommendations on development applications including but not limited to Rezoning, Comprehensive Plan Amendments, Conditional Use Permits, Preliminary Plats and Variances.
2. Initiate the review and recommendations regarding the 2050 Comprehensive Plan Update.
3. Make recommendations on Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments that will include the following topics:
  - a. Shipping Containers
  - b. List of Interim Uses
    - i. Currently a text list; the plan is to move into the table of other uses
4. Review and make recommendations on District Plans, Small Area Plans and other studies or special projects. Potential plans and specific projects in 2026 including:
  - a. Cahill Streetscape Plan - including conversion from four-lane to three-lane, landscaping, traffic calming, etc.
5. Provide recommendations on any other topics assigned by the City Council.

Planning Manager Shay invited the Planning Commission to provide input.

#### **Planning Commission Discussion**

Chair Weber clarified that members of the Planning Commission can propose changes to ordinances.

Commissioner Wippermann asked Chair Weber if he wanted to add specific ordinances under Item 3 of the Work Plan.

Chair Weber said that there are many issues that he would like to look at.

Planning Manager Shay mentioned that this Work Plan will go to City Council for their acceptance.

Commissioner Schaefer suggested adding "review of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan".

Planning Manager Shay said that that was already included under Item 1 (duties assigned by City Code).

Commissioner Schaefer said it would be helpful to provide a more thorough list under Item 1. She added that it would be helpful to align the Work Plan with the priorities of City Council to ensure that the Planning Commission is supporting their goals.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, December 2, 2025

Planning Manager Shay said that was a good idea. He mentioned that the City Council can modify Commission work plans based on their goals.

Motion by Clancy, Second by Gosell, to Approve the 2026 Planning Commission Work Plan as presented.

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0      Motion Carried.

This item is tentatively scheduled to go before the City Council on December 15, 2025.

**7. ADJOURN**

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Will Clashe, Recording Secretary.