

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES - CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS

Tuesday, January 6, 2026 - 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

Commissioner(s) Absent: Dennis Wippermann - *excused*

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

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Twedt, Second by Heidenreich, to Approve the Agenda as Published.

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0 Motion Carried.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Minutes of the December 2, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting.

Motion by Hunting, Second by Twedt, to Approve the Minutes as Submitted.

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0 Motion Carried.

5. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Request for a Variance from the Maximum Permitted Square Footage of an Accessory Structure in the E-1, Estate Zoning District for a lot between 2.5-3.3 acres and a Variance from the Minimum Side Yard Setback for an Accessory Structure that exceeds 1,000 square feet in the E-1, Estate Zoning District, located at 8313 Delaney Circle.

Reading of Public Notice

Secretary Twedt read the Public Hearing Notice.

Presentation of Request

Senior Planner Schneider presented the staff report.

Background

Existing Zoning: E-1, Estate Zoning District
Guided Land Use: RDR, Rural Density Residential

The existing accessory structure is 896 square feet and is located on the southern portion of the property. The applicant is proposing to expand the structure to 1,792 square feet, effectively doubling its size. The proposed addition is generally located to the west of the existing structure.

Two Variances are required to accommodate the request. The first Variance is to exceed the maximum allowed accessory structure size of 1,600 square feet by 192 square feet. The second Variance is to reduce the required 50-foot side yard setback by 19 feet, resulting in a proposed setback of 31 feet.

A Utility Easement is located along the rear portion of the property. Any work within this area requires approval from Xcel Energy. Since publication of the meeting packet, the applicant has received written authorization from Xcel Energy, contingent upon City approval, allowing the proposed expansion within the Easement area.

Variance Criteria Evaluation

The Variance request is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the City Code and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Not Met.

The accessory structure is located well over 10 feet from the southern property line, maintaining adequate separation from the neighboring home. The City Code establishes a 1,600 square foot maximum to limit the overall size of accessory structures, independent of setback requirements.

The Property Owner proposed to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance. Met The plight of the Landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the Landowner. Not Met

Alternative options may be feasible, including expanding to the south despite trees and grade changes, expanding to the north subject to Xcel Energy approval, or constructing a new structure east of the driveway, which would avoid setback issues but at a higher cost.

The Variance will not alter the essential character of the locality. Not Met

Review of the surrounding neighborhood indicates that most accessory structures comply with both setback and size requirements.

The request does not rely on economic conditions alone. Met

Chair Weber inquired as to whether locating the accessory structure on the opposite side of the driveway had been considered. Schneider noted that locating a new, code-compliant structure on the opposite side of the driveway could serve as an alternative, as the existing structure would then need to be removed or relocated, eliminating the need for a setback Variance.

Commissioner Twedt inquired as to what occurred first, the Utility Easement or the property being built. Schneider stated that while he was not completely certain, his reasonable

assumption is that the power line predates 1980, based on his recollection that the Easement existed prior to the neighborhood being subdivided in 1980.

Commissioner Twedt asked for clarification as to whether the Utility Easement existed when the original accessory structure was constructed and whether it was built within the Easement despite that condition. Schneider clarified that Xcel Energy Easement does not prohibit structures but requires written approval from Xcel Energy confirming there are no issues with the proposed construction.

Commissioner Twedt questioned whether a Utility Easement for a power line is substantially different from an Easement for buried electrical infrastructure. Schneider explained that public electric lines are typically located within standard Drainage and Utility Easements, which are shown along the perimeter of the property and are common on most platted lots in the City. Structures are not permitted within Drainage Easements, even with a Variance. The Easement affecting this property is not a Drainage Easement.

Opening of Public Hearing

Brian and Julie Bischoff, 8313 Delaney Circle, Applicant, stated that they received the staff report, but have multiple questions. Mr. Bischoff stated that the practical difficulty arises from the proximity of the existing garage to the power line, which prevents Xcel Energy approval for any garage expansion and prompted the Variance request. He explained that the issue was not self-created, as it did not result from changes to the property or buildable area, but from existing infrastructure constraints. He expressed concern that suggested alternatives, such as demolishing and relocating an existing, fully finished structure or constructing additions in less desirable locations, would be excessively costly, impractical, and aesthetically unfavorable. He further disagreed with staff's characterization of neighborhood conditions, citing nearby examples of larger or nonconforming accessory structures, and noted that adjacent neighbors support the proposed location. The request is a reasonable improvement constrained by external limitations and expressed frustration with the application process.

Chair Weber apologized for the difficulty of the Variance application process and explained that while a request may seem straightforward, the City applies specific standards to ensure fairness, with the Variance process allowing the Planning Commission and City Council to determine reasonableness.

Commissioner Hunting inquired as to whether the property owners built this home or purchased.

Mr. Bischoff stated that they purchased the property with the home already built.

Commissioner Schaefer inquired as to how the circumstances are unique to the property and not created by the property owner.

Mr. Bischoff stated that he purchased the property about 10 years ago, renovated the home, and finished the existing shop. The power line likely predates the house and creates safety concerns that make garage expansion infeasible under Xcel Energy guidance. The Variance request is driven by the inability to expand the existing garage due to the 345 kV power line. The proposed location minimizes visibility and tree removal, and that the additional 192 square feet is requested only because a garage expansion is not feasible.

Commissioner Schaefer asked for clarification that the claimed unique circumstance is the inability to expand the garage, rather than the owner's personal storage needs.

Mr. Bischoff stated that expansion of the existing house or garage is not possible due to the location of the power lines, and that Xcel Energy has clearly indicated this is not permitted.

Susan Becker, 8309 Delaney Circle, stated that she is confused as to when the power line Easement was created this large, is in favor of the request and does not believe that the Easement is actually that large.

Cody Taubman, 8314 Delaney Circle, stated that they are in favor of their neighbors request to obtain the Variances.

Chair Weber closed the Public Hearing at 7:24 p.m.

Recommended Action

Staff recommend a Motion of Denial for the Variance requests.

Planning Commission Discussion

Chair Weber asked whether the Utility Easement is established at the request of the utility company.

Schneider responded that the Xcel Energy Easement is a private Easement, not a City Easement. While the boundary shown is based on City GIS records and is not official, it closely reflects the Easement depicted on the recorded plat, and that structures predating the Easement are typically not subject to enforcement by Xcel Energy.

Chair Weber asked whether accessory structure size is measured by interior square footage or exterior dimensions.

Schneider responded that accessory structure size is typically measured by the interior, usable square footage.

Chair Weber requested clarification on whether the 1,792 square foot figure shown on the plans reflects exterior dimensions or interior usable square footage. He emphasized the need for precision when considering a Variance and asked whether plans identifying interior square footage are available to ensure the Variance amount is accurately calculated.

Schneider stated that interior square footage was not included in the presentation and that the plans in the packet reflect exterior dimensions. The request is based on a total of 1,792 square feet and that further clarification could be provided if needed.

Chair Weber asked Mr. Bischoff whether he knew the actual interior square footage of the proposed building.

Mr. Bischoff stated that 1,674 square feet is the interior square footage.

Chair Weber stated that the square footage calculation should account for wall thickness on the existing structure and indicated that subtracting a full foot on each side would be excessive.

Planning Manager Shay clarified that accessory structures are measured by gross square footage, defined in City Code as the area measured from the exterior face of the exterior walls. Under this definition, the proposed structure would be 1,792 square feet, as specified in the City Code Definition Section, 10-2-2

Commissioner Clancy stated that there appears to be sufficient practical difficulty to consider the setback Variance due to the power line and Xcel Energy constraints limiting expansion options. He noted, however, that he was struggling to identify a practical difficulty that would justify the requested increase in allowable square footage.

Commissioner Hunting stated that after visiting the property and reviewing the neighborhood, she could support the setback Variance given neighbor agreement but could not support the requested increase in accessory structure size.

Motion by Clancy, Second by Teiken, to Approve a Variance from the minimum side yard setback of 50 feet for an accessory structure exceeding 1,000 square feet to have a setback of 31 feet in the E-1, Estate Zoning District. With Practical Difficulty being the Utility Easement.

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0 Motion Carried.

Commissioner Twedt questioned whether the proposal could be revised to comply with City Code by reducing the size of the structure and resubmitted for consideration.

Schneider explained that if the second Variance were denied, the applicant could either proceed to City Council with the remaining Variance request or revise the plans to reduce the structure size. In that case, the City Council would consider one fewer Variance, depending on the applicant's decision.

Chair Weber stated that if the applicant reduced the structure to 1,600 square feet that would eliminate the need for a Variance and require only a building permit.

Schneider clarified that the setback Variance would still be required, but if City Council denies the size increase and approves the setback Variance, the Applicant could proceed with a building permit for a 1,600 square foot structure without returning for additional Variance.

Motion by Clancy, Second by Heidenreich, to Deny a Variance from the maximum permitted square footage of 1,600 square feet for an accessory structure that is 1,796 square feet in the E-1, Estate Zoning District for a lot size between 2.5-3.3 acres.

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0 Motion Carried.

This item is tentatively scheduled to go before the City Council on January 26, 2026.

Chair Weber asked for clarification, noting that the definitions in City Code Section 10-2-2 are correct and specifically apply to areas outside the walls.

Planning Manager Shay explained that this relates to the definition in the accessory structure section in 10-15-18, which provides that measurements are based on gross square feet, and that gross square feet, as defined in the definition section, refers to the square footage within the exterior walls, noting that the definition is more detailed but that this reflects its intent.

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. *(Tabled Item from Planning Commission Meeting, December 2, 2025)*

Presentation of Request

Planning Manager Shay summarized that the overall purpose of the proposed City Code Amendments is to remove application material checklists from the City Code, align more closely with State Statute, make processes clearer and more user friendly, eliminate duplicative steps, and shift more items to an administrative process with less discretionary review. The intent is to streamline applications that already meet the City Code requirements so they can move through the process more efficiently while still receiving appropriate City approvals.

The proposed updates include updating the practical difficulty standard for Variances to comply with State Statute, removing the Determination of Substantially Similar Use from City Code, eliminating the Northwest Area Environmental Studies Fee, changing Conditional Use Permits from a Super majority to a Simple majority vote, removing the twelve (12) exemptions, and deleting redundant environmental review language that is already addressed through State Statute requirements. The Interim Use Permits would simply reference the Conditional Use section, Site Plan Review would move fully to an administrative process without a minor versus major distinction, financial guarantees would be reduced from 125% to 100%, Final Planned Unit Developments would no longer require Planning Commission review prior to City Council action, and the Waiver of Plat section would be removed entirely.

Shay stated that based on data from the last ten years, the proposed changes would have reduced the applications brought before the Planning Commission by approximately 5.3%, primarily by removing standalone Site Plan Reviews and Final PUDs. These applications would still require City approval, either administratively or through City Council, but would not necessarily come before the Planning Commission. The City Attorney reviewed all proposed changes and had no red lines, comments, or concerns about compliance.

Regarding the Northwest Environmental Studies Fee, has been collected inconsistently over time and is difficult to track because it was previously included in Development Agreements in varying ways and later incorporated into application fees. Only one recent project, Stuart Development, had a clearly itemized receipt for the fee. Based on recent legal precedents, including the Harstad vs City of Woodbury case, such fees must have a clear nexus to a specific development, which this area wide study does not. The City Attorney generally agreed that the City would have difficulty defending this fee if challenged and therefore recommended removing it from the fee schedule.

The item could be tabled to provide additional time for review.

Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Heidenreich inquired if the Environmental Study Fee was eliminated, if those who previously paid the fee would be entitled to a refund.

Shay stated that if the fee were removed, it would not apply retroactively, and the City would not issue refunds to those who had already paid it.

Commissioner Schaefer stated that, as she understood it, the Environmental Study Fee was not budgeted for the City to absorb this year, eliminating it would represent an unplanned incremental loss of revenue rather than a reduction in expenses.

Shay stated that the City did not originally budget for these funds because they are not tied to a predictable revenue source. The approximately \$314,000 that had already been paid and recorded as a sunk cost. This mechanism was intended to recoup that expense, though the timing of future revenue remains uncertain due to the unpredictability of development and related fee payments.

Commissioner Schaefer inquired about the City's practice of not making assumptions regarding the types of development that may occur in the coming year or the fees those developments might generate.

Shay explained that when the City pays upfront for a study, such as a \$40,000 Master Plan, that cost is treated as a sunk cost and is not expected to be directly recouped through future study or environmental fees. While the City may project potential future sewer and water fee revenues based on anticipated development trends, it does not structure studies with the expectation of recovering specific portions of their cost over time. Rather, any recovery of those expenses occurs indirectly through subsequent development.

Commissioner Schaefer questioned whether the fee was intended to be charged except when a waiver was granted, how much of the roughly \$300,000 had been collected, and whether eliminating the fee would forfeit potential future revenue given development uncertainty and possible litigation risk.

Shay confirmed that if there is no clear nexus and the fee were successfully challenged, the City would be unable to demonstrate a direct connection between the fee and a specific development, making the fee legally unenforceable and uncollectible.

Commissioner Schaefer stated that the larger concern is whether the City is diligent in collecting fees and suggested revising forms to clearly list applicable fees in one place, particularly for developments in the Northwest Area.

Shay stated that this practice has already been implemented within the last year, but he could not speak to all historical practices. The process was implemented within the last year and is now in place moving forward. This fee was likely missed because it was a relatively small amount that should have been collected at the time of initial application rather than later in the development process. Because the fee is tracked in two different locations and earlier documentation from prior to his tenure was incomplete or unavailable, he was unable to determine the exact amounts for each project, noting only that the fee had been recorded as paid and satisfied.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 6, 2026

Commissioner Schaefer stated that it is challenging to review records from 10 to 20 years ago but that, as a taxpayer concerned about rising City property taxes, \$300,000 is a significant amount, comparable to several years of salary and benefits for a lower-level staff position.

Shay stated that Staff may consider increasing application fees to offset costs, noting that a separate fee without a clear nexus to development is concerning Staff and the City Attorney.

Chair Weber inquired as to how many net developable acres are in the Northwest Area.

Shay stated that, based on rough estimates prepared for utility updates, there are approximately 1,000 net developable acres in the Northwest Area.

Chair Weber questioned whether the maximum revenue from the fee would be \$80,000, given that it is \$80 per gross acre.

Shay explained that the net acreage is 1,000, but the gross acreage is higher because it includes wetlands and other areas that cannot be developed. The way the fee was structured in relation to the cost of the study, it was never intended that the fee would fully recoup the total cost of that study.

Commissioner Hunting inquired as to with respect to the environmental studies fee, whether the City Attorney believed the City would have difficulty prevailing in potential litigation, or whether she was primarily cautioning that the fee could invite a legal challenge.

Shay stated that the discussion with the City Attorney focused on State Statute language regarding nexus for fees. The City is not currently facing litigation, but that proving nexus for this fee could be difficult depending on the circumstances. This concern is informed by prior experience with legally challenged fees in other cities and reflects a desire to avoid similar costly and time-consuming disputes.

Chair Weber inquired as to whether this had been paid for in 2006.

Shay stated that he believes the study was completed in either 2004 or 2006.

Chair Weber stated that the study is roughly 20 years old and that much of the development in the Northwest Area has not aligned closely with that original plan. Adjusting the City's fee structure is therefore reasonable given that recent development has not strictly followed the earlier planning framework.

Commissioner Teiken stated that he had previously asked whether the City Attorney had reviewed the proposed changes to ensure compliance with State Statute and thanked her for doing so. In Staff's view, the City Attorney's advice to the City was to eliminate the Environmental Studies Fee due to litigation risk related to the nexus issue.

Shay clarified that the proposed changes originated with Staff due to their familiarity with the issue. After discussing the concerns with the City Attorney, she agreed they were a sound approach because they would help insulate the City from potential litigation risk and indicated she was supportive of moving them forward.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 6, 2026

Commissioner Teiken stated that while the Commission can make a recommendation to the City Council, the nexus issue distinguishes this fee from other proposed changes. The potential legal risk raises the stakes and makes this decision different from the others under consideration. Tabling the item on December 2nd was appropriate because it allowed additional time to review the minutes and materials. In the future, complex matters such as Variances and related Ordinance changes be separated into individual agenda items. Doing so would improve organization, help the Planning Commission make clearer recommendations, assist City Council in understanding those recommendations, and make the proceedings easier for the public to follow.

Shay thanked Commissioner Teiken for the suggestion and stated that he would follow that approach in the future, noting that while agendas may appear longer, it would ultimately be beneficial to address items individually.

Commissioner Schaefer stated that the length and complexity of the proposed Ordinance changes made it difficult for the Planning Commission to understand priorities and strategy. A Work Session would be more appropriate for reviewing extensive redlines, allowing for dialogue before a public hearing. There is concern that many proposed changes reduce public visibility and the Planning Commission's role by shifting responsibilities to the Zoning Administrator. Inquired as to whether the City Council considers these changes a priority and requested clearer direction on overall goals for the Planning Commission.

Shay stated that the Planning Commission's 2026 Work Plan is intended to provide general guidance, though development activity cannot be fully predicted. Some Ordinance Amendments are anticipated based on prior direction from Staff or City Council, but other issues will arise that cannot be forecast. The upcoming Comprehensive Plan cycle will be the Commission's primary focus for the next year and a half to two years, which is why the current Work Plan is relatively limited. This process will include significant public input. Addressing concerns about transparency, when items do not appear on Planning Commission or City Council agendas, some residents may be unaware of certain developments. The City also shares information through the Insights newsletter, the City website, and Staff updates. The intent of the proposed changes is to make it easier for compliant businesses, particularly small businesses, to proceed without lengthy review processes, while recognizing that this may shift how the public receives information about certain projects.

Commissioner Schaefer stated that streamlining processes can remove the public's opportunity to provide input before plans are finalized, which can help address issues such as lighting, compatibility, and neighborhood impacts. Her intent is not to delay development, but to encourage more open dialogue between residents and businesses. The Planning Commission to be more proactive, noting past discussions about needs for lower income and senior housing, and suggesting that the City should plan for these needs rather than waiting solely for developers to bring forward proposals.

Shay stated that the City completed the Dakota County Housing Needs Assessment, which identified gaps across nearly all housing categories, including senior, rental, for sale, affordable, and market rate housing. The City generally responds to development proposals rather than initiating them, working with developers once they have control of land, except when the City owns property and can be involved earlier in the process. The City's role is to set expectations

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 6, 2026

through its Code and Comprehensive Plan, which signal to the development community the types of uses and locations the City supports.

Commissioner Schaefer stated that she understood Staff's position but disagreed, noting that the City has tools such as incentives and TIF to encourage senior and lower income housing. If the City truly wants to plan, it will need to adopt a more proactive approach rather than relying solely on its traditional practices.

Shay stated that the City does use those tools, but that they fall primarily within the Economic Development Authority's area of responsibility rather than the Planning Commission's.

Commissioner Schaefer suggested that the Planning Commission and Economic Development Authority collaborate on housing needs to establish shared priorities and identify ways to help the City achieve them.

Shay stated that staff could structure opportunities for those conversations to occur.

Commissioner Schaefer expressed that, in her view, the Planning Commission represents an underutilized resource and could be engaged far more extensively than it is at present.

Chair Weber inquired as to whether a request was being made to approve the Hockey Hall of Fame.

Shay stated that the project did not come before the Planning Commission because there were no development plans at that stage. The City first entered into a Purchase Agreement for the site to compete with other Cities for the Minnesota Hockey Hall of Fame, which occurred before any formal development approvals. The applicant has since submitted a Comprehensive Plan Amendment currently under staff review, which could come before the Commission in February, and no other applications have been required to date because the process has involved only real estate transactions.

Chair Weber inquired as to whether Rezoning and other related approvals would still come before the Planning Commission for review.

Shay confirmed that the Comprehensive Plan Amendment comes first, followed by development plans and Rezoning, all of which will be brought before the Commission.

Commissioner Heidenreich stated that it appears Staff combined Minor and Major Site Plan Review into a single process under Section 10-15-6, with Staff applying the evaluation criteria without the item coming before the Planning Commission or City Council. He asked whether that interpretation is correct or whether he is misunderstanding the change.

Shay confirmed that under the proposed changes, all Site Plan Review would become an administrative process. Currently Minor Site Plans are reviewed administratively while Major Site Plans go before the Planning Commission and City Council, but the proposal would eliminate that distinction so any project that meets City Code would be handled through Staff review only.

Chair Weber inquired as to whether projects would still be required to meet all applicable criteria under City Code.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 6, 2026

Shay stated that the criteria would still include items such as landscaping, parking, lighting, setbacks, and building materials.

Commissioner Heidenreich stated that this relates to Commissioner Schaefer's concern, noting that the proposed change would allow a single Staff member, who may not even reside in the community, to make decisions affecting it, which he finds difficult to support.

Shay stated that in the past ten years there have been only ten such administrative Site Plan Reviews, as most projects have involved Conditional Use Permits, Variances, Interim Use Permits, or PUDs. Any development in the Northwest Area is required to be a PUD and would therefore still come before the Planning Commission.

Chair Weber inquired for an example of one of the administrative Site Plan Reviews.

Shay stated that the example from 2025 was Pine Bend Elementary's parking lot improvements for the bus turnaround and parking expansion, which did not come before the Commission because the project met all City Code criteria.

Shay stated that the action tonight is to make a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed Ordinance changes.

Motion by Weber, Second by Clancy, to Approve an update to the Variance section of the City Code referring to "practical difficulty" standard to comply with State Statute.

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0 Motion Carried.

Motion by Weber, Second by Clancy, to Approve the removal of the Determination of Substantially Similar Use section from the City Code.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 1 (Schaefer) Motion Carried.

Motion by Weber, Second by Clancy, to Approve the removal of the Northwest Area Environmental Studies Fee from the City Code.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 2 (Schaefer, Hunting) Motion Carried.

Motion by Weber, Second by Clancy, to Approve a change from a Super Majority vote (4/5) to a Simple Majority vote (3/5); remove exemption for I-2 zoning district; and remove specific environmental review language for Conditional Use Permit section.

Ayes: 4

Nays: 4 (Schaefer, Hunting, Teiken, Heidenreich) Motion Failed.

Commissioner Heidenreich stated that this illustrates what could occur if the City Council's vote threshold were changed from a 4/5 Super Majority to a 3/5 Simple Majority. If the Commission reconsidered what that change would mean in practice, members would likely vote to deny the Variance or change, which he believes no one truly wants to see approved.

Chair Weber inquired whether he favors continuing to require a Super Majority vote.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 6, 2026

Commissioner Heidenreich stated that he supports keeping the Super Majority requirement, warning that lowering it could allow Conditional or Interim Use Permits to pass too easily, especially when a Council Member is absent. Past example on Akron Avenue and asked whether a second motion could be made after the first vote.

Shay stated that the Commission may proceed with a recommendation because the prior vote did not pass for lack of a majority.

Commissioner Heidenreich stated that he was unsure whether it would be better to leave the matter as is or pursue a different approach.

Commissioner Schaefer clarified that the motion was not denied but simply failed.

Chair Weber stated that the motion to approve the CUP change failed due to a tie, so there is neither a recommendation to approve nor to deny the change. The matter would move forward to the City Council for a final decision.

Motion by Weber, Second by Clancy, to Approve a change from a Super Majority vote (4/5) to a Simple Majority vote (3/5); remove exemption for I-2 zoning district; and remove specific environmental review language for Interim Use Permit section.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 5 (Schaefer, Hunting, Teiken, Twedt, Heidenreich) Motion Failed.

Motion by Heidenreich, Second by Teiken, to Deny a change from a Super Majority vote (4/5) to a Simple Majority vote (3/5); remove exemption for I-2 zoning district; and remove specific environmental review language for Interim Use Permit section.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 3 (Gosell, Weber, Clancy) Motion Carried.

Motion by Weber, Second by Clancy, to Approve the removal of the distinction between "Minor" and "Major" Site Plan Reviews; Move the review process to administrative; and change from 125% to 100% for financial guarantees for Site Improvement Performance Agreements (SIPA's).

Ayes: 4

Nays: 4 (Schaefer, Hunting, Teiken, Heidenreich) Motion Failed.

Motion by Weber, Second by Clancy, to Approve the removal of requiring a Final Planned Unit Development to be reviewed by the Planning Commission prior to going before the City Council.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 5 (Schaefer, Hunting, Teiken, Heidenreich, Twedt) Motion Failed.

Motion by Teiken, Second by Schaefer, to Deny the removal of requiring a Final Planned Unit Development to be reviewed by the Planning Commission prior to going before the City Council.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 3 (Gosell, Weber, Clancy) Motion Carried.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 6, 2026

Motion by Weber, Second by Clancy, to Approve the removal of Waiver of Platting section from the City Code.

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0 Motion Carried.

This item is tentatively scheduled to go before the City Council on January 26, 2026.

Planning Manager Shay explained that last year's Ordinance Amendment to reduce Planning Commission and Visitors Bureau meetings from two per month to one did not pass. As a result, two meetings remain on the calendar, with the second meeting being used only if needed, similar to last year's practice.

7. REGULAR BUSINESS

None.

8. ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Tammy Greenlee, Recording Secretary.