

**City of Cottage Grove
Planning Commission
April 24, 2006**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the Planning Commission was duly held at City Hall, 7516 – 80th Street South, Cottage Grove, Minnesota on the 24th day of April, 2006, in the Council Chambers and telecast on local Government Cable Channel 16.

Call to Order

Chairperson Brittain called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Members Present: Shane Bauer, Ken Brittain, Jason Cavallo, Tina Folch-Freiermuth, Rod Hale, Tracy Poncin, Chris Reese, David Thiede

Members Absent: Rebecca Kronlund

Staff Present: Howard Blin, Community Development Director
John McCool, Senior Planner
Mark Grossklaus, City Council Liaison

Approval of Agenda

Motion by Reese, second by Thiede, to approve the agenda. Motion approved unanimously (8-0 vote).

Open Forum

Chairperson Brittain asked if anyone wished to address the Planning Commission on any non-agenda item. No one appeared to address the Commission.

Chair's Explanation of the Public Hearing Process

Chairperson Brittain explained the purpose of the Planning Commission, which serves in an advisory capacity to the City Council, and the City Council makes all final decisions. In addition, he explained the process of conducting a public hearing and requested that any person wishing to speak should come to the microphone and state their full name and address for the public record.

Public Hearings

6.1 Runze Addition – Case V06-015

Paul Runze, 11931 Lofton Avenue South, has applied for variances to City Code Title 11-9B-5, Development Standards for the R-2, Residential Estate District, to reduce the 25-foot

minimum side yard setback to 23 feet, and to Title 11-15-8C(1), Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area Overlay District Development Standards, to allow an addition to be setback less than the required 100 feet from the bluff line.

McCool summarized the staff report and recommended approval subject to the conditions stipulated in the staff report.

Brittain opened the public hearing. No one spoke. Brittain closed the public hearing.

Thiede made a motion to approve the application subject to the conditions listed below. Hale seconded.

- 1. Erosion control measures must be utilized during construction.***
- 2. The exterior materials and color for the proposed addition must be similar to the principal structure.***
- 3. The property owner must complete a building permit application and obtain a building permit from the City before any construction begins.***

Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0 vote).

6.2 Holiday Station, Hadley and Grange – Case CUP06-016

Holiday Companies has applied for a conditional use permit to allow the reconstruction of the convenience store/gas station at 8101 Hadley Avenue. The new facility will include a 3,856 square foot convenience store, including an attached car wash and a gasoline-dispensing system that will serve 12 vehicles.

Blin summarized the staff report and recommended approval subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Dave Hoeschen, Vice President of Real Estate for Holiday Companies, explained that they recently acquired the lease. They would like to shift the building site, move the access points, and add fueling stations. He stated that the face of the canopy would be the EFIS color, not red and blue. He passed around samples of the building exterior materials.

Hale requested a requirement that the car wash water be recycled. Hoeschen responded that they are not planning to recycle the water. He explained that their touch free system uses a lot of chemicals and customers who have used car washes that recycle water have not been satisfied.

Cavallo asked how much water is used by the car wash. Hoeschen responded approximately 32 gallons per wash and about 20,000 to 22,000 gallons per year. Cavallo stated that the building looks the same as other gas stations and he believes that it should look nicer. He suggested adding a pitched roof to the canopy.

Poncin asked if the existing tanks would be removed. Hoeschen responded yes. Poncin stated that the proposal would be an improvement over the existing conditions on the site. She also stated that she likes the mix of brick and other materials.

Thiede asked for more details on the 15-year lease. Hoeschen explained that they understand the condition that if the two parcels are ever fee-owned by the same entity, they would need to be platted as one lot. Thiede asked if there would be any scenarios in the future where the lease could cause any problems. Blin responded that ultimately it would be the responsibility of the landowner, and he can't foresee a situation where that would cause a problem.

Cavallo asked if the intersection could handle the increased traffic due to redevelopment. Blin responded that the County looked at the site and they believe that the intersection as it is currently configured is sufficient to handle existing and new traffic generated from this development.

Hale asked about the location of the access point onto Hadley Avenue. Blin responded that the access would be moved further from the intersection.

Folch asked if there are assurances that the water from the car wash won't run off onto Belden Boulevard. Hoeschen responded that the site drains towards the east and he pointed out the locations of the two catch basins, which will trap any runoff and brought into the pond.

Brittain opened the public hearing.

Holden Smith, 1764 Jones Lane, Mound, owner of the G-Will Center, asked about the height of the proposed structures as compared to the existing structures. Hoeschen responded that he is not sure about the height of the existing structure, but he thinks it is about 13 feet high. The top of the peak on the proposed building would be approximately 24 feet.

No one else spoke. Brittain closed the public hearing.

Hale stated that he would like to pursue requiring recycling of the water from the car wash. He knows that there are car washes in the city that do recycle water. He wants to require that they at least clean up the water before it enters the city system.

Thiede agreed with Hale but noted that if we require recycling for this station, the city may need to require all car washes to recycle their water. Cavallo stated that he would like require all future washes to recycle their water.

Reese asked about the hours of operation for both the gas station and the car wash. Blin responded that they could operate 24 hours a day, and staff is not proposing to restrict the hours because this is a commercial location with no nearby residential.

Reese made a motion to approve the application subject to the conditions listed below. Folch-Freiermuth seconded.

- 1. All applicable permits (i.e., building, electrical, grading, mechanical) and a commercial plan review packet must be completed, submitted, and approved by the City prior to***

the commencement of any construction activities. Detailed construction plans must be reviewed and approved by the Building Official and Fire Marshal.

- 2. Final exterior construction materials and colors must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the issuance of a building permit.***
- 3. Colored stripes/corporate branding inconsistent with the primary building design features are prohibited on the canopy.***
- 4. The pump canopy is prohibited from being back lit.***
- 5. The grading and erosion control plan for the site must comply with NPDES II Permit requirements. Erosion control devices must be installed prior to commencement of any grading activity. Erosion control must be performed in accordance with the recommended practices of the "Minnesota Construction Site Erosion and Sediment Control Planning Handbook" and the conditions stipulated in Title 10-5-8, Erosion Control During Construction, of the City's Subdivision Ordinance.***
- 6. The applicant must provide the City with an as-built survey of all private utilities prior to certificate of occupancy.***
- 7. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant must pay a park dedication fee amounting to \$9,835.52.***
- 8. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant must pay the required area charges.***
- 9. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant must submit a comprehensive sign package to the City for review and approval.***
- 10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant must submit to the City a comprehensive lighting package consistent with the city redevelopment plan for review and approval. All outdoor lighting must be directed downward and away from residential property and public streets, and must not exceed one footcandle at the property lines.***
- 11. All curbing for the project must be B618.***
- 12. The landscaping plan must be revised to address the items identified in the staff report. Said plan must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the issuance of a building permit.***
- 13. A bona fide cost estimate of the landscaping improvements must be submitted in conjunction with a letter of credit approved by the City in the amount of 150 percent of such estimate. Upon completion of the landscaping requirements, the applicant must in writing inform the City that said improvements have been completed. The City will retain the financial guarantee for a period of one year from the date of notice to insure the survival of the plantings, and until the as-built utility survey has***

been submitted. No building permit will be issued until the required financial guarantee has been received and accepted by the City.

14. Ornamental wrought iron/aluminum fencing that is consistent with the City standards will be required for any fencing completed on the site.

15. The applicant must convey an indemnification letter to the City recognizing the planned encroachments on all public drainage and utility easements and holding the City harmless for any costs incurred during public projects that may occur in the easements.

16. The Conditional Use Permit allows the gas station to have 12 (twelve) fueling stations and 24-hour operation.

17. Outdoor storage and display of retail sales items is prohibited with the exception of exterior sales of propane tanks and ice, except for temporary sales by permit.

18. The developer is responsible for the cost of installing a "STOP" sign at each exit lane. The "STOP" sign must be 10 feet from the roadway edge and 2 feet from the driveway edge. The bottom of the sign must be 6 feet from the ground. The "STOP" sign must be a 30-inch sized sign having a high intensity reflective face. Said sign should be mounted on a six-foot No. 3 and eight-foot No. 2 steel post. The applicant may request the City's Public Works Department to install this sign, but must reimburse the City for actual costs incurred by the City.

19. A radio-read water meter(s) must be installed.

Motion passed on a 6-to-2 vote (Cavallo, Hale).

Hale explained that he does not want to hold up the project but he thought an amendment would have been appropriate to require recycling of water from the car wash. He asked staff to consider requiring car washes to recycle their water prior to the water entering the sewer system. Cavallo agreed with Hale. Blin responded that staff would look into that.

6.3 East Ravine Development Standards – Case TA06-017

The City of Cottage Grove has applied for amendments to the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances to add development standards for properties in the East Ravine.

McCool summarized the staff report and recommended approval.

Thiede asked with the street width minimum of 28 feet if a developer could put in 32-foot wide streets. Blin responded that the street width requirement is 28 feet. Thiede asked if sidewalks would be required along all streets that are 28 feet wide. Blin responded that would depend on the traffic volumes.

Cavallo believes that all roads should have a sidewalk for public safety reasons.

Reese asked if the 28-foot wide street only applies to Neighborhood 1 and not to Neighborhood 2. Blin responded that was correct. Reese wants that clarified in the ordinance.

Folch-Freiermuth agreed with Cavallo about requiring sidewalks. She asked about the language regarding public streets and if all streets within Cottage Grove are public. McCool responded that there are a few private roads in the rural areas that service only a few lots.

Hale asked about Title 11-9I-5, Multi-Family Townhouse Performance Standards, paragraph D, which would allow 60 townhouse structures or 100 multiple family units with the same exterior in one area. He stated that in past discussions the Commission did not want that type of development. He wants to consider a smaller number of units.

Reese asked if there was a minimum setback for sidewalks and trails from collector streets. He expressed concern about sidewalks being too close to streets for safety reasons. McCool stated that he does not recall what the boulevard separation is. Reese asked if there was a minimum lighting requirement for trails. Blin responded that there are no specific requirements for lighting but there is a typical spacing for street lights. Reese asked if these are the standards for all developments going forward or just for the East Ravine. McCool responded that the proposed zoning classifications can be applied anywhere in the city, not just the East Ravine. If a property is zoned with one of the existing classifications, the city cannot require them to rezone it to one of the new classifications.

Cavallo asked how important monument signs are, expressing the opinion that most people want to live in Cottage Grove, not a particular subdivision. Blin responded that the city wants to minimize the amount of signage at the entrances to these developments, but have landscaped entrance features. He stated that developers believe the monument signs identifying the name of the subdivision are important in marketing the development.

Bauer stated that one of the issues with 28-foot wide streets revolved around safety and he would like further clarification on where sidewalks will be placed. Blin responded that one option would be to require a sidewalk on at least one side of each local street.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to that there should be further discussion on requiring sidewalks, the design of those sidewalks, and their maintenance.

Brittain opened the public hearing.

Bill Pritchard, 2100 West County Road 42, Burnsville, expressed concern about the width of the right-of-way for minor arterial roads and the 75-foot wide buffer along the minor arterial roads in Neighborhood 1. He would like the Commission to look at streetscapes, with landscaping closer to the roads in the boulevard areas to help create a canopy. Blin responded that different right-of-ways for arterial streets relate to whether it is a city or county roadway; the county has higher standards. The city has talked to the County about reducing their required right-of-way because of the 75-foot buffer strips. He noted that utilities, trails, and sidewalks, which are normally found within the right-of-way, could be placed within those buffer strips.

No one else spoke. Brittain closed the public hearing.

McCool summarized the proposed residential zoning ordinance classifications and uses in each of those districts.

Poncin reiterated the point made by Hale regarding the concentration of multi-family housing with similar designs, which seems inconsistent with what the city is requiring of single family developments.

Hale asked if the intent was to vote on these amendments this evening. Blin responded that the ordinances are before the Commission for approval but the discussion could be continued. Hale stated that the number of units for multi-family and sidewalks seems to need further discussion. He asked if the ordinances could be approved without those two provisions and continue those discussions at a later date. McCool responded yes, noting that ultimately all the amendments would be combined into one ordinance.

Hale made a motion to approve the amendments with the exception of sidewalks and Section 5-5, which would come back for further discussion. Reese seconded. Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0 vote).

Applications and Requests

7.1 Kath Oil – Almar Village Gas Station

Blin summarized the staff report and recommended approval subject to the conditions stipulated in the staff report.

Steve Dahl, Kath Fuel Oil Company, 3096 Rice Street, Little Canada, stated that the reason that they did not commence the project with last year's approvals was due to financing issues. He explained the commitments that they have put forward for this project and that they recently received the financial commitment from their bank. He stated that their proposal is the same as the previous submittals. He did ask the condition #16, which limits the station to 12 fueling stations and 6 pumps, be changed to 12 fueling stations due to the various alternative fuels being mandated by the government. Blin asked if instead of limiting the number of fueling stations, that the number of pump islands be limited with no limitation on fueling stations. Dahl agreed. Blin suggested limiting it to six pump islands.

Cavallo asked about the front entrance. Dahl responded that is a barrel arch that is extended forward to protect from the rain. Cavallo stated that he liked the appearance of the building. Dahl reiterated that the architecture on the gas station matches the Almar Village building.

Dahl then explained that due to the square footage, they would not be able to reclaim the water from the car wash. Cavallo asked if that would be a hardship to Kath and if that requirement would delay the project. Dahl responded that their equipment room would not be large enough for a reclamation system, so they would not be able to have a car wash.

Hale asked if Kath was going to operate the gas station or are they selling it to another brand. Dahl responded that Kath will operate the station.

Brittain noted that on the north side of the property there is a connection from the parking lot to the trail system and he asked if they would be opposed to adding a pedestrian access on the eastern side by Keats Avenue. Dahl had no objections. Blin stated that a requirement could be added to construct a sidewalk to the trail along Keats. Brittain asked why backlighting of the canopy is being allowed for this project. Blin responded that only the sign attached to the canopy face may be backlit.

Folch asked why there is a difference in the number of parking spaces required for this station versus the Holiday on Hadley. Blin responded that the number spaces is based on the square footage of the store. Dahl stated that they also share parking with the retail center.

Reese asked about their time line. Dahl responded that they plan to start construction this summer. Reese asked if 24-hour pay at the pump would be allowed. Blin responded that right now that would not be allowed, but it was approved for the Holiday on Hinton and there have been no complaints. Reese asked if the pumps would have the capability to service customers after hours with pay at the pump. Dahl responded yes, and they would like to be able to do that if the city allows it. Blin stated that the city would allow 24-hour pay at the pump but not require it.

Thiede made a motion to approve the application subject to the conditions listed below, with a change to limit the number of pump islands to six with no limitation on the number of fueling stations, to require a sidewalk connection to the trail along Keats Avenue, and to allow 24-hour pay at the pump service. Hale seconded.

- 1. The project must conform to all conditions of approval for the Planned Unit Development for the Almar Village development included in Ordinance No. 698.***
- 2. All building and site improvements must conform to plans dated September 15, 2003 and stamped as received by the Community Development Department on February 28, 2005. The site plan, grading, and utility plans shall be modified to reflect the comments and additional required performance standards identified in the staff report.***
- 3. All applicable permits (i.e., building, electrical, grading, and mechanical) and a commercial plan review packet shall be completed, submitted, and approved by the City prior to the commencement of any construction activities. Detailed construction plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Building Official and Fire Marshal.***
- 4. The convenience store entrance canopy must include brick along the piers and on the recessed building façade, within the canopy location.***
- 5. Final exterior construction materials and colors shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. The materials and colors must be in substantial compliance with the currently under construction shopping center.***
- 6. The applicant shall provide the City with an as-built survey of all private utilities.***

- 7. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a comprehensive sign package to the City for review and approval. All signs shall comply with the provisions of the sign ordinance and a building permit must be obtained prior to the installation of any new signs.**
- 8. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a comprehensive lighting package consistent with the city redevelopment plan to the City for review and approval. All outdoor lighting shall be directed downward and away from residential property and public streets, and shall not exceed one foot-candle at the property lines.**
- 9. The landscaping plan and irrigation plan shall be revised to meet the items identified in the staff report. Said plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the issuance of a building permit.**
- 10. A bona fide cost estimate of the landscaping improvements shall be submitted in conjunction with a letter of credit approved by the City in the amount of 150 percent of such estimate. Upon completion of the landscaping requirements, the applicant shall in writing inform the City that said improvements have been completed. The City shall retain the financial guarantee for a period of one year from the date of notice to insure the survival of the plantings. No building permit shall be issued until the required financial guarantee has been received and accepted by the City.**
- 11. Rooftop and at-grade electrical or mechanical equipment shall be screened from view with materials and landscaping similar to or compatible in design and color with those used on the primary structure.**
- 12. A radio-read water meter shall be installed.**
- 13. The trash enclosure shall in accordance with Title 11-6-3 and include the use of dog-eared plastic composite wood boards for the gate screening material.**
- 14. No lighting in any manner is permitted on the face of the gas station canopy, with the exception of the areas allowed for signs. All lighting under the gas station canopy must be recessed from the bottom of the canopy.**
- 15. Exterior storage, display, or sales of merchandise is prohibited at the gas station C-store, except for temporary sales by permit.**
- 16. The number of fueling stations shall be limited to 12 (6 pumps).**
- 17. No fast food (Class 3) restaurant shall be allowed as an accessory use or within the gas station C-store use.**
- 18. An additional hydrant shall be added to the site as required by the City's Fire Marshal.**

Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0 vote).

7.2 Platinum Development Concept Plan – Neighborhood 1 East Development Area

Blin provided background information on the proposed Cedarhurst Point development. Steve Boynton from Platinum Development introduced himself, Jeff Richter and Tom Verneer, who are also from Platinum Development, and Kim Graper from Westwood. Boynton described their concept plan for Cedarhurst Point, which would be located at the V that is formed by Keats Avenue and Military Road. He stated that it is a 34-acre site that is guided for medium and high residential development. Their plan consists of a density of approximately 8.1 units per acre, which includes 62 row homes and 216 town homes for a total of 278 units. He displayed drawings of the proposed development, explaining the different components of the project, which include a pool and a club house. He then explained that the plan that the Commission was viewing extends beyond the boundary of the land that they control. In discussions with staff, they are exploring a land swap that would allow them to accommodate the city's parkway plan. They have another version that keeps the project entirely on their site. Blin explained that the other landowner is the South Washington Watershed District, who is willing to discuss trading excess watershed land to Platinum.

There were comments on the pool, which would be association maintained; the addition of a tot lot or playground in the open space; the trail that would replace Military Road with historical monuments; using historical names for streets in the development; the plans for Military Road; the size of the green space in the development; a variety of exterior materials on the housing units; mail box areas; garage sizes and off-street parking; the need for sidewalks; width of private roads; and park dedication. It was the consensus of the Commission that this concept plan meets the spirit of the East Ravine Master Plan.

Bauer asked about the construction of the Ravine Parkway. Blin explained that roadway would be built in segments and the direction staff has received from the City Council is to wait for properties to develop prior to constructing the Ravine Parkway.

7.3 Platinum Development Concept Plan – West Draw Phase II

Blin provided background information on the proposed concept plan for Walden Woods. Boynton described the proposal, noting that location in the West Draw area has some very special requirements, such as the preservation of the woods, maintaining the integrity of the slopes, and preserving the natural amenities on the site. He displayed an aerial photo of the area. He explained that many of the lots would be custom graded to preserve trees and slopes. They would also like to have 28-foot wide roads to help preserve as many of the natural amenities as they can. He explained that Walden Woods would be comprised of three separate neighborhoods each with its own unique character linked by a comprehensive trail system. The Estates of Walden Woods, located on the northwest portion of the site, would encompass the old growth woods area; to the east is the Savannah of Walden Woods; and the southern portion would be the Meadows at Walden Woods. The overall density of the site would be 1.6 units per acre and the lot size average is 18,000 square feet. The lots in the Estate of Walden Woods neighborhood would be about a half acre in size to allow custom grading and tree preservation, the lots in the Savannah neighborhood would be average sized, and the Meadows would have smaller lots. A handful of lots in the Meadows would be 75 feet wide with the majority 80 feet wide and a few 85 feet wide; all lots would exceed 11,000

square feet. He explained that they could have put together a plan with all 85-foot wide lots consisting of 11,000 square feet but they decided to follow what they believe is the spirit that the city wants this area to have. Their goal with this proposed concept plan is to preserve the natural features of the parcel.

Hale asked how many of the lots in the Meadows would be less than 85 feet wide. Graper stated that there are 100 lots between 75 and 85 feet, with the average width being 80 feet, reiterating that none of the lots are less than 11,000 square feet.

The Commission commented on tree preservation; lot widths and sizes; the need for sidewalks if the streets are 28 feet wide; having larger lots for a more rural feel; the location and setback of the trail; water and sewer service to the area; drainage and the storm water system; impact on Hadley Avenue and 65th Street; and the cost and marketability of the homes.

Brittain asked if anyone wanted to speak on this proposal.

Pat Kotnour, 9770 Military Road, stated that Platinum has done a wonderful job working with the property owners by Military Road and Keats Avenue. She asked if the city to allow this project.

Tim Reimann, 6100 Hadley Avenue South, stated that he is representing 10 of 12 families that live in the affected area. He stated that none of the property owners oppose the development but have suggestions on how to proceed with that development. He asked that the City respect the West Draw Task Force Report so the proposed development comports with the Report's recommendations. He asked that sewer and water not be brought up Hadley from 65th Street, that the zoning along the east side of Hadley from the Woodbury boundary to 65th Street remain three acres or greater, that the areas immediately behind all properties fronting the east side of Hadley have appropriate buffering or graduated zoning, that the developments east of Hadley be accessed 65th Street and Hinton but not from Hadley, and that Hadley Avenue not be upgraded.

There was additional discussion on assessments for road improvements, neighboring homeowners objection to accessing the development from Hadley, buffering and preservation of the woodland areas on the east side of Hadley Avenue, access to the project from 65th Street and removing the access from Hadley Avenue, and increasing the size of the lots on the western portion of the project.

Stan Whiting, 65th Street, stated that he grew up in Cottage Grove and believes that the proposed development would be good for the area. He believes that the developers have done a good job and he may buy two lots in the development. He noted that the area has changed. He uses the walking trails every day and is concerned about the one that ends at Hadley and forces walkers onto the roller coaster road. He stated that most walking trails in the city go past people's houses.

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes of March 27, 2006

Motion by Reese, seconded by Bauer, to approve the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting on March 27, 2006. Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0).

Reports

9.1 Recap of April City Council Meetings

Blin reviewed the items discussed by the City Council at their meetings in April 2006.

9.2 Committee Reports

Hale updated the Commission on the South Washington Watershed District. The last watershed plan was developed in 1997, and the SWWD is holding meetings to discuss the new plan. He suggested that Matt Moore, Director of SWWD, come before the Commission to review the proposed plan. He also asked about the plan that the city put together. Blin responded that he would arrange to have the Commission look at both plans at a future meeting.

9.3 Response to Planning Commission Inquiries

Blin reported that a few months ago the Commission looked at a concept plan for a development on land south of 85th Street and west of the tank farms. Staff was going to prepare a study on development in that area. The study was aborted because development of that parcel was predicated on the adjacent land in St. Paul Park being developed by DR Horton as part of the Rivers Edge project, but rather than being the first area developed, it will be one of the last. Secondly, staff talked with Marathon Ashland and the pipeline company, and they have no plans to change their operations in that area. Given that, staff decided that there is no point in completing that study.

9.4 Planning Commission Requests

Hale stated that there was a sign on Grey Cloud Trail off 103rd Street that restricted truck traffic during the road reconstruction and asked if that sign was still needed. Blin responded no.

Reese asked if construction on the Washington County building is starting. Blin responded that the ground breaking is scheduled for May 2 and that utility work has commenced. He stated that 400 or 500 feet of 90th Street west of Keats will also be reconstructed as part of the Ravine Parkway construction project.

Hale asked for an update on the Biscoe Grove/Lehigh Acres project. McCool responded that a developer had been looking to buy the project but staff has not recently heard anything further. Hale asked how long the plat approval is good for. Blin responded for one year.

Bauer asked if the realignment project of Military Road, 70th Street, and Keats Avenue includes the straight extension of 70th Street. Blin responded not yet.

Cavallo asked when the Commission would further discuss sidewalk issues. Blin responded at the next meeting.

Bauer asked for an update on the lighting at the auto marshalling yard. Blin responded that staff will take another look soon.

9.5 Adoption of 2006 Planning Commission Rules

Thiede made a motion to adopt the 2006 Planning Commission Rules. Reese seconded. Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0).

Adjournment

Motion by Reese, seconded by Cavallo, to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously (8-to-0). The meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m.