



Approved: June 6, 2018

**CITY OF ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA
PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2018
6:30 P.M. - ARDEN HILLS CITY HALL**

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, Chair Roberta Thompson called to order the regular Planning Commission meeting at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Chair Roberta Thompson, Commissioners Steven Jones, James Lambeth and Clayton Zimmerman

Absent: Commissioners Matt Dixon, Nick Gehrig, Brent Bartell (Alternate), and Angela Hames (Alternate).

Also present were: City Planner Matthew Bachler and Councilmember Steve Scott.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – MAY 9, 2018

Councilmember Scott discussed a recent decision made by the City Council noting staff would no longer be making a recommendation to the Planning Commission for their planning cases. Rather staff would be noting the options available to the Planning Commission.

The agenda was approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 4, 2018 – Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Councilmember Scott noted a change to the minutes on Page 10 stating for Planning Case 17-029, it should be noted the Council moved to approve this item, but the amendment failed on a 2-3 vote.

Commissioner Jones moved, seconded by Commissioner Zimmerman, to approve the April 4, 2018, Planning Commission Regular Meeting as amended. The motion carried unanimously (4-0).

PLANNING CASES**A. Planning Case 18-007; 4535 Lakeshore Place – Variance**

City Planner Bachler stated the applicants are the owners of the property at 4535 Lakeshore Place, which is located in the R-1 District on the northeast side of Round Lake. The property owners are proposing to tear down the existing dwelling and reconstruct a new dwelling within approximately the same footprint. The existing single-family residential dwelling is a nonconforming structure because of an encroachment of 6 feet – 2 inches into the required 40-foot front yard setback from Lakeshore Place. Since the nonconforming structure is being completely removed and not being replaced within the exact same footprint and with the same dimensions, the property owners are required to reconstruct the new dwelling to meet the 40-foot front yard setback.

City Planner Bachler explained the applicants have requested a variance to allow them to reconstruct the new dwelling generally within the same footprint of the existing structure with a proposed encroachment of 5 feet – 4 inches and a setback of 34 feet – 8 inches. The new dwelling would include a two-car attached garage and a walk out basement facing Round Lake. The proposed dwelling would meet all other setback and lot coverage requirements.

Site Data

Land Use Plan:	Low Density Residential
Existing Land Use:	Single Family Detached Residential
Zoning:	R-1: Single Family Residential
Current Lot Sizes:	0.45 Acres (19,853 square feet)
Topography:	Slopes down approximately 22 feet from Lakeshore Place to Round Lake

City Planner Bachler reviewed the surrounding area, the Plan Evaluation and the Variance Evaluation Criteria.

City Planner Bachler provided the Findings of Fact for review:

General Findings:

1. The property at 4535 Lakeshore Place is located in the R-1 Single Family Residential Zoning District.
2. The existing single-family residential dwelling on the property is a nonconforming structure because of an encroachment of 6 feet – 2 inches into the required 40-foot front yard setback from Lakeshore Place.
3. The property owners are proposing to tear down the existing dwelling and reconstruct a new dwelling within the same footprint.
4. Since the nonconforming structure is being completely removed and not being replaced within the exact same footprint and with the same dimensions, the property owners are required to reconstruct the new dwelling to meet the 40-foot front yard setback.
5. The property owners have requested a variance to allow them to reconstruct the new dwelling generally within the same footprint of the existing structure with a proposed encroachment of 5 feet – 4 inches and a setback of 34 feet – 8 inches.

6. The proposed single-family residential dwelling would meet all other minimum setback requirements for the R-1 District and the setback requirements included in Section 1330 of the Shoreland Regulations.
7. The proposed single-family residential dwelling would meet the minimum lot coverage requirements for the R-1 District.
8. The proposed development would not encroach on any flood plains, wetlands, or easements.
9. The proposed development is not expected to impact any significant trees on the property.

Variance Findings:

10. The variance request would comply with the purpose and intent of the R-1 Zoning District and with the policies within the City's Comprehensive Plan.
11. A single-family detached dwelling is a permitted use in the R-1 District and is a reasonable use of the subject property.
12. The existing topography of the lot could be considered a unique circumstance that justifies the proposed location of the dwelling.
13. The proposed front yard setback appears to be consistent with the prevailing setbacks for the three dwellings located west of the subject property.
14. The proposed variance does not appear to be based on economic consideration alone.

City Planner Bachler reviewed the options available to the Planning Commission on this matter:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted.
3. Recommend Denial
4. Table

Chair Thompson opened the floor to Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Lambeth asked if proposed encroachment was measured from the front wall of the structure or the front porch.

City Planner Bachler noted the encroachment was measured from the front wall of the structure and not the front porch. He explained front porches are allowed to encroach within the front yard setback if the City's design standards for front porches are met.

Commissioner Lambeth indicated the pitch of the roof on the porch was the same as the house. He questioned if staff had the dimensions for the front porch.

City Planner Bachler indicated staff did not have the final dimensions for the front porch. He noted the final design of the porch would be verified with the Building Permit application. Further discussion ensued regarding the setbacks for the adjacent properties.

Commissioner Jones asked if the owner had expressed a hardship as to why the house cannot be setback 40 feet.

City Planner Bachler stated the owner would be reusing the existing foundation. He explained shifting the house back would require a great deal of fill and noted a significant maple tree would be lost.

Commissioner Lambeth inquired if what the existing encroachment was.

City Planner Bachler reported the existing encroachment was six feet – two inches. He stated this measurement was taken from the property line to the northwest corner of the home. It was noted the brick enclosure encroaches further into the front yard.

Mike Loosbrock, 4535 Lakeshore Place, explained he was requesting to maintain the same building envelop as was in place today. He estimated the front porch would be about six feet deep. He stated he valued the quality of the backyard space and large maple tree. He commented it was his hope to keep the home on the same building pad with no grade changes. He requested he be allowed to encroach six feet into the front yard setback.

Commissioner Zimmerman asked why the applicant was requesting to demolish and rebuild his home versus renovating the existing house.

Mr. Loosbrock explained the existing house was in rough shape and noted substantial rehabilitation would be needed. For this reason, he was proposing to demolish and rebuild as he did not want to raise the roof on the existing home.

Commissioner Zimmerman questioned when the original home was built.

Mr. Loosbrock indicated he believed the home was built in the 1950s.

Commissioner Jones moved and Commissioner Lambeth seconded a motion to recommend approval of Planning Case 18-007 for a Variance at 4535 Lakeshore Place based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, as amended by the five (5) conditions in the May 9, 2018, report to the Planning Commission.

Chair Thompson stated she supported the rear yard not being impacted as this could disturb the adjacent lake.

The motion carried unanimously (4-0).

B. Planning Case 18-008; 1275 Nursery Hill Court – Variance

City Planner Bachler stated the applicants are the owners of the property at 1275 Nursery Hill Court, which is located in the R-1 District. The property owners are proposing an addition to their existing home that would include a third stall on the garage and a bedroom above the garage addition. The applicants have requested a variance to allow the first-floor garage addition to encroach 3 feet – 1 inch into the 40-foot front yard setback. The existing garage is setback 39 feet – 5 inches from the front lot line and the addition would extend the structure an additional 2 feet – 6 inches towards Nursery Hill Court. The proposed second floor bedroom addition would not encroach within any required setbacks. The proposed addition would meet all other setback and lot coverage requirements.

Site Data

Land Use Plan:	Low Density Residential
Existing Land Use:	Single Family Detached Residential
Zoning:	R-1: Single Family Residential
Current Lot Sizes:	0.51 Acres (22,225 square feet)
Topography:	Relatively flat. Slopes down to north and west.

City Planner Bachler reviewed the surrounding area, the Plan Evaluation and the Variance Evaluation Criteria.

City Planner Bachler provided the Findings of Fact for review:

General Findings:

1. The property at 1275 Nursery Hill Court is located in the R-1 Single Family Residential Zoning District.
2. The existing single-family residential dwelling on the property is a nonconforming structure because of an encroachment of 7 inches into the required 40-foot front yard setback from Nursery Hill Court.
3. The property owners have requested a variance in order to construct a third stall garage addition that would encroach 3 feet – 1 inch into the required 40-foot front yard setback and result in a setback of 36 feet – 11 inches.
4. The proposed addition would meet all other minimum setback requirements for the R-1 District.
5. The proposed addition would be required to meet the minimum lot coverage requirements, maximum building height requirement, and floor area ratio requirement for the R-1 District.
6. The proposed development would not encroach on any flood plains, wetlands, or easements.
7. The proposed development is not expected to impact any significant trees on the property.

Variance Findings:

8. The variance request would comply with the purpose and intent of the R-1 Zoning District and with the policies within the City's Comprehensive Plan.
9. The proposed addition for a third garage stall and additional living space above is a reasonable use of the property.
10. The presence of the large drainage and utility easement area on the west and north side of the property along with the location of the existing dwelling at the far eastern side of the property could be considered unique circumstances.
11. A third garage stall would not be inconsistent with the other dwellings on Nursery Hill Court.
12. The proposed variance does not appear to be based on economic consideration alone.

City Planner Bachler reviewed the options available to the Planning Commission on this matter:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted.

3. Recommend Denial
4. Table

Chair Thompson opened the floor to Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Lambeth asked if the garage would have an upstairs addition.

City Planner Bachler reported this was shown in the drawings.

Commissioner Lambeth questioned what would be stored in the new one-car garage given the fact it was only 18 feet deep.

City Planner Bachler explained the home already had an attached two-car garage. He anticipated the third stall could house a small vehicle, yard equipment, toys and bikes. He reported the plans would be inspected by staff to ensure they comply with all fire code requirements.

Ross Johnson, 1275 Nursery Hill Court, introduced himself to the Commission and stated the proposed single car garage expansion would allow him to store bikes and yard equipment.

Commissioner Lambeth asked if the new garage would require the property to be regraded.

Mr. Johnson stated he did not anticipate this would have to occur.

Chair Thompson asked if staff had reviewed the drainage plans for this request.

City Planner Bachler reported the Public Works Director/City Engineer had reviewed the preliminary plans and had no comments or concerns.

Commissioner Zimmerman stated he was pleased to see Arden Hills' residents were willing to invest in their homes instead of moving out of the community. He indicated this assists in improving the City's housing stock.

Commissioner Jones commented this was an odd shaped lot. He questioned if Mr. Johnson had taken the time to speak with the property owner at 1259 Nursery Hill Court.

Mr. Johnson reported he had not yet spoken to this neighbor. He explained that all of his other neighbors have been supportive of his request.

Commissioner Zimmerman moved and Commissioner Lambeth seconded a motion to recommend approval of Planning Case 18-008 for a Variance at 1275 Nursery Hill Court based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, as amended by the three (3) conditions in the May 9, 2018, report to the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously (4-0).

C. Planning Case 18-009; 1290 County Road F – Site Plan Review

City Planner Bachler stated the property at 1290 County Road F West is owned by Arden Village, LLC and is occupied by a four story, 60-unit apartment building. The property is zoned R-4 – Multiple Dwelling District and is located south of County Road F, east of Hamline Avenue, north of Interstate 694, and west of Lexington Avenue. Arden Village, LLC has expressed concerns about its ability to lease units in the building during the reconstruction of County Road F in 2018 due to decreased traffic.

City Planner Bachler reported the applicant has requested a Sign Standard Adjustment through the Site Plan Review process to permit additional temporary wall signage for the building to increase its visibility during the construction period. One wall sign would be installed on the south elevation facing Interstate 694 and would measure 6 feet by 40 feet for an area of 240 square feet. The second sign is proposed to be located on the north elevation facing County Road F and would measure 6 feet by 33 feet for an area of 198 square feet. The combined area of the two signs would be 438 square feet.

City Planner Bachler commented Section 1250.02 of the Sign Code regulates the use of temporary signs. The property is located in Sign District 3 and is permitted to have no more than one temporary wall sign not to exceed 10 square feet in size. Since the building currently has units for lease, the property is allowed one additional temporary sign not to exceed 25 square feet in size.

City Planner Bachler explained the applicant has indicated they would like to display the temporary signs from when a sign permit is issued until November 1, 2018. The Sign Code allows a property to display a temporary sign for no more than 30 days per calendar year. A sign advertising available space for lease in a building can be displayed until seven days after the building is leased. The City approved a similar application from Arden Village, LLC in 2014 for the same two temporary wall signs after the building first opened (Planning Case 13-023). The temporary signs were displayed for approximately seven months at that time. The applicant has provided a letter with their request for additional signage and elevations of the building depicting the proposed signage.

Site Data

Land Use Plan:	High Density Residential
Existing Land Use:	Multiple Family
Zoning:	R-4: Multiple Dwelling District
Current Lot Sizes:	2.26 Acres
Topography:	Fairly Flat

City Planner Bachler reviewed the surrounding area, the Plan Evaluation and offered the following Findings of Fact for review:

1. The property at 1290 County Road F West is located in the R-4 – Multiple Dwelling District and in Sign District 3.
2. Section 1250.02 of the Sign Code allows the property to display one temporary wall sign with a maximum area of 10 square feet for a maximum duration of 30 days per calendar year.

3. Section 1250.02 of the Sign Code allows buildings or parcels with space for lease to have one temporary wall sign up to 25 square feet in size to be displayed until seven days after a building or parcel is fully leased.
4. The applicant has proposed installing one temporary wall sign measuring 240 square feet in area on the south building elevation facing Interstate 694 and one temporary wall sign measuring 198 square feet in area on the north building elevation facing County Road F West.
5. The applicant has proposed displaying the two temporary wall signs from the date a Sign Permit is issued until November 1, 2018.
6. Section 1260 of the Sign Code permits deviation from the Sign Code through the Site Plan Review process.
7. The permitted size of temporary wall signs may limit the owner's ability to effectively advertise the availability of apartment units for rent given the size of the building and the distance the building is setback from Interstate 694 and County Road F West.
8. The applicant has requested to extend the duration of time that the temporary wall signs can be displayed due to the expected decrease in traffic as a result of the County Road F West reconstruction project.
9. The proposed signs would not be in direct view from residential properties.
10. The sign standard adjustment is not expected to result in signs that are inconsistent with the purpose of the R-4 – Multiple Dwelling District.
11. The proposed signs are not expected to have a negative impact on adjacent properties or the City as a whole.

City Planner Bachler reviewed the options available to the Planning Commission on this matter:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted.
3. Recommend Denial
4. Table

Chair Thompson opened the floor to Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Lambeth asked when the utility and construction work would be complete.

City Planner Bachler explained the majority of the work along County Road F would be completed by this fall.

Commissioner Jones questioned what sign standards were followed previously for this property.

City Planner Bachler stated in 2014 the City approved a similar application for two signs that were the same size and in the same locations. He indicated these signs were displayed for approximately seven months.

Commissioner Zimmerman inquired what percentage of the apartment building was currently vacant.

Megan Carr, Sand Companies, reported she currently only had seven or eight vacant units or 10% of the building. She provided further comment on the proposed location for the requested signs and how these signs would assist with marketing this building.

Commissioner Zimmerman requested the signs be removed when the building no longer had any availability.

Commissioner Lambeth stated he valued building signage and the messages businesses were trying to display. He questioned if the sign on the south elevation would be visible from the freeway once the trees were fully green.

Ms. Carr commented the signs and online targeting would be used to assist with filling the vacant units. She explained the sign on the south elevation would be changed to a web address to assist people in remembering the site.

Commissioner Jones asked if the sign size would remain the same or decrease in order to not cover the windows.

City Planner Bachler indicated if the sign size were to decrease, this could be approved administratively, but noted the sign size could not increase.

Commissioner Jones moved and Commissioner Lambeth seconded a motion to recommend approval of Planning Case 18-009 for a Site Plan Review for a Sign Standard Adjustment at 1290 County Road F West based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, as amended by the six (6) conditions in the May 9, 2018, report to the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously (4-0).

Commissioner Jones stated he supported this applicant being able to receive an administrative sign standard adjustment approval if the applicant were to request the same signs in the future.

D. Planning Case 18-010; 4061 Lexington Avenue North – Site Plan Review

City Planner Bachler stated Primrose Schools is a national system of accredited private preschools that provide child care and early education. There are currently over 300 centers nationally, including 17 locations in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metro area. Primrose is considering purchasing the property located at 4061 Lexington Avenue North for a new daycare center and has requested a Site Plan Review in order to complete site modifications. The subject property is currently owned by Bremer Bank and includes an approximately 18,000 gross square foot, two-story bank and office building. The site also has a teller drive-up lane on the south side of the building and a drive-up ATM located on the north side of the parking lot.

City Planner Bachler reported Primrose would complete extensive renovations to the interior of the building for the daycare center. This would include constructing seven rooms for young infants, toddlers, and early preschool on the first floor and five rooms for preschool, pre-kindergarten, and explorers (school-aged children) on the second. The basement floor would be utilized for food preparation, staff space, a conference room, and storage. The design capacity would be for up to 176 children. No additions to the existing structure are proposed at this time

and Primrose would only be completing minor modifications to the building's exterior, such as installing new doors.

City Planner Bachler commented in terms of the exterior of the site, the most significant change would be the replacement of the parking stalls and drive lanes on the west and south side of the building with an approximately 13,500 square foot playground area. The proposed playground would include a variety of different types of equipment for different age groups, including play structures, swing sets, and a basketball hoop.

City Planner Bachler stated the parking area on the north side of the building would be modified to include two one-way drive lanes with diagonal parking stalls. Two new parking lot islands would also be added to help better define the central row of parking. Six new parking stalls would be constructed on the eastern side of the site directly south of the Lexington Avenue driveway.

City Planner Bachler explained the site currently has access driveways on County Road F and Lexington Avenue and no modifications are proposed to these driveways at this time. The County Road F driveway has full access and the entrance on Lexington Avenue only allows right turns in and out of the site. Both roadways are owned and managed by Ramsey County. Ramsey County has recommended that the Lexington Avenue driveway be removed due to proximity to the County Road F intersection.

City Planner Bachler indicated an expanded sidewalk is proposed to provide safe pedestrian access to the center from the parking lot. Additionally, a new sidewalk would be constructed to connect the site to the existing sidewalk along Lexington Avenue. Other site modifications would include the replacement of the existing nonconforming pole sign at the corner of Lexington Avenue and County Road F with a new monument sign in the same general location. A new trash enclosure with brick veneer and a metal gate is also proposed adjacent to the existing building within the northern parking area.

City Planner Bachler stated new tree plantings would be added within the parking area on the north side of the building and along Lexington Avenue. A portion of the parking area on the south side of the building would also be converted to turf grass and include tree plantings. Outside of the existing developed area, the majority of the property is forested with extensive tree coverage. The proposal would not impact this area except for the removal of five trees at the southeast corner of the development area.

Site Data

Land Use Plan:	Light Industrial and Office
Existing Land Use:	Retail and Other Commercial
Zoning:	I-1 Limited Industrial District
Current Lot Sizes:	4.86 Acres
Topography:	The developed portion of the site contains the current bank building and parking lot. The three undeveloped acres are forested and partially covered by wetlands.

City Planner Bachler reviewed the surrounding area, the Plan Evaluation and offered the followings the Findings of Fact for review:

1. The property located at 4061 Lexington Avenue North is located in the I-1 – Limited Industrial Zoning District and within Sign District 6.
2. The applicant has submitted a Site Plan Review application for modifications to the site for a new daycare facility serving more than 10 individuals with care.
3. The proposed daycare facility is a permitted use in the I-1 District.
4. The proposal does not include any additions or modifications to the footprint of the existing principal structure on the property.
5. The proposed exterior playground equipment is in conformance with the I-1 District Requirements for accessory structures.
6. The proposed site plan would be in conformance with the lot coverage requirements for the I-1 District.
7. The proposal is generally in conformance with the design standard requirements included in Section 1325.05 of the Zoning Code.
8. The existing parking lot does not include planting islands and the proposed site plan would increase the area of the parking lot occupied by planting islands to approximately 4.6 percent. The Zoning Code requires that 10 percent of the parking area be occupied by parking islands.
9. The proposed site plan meets the minimum requirements for parking, loading, and circulation in Section 1325.06 of the Zoning Code.
10. The proposed freestanding sign is in conformance with Chapter 12 of the City Code.
11. The proposal is not expected to adversely affect the surrounding area of the community as a whole.

City Planner Bachler reviewed the options available to the Planning Commission on this matter:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted.
3. Recommend Denial
4. Table

Chair Thompson opened the floor to Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Lambeth asked what the surface material would be for the playground area.

City Planner Bachler stated he believed the playground would have a synthetic or real turf surface material.

Commissioner Lambeth questioned if the fencing would be six feet in height.

John Finnemore, Primrose Schools representative, reported the playground surface would be a synthetic turf. He reported the fencing would be powder coated tubular metal and would not be wrought iron. He explained the fence posts would be 3½ inches apart for safety purposes.

Commissioner Jones asked if Primrose Schools had purchased the entire lot.

Mr. Finnemore reported this would be his intent. Further discussion ensued regarding the traffic flow in and out of this property.

Commissioner Jones questioned if Primrose Schools had plans for the remainder of the land for the future.

Mr. Finnemore commented there were no plans in place at this time. He explained that a portion of the land was not developable because of the wetlands. He asked if the franchisee would be able to utilize and recondition the existing sign on the property. He stated a lower sign would be less visible.

Chair Thompson indicated she had concerns about the design of the existing sign.

City Planner Bachler reported the current sign was non-conforming due to its size and height. He stated this sign could continue and be replaced for current users but could not be expanded in any way or relocated. He explained the Planning Commission could look at modifying Conditions 5 and 6.

Chair Thompson commented the new conditions would state the property owner will work with the City to utilize the existing sign while continuing to meet City sign requirements. She stated her goal would be to make the sign more attractive.

City Planner Bachler indicated staff's preference would be to have a monument sign installed versus reconditioning the existing sign. He suggested the condition state the applicant will work with staff on any plans to modify the existing pole sign so that all plans are in conformance with the sign code. He noted a sign permit application would have to be submitted to City staff.

Chair Thompson recommended Condition 5 remain be amended to remove the words free-standing monument sign that Condition 6 also be amended per staff direction.

City Planner Bachler supported this recommendation and suggested Condition 6 read: A sign permit shall be required for renovation of the existing free-standing sign and for any wall signage. The existing pylon sign will remain in place so long as any modifications are in conformance with the City's sign code requirements.

Chair Thompson commented a sign permit would still be required for all other signage on the property.

Commissioner Lambeth stated he would like the Commission to consider minimizing the requirements and conditions for this request. He noted the existing sign was already in place, it was too high and was non-conforming. He encouraged the Commission to restrain piling on additional conditions that were not necessary for this case.

Chair Thompson recommended the applicant have sign renderings available prior to this item being reviewed by the City Council.

Commissioner Jones stated he would rather leave the pylon sign in place versus having a monument sign. He feared that the monument sign would block sight lines for those traveling on Lexington Avenue.

Chair Thompson moved and Commissioner Zimmerman seconded a motion to recommend approval of Planning Case 18-010 for a Site Plan Review at 4061 Lexington Avenue based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, as amended by the ten (10) revised conditions in the May 9, 2018, report to the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously (4-0).

UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS

None.

REPORTS

A. Report from the City Council

Councilmember Scott updated the Planning Commission on City Council activities from the April 9, 2018 City Council Regular Meeting, stating the City Council voted to approve (5-0) Planning Case 18-004 for a Preliminary and Final Plat for the TCAAP redevelopment site. The purpose of the plat is to define an accurate boundary of the property and to simplify the current legal description. Several large road and infrastructure projects have recently been completed on or adjacent to the property and the platting process will allow for the transfer of these portions of the property to public agencies.

Councilmember Scott updated the Planning Commission on City Council activities from the April 23, 2018 City Council Regular Meeting, stating the City Council considered the recommendation of approval from the Planning Commission for the adoption of the draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The City Council voted to table the request to release the draft plan for review by adjacent communities and affected government entities to allow for further discussion regarding the land use section of the plan at the Work Session on May 21, 2018.

Councilmember Scott noted the Scoops for Troops event was held on Sunday, April 29th. He reported City Administrator Dave Perrault participated in the 5K race. He provided the Commission with an update on development occurring in and around Arden Hills.

B. Planning Commission Comments and Requests

Commissioner Jones reported he drove by the Land O'Lakes building and stated this project was coming along nicely.

Chair Thompson noted a potential Planning Commission member was interviewed and noted the City Council would consider the appointment of this individual at their Monday, May 14th meeting. She reported this new member should be in attendance at the Commission's next meeting on Wednesday, June 6th.

C. Staff Comments

City Planner Bachler reported the July Planning Commission meeting has been pushed back a week to Wednesday, July 11th. He noted the City was appointing members to a Civic Center Task Force to assist the Council in creating plans for the civic property within TCAAP.

ADJOURN

Commissioner Zimmerman moved, seconded by Commissioner Jones, to adjourn the May 9, 2018, Planning Commission Meeting at 8:35 p.m. The motion carried unanimously (4-0).