

**CITY OF HANOVER  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
FEBRUARY 26, 2018  
OFFICIAL MINUTES**

**Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance**

Stan Kolasa called the February 26, 2018, Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:04 pm. Members present were Stan Kolasa, Jim Schendel, Michelle Armstrong, Dean Kuitunen, and Mike Christenson. Also present Council Liaison Doug Hammerseng, City Planner Cindy Nash, and Administrative Assistant Amy Biren. Guest were present and signed in on attached sheets.

**Approval of Agenda**

**MOTION** by Schendel to approve the agenda with the change of moving New Business to proceed prior to the Citizen's Forum and removing a typo, seconded by Armstrong.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Approval of Minutes from the January 22, 2018 Regular Meeting**

**MOTION** by Christenson to approve the January 22, 2018, minutes with a correction of 2076 to 2017, seconded by Schendel.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**New Business**

**a. H & R Construction Co.: 8<sup>th</sup> Street Industrial Park Site Plan**

Nash explained that the applicant was requesting site plan approval for outside storage on the parcel that is located at the end of 8<sup>th</sup> Street next to the marshy area. The end of this street is gravel and not improved to City standards. The Council has considered designating it as a private driveway as there are not plans to improve it at this time. An agreement with the applicant and the other two business would be signed stating that maintenance is not the City's responsibility. In the packet is included the site plan along with grading and stormwater plans.

Bob Ronning, H & R Construction Co.: As the applicant, he explained that he is in the business of supplying road work signs and guardrails to construction projects in the Twin Cities and have been renting space in the past. As that is no longer an option, he desires to have a site to store the signs and guardrails.

Armstrong asked about the intended fence and if it would look like the photo supplied in the packet. Ronning said yes, that is what was desired and the fence would be along the south side of the property along with a gate. The area would be secured. Armstrong asked if this was similar to the fence on the property to the east and Ronning replied in the affirmative. He continued that the signs are primarily new ones and that there would be some truck traffic when hauling the signs to where they are needed.

Hammerseng asked the height of the fence. Ronning said that it would six feet. Hammerseng asked if the items stored on the property would be visible above the fence line. Ronning said that the only time anything would be visible is when the trucks are parked on the property. The upper part of the trucks would be visible. The materials themselves would not be visible.

**MOTION** by Armstrong to recommend approval of the site plan as presented with the confirmation of the fence being as shown and to direct it to Council for the final approval, seconded by Kuitunen.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Citizen's Forum**

None

## **Public Hearing**

### **a. Requested Conditional Use Permit to Permit an Accessory Building in the Side Yard and to Exceed the Footprint of the Home**

Kolasa closed the Planning Commission meeting at 7:17 pm and opened the Public Hearing.

Nash explained that two conditional use permits were being requested, one for an accessory building in the side yard and a second for the size of the accessory buildings to exceed the footprint of the home. The property is located at 10677 Jonquil and is located in the Residential Agriculture zoning district. Per the ordinances, a conditional use permit is necessary for this to be allowed.

Armstrong asked whether the proposed accessory building meets the setback requirement from the septic system and if both primary and secondary septic areas had been identified. Nash replied that the proposed building did meet the setbacks and that both septic areas have been identified on the survey.

Kolasa closed the Public Hearing at 7:22 pm and reopened the Planning Commission meeting.

**MOTION** by Armstrong to recommend approval by the City Council as presented, seconded by Kuitunen.  
**Motion carried unanimously.**

### **b. Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the Hanover Cove Development and Review of Concept Plan**

Kolasa closed the Planning Commission meeting at 7:30 pm and opened the Public Hearing.

Nash explained that members will be looking at two separate items: an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan as well as a concept plan of a new development, Hanover Cove. The amendment requires a public hearing while the concept plan review does not, but it makes sense to combine them in order for the developer to hear feedback from residents in order to prepare a preliminary plat.

Nash reviewed the current zoning of the property surrounded by River Road, 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Meander Road, and Riverview Road, commonly known as the Duinick Pit. Currently it is zoned Single Family Residential and Light/General Industrial. For a development to go in, this would need to be re-guided. She went on to say that this area has been discussed during the Comprehensive Plan Review meetings and is consistent with the proposed future zoning. Because the future land use guidance has not been changed, an amendment is needed to re-guide the area for neighborhood residential. Nash also explained how the proposed development would have a greater density that is allowed by the Comprehensive Plan, but that the preliminary plat would be designed to meet density requirements.

Nash went on to explain the second item to be considered, the concept plan for Hanover Cove, proposed for the Duinick Pit, has a high level of view showing the suggested development. She explained that this is just a starting point and that the preliminary plat will have the exact details of how it will be developed. She went on to say that very few concept plans that are reviewed actually stay the same and are presented as the preliminary plat—the concept plan is fluid and changes with the process.

The concept plan was explained by Nash with her showing the entrances to the development, the four types of housing being proposed, and the existing pond being expanded for natural drainage and stormwater management.

Nash explained that there is a lot of the process left:

- The property needs to be rezoned.
- An Environmental Assessment Worksheet has already been ordered by the City Council and that will aid in assessing impacts on the natural environment, traffic, residents and the like.
- A preliminary plat has to be approved. This will give more definite details of the development and provide the guidelines that need to be followed.

- A final plat would be approved in order for construction to start.

She went on to review the staff comments as outlined in the memo to the Planning Commission and highlighted the following:

- The development needs to meet density requirements as it is higher than allowed.
- A Planned Unit Development (PUD) application may be needed. A PUD asks for things that vary from the ordinances, a change in design standards.
- Adjusting the site entrance that is closest to Riverview Road as it may cause a traffic conflict with the closeness of the two streets.
- Consider whether Duininck Road should have a connection in the southeast corner of the development.
- The homes along River Road should be provided with additional depth and buffer.
- Additional park space is not needed in this location and the City would like more information about the amenities being provided.

Allan Roessler, Paxmar Development, presented information about the proposed development, Hanover Cove, through a PowerPoint presentation. He spoke of what was planned for the property and showed types of housing, the lot sizes, and the request for changes in lot sizes, densities, and setbacks. The final details would be flushed out in the preliminary plat. He included advantages of the Paxmar proposal including an increase in taxable value, multiple price points, increased value of surrounding properties, and control by a master Home Owners Association (HOA).

Kuitunen asked about the discrepancy in density figures from Paxmar and what Nash had figured. Nash explained that Paxmar had more than likely used gross acreage of the site, while she had subtracted out the land that is undevelopable.

Armstrong said that the location of the row townhouses seems odd and out of place. A. Roessler explained that they were located in an area that had more traffic and the row townhouses would have one driveway going into a set of four, so there would be less entrances. Armstrong said that they visually may not be pleasing and asked if they would be willing to take those out and put in single family homes. A. Roessler said possibly.

Armstrong went on to ask about the existing trees on the property and whether or not they would be maintained. A. Roessler said that they would be willing to save as many trees as possible, but that many would need to be taken down. Armstrong then inquired about the park abutting Pheasant Run Park. A. Roessler said that they desired to make the current park larger for the community, and would remove the berm that is currently there and smooth the area out.

A. Roessler was asked by Armstrong if they would be willing to make a few lots larger in order to accommodate a rambler style of housing. He replied that they are currently constructing ramblers on a 75 foot lot in other developments with similar setbacks. He went on to say that even with a 10-15 foot increase in the lot, there is not an increase in value.

Armstrong continued, referencing the Bridges at Hanover homes that have a bigger house to meet the needs of residents that want that without having to have acreage to maintain. She stated that she understands the developer's perspective. A. Roessler stated that the demand is there for smaller lots. Armstrong asked about interest from any national builders. A. Roessler replied that it is early in the process, but there will be opportunities to connect with both national and local builders.

Armstrong asked about the orientation of the row townhouses along River Road. A. Roessler said that they would be perpendicular to the road and have one driveway going into the "row".

Hammerseng questioned whether there would be enough dirt onsite for the project or if more was to be hauled to the site. A. Roessler replied that the hope is there will be enough dirt to balance out the site so

that none was exported or imported. Much of the dirt will be taken from the berm and the northern side of the property.

Hammerseng asked how they determined the location of the different types of housing. A. Roessler said that they start with the traffic flow and then the desirability of the lots. Hammerseng asked why not have less housing types. A. Roessler replied that by having more housing types, it is opened up to more people. Hammerseng inquired about the length of time for the development to be completely full. A. Roessler said that under eight years is desirable.

Christenson asked about the amenities being planned for the development such as a pool. A. Roessler replied that currently it is about open spaces and trails; a pool has not been considered.

Hammerseng asked if the patio homes would be an area that would be good for senior housing. A. Roessler replied that this is exactly what this product is intended to be: for empty nesters, 55+, and seniors.

A. Roessler went on to explain that a home owner's association (HOA) would be the property manager and that the builder selected would choose the HOA manager. There would be a master HOA with sub-HOAs for the different types of housing. Nash interjected that the City would also review any proposed HOAs and have to approve them.

As the questions from the Planning Commission came to an end for the time being, Kolasa explained that he would call on the residents that had signed up to speak at the Public Hearing next. He would call them in order of sign up and then call on any other residents that would like to speak.

Dana Arrigo, 11344 Crow River Drive: comments sent via email and read by Biren: I would not be in favor of high density homes built in Hanover. This includes the single family and town home development being talked about tonight. My reasons for not wanting this development: 1. Hanover is only 5 square miles. It's first tier (sic) rural and I would like to see it remain (sic) it's (sic) small town feel. 2. I'm assuming the traffic would increase in front of the River Inn as people try to access Co19. On busy evenings this corner is already congested. I'm assuming this will get worse with more high density housing. 3. Having lower priced town homes could increase rental properties. I do not want to increase rental in Hanover. Again, I do not want this for our town.

Sara Williams, 364 River Road: She is concerned with the number of cars that would be leaving the area and the increased traffic through neighborhoods. She continued with concerns about the natural environment and wetlands of the area and how it will be handled. She sees the development as a way to maximize profits for the developer and the rest is an afterthought.

Robert Reichardt, 720 Meander Road: He stated that he lives next to Pheasant Run Park. He went on to say that more homes are needed as well as mixed use. Homes need to be by homes, not industrial parks. This is a good thing. He did express concern about the capacity of water and sewer systems with a new development. He responded to a prior comment stating that the natural beauty has been gone for a long time as it is a gravel pit.

Jason Leonard, 517 Overlook Circle: The proposal meets none of the guidelines in the Comprehensive Plan. He echoed concerns about the traffic and asked where are the people going to go. He moved here to be in a small town and likes being a pass-through city. He asked that the members please think of the families living around the property. He has lived in a townhouse, so he understands the difference between that and living in a single family home. It's about taxes and not the community.

Kevin Roberts, 11979 Riverview Road: He said that he doesn't mind if it's houses that go into the development. Lots were bigger in the past, but have grown smaller, so he would prefer to see larger lot sizes than proposed. He asked if any of the housing types would be subsidized or rented and what happens if the development cannot be filled. He also questioned where parking for the Hanover Harvest Festival would be if a development was approved.

Colleen Williams, 996 Mallard Street: She would like to keep Hanover smaller, keep it the Little City on the Crow. She believes that thoughtful development is needed and proposed making the property a “junior” Hanover Hills with fewer houses. Other communities are building on bigger lots. Williams went on to give feedback about park amenities, requesting a splash pad. She suggested single family homes on the south side of 8<sup>th</sup> Street instead of the patio homes so as to reflect the homes on the north side. She also expressed concern about the traffic, using her street as an example as the development became fully developed, suggesting curvier streets or speed bumps.

Amy Sefton, 11551 Lynwood Court: Sefton expressed concerns about the high density being proposed, especially the patio homes; the effect on home values; and the increased amount of traffic. She asked how the increased traffic from the development would impact the traffic on the bike trails. She also questioned the home values expressed in the presentation as they do not seem to match the comparable properties they were shown when possibly listing their home for sale.

Karla Schendel, 443 River Road: She explained that she has lived here since 1978. She also is concerned about the traffic, both now and in the future. She also expressed concern about the safety of the children at the elementary school and the difficulties experienced in getting them to school. She went on to say she avoids parts of River Road due to the increase traffic and will go out of her way. K. Schendel thinks that the homes should be single family homes. Developments need to think of the future and what is good for everyone.

Claudia Pingree, 11711 Riverview Road: Pingree said that she has lived her for 30 years and has been looking forward to something like this with patio or town homes. After hearing the presentation, she does not believe that this would be good for Hanover and that it would be allowed in any other part of the city. She believes that something less crowded is needed, and something for seniors. Pingree shared that she and the seniors had talked with Duininck in the past about this, including some sort of senior center. She believes that this needs to be thought about and perhaps wait for something in the future.

Debbie Krajsa, 11534 Lynwood Court: She said that she supports a strong community and development, one that betters the community and does not deter from it. A wholistic perspective is needed and the entire city needs to be looked at and the developments within it. A concern she has is that future infrastructure improvements are not billed to the existing residents, as well as how a new development would impact the Crow River. Traffic is a concern and cited a traffic equation involving vehicle trips per day would increase the trips from that development’s entrances as 3400 per day. She sees traffic issues already in the surrounding intersections at River Road, 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Mallard Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Street and CSAH 19. Krajsa wondered why 5<sup>th</sup> Street was not extended into the development. She asked that the Board members understand the market demands and the impact on the schools. She suggested looking to other cities where this developer has worked and see what the results have been. She asked the developer how will they support the community and better the community and how the city would support the developer through waived fees, etc. She questioned the governance of the HOA and the expressed how critical the design of the homes would be. Will the development be phased in and what portion would be allocated for low income and rental housing.

James Steinbrueck, 11557 Lynwood Court: He gave a history of he and his family living in other cities and that moving to Hanover was the best as it was a small town. He reiterated that Hanover was not part of the Cities where houses are expensive and close together. He mentioned that the current owner of the property does not reside in Minnesota, but Crete, IL, which is 600 miles away. He mentioned that there is just sand and gravel, no dirt, located in the Duininck Pit. Steinbrueck expressed concern over the impact on the water and sewer capabilities, the class size at Hanover Elementary, and what will happen to the infrastructure. He mentioned a study done for the City of Buffalo last year that looked at the infrastructure in the future of that city. He suggested putting another school in the southern portion of the property as had been proposed in the past.

Cullen Jackson, 11620 Lynwood Avenue: He expressed concern about the rush hour traffic coming through Hanover daily and how it would be further impacted with a new development. He stated that Hanover

Elementary does a fantastic job at educating the students and has won awards for it, but worries about the increased class size being detrimental to that characteristic. He believes that people's property values will go down, and while he respects the work the developer has done, he would vote against it.

Bill Bauer, 11989 Riverview Road: He said that he grew up in the area and went to Hanover Elementary School as a child. He recently moved to Hanover with his family and now his kids go to the same school as he did and have some of the same teachers. Concern was expressed about the increase in student numbers and then the increase in additional schools with the funding supported by tax payers. Along with increased residents, the increased traffic would also have serious impacts. He believes the developer needs to look at the whole picture when developing the area.

Mike Dumas, 776 Meander Road: He said that he enjoys living where he does and would be okay with some development such as single family homes on half acre lots. He doesn't want to see smaller lots where enjoying the outdoors may be impacted.

Stephanie Gleason, 11875 Riverview Road: She is excited about a new development but being transparent and asking the residents for input is critical. She sees a new development as greatly impacting the school district. There are many pieces that need to be looked at. Gleason asked what type of amenities in the parks are being planned and what the residents would like to see should be considered. She would like Hanover to keep its small town feel with a well-thought out planned development.

Kolasa closed the Public Hearing at 8:51 pm and reopened the Planning Commission meeting. He spoke to the audience, stating that this was the time for Board members to discuss what has been said and he would acknowledge audience members at appropriate times.

Nash indicated that the members could start with either of the two items—the amendment or the concept plan. Kuitunen said that they should start with the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan first. Nash said that what the applicant is asking for is consistent with what has been discussed at the Review meetings and the proposed update to the future land use map.

Kuitunen asked if there was any reason why the southern part of the property had been zoned Industrial rather than Residential. Nash replied there was no reason. Kolasa acknowledged Steinbrueck to speak: He said there is no difference in the land that would suit one zoning district over another.

**MOTION** by Kuitunen to recommend the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan be forwarded to the City Council for approval, seconded by Armstrong.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Nash moved on to the review of the concept plan for Hanover Cove. She said that approval of a concept plan is a non-binding agreement for both the developer and the City. A PUD is not being considered tonight and will accompany the preliminary plat. The Board can give guidance and suggestions for it.

Kent Roessler, Paxmar, asked Kolasa if he would be permitted to speak in response to some of the comments by the residents. Kolasa agreed. K. Roessler addressed the following:

- As the developer, his name is on the development and the residents can be assured that the development will be done right.
- He wouldn't want to short the community in any way and is presenting a concept plan that reflects that. He wants to work with the residents to bring a high quality development to the city.
- The concerns voiced are the same as ours. The EAW has been hired out to professionals and all of the concerns will be addressed. The EAW will provide some of those answers.
- Every community that Paxmar has proceeded with development has had similar concerns.
- He spoke to the wide range of home values in the area and said that the ones in the proposed development would range from about \$190,000 to \$500,000.
- The concept plan is well thought out and yes, the density is higher.

- He said that building on a half acre lot would not be as cost effective as building on a smaller lot.
- The property is a bowl and will remain that way due to the mining done in it.
- The land will become developed and we are a quality company to do it. If not, another developer may have different plans that are not as beneficial.

Kolasa said that the Board will review the comments made and asked Nash if they will all be covered by the EAW. Nash replied that the majority of the concerns will be addressed, but that the impact on the schools is not covered by the EAW. Once the EAW is completed, the public has a lengthy time period to review it, as does the Board.

Kolasa asked if the concept plan needed to go forward to Council. Nash replied yes, that by doing the concept plan review allows concerns and comments to be voiced and then allows the developer a chance to address them in the preliminary plat. This also allows for issues to be resolved prior to construction.

Armstrong stated there is a need for different types of housing in Hanover and in the nearby cities. She doesn't see a need for the row houses and that they do not fit in with the other styles of housing in Hanover. She added that there is a high demand for the patio/villa type of housing. It makes a lot of sense with the different types of housing. She does see the entrance closest to Riverview Road as a concern.

Kuitunen agreed that row houses do not seem to be consistent with other types of housing in Hanover.

Armstrong said that the twin homes fulfill a housing need for people that want a smaller house and little maintenance, but at the same time do not want to be sandwiched in a row. End units usually are a premium unit in town homes.

Pingree asked Kolasa to be able to address the Board. Kolasa agreed. Pingree said that type of housing is needed here and would also meet transitional housing needs such as adult children living near parents.

Armstrong said that when first looking at the number of units proposed, it seems like a lot. However, it seems like the developer is open to listening to the residents.

Kolasa asked if the developer needs to see this go forward to Council. Nash replied yes. Planning Commission would be recommend approval of a general idea or concept that is non-binding. Concept plans rarely look like the preliminary plat.

Kolasa reaffirmed that residents will be given more opportunities to review plans and speak. Nash said that this is just the beginning of the process. She explained that this concept plan could go forward or they could present a different plan, but she doesn't think the comments would be any different with a new concept plan.

Kolasa allowed audience members to ask further questions or make comment.

K. Roessler asked that the concept plan be forwarded to Council with the concerns highlighted and then they will be to address them.

Jackson said that he is not opposed to development, but is afraid this will lower his property value.

Williams said that she feels that the concerns were not heard.

Lee Dalchow, 11969 Riverview Road: He asked if the EAW would take into consideration other developments going on or being proposed. Nash answered that an EAW is site specific and would not include other future developments. Dalchow went on to say that he doesn't know why they couldn't include the vacant land like the Ruter Farm. He went on to voice concerns about the traffic and how he has to go to the light to access CSAH 19.

Nash explained that during a Comprehensive Plan Review, which Hanover is in the process of doing, the City Engineer will work on the transportation aspect of planning for the future. This looks ahead 20-40

years to see what needs may be predicted. An EAW looks at the needs to be addressed at the present time or a few years into the future.

K. Schendel said that traveling north on CR 123 and trying to access CSAH 19 is extremely difficult and will become more so with another development. This needs to be addressed.

Heather Sandberg, 11578 Riverview Road: The last proposed development for this land was supposed to be a school. Riverview Road is narrow and dangerous already. She wonders who is going to pay for the changes to the infrastructure.

Armstrong asked if the points outlined on the memo will be shared with Council. Nash replied that they will be forwarded along with comments from tonight.

Christenson said that he feels it is too dense and too much housing. He would encourage single family housing following the current ordinances. He does not believe patio homes belong in Hanover.

Kuitunen said that patio homes are needed, but not the row houses. He also believes that the area needs to be managed correctly.

Armstrong agreed saying that three of the housing types work, but not the row houses. There is a demand for these types of houses if people want to stay in Hanover through the various phases of life. This needs to be forwarded to Council.

Christenson said he could live with the patio homes, but not the town homes.

**MOTION** by Armstrong to recommend bringing the concept plan for Hanover Cove to Council along with the staff recommendations, residents' concerns, and Planning Commission comments about the row houses, seconded by Kuitunen.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Kolasa ordered a five minute break before continuing.

## **Unfinished Business**

### **a. Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance Related to Mining and Extraction**

Nash reviewed that the outstanding issue was regarding the ratings of the roads. Justin Messner, City Engineer, had a prior commitment, but discussed the issue of road ratings with Nash. Messner said that MnDot considers all roads to be rated at 10 tons unless it is posted at a lower rating, therefore, if the road is not posted, it is considered to be a 10 ton road.

Hammerseng asked that if a new mine was in operation, it is the responsibility of the owner to improve the road to a 10 ton standard. Nash replied yes, unless it is posted at a lower rating. Nash handed out a guide outlining Minnesota Weight Laws and Limitations.

Nash acknowledges that the concern is there during the spring with road restrictions on. If it comes to a point where that is inhibiting a mining operation, then money would need to be spent to improve a lesser rated road to the 10 ton standard or to change hauling loads.

Schendel questioned the roads in the Industrial Park are 9 ton roads, but now are considered 10 ton roads. Nash stated according to Messner, if the road is not posted, it is considered a 10 ton road.

Hammerseng inquired about the site and sound of the mining operations, particularly the recycling aspect, and how that would be handled. Nash said that the view shed requirements that are written into the ordinance will take care of any issues regarding visibility of the operation. The view shed analysis will allow mines to be considered individually and ensure that visibility requirements are met. In another area of the ordinance, sound is covered, including the impulse noise such as a back up beeper. She added that there are also environmental standards that need to be met. Hammerseng questioned Gary Fehn about the

time and length of the recycling process. Fehn said that it is a short-term project during a short time period and not consistently done throughout the year. Nash also included the fact that the recycling process will be part of the site plan and if it is done in an area not approved in the Interim Use Permit (IUP), that would constitute a violation of the IUP.

Kuitunen asked if anything had been found on the agreement between St. Michael and Hanover regarding 15<sup>th</sup> Street. Biren responded that no agreement could be found and that the city administrator had also been consulted about its existence. The only items found regarding it were the original IUP and updated IUP for the Mahler Pit.

Bauer asked about how the new laws regarding silica dust are related to recycling concrete as it is a by-product. Nash responded that she has been working with other cities that have silica sand mine and that monitoring was completed. Test samples prior to mining operations were taken and then during the mining operations. It was found that the farm fields and gravel roads were producing background readings in the air monitors. The Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) requires certain precautions for workers. When proper buffers and best management practices were in place, the issue of the dust leaving the site was minimal.

Fehn added that there are also regulations that need to be followed when recycling the concrete.

Hammerseng asked if monitoring is a concern and who is responsible for it. Nash said there are many components that are monitored by other agencies, but cities can be involved in the monitoring process. MSHA is good about protecting the workers, but is not as concerned with outside of the operation.

**MOTION** by Kuitunen to recommend Ordinance 2018-XX Amending Chapter 10 Pertaining to Mineral Extraction be sent forth to the City Council for final approval, seconded by Armstrong.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **Reports and Announcements:**

**Staff:** Nash said that an EAW has been ordered for the next phase of Crow River Heights West Third Addition. There also may be a commercial development application at the next meeting for the corner of Fifth Street and CSAH 19. The spring is looking to be a busy one for the Planning Commission.

Schendel asked if a traffic study or information be made available to residents, including what nearby cities are in the process of doing. He referenced when the CSAH 19 bridge was closed for five hours due to a traffic accident, and how difficult that made traveling in the area. Kuitunen said that traffic studies tend to be expensive. Nash agreed and stated that often a traffic study will not provide the information desired or be of value.

Nash also spoke of setting up a project page on the City website to provide information to residents and Planning Commission members.

#### **Adjournment**

**MOTION** by Armstrong to adjourn, seconded by Christenson.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 10:17 pm.

#### **ATTEST:**

---

Amy L. Biren  
Administrative Assistant