

CARVER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting – November 18, 2025
Minutes

Members Present: Scott Hoese, Frank Mendez, Matthew Kerber, Greg Grazzini, Scott Wakefield, Andy Steinhagen, Tim Lynch (as alternate for John P Fahey)

Members Late: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Jason Mielke, Donovan Hart, Lauren Whetstone, Laura Jaunich

Pursuant to due call and published notice thereof, the November 18, 2025, regular meeting of the Carver County Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Scott Hoese at 7:00 p.m.

Chairman Hoese acknowledged all seven board members are present.

Agenda – A motion was made by Steinhagen to approve the agenda. Lynch seconded the motion. Chairman Hoese called for a vote on the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

Minutes – A motion was made by Wakefield and seconded by Kerber to approve the minutes from the October 21, 2025, regular meeting. Chairman Hoese called for a vote on the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried.

File #PZ20250048 –Patrick Fabish – Chairman Hoese called the public hearing to order at 7:01 p.m. to consider a request by Patrick Fabish. The purpose of the public hearing was to consider a request for adaptive re-use of an existing building in an RSD pursuant to Chapter 152 of the County Zoning Code. The property is in Section 16 of Benton Township.

The following was present: Patrick Fabish, Steve Erhard, Chris Commers

The following items were entered into the record:

Exhibit A – Legal Description

Exhibit B – Proof of Publication of the Hearing Notice

Exhibit C – Proof of Mailing of the Hearing Notice

Exhibit D – Site Plan

Exhibit E – Letter from the applicant dated October 8, 2025

Exhibit F – Staff Report addressed to the Planning Commission and Benton Township dated November 7, 2025, and all attachments.

Whetstone explained the subject 1.15-acre parcel at 13345 County Rd 51 is owned by Steve Erhard and improved with an 85' x 43' commercial structure with an approximate 40' x 36' loading area. The structure is within the Rural Service Overlay District of Bongards. A request has been received from Patrick Fabish to operate warehousing and contractor's yard uses from the existing building and outdoor area as an adaptive re-use on the subject parcel. Previous CUP's on the property have allowed for a local feed store, a cardboard, newspaper and pallet recycling business, and most recently a K-Bid online auction facility. The applicant, Patrick Fabish, owns Sage Flooring and Sage Equipment Rental. He is requesting

use of the building for storing flooring products in addition to rental equipment inside the building. There would be two employees on site with one part-time seasonal employee in the summer. Sage Flooring is a family-owned and operated business with a showroom in downtown Waconia. The subject property would be used for indoor storage of flooring materials. There would be no customer visits to the site. Three installers are anticipated to access the site to pick up products for installation. The primary hours of operation would be 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Sage Equipment Rental would also occupy the building with indoor storage of inventory to include track loaders, trailers, excavator, a wood/brush chipper and similar equipment. Occasionally a machine may be left outside for customer pickup or return. Approximately 90% of the time, the equipment is delivered directly to the customers' locations. Additionally, the applicant operates a snowplow which would depart the location around 9:00 p.m. and return around 8:00 a.m. During snowfall events. Two dump trucks used to haul rock, dirt, concrete and other materials would depart the site at approximately 6:30 a.m. and return around 7:00 p.m. The two dump trucks, along with three trailers and a pickup truck would be stored outdoors within the designated operational area. Four parking spaces for employees and customers would be provided in front of the building, illustrated on the site plan. Approximately 4-5 vehicle trips to and from the site are estimated daily. A septic compliance for the site is a requirement of Environmental Services. Carver County Public Works had no concerns with the request as the use appears to be similar to the current activity. Currently, no signage is proposed for the site. The applicant would need to contact Environmental Services regarding any hazardous waste, if applicable. The proposed land use is not expected to significantly alter the character of the neighborhood, nor would it result in a detriment to neighboring properties. The proposed use appears to meet the criteria for a CUP in and RSD for an adaptive re-use of an existing structure. The Benton Town Board reviewed the request at their October 9, 2025, meeting and recommended approval with staff recommendations. Whetstone read the proposed conditions for consideration if the Planning Commission recommends approval of the request. If the Planning Commission recommends denial of the permit application, the deficiencies identified in Section 152.251 of the Carver County Zoning Code should be referenced.

The applicants had no additional comments.

Chris Commers, speaking for Benton Township Board, confirmed the Township's recommendation for approval stating they had no issues with the request.

There was no one present from the public to comment on the request.

A motion was made by Wakefield to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Grazzini. Chairman Hoese called for a vote on the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 7:07 p.m.

A motion was made by Steinhagen to **approve and adopt Resolution #25-18** incorporating the findings of fact with staff considerations for an adaptive re-use of an existing building in an RSD. Mendez seconded the motion for approval. All voted aye. Motion carried.

File #PZ20250049 – Laura Zimmerman/Carver Canines – Chairman Hoese called the public hearing to order at 7:09 p.m. to consider a request by Laura Zimmerman. The purpose of the public hearing was to consider a request to expand operations for an existing commercial dog kennel pursuant to Chapter 152 of the County Zoning Code. The property is in Section 31 of Waconia Township.

The following were present: Laura Zimmerman, Doug Pritchard, Lyle Braun, Sue Goede, Larry Goede, Jeff Lenzmeier, Kent Bloudek, Teri Bloudek, Mike Lovich, Shannon Lovich, Harlan Riech

The following items were entered into the record:

Exhibit A – Legal Description

Exhibit B – Proof of Publication of the Hearing Notice

Exhibit C – Proof of Mailing of the Hearing Notice

Exhibit D – Site Plan

Exhibit E – Letter from the applicant dated October 21, 2025

Exhibit F – Staff Report addressed to the Planning Commission and Waconia Township dated November 7, 2025, and all attachments.

Hart described the current site of the of dog boarding and dog day care facility on a 3.5-acre parcel improved with a commercial building of approximately 11,400 square feet and a fenced enclosed area of about 6,500 square feet. In 2023, the applicant received a variance to operate a commercial kennel from a parcel less than the required 5-acre size, and without a single-family dwelling for the owner to occupy and homestead. This also allowed for an operational area to be located within the 1,000-foot setback from a neighboring residence and within ½-mile of 12 neighboring residences. After obtaining the variance, the applicant was issued a Conditional Use Permit for a Commercial Kennel with operating hours of Monday – Friday 7:00 AM – 7:00 PM and weekends (Saturday, Sunday) 7:00 AM – 6:00 PM. The operations plan listed a maximum of 17 employees plus two owners, with a maximum of five staff and a minimum of one staff member for the overnight shift. The maximum number of boarded dogs is currently 50, with an estimated daily range of 20 to 50 dogs. The application for the CUP amendment requests an expansion of operations in the form of increasing the outdoor fenced exercise area by about 10,000 square feet to a total of about 16,500 square feet, increasing the maximum number of boarded dogs to 100, increasing the maximum number of employees to 30, and expanding the operating hours in which clients can drop off and pick up dogs to 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM daily. The applicants note that even at maximum capacity, the outdoor play areas are approximately one-quarter the size of the area recommended by Pet Industry Association. Hart explained that since the original CUP was issued the owners of the business have added insulation and inner steel walls to reduce the sound of barking dogs. The Land Management Department has not received any noise complaints from neighbors since the kennel operation began. Hart stated that the main access to the parking area is from Hwy. 5, which averages about 4,500 vehicles per day passing the facility. There is no proposed change in signage. Hart pointed to an email dated November 18, 2025, received from Lori Brinkman, Carver County Senior Environmentalist, which stated that recent septic water samples subject to waste strength analysis show the system is within acceptable residential waste strength parameters. Carver County Water Management reviewed the application and determined that no CCWMO permits would be needed. DNR had no comments and MNDOT had yet to offer comments on the CUP amendment proposal. Hart also described an email dated November 11, 2025, and signed by ten nearby neighbors, expressing concerns about the expanded hours of operation, current exterior lighting that impacts neighbors, and requests the kennel operation implement a noise mitigation plan and not include the proposed outside dog exercise area on the north side of the building. The email described that ten or more trees, which had provided some blocking of the barking noise, had recently been removed. In addition, the letter includes a table of the operating hours of 17 other dog boarding businesses, noting that Carver Canines hours would be in excess of similar operations. Hart read an emailed response from the property owner Lyle Braun noting that dead trees had been removed from the property. Hart noted that the Waconia Township Board recommended approval of the CUP amendment at their October 13, 2025 meeting.

Chairman Hoese asked if the applicant had anything to add.

Mr. Pritchard commented on the letter which was signed by ten neighbors to the property. He clarified that the extended hours of 6AM to 10PM are to accommodate the dog owners for drop off and pick up of their animals. It is not requesting extended hours for dogs to be in the outside play areas. He was unsure why there was reference to a noise complaint, since they had not been contacted or notified of any noise issues in the 631 days they have been operating. He mentioned that Hwy 5 is heavily traveled and there is traffic noise all the time. He explained the use for the expanded outdoor play area on the north is dogs that are new to the facility to become familiar with the space and boarding process and the expanded area to the south will be an overflow area from the main existing play area to accommodate senior dogs or busy weekends or holidays. He stated the only outside light at the facility that is lit 24/7 is the one facing east of the building for the safety of employees as well as customers entering and exiting the building. He stated there will be an additional two lights in the proposed new play area to the southwest which will be directed toward Hwy 5 and Rome Av and will not interfere with any residences. He stated they do take the neighbors' comments seriously to try and appease their concerns. He acknowledged the listing of other area kennels and stated some have very similar hours to their proposal and others may not providing convenient hours for their customers. He stated they understand the neighbor's concerns and apprehension, but they want to position the business to be able to grow with the growth in the County.

Wakefield relayed a message from Waconia Town Board Supervisor Grandy stating one comment from the Town Board was a question concerning the number of dogs and how it related to the space/area of the operation. Town Board Supervisor Grandy stated the increased number of dogs would be within the operational area of the facility. Town Board Supervisor Wickenhauser asked if the surrounding neighbors would be notified of the public hearing. He was told that the surrounding neighbors would be sent the public hearing notice as notification of this meeting. With those comments, the Town Board made a motion to recommend approval of the request.

Chairman Hoes opened the public hearing for public comments.

Shannon Lovich, 10625 Rome Av, referred to the four variances which were initially requested in 2023 for the commercial kennel to be located at this site. She stated at that time, a big concern of the neighbors was noise from barking. She confirmed the barking of dogs can be heard when they are outside the facility. The barking is not audible when the dogs are indoors. She stated the barking has impacted the tranquility of their residences and they have an interest to protect their homes from increased barking noise with a potential doubling of the number of dogs and the outdoor space. She mentioned the new outdoor space was proposed to be fenced with chain-link fencing with plastic. She felt this was not acceptable as it would not mitigate any increased noise. She also noted the former tree line has been diminished due to removal of dead trees, which everyone understands was necessary, however; it does have an effect on the noise. She offered to help purchase and plant trees and other shrubs on the kennel property to help regulate and reduce the barking noise. Ms. Lovich stated the neighbors have tolerated dogs barking since the business opened, but doubling the numbers would be extreme. She stated the ordinance guidelines are in place for a reason and continuing to allow changes and increases would be problematic.

Lynch asked Ms. Lovich if she had attended the Township meeting.

Ms. Lovich stated she had not because she was not notified or aware of the meeting.

Wakefield, speaking as Waconia Town Treasurer, stated it is not a requirement that the Township send notification of their meetings and stated the information was available on the Township website.

Mielke further explained the notification requirements and stated the Township provides a recommendation to the County on any requests to be presented at the public hearing.

Mendez asked Ms. Lovich for her recommendation for a solution to measurably reduce the barking noise.

She stated she knows more about controlling or training dogs than noise mitigation measures and realizes that training dogs in a kennel situation would be impossible.

In reference to mitigation measures, Mendez asked Ms. Lovich what measurable effect removal of the trees had on the noise and what would make it acceptable or tolerable for the neighbors.

Ms. Lovich stated she had no measurement of the noise but felt that large evergreens or trees or bushes that have foliage year 'round would provide more than just a chain-link fence with plastic in it. She was unsure if the proposed fencing would be lesser than the initial fencing for the outdoor area and felt that would not be acceptable.

Mendez posed the question to the applicants as to what they could offer the neighbors to offset the potential increased barking noise with double the number of dogs.

Mr. Pritchard stated putting muzzles on all of the dogs would solve the problem but would definitely not be practical. He stated the dogs would not be outside and barking 24/7 and the chain-link fence is to keep the dogs in their space and has nothing to do with sound mitigation.

Mendez asked for suggestions to reduce the noise concern of the neighbors.

Mr. Pritchard stated if a dog is outside and barking consistently for more than a minute or so, they can return the dog indoors and if that dog was making the others bark, then the problem should be resolved. It is difficult to have dogs outside and not have any of them bark. He stated they could research other fencing or materials that might mitigate sound in the outdoor area, however, cost is also a factor for the business. Mr. Pritchard stated the increase in dog numbers is coming from demand because they were at their capacity on a holiday weekend and had to turn several clients away. They would like to be able to increase or recover their revenue potential by increasing the dog numbers, which in turn, creates a need to increase outdoor space. He stated the tree removal is factual and they could look into appropriate replacements for them.

Hoese asked the difference between the existing fencing and the proposed fencing.

Mr. Pritchard described the existing fencing and stated the proposed fencing is more economical and would still retain an aesthetic appeal.

Hoese asked if the property owner has considered replacing the trees that needed to be removed.

Lyle Braun, property owner, restated some of the facts from his submitted letter indicating the trees which were planted were fast-growing and have exhausted their expected life. New trees would need some space to grow and could be planted as replacements.

Ms. Lovich stated that there needs to be some balance between the right to expand and grow a business and the rights of the existing homeowners to enjoy their property with minimal disturbance from noise. She stated the proposed hours of operation are more than any of the other kennels in their sample listing.

She again offered to research trees for planting, possible noise mitigation materials or fencing to reach a reasonable solution for the business and the neighborhood.

Kerber recalled at the initial meeting when the CUP was recommended for approval, the longest discussion topic was the noise nuisance. He asked if anything had been done since opening to reduce outdoor noise from the dogs. He recognized the need to be a compromise to find a satisfactory resolution for both the business and the neighborhood.

Ms. Zimmerman confirmed they focused on the indoor finishing and soundproofing than the outdoor areas. It was recommended to have trees planted on the westerly side near Rome Av, however, they chose not to complete that so it wouldn't interfere with the farmer and his field. She confirmed the tree removal was significant and they can work to plant replacement trees. Ms. Zimmerman shared she had interactions with two residents on Rome Av and both said they were not able to hear the dogs barking, or it was not disturbing for them, so she had no idea that noise was a concern. They have received no complaints from the neighbors about the barking since they have been operating.

Mr. Pritchard also stated their contact information is available on their website so if anyone had wanted to let them know about any noise complaints, they certainly would have been able to contact them. He reacted to a comment about property value and felt a thriving business in the area would not be a detriment to the property value, such as an abandoned building might be.

Mendez stated he understood the neighbors' concerns about noise with a potential increase in the number of dogs and fewer trees for noise protection. He would like to see a concerted effort and commitment to reduce the outdoor noise effects to the neighborhood.

Mr. Pritchard stated they would have no problem with putting a tree planting statement in writing.

Kent Bloudek, 13850 Hwy 5, expressed his concern for traffic and safety when using the Hwy 5 access to the kennel. He has seen traffic backed up as well as vehicles from the east back up if they missed the driveway entrance. He was concerned that MnDOT had not offered comments about the request concerning traffic and safety. His suggestion to reduce the outdoor noise was to reduce the number of animals. He also stated a noise mitigation plan should be prepared by a mitigation specialist to offer a professional opinion about what can be done to reduce the noise. He felt planting trees was more of a visual resolution than a sound solution. He reiterated the traffic safety issues and noted an increase in dog numbers will increase the number of vehicle trips to the site.

Harley Rieck, 12460 Hwy 5, was surprised that the business has grown so quickly to request expanding to double the original size. He also reiterated the vehicle safety and traffic numbers traveling Hwy 5 making that access very dangerous since there are no turn lanes. He stated the original CUP for this site was issued in the 1980's and noted a substantial increase in vehicle numbers travelling Hwy 5 in forty years. He related the dangers he experiences while driving his farm equipment at the intersection of Rome Av and Hwy 5 which has turn lanes.

Mielke clarified this public hearing is for a Conditional Use Permit which will address each request change with conditions of the permit. He stated this to clarify an earlier reference to the variances which were addressed prior to the initial CUP being issued.

Jeff Lenzmeier, 13525 102nd St, stated the security light from the kennel parking lot is visible at his location across Hydes Lake. He asked if the light could be pointed in a different direction and still be

effective for employee safety. He added that pine trees and arborvitae do help with sound mitigation. He also expressed concern with the increase to double the number of dogs at the facility.

Ms. Zimmerman was unaware that the light was an issue for anyone. She stated they would certainly be willing to add a shield to deflect the light more toward the parking lot area.

Mr. Braun stated he would contact an electrician to resolve that issue.

Wakefield asked about the proposed lighting for the additional outdoor areas and clarified the lights would be affixed to the building and not on poles.

Mr. Pritchard confirmed that was correct. He clarified there is a motion-sensored light by the service door from the building out to the current play area, which will shut off after 10 minutes of sensing no motion. He stated they would install similar lights in the proposed south play area directed toward Hwy 5 and the play area. He wanted neighbors to know that the lights are sensitive to any motion which doesn't mean there are dogs outside in the play area every time the light is on.

Wakefield recalled Ms. Lovich indicating the neighbors were concerned about the additional outdoor space to the north and asked if the south area nearer to Rome Av was also a concern.

Ms. Lovich stated the northerly area faces the neighborhood more than the south area. She stated the current lighting is disturbing so she hoped any added lighting would be directed away from the view of the residences.

Mielke stated lighting has been discussed with other CUP requests and certain lights can be brighter than others. He agreed that covers or shields can help to direct lighting downward to reduce annoyances.

Wakefield from his experience with landscaping, offered suggestions about strategic tree plantings and how it can help to mitigate sound. He gave examples of local locations he had worked on.

Mendez recognized the road angle at the intersection of Hwy 5 and Rome Av and stated that is a difficult tight right turn.

Mr. Rieck stated there is a turn lane at that intersection for westward traffic turning onto Rome Av.

Wakefield suggested using electronic scheduling for clients which would help to space the vehicle traffic entering and leaving the site.

Mr. Pritchard stated they already use an electronic scheduling with their clients, and it works well when everyone meets their scheduled time, but sometimes things happen to interfere with the scheduled time.

Mielke stated establishing a traffic pattern and educating clients to enter the site from Rome Av and exit onto Hwy 5 might alleviate some of the traffic backup and safety issues. MnDOT is aware of the turn lane and the bypass lane for the eastbound traffic and does not always return comments when notified of a request.

Mr. Bloudek stated that a traffic flow pattern to enter from Rome Av and use the turn lane would be good, however, he figured it could be difficult to have people comply since the main entrance to the property is

on Hwy 5. He stressed the traffic safety issue especially if the number of dogs is increased which will result in more vehicles entering and exiting the property.

Mielke clarified he was not indicating any approval or denial of the request, but only offering a suggestion on how to create a reasonable traffic flow on the site to reduce any safety issues or traffic backups with the current traffic numbers.

Wakefield asked if there have been any traffic complaints about this area to date.

Mielke replied no traffic complaints have been received, however, it is not uncommon for people to tolerate things that have bothered them and voice them when there is a public hearing or a request for change of a permit. These things remain unknown if problems are not identified or staff is made aware of them.

Mr. Pritchard stated their request for one hundred dogs is a future number to allow the business to grow with the County. Currently, they may have occasions to have busier weekends or clients' vacation times in the summer which would put them over their current maximum number, and they wanted to be able to accommodate more clients for those times. He did not anticipate that it would be an immediate surge to that number if the request was approved but would be a gradual increase as the need increases in the area.

Ms. Zimmerman most of the holiday or weekend clients are boarding their dogs rather than using it as a daycare where they would be arriving and leaving the same day. And generally, the daycare dogs are not staying on holidays or weekends.

Hoese asked the current capacity maximum with the current CUP.

Ms. Zimmerman replied "fifty".

Mr. Pritchard stated they are 'kennel free', but have areas where dogs can be separated from a group if their behavior warrants it. The building as a vet clinic had an area with kennels which they use as a feeding space to allow dogs their own space in which to eat, which is the same area used if a dog needs to be separated from the others.

Hoese commented that if the request is recommended for approval, the increase of dogs to a maximum of 100 could increase gradually over a few years or it could be immediate, and he has concerns with a plan to mitigate the barking noise, either with tree plantings or fencing or another plan.

Mr. Pritchard stated that they have no issues with or objection to planting trees if that is what is required.

Wakefield stated a landscaping or tree planting plan should be created which would give details about what is planted and the location.

Mielke stated a condition could be added to the permit requiring tree plantings for screening as well as noise mitigation and have it required for the duration of the permit. This would address only the noise issue and not the extended hours of operation or the maximum number of dogs. He offered language appropriate for the planting requirement. Initially when the permit was issued, the trees were standing, and visibility and noise may not have been as noticeable. He stated the Planning Commission can require screening according to that section of the Zoning Code.

Steinhagen asked if the County provides any insight or resources for screening materials or plantings.

Mielke stated possibly the Soil & Water Conservation District might be a resource for that information.

Hoese noted the noise issue is immediate, and it takes time for trees to grow. He stated maybe an investment into better fencing would address the issue more quickly. He asked the applicants for an estimate of cost to provide the same fencing as the existing outdoor area.

Ms. Zimmerman stated they received quotes for both types of fencing and the chain-link fencing with the privacy slats was less than half of the cost of the other fencing. She stated the additional space is not an immediate need but they wanted to include their complete business growth plan into this request so they wouldn't have to request another amendment to the permit. She offered a compromise to delay adding the play area for a few years.

Mielke summed up the concerns as the established screening on the north and east sides should be maintained for visibility and noise.

Kerber stated having trees or plantings tighter together and closer to the outdoor fencing might have a bigger impact on sound better than having them planted further away and could be more affordable with the chain-link fence.

Lynch asked for clarification about the additional hours, having heard that the extended hours would not apply to the dogs being outside.

Ms. Zimmerman replied they don't intend to change their hours, but wanted the flexibility to better accommodate their clients for the occasional times someone couldn't comply with the current 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Pritchard reiterated that the extended hours are to provide customer service to their clients by having the front office available for pickup or drop off so they wouldn't charge the customer for an additional day.

Lynch stated the request for the extended hours was not made clear in the application.

Wakefield agreed that it was not clearly stated and could imply that the dogs could be outdoors early mornings or later evenings.

Mielke stated it would be good to have more clarification on the extended hours activity.

Mendez strongly suggested listing the hours dogs would be outside, maybe not before a specified time in the morning and a designated time to be indoors in the afternoon or evening which would not be disturbing for the neighbors. He also stated trees planted around the fence line would ergonomically make a nicer environment for the dogs.

Hoese repeated the change in hours and asked for clarification of the activity.

Mr. Pritchard stated he would consider the 6:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. to be lobby hours and not playtime hours. He reiterated they are asking for this to have the flexibility to operate during these times to offer better scheduling for clients.

Mielke clarified that even if the intention is not to use the stated hours immediately, in reality, if it is stated as a condition of the permit and approved, it could happen instantly.

Mendez suggested shortening the winter hours to coincide with sunset.

Mr. Pritchard explained if they have a client who cannot get a dog to the kennel before 6:00 p.m., it would be unfair to the dog to be indoors all evening without having some outside relief time. They feel that 7:00 p.m. is not an unreasonable request for the dogs comfort.

Kerber recalled the hours ending at 6:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday for the enjoyment of the neighbors, especially during the summer and suggested that it remain that way on the weekends.

Wakefield stated that should also be clearly stated in the narrative.

Lynch asked if this would be considered an incomplete application since there are questions about the hours, screening, lighting, and the traffic or access concerns. He asked if the Township would like to review the request and consider the concerns expressed at this meeting and suggested continuing the public hearing to a future date.

Mielke explained the 60-day notification process for the applicant and scheduling attendance at another Township meeting. He listed items for more clarification including more descriptive hours of operation, lighting and placement of lights, number of dogs, screening plan, and traffic patterns.

A motion was made by Wakefield to continue the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mendez.

Mielke asked for a specific meeting date for the continuation. Discussion ensued about having it after the applicant can meet with the Township, with the next Township meeting date being November 24th. Commissioner Steinhagen stated that would be a very short timeframe for the applicant to have all the requested information ready to present. Mielke stated if comments are requested from MnDOT, it might be better to wait until the January Planning Commission meeting.

Wakefield made a friendly amendment to his motion to continue the public hearing to the Planning Commission meeting date of January 20, 2026. Mendez agreed to second the amended motion. Chairman Hoesle called for a vote on the motion. All voted aye. Motion carried. The public hearing was continued at 8:48 p.m. to the meeting date of January 20, 2026.

Other Business

Steinhagen recalled the annual Planning Commission appointment process for designating a member of the board to serve on the Board of Adjustment and asked whether that could be addressed at the December meeting. Mielke stated that, due to potential new appointments, vacancies on the board, and the reorganization of the Planning Commission, the appointment to the Board of Adjustment must occur at the first meeting of 2026.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Kerber and seconded by Mendez to adjourn the meeting. All voted aye. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m.