

MISSION STATEMENT: “The City of Mound, through teamwork and cooperation, provides, at a reasonable cost, quality services that respond to the needs of all citizens, fostering a safe, attractive and flourishing community.”

**MOUND PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**
TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 2026, 6:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MOUND CENTENNIAL BUILDING
5341 MAYWOOD ROAD, MOUND, MN

	Pages
1. Call to Order	
2. Roll Call	
3. Discussion/action – Nominations and Election of Chair and Vice Chair	
4. Review and approval of agenda, including any amendments	
5. Review and action on meeting minutes	
A. November 18, 2025 special/reschedule meeting	1 - 4
B. December 2, 2025 regular meeting	5 - 9
6. Board of Adjustment and Appeals	10 - 23
A. Planning Case No. 25-12Review/discussion/recommendation of a comprehensive plan amendment, a major subdivision-preliminary plat, a conditional use permit for a planned unit development (PUD) in the shoreland overlay district and to allow a multiple family dwelling unit structure and townhouses in the R-3 zoning district, a rezoning request and site development plan for “North Pointe at Halsted Bay” for properties at 6625, 6627, and 6639 Bartlett Boulevard and a property with PID 222-117-24-43-0028 in Mound	
7. Old / New Business	24 - 33
A. Discussion/action – 2026 Planning Commission Work Rules	
B. Discussion/action – 2026 regular meeting cancellation and scheduling of special/rescheduled meetings	
C. City Council Liaison and Staff Project Update / Report	
8. Information Items - None	
9. Adjourn	

The Planning Commission is an advisory body to the City Council. One of the Commission’s functions is to hold public hearings and make recommendations to the City Council. The City Council makes all final decisions on these matters. Mound City Ordinances require that certain documents and information be included in applications. The Planning Commission may postpone consideration of an application that is incomplete and may for other reasons postpone final action on an application. For each agenda item the Commission will receive reports prepared by the City staff, open the hearing to the public, and discuss the action on the application.”

QUESTIONS: Call Sarah Smith at 952-472-0604

MEETING MINUTES
SPECIAL/RESCHEDULED PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 18, 2025

1. Call to Order

Chair Goode called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members present: David Goode, Sheri Wallace, Jason Baker, Drew Heal, Samantha Wacker and Kathy McEnaney

Members absent: Nick Rosener

Staff present: Sarah Smith, Rita Trapp, Mia Colloredo-Mansfeld, Sarah Lenz

Others present: Scott Gates (4407 Wilshire Blvd), Tim & Joan Kenny (2971 Cambridge Lane), Erica Hwy & Jon Monson (202 Water Street Ste 202, Excelsior), Lisa & Mark Thostenson (5459 Bartlett Blvd), Trent Sims (2957 Cambridge Lane), Tom Sims (70 Birch Bluff Road, Tonka Bay)

3. Review and approval of agenda, including any amendments

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Heal, to approve the agenda. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

4. Review and action

A. September 2, 2025 regular meeting minutes

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Heal, to approve the September 2, 2025 meeting minutes. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

5. Board of Adjustment and Appeals

A. Review/recommendation – Planning Case No. 25-11

Lakeshore variance – patio removal / open deck replacement

5459 Bartlett Boulevard

Applicant: Lisa Thostenson

Smith gave an overview of the property and the request for a variance to replace a impervious patio with an open deck with $\frac{1}{4}$ inch spacing and no impervious surface underneath. The existing patio and proposed replacement deck do not meet the required 50-foot lakeshore setback. There was an expansion permit approved in 2017 for an attached garage addition and main floor master suite allowing for 45% hardcover on the property.

Smith explained with the replacement open deck being a pervious at grade deck it would not count towards hardcover, reducing the proposed hardcover to 39.89%, bringing it into conformance which is favorable. A comment was received by MnDNR Hydrologist Ryan Toot recommending a vegetated buffer be added to screen and assist in preventing runoff, no other comments were received.

Smith stated that staff recommends approval to include conditions and findings of fact.

Wallace asked about the difference from a patio to a deck in regard to hardcover. Smith explained the existing patio surface does not allow for water to go through it but the proposed deck will have no roof, $\frac{1}{4}$

inch openings, and a soft surface underneath which will no longer count towards the hardcover as water will be able to go through it.

Wallace asked if the plans have been reviewed yet, if a watershed permit will be required and recommended a condition that the new deck show proof of being pervious.

Smith said the permit has not come through but the pervious design will need to be demonstrated in the building plans and a watershed permit will be required if the scope of work meets the threshold for soil disturbance.

Heal asked if the vegetated buffer is a recommendation or requirement and asked if no buffer goes in does void the variance.

Smith said it was included as a recommended condition of the variance and the applicant is on board with adding a buffer.

Discussion ensued about shoreline vegetation/buffers and guidelines.

Scott Gates introduced himself as the representative of the applicant and discussed details of the deck application that will be submitted to the City.

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Heal, to approve the variance as recommended by Staff with an additional condition that the new deck meet the condition of pervious. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

B. Review/recommendation – Planning Case No. 25-13

Expansion permit – new/replacement house

2971 Cambridge Lane

Applicant: Erica Hway from Landschute, on behalf of owners, Timothy and Joan Kenny

Planning consultant Colloredo-Mansfeld presented an overview of the property and expansion request. Colloredo-Mansfeld noted that the lot area requirement of a R-1A lot of record is 6,000 square feet, but the existing lot is only 4,005 square feet. The house is currently nonconforming on the rear and north sides. The new proposed house will be constructed predominately in the same footprint but will add a second story to the home which is why an expansion permit is needed. She also noted that the proposed project will decrease the hardcover on site with changes to the patio on the northern side of the house, removal of an accessory shed and replacement of the driveway with permeable pavers. The nonconforming setbacks will remain the same but the hardcover will go from 64.69% to a proposed 48.31%.

Colloredo-Mansfeld explained that the northeast corner of the property is required to be used by the neighboring property owner for access to the home due to Cambridge Lane ending at 2971 Cambridge Lane. Due to the unusual access for the properties, it is recommended the applicant contact Public Works to coordinate construction-related activities to ensure the road remains clear.

Colloredo-Mansfeld noted there is a bay window on the second story that exceeds the eight square feet requirement and will need to be reduced. Baker asked why the eaves are allowed to be 2 feet into the setback but the bay window, being less than that, are not. Trapp explained that it is not about the depth of the window, it's the combination of the depth and the width. The intent of the code is to make sure that the window does not take up the whole width of the wall as that would increase the usable area of the room.

Erica Hway, with Landschute, introduced herself and stood for questions. Smith asked what the lower level elevation for the elevator pit will be. Hway responded that the pit will be the same elevation as the slab.

Chair Goode invited attendees to comment on the proposed project. Trent Sims, the owner of the neighboring property, approached expressing concerns about how tight the access is to his property. With the applicant family intending to use the home on a more permanent basis the concern is that there will be cars parked in the driveway more often, creating issues which have been dealt with amicably up to this point. Baker asked if there are any plans to finish out the road or why the driveway cannot be moved north on Cambridge Lane. Sims stated that utilities are located in the hill behind the retaining wall so the driveway cannot be extended to create more space. Smith responded that there are no known plans to expand the roadway. McEnaney added that the future projects list through 2029 for mill & overlay or reconstruction does not show Cambridge Lane.

Tim Kenny, the applicant, introduced himself explaining the home will be used as a full-time residence instead of a summer home with the intent to allow guests or family members to visit. Kenny explained the garage is being moved 4 feet south creating more space and allowing additional access on the driveway.

Tom Sims introduced himself and discussed some history of the purchase of the property and how the retaining wall came to be. Sims expressed his concerns about the driveway access and future marketability of the property.

Discussion ensued about accessibility, future hardships and a whether a discussion with Public Works and Engineering may be needed. Commission Members agreed, from a land use perspective, the project meets all requirements for the approval but expressed concerns that it may cause hardship for the neighboring property in the future, particularly if either property changes ownership.

MOTION by Young, seconded by Heal, to approve the expansion permit with 6 conditions and 5 findings of fact. **MOTION** passed 6-1 with Baker opposed. Baker voted against the motion as he would like additional information about the driveway access issues in ROW before proceeding. Baker also suggested to keep both property owners informed of any new information.

6. Old/New Business

A. Review/discussion– Exterior Storage Regulations in City Code Sec 129-314

Smith stated that review of exterior storage was included in the 2025 Planning Commission's work plan list and Staff requests review/discussion from the Planning Commission about the specific areas of the storage regulations the Planning Commission would like to evaluate so Staff can prepare a report/study to be brought back to an upcoming meeting. Chair Goode requested members of the Commission review the exterior storage regulations and bring back their discussion items to the December 2nd meeting.

B. City Council Liaison and Staff Project Update/Report

- i. City Council Policy for Commission Appointments and Reappointments approved October 28, 2025**
- ii. Other(s)**

Smith described the new policy adopted by the City Council stating the Council will do candidate interviews for Commissions instead of current Commission Members. Smith said the interviews are expected to take place at the December 9th City Council meeting.

McEnaney spoke about some upcoming events including the following:

- Annual Tree Lighting Thursday, November 20th from 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
- Free Thanksgiving meal through the Legion from Noon to 4:00 p.m. on November 27th
- Mound Rotary Annual Holiday Luncheon at the Lafayette Club from Noon to 1:00 p.m. on December 16th

Smith said the North Point at Halsted Bay applications will be on the December 2nd meeting.

C. Next Meeting - Tues., December 2, 2025 Regular Meeting at 6:00 p.m.

7. Information Items - *None*

8. Adjourn

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Heal, to adjourn at 7:51 p.m. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

Submitted by Sarah Lenz

DRAFT

MEETING MINUTES
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION
DECEMBER 2, 2025

1. Call to Order

Chair Goode called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members present:	David Goode, Sheri Wallace, Nick Rosener, Jason Baker, Samantha Wacker, Kristin Young and Kathy McEnaney
Members absent:	Drew Heal
Staff present:	Sarah Smith, Rita Trapp, Mia Colloredo-Mansfeld, Sarah Lenz
Others present:	Tonia Kurth (18113 Lamar Ct, Lakeville), Cammie & Steve Lillehaug (6627 Bartlett Blvd), Sheldon Berg (333 Washington Ave N STE 210, Minneapolis), Bill Gleason (6557 Bartlett Blvd), Wayne Stark (320 2 nd Ave N, Sauk Rapids), Keith & Elizabeth Randklev (6680 & 6690 W Co. Road #110), Ben Hahn (6659 Addie Lane, Eden Prairie), Jerry Mader (6607 Bartlett Blvd), Pete Taylor (6615 Bartlett Blvd), Gal Peremislov (6619 Bartlett Blvd), Ronald J Walsh, Maple Grove, Jim Koch, Robert Bauman, 5310 West 16 th Street, 101, St. Louis Park

3. Review and approval of agenda, including any amendments

The Chair noted that an email and graphic from David and Jean Fasching was received after the preparation of the packet and shared with the Planning Commission and requested to be amended into the agenda for review and discussion of Planning Case 25-12.

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Rosener, to approve the agenda as amended. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

4. Review and action

- A. **November 18, 2025 special/rescheduled meeting minutes – Staff recommended the Planning Commission table action on the November 18, 2025 special/rescheduled minutes to the January 6, 2026 meeting**

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Rosener, to table the November 18, 2025 special/rescheduled minutes to the January 6, 2026 meeting. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

5. Board of Adjustment and Appeals

- A. **Planning Case No. 25-12**
Public Hearing - Comprehensive plan amendment and major subdivision-preliminary plat for “North Pointe at Halsted Bay” for properties at 6625, 6627, and 6639 Bartlett Boulevard and a property with PID 222-117-24-43-0028 and review/consideration of conditional use permit for a planned unit development (PUD) in the shoreland overlay district and to allow a multiple family dwelling unit structure and townhouses in the R-3 zoning district, a rezoning request and site development plans

Trapp provided an overview of the Planning Commission review process at the meeting and the role of the Planning Commission to act as advisors to the City Council. Trapp outlined the North Pointe at Halsted Bay project, which proposes a 9-unit condominium building, 4-unit townhouse building, a single-family lot and an

amenity building located on the Mound side adjacent to the Minnetrista side of the project proposing 45 units in 3 condominium buildings and 15 single family homes. Approvals with conditions have already been received from Minnetrista.

Trapp broke down the individual requests of the project and reviewed each as they will be applied. The requests presented are as follows:

- Comprehensive Plan Amendment
-Reguide a portion of the site to Low Density Residential and another portion to Medium Density Residential
- Rezoning Application
-Rezone from R-1 to R-3 Shoreland Planned Unit Development (PUD)
- Major Subdivision – Preliminary Plat
-Replat the existing lots into 8 lots
- Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
-Required for Shoreland Planned Unit Development (PUD) and for townhouses and multi-family in R-3

Trapp presented the comments received from organizations that reviewed the applications including the DNR, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, Metropolitan Council Environmental Services, Hennepin County, City Engineer, Mound Fire Department, City Consulting Surveyor and Lake Minnetonka Conservation District.

A public comment was received from David and Jean Fasching expressing concerns about the following subjects:

- Shoreland environmental protection
- Density inconsistent with shoreland district and neighborhood character
- Regional impacts to Minnetrista residents without representation
- Infrastructure burden shifted to City of Mound and taxpayers
- Comprehensive Plan Amendment standard not being met
- Required City Conditions if denial not granted
- Burden of proof must remain with the applicant

Young asked if there will be a stormwater pond and if the dock will be a part of the development. Trapp replied no stormwater pond will be on the Mound side of the project and the dock will be included in the project on the Mound side but discussion is on-going with the LMCD, who is the authority for how docks can be operated and managed.

Wallace asked about the proposed use of the amenity building expressing concerns about how limited the parking is and the slopes of the walking paths for residents. Wallace also asked if there is a stormwater plan. Trapp replied that MCWD is the lead agency for stormwater review and the applicant has been in contact with MCWD. The typical process is that the City reviews a project and then the MCWD. Any approvals by the City are conditioned on approval from MCWD.

Wallace requested shoreline vegetation to better protect the lake.

McEnaney spoke about the 50 foot height of the condominium building stating that the zoning code caps buildings to the height of 35 feet in Mound. McEnaney also expressed concerns about the added traffic to County Road 110. Trapp replied that Hennepin County has reviewed the plans and not expressed concern about the additional traffic. Hennepin County has requested additional right-of-way for County Road 110 and turn lanes for safe and efficient traffic operations.

Baker asked for clarification regarding the impervious measurements, height, and setback regulations and what these regulations are for Minnetrista. Baker also requested that Lot 3 be handled separately so it is clearer for everyone about the maximum impervious allowed on the site.

Sheldon Berg and Wayne Stark introduced themselves to the Planning Commission as representatives for the applicant. Berg provided an overview of the goals of the project and responded to questions regarding the amenity building asked by Commission members earlier. He stated that they do not have concerns about the amenity building being too busy as it is modest in size. It was felt that with the sidewalks/trails many residents would walk rather than drive to the building. Berg addressed the condominium building height stating that some of the building will be built into the slope and the entire height of the building will not be visible from all angles. The project was designed to keep the higher buildings away from the lake. Berg also mentioned the building heights have been accepted by Minnetrista.

Stark addressed the questions regarding stormwater and provided more details of the storm water treatment proposed for the project. Stark noted that the ponding occurs in the Minnetrista portion of the project.

Rosener asked what the tradeoff is with the height versus the number of units in the condo building. Berg responded that the ceiling heights in the units are 10 feet and could be lowered but the overall intent was to make the units comfortable but not overwhelming while keeping in mind general interests of potential residents.

Wallace asked if the black area on the top of the building is decorative. Berg responded that it's a bit decorative but intended mostly as screening for mechanical equipment on the roof.

Chair Goode opened the Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m.

Gal Peremislov introduced himself and questioned what type of impact it will be having a 50 foot building go up next to his house with additional traffic and a neighboring driveway.

Beth Randklev said she lives directly across the road from the site and expressed concerns for the height of the building, increased traffic flow, and requested more information about the screening that will take place.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:23 p.m.

McEnaney repeated her concern for the height and traffic flow. There was discussion about how reducing the number of units may impact the ability of the project to meet Metropolitan Council density requirements.

Wacker recommended more visual examples, such as a 3D drawing or model of some kind to better see how it will look from the road and how far back from the road it will be.

Rosener said, looking from an economic standpoint, the increase of density could potentially be good for local businesses. Rosener said we are in a housing challenge and there are not many development opportunities available in Mound causing concern about reducing units within the project.

Wallace expressed concerns with the impervious surfaces and stormwater treatment.

Trapp summarized the discussion and confirmed which items needed further information for the next meeting.

The Planning Commission tabled its review and discussion of the applications to its Tuesday, January 6, 2026 meeting due to the need for additional time for review and to address questions brought up in the current meeting relating to the building height, traffic, impervious surface amounts, stormwater and parking/access/use for the amenity building.

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Rosener, to table Planning Case 25-12 to the January 6, 2026 meeting.
MOTION passed unanimously.

6. Old / New Business

A. Review/discussion – 2025 Work Plan Project

i. Review/discussion of City Code Sec. 129-314 Exterior Storage -- *continued from November 18, 2025 special/rescheduled meeting*

Chair Goode outlined the continued discussion of exterior storage and suggested going around the table to allow each Commission Member to identify areas of concern or satisfaction. Comments of Commission Members are as follows:

Kristin Young – Young said she spoke with residents and neighbors and the overall feedback received was to get junk out of yards, including cars and miscellaneous storage.

Samantha Wacker – Wacker stated that there needs to be review of what is considered acceptable storage but would like to focus on enforcement of violations first. Wacker also asked if environmental hazards overrule the need for a complaint to address an issue.

Jason Baker – Baker believes the code could be consolidated more efficiently and would like objects screened by tarps and other screening devices to be removed. Baker also said there are definitions that are not clearly defined including:

- operable vehicle
- pervious vs impervious surfaces for parking
- storage of special mobile equipment
- significant impact regarding lakeshore lot views
- where the property line is, starting from grass or paved surfaces

Trapp pulled up section 129-2 for definitions and read aloud the definition for “special mobile equipment” and explained that permanent storage for these items is prohibited except when in use during construction.

Nick Rosener – Rosener declined comment as he was not present for the meeting in which the task to review the code was assigned. He will provide feedback to Sarah Smith after the meeting.

Sheri Wallace – Wallace thinks there should be direct guidelines and procedures for enforcement involving the police, there should be a smaller limit of items allowed, and suggested having designated locations for storage in general.

Kathy McEnaney – Council Member McEnaney wants to focus on enforcement solutions first to see what the realistic range of capability is to guide exterior storage changes in the future.

B. City Council Liaison and Staff Project Update/Report

McEnaney said the Commission interviews will be held Tuesday, December 9th, with 15 minutes allowed per candidate. McEnaney stated that December 3rd will be the last day for Noah Iverson, the Finance Director.

Smith gave her compliments about the Tree Lighting Ceremony and reminded that the Planning Commission will be going from 9 members to 7 members.

C. Next Meeting - Tues., January 6, 2026 at 6:00 p.m.

The next meeting will take place Tuesday, January 6, 2026 at 6:00 p.m.

7. Information Items - *None*

8. Adjourn

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Rosener, to adjourn at 8:21 p.m. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

Submitted by Sarah Lenz

DRAFT



PLANNING REPORT ADDENDUM

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Sarah Smith, Community Development Director
DATE: Rita Trapp and Mia Colloredo-Mansfeld, Consulting Planners
SUBJECT: January 2, 2026
Supplemental Information for the North Pointe at Halsted Bay
(Planning Case No. 25-12) Project Applications
Consideration -- Subdivision-Preliminary Plat, Comprehensive
Plan Amendment, Rezoning, and a Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
for a Shoreland Planned Unit Development (PUD) and to allow
multi-family residential and townhouses in the R-3 District
APPLICANT: Robert Bauman
LOCATION: 6625, 6627, & 6639 Bartlett Blvd and the property with PID 22-
117-24-43-0028
(*PID Nos. 22-117-24-43-0046, 22-117-24-43-0028, 22-117-24-43-
0009, and 22-117-24-43-0007*)
MEETING DATE: January 6, 2026
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential
ZONING: R-1 and R-3 in Shoreland Overlay District

Planning Commission members are requested to bring their December 2nd Planning Commission packets to the meeting. Alternately, members may individually contact Staff and request an electronic copy of the report and support materials related to this request be forwarded by email.

OVERVIEW

On December 2, 2025 the Planning Commission held a public hearing and considered multiple land use and subdivision requests from the applicant, Robert Bauman, for a proposed development of a multi-family residential building (9 units), townhouse building (4 units), single-family lot, and amenity building. After the public hearing and discussion, the Planning Commission tabled the request so that the applicant could provide additional information on a number of items identified by staff and the Planning Commission, including building height of the 9-unit condominium building, traffic impacts, open space calculations, parking and use of the amenity building, stormwater, and impervious surface area.

Members of the Planning Commission are advised that all the required public hearing was opened and closed on December 2, 2025 but public comment at the upcoming meeting can be taken at the Planning Commission's discretion.

On December 22, 2025, the applicant submitted supplemental application materials which are intended to address Planning Commission and technical review comments. The materials received included updated civil plans, landscape plans, building height calculations, and building elevations. New submittals also include a project overview diagram, renderings for the 9-unit condominium building, an open space diagram, and a lighting plan. Due to file size, additional applicant submissions are available at the below link:

https://www.cityofmound.com/government/public_notices/north_pointe_at_halsted_bay.php

Hardcopies of plans will be provided to Planning Commission members upon individual request.

The applicant has made a number of changes to the plan. A few to particularly note include:

- The landscape plan notes a 50 foot by 15 foot sandy beach area on the western side of shoreline and a 10 foot shoreline revetment (retaining wall) and 2 foot native seed buffer area on the east.
- A stormwater swale ('E') has been added to the east of the amenity building.
- The patio/deck area in front of the amenity building has been reconfigured to reduce the amount that extends into the OHWL setback area.
- A path constructed of permeable pavers has been added to the south of the amenity building to allow access to a seasonal dock. The seasonal dock is noted as needing to be further reviewed by LMCD.
- The trail between the buildings has been modified to be constructed of permeable pavers with stairs.

REVIEW PROCEDURE

Extension of Timeline for Review

Planning Commission members are advised that the City executed an extension for action on the conditional use permit and rezoning for an additional 60-days as allowed by Minnesota State Statutes Section 15.99. The new deadline for action on the conditional use permit and rezoning application is March 3, 2026.

The City previous executed a 60-day extension for the comprehensive plan amendment and the extended deadline for action is January 31, 2026. Staff has informed the applicant and representative that an applicant extension is requested.

North Pointe at Halsted Bay – Planning Report Addendum for January 6, 2026 Mound Planning Commission Meeting

The 120-day deadline for action on the major subdivision-preliminary plat is March 3, 2026.

Public Hearings

Planning Commission

City Code Section 121-61 requires that a public hearing for review of the major subdivision-preliminary plat be held by the Planning Commission. Minnesota State Statutes Section 462.355 requires the Planning Commission hold a public hearing for review of the Comprehensive Plan amendment. The public hearing was opened and closed at the December 2, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting. Additional public comment at the January 6, 2026 meeting will be at the discretion of the Planning Commission Chair.

City Council

According to City Code, the City Council is required to hold a public hearing for review of the rezoning, conditional use permit, and the major subdivision-preliminary plat (Sections 129-34, 129-38 and 121-61). This public hearing will be set once a recommendation for the project applications has been received from the Planning Commission.

Public Comments Received

Comments or emails received by 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, December 22, 2025 were included in the Planning Commission agenda packet for the January 6, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. Comments received after that time will be presented to the Planning Commission at the meeting. Information submitted will be made part of the public record. As of the packet preparation, no new comments regarding these subdivision and land use applications have been received.

At the December 2nd meeting, the Planning Commission requested Staff to provide a response to the comments received from neighboring property owners David and Jean Fasching that were amended into the packet at the start of the meeting. The following is Staff's response:

- 1) Shoreland environmental protection – stormwater – Staff notes that MCWD is the lead agency related to stormwater and erosion control. Since the Planning Commission meeting, the applicant has formally applied to the MCWD. According to the copy of the incomplete letter the City received, the applicant has been asked to revise their submittal to account for the nearby area that is draining into the development.
- 2) Density inconsistent with shoreland district and neighborhood character – A portion of this project area is guided and zoned for medium density residential. The proposed comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning is rearranging the density to reflect the location of specific uses within the project. Staff also notes that this project is required to meet both the MnDNR density requirements and the Metropolitan Council density

requirements, which are contradictory in a shoreland area. The applicant has demonstrated compliance with both at this time.

- 3) Regional impacts to Minnetrista residents without representation – Cities have the authority to review and approve projects within their boundary. As required, public notice about the project was sent to all residents within 350 feet. Both Mound and Minnetrista residents are able to comment on the project at Mound meetings.
- 4) Infrastructure burden shifted to the City of Mound – As with any development project, the applicant is responsible for the costs related to the construction of infrastructure, including erosion control and utility extension. The infrastructure construction must meet City standards. The proposed infrastructure is not notably unique as compared to other areas of Mound.
- 5) Comprehensive Plan Amendment standard not met – The City is able to determine when a Comprehensive Plan Amendment is appropriate. While there is a process that must be followed, there is not a specific standard that must be met. The amendment requested is intended to reshape the existing land use guidance within the project area to match the proposed project.
- 6) Required City Conditions – The MCWD is the lead agency regarding stormwater management and erosion control and as such, they determine what modeling is needed. Current practice is that the City is the first agency to review a proposed development and any approval is contingent on MCWD approval. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet is not required per Minnesota Rules. Both Hennepin County and the City Engineer have reviewed the proposed project for public safety concerns.
- 7) Burden of proof – Unless deemed necessary by the City Council, review of proposed developments is completed by technical staff. This development has been reviewed by engineers, landscape architects, planners, public works, and fire safety from a number of agencies. In addition to City Staff and the City's consultants, comments indicate the project has been reviewed by Hennepin County, MCWD, LMCD, DNR, and the Metropolitan Council.

STAFF / CONSULTANT / AGENCY / UTILITIES REVIEW

Copies of the request and supporting materials were forwarded to involved departments, consultants, agencies, and private utilities for review and comment on October 10, 2025, November 4, 2025, November 7, 2025, November 19, 2025, November 24, 2025 and November 25, 2025. On December 11, 2025 commenters were requested to review the additional material received on November 24 and 25 and share any revisions, additions, or deletions to their previous comments. The following summarizes what was received in preparation for the January 6, 2026 meeting.

As was noted previously, the applicant sent updated plans on December 22, 2025 to address comments received to date. These plans were distributed to agencies for technical review on December 23, 2025. There may be additional comments/conditions forthcoming from technical review of those plans. These will be incorporated as appropriate as they are received.

Abigail Couture, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD)

A December 19, 2025 letter from the MCWD indicates that the applicant submitted a permit application on November 24 and 25, 2025. Based on information received to date, MCWD believes the project will be subject to the erosion and sediment control and stormwater management rules. A letter of incomplete to the applicant was issued on December 15, 2025 identifying the information and revisions needed to complete the application.

The MCWD indicates that two requirements of the Stormwater Management rule are of particular focus for additional information. For rate control, the applicant is being requested to delineate the off-site drainage area that discharges into the project site and incorporate the area into the stormwater model. For vertical separation, the applicant is requested to provide additional information demonstrating that there is a minimum of two feet of vertical separation or hydraulic disconnection between the 100-year high water level of a waterbody or stormwater practice and the lowest openings of existing and proposed structures.

Ryan Toot, MN DNR Area Hydrologist

On December 29, 2025, Mr. Toot indicated that most of his previous comments have been addressed. The additional submittals show that the deck/patio meet structure setbacks and open space has been provided. The only outstanding item is related to homeowners association language. Staff notes that this language typically is part of the final plat process.

Carla Stueve and Christina Neel, Hennepin County

Staff indicated that they do not have any additional comments or requested conditions and they appreciated the responses from the applicant.

Gregory Pederson, Fire Chief, Mound Fire Department

St. Boni Fire Chief Eric Anderson and Andy Drilling and Gregory Pederson from the Mound Fire Department met to provide input and guidance to the developer on fire code and fire response related topics. The requests are intended to improve the overall water supply, as well as the effectiveness for fire department response and access. The developer made the following changes that were requested:

- adding 5 or 6 fire hydrants within the entire site
- relocating some fire hydrants
- adding a water supply (loop as shown in blue) in front of the 3 main buildings
- widening the fire access road in front of the 3 main buildings

Ryan Pritch, Mound Public Works

In response to the updated plans provided to the Mound Fire Department, Mound Public Works notes that the Mound and Minnetrista water systems must be kept separated because of the water cemetery between them. They may only be connected in the event of an emergency.

Matt Bauman, City Engineer

The applicant has addressed the issues raised. The only comments remaining for the recent plan set is:

- Gate valves shall be placed on interconnected watermains between cities at the city boundary (or extension of).
- Add a gate valve on the east end of the WM connecting to the existing main for testing.
- Revisions to the plans are needed with the addition of Swale E by the amenity building.

DEVELOPMENT SUBMITTAL REVIEW

It is Staff's understanding that the nature of the proposed project has generally remained the same. The following summarizes information provided by the applicant on the areas of concern specifically noted by the Planning Commission at its December 2nd meeting.

Building Height

The proposed building height of the 9-unit condominium building has been decreased due to a reduction in ceiling heights and architectural detailing. It is estimated that the front façade height has decreased by about 3 feet in the front to just over 40 feet, while the rear façade has decreased by about 4 feet to about 46 feet.

The applicant provided supplemental narrative information, including renderings of the 9-unit condominium building from the street view. In the narrative, the applicant notes that the distance from the road, preserved trees, and newly planted trees will help reduce the visual impact of the building height and the trees will provide screening. Staff notes additional clarification about landscaping is needed on the west side of the driveway given what is shown in the landscape plan versus the rendering.

At its December 2, 2025 meeting, the Planning Commission asked for information about the building heights for the condominiums in Minnetrista. The August 2, 2025 Minnetrista City Council Memorandum indicated the condominiums were held to a maximum of 3 story/45 feet using average grade. In addition, the basement level garages are not considered a story because they are built into the hill. Minnetrista staff indicated that building heights did not come up as discussion at their meetings.

The Planning Commission also requested information about building heights for recent Mound projects. Staff reviewed the planning reports for those projects. Artessa was approved to be up to 48 feet in height. Harrison Bay Senior Living project approvals allowed building height to be 39.5 feet.

Impervious Surface

The applicant is proposing a total of 35.5% impervious surface on the site. This is an increase from 34.0% on the previous plans, however, it removes Lot 3, the single-family lot, from the calculations. The Planning Commission requested calculations exclude Lot 3 as no applications or permits have been submitted for construction on this lot. The applicant is proposing to use permeable pavers for portions of the road/driveways and parking areas in order to limit increases to impervious surface.

As required for a Shoreland PUD, impervious surface must be calculated in tiers. It should be noted that the applicant did include Lot 3 information based on the preliminary plans for the house size and drive. The applicant is proposing 29.5% impervious surface in Tier 1, which has a maximum impervious surface coverage of 30%. The proposed 29.5% is slightly less than the previous plans, which had 29.9% impervious surface in Tier 1. Tier 2 is 27.2% impervious and Tier 3 is 46.5% impervious surface. The Mound Tier Areas – Impervious on the Utility Plan should clearly note that Lot 3 is not included in the calculations and that it is limited to a maximum hardcover of 30%.

Tier	Total Area (SF)	Impervious Area (SF)	Percent
1	41,873	12,345	29.5%
2	72,149	19,658	27.2%
3	36,097	16,790	46.5%

Amenity Building

The proposed amenity building has been reconfigured to change the amount of impervious surface located below the OHWL. The previous plans showed a deck/patio located predominately below the OHWL on the lakeshore side of the amenity building. The deck/patio has been redesigned to be smaller with more of the area located above the OHWL. The new

design includes a pervious paver path/patio area that is below the OHWL connecting to the seasonal dock.

With the applicant counting the pervious pavers as 50% impervious surface, the redesign has resulted in a decrease of impervious surface below the OHWL of approximately 68 square feet. The new design does extend farther south in some areas into the shore impact zone.

The applicant was asked to respond to concerns about use and parking of the amenity building. The applicant response is *“Due to the modest size and nature of the amenity building, and proximity of project buildings, the development team is confident of the parking that is proposed. Many HOA members can walk and the building has some lower level storage for bulky items for members.”*

Staff recommends continued discussion about the use and design of the amenity building area. Staff has concerns about the impacts of the proposed use on the neighboring single-family homes and additional refinements may be helpful to reduce impacts.

Open Space

The applicant is proposing 61.2% open space for the development. The 61.2% includes the single-family lot and a proposed building footprint for this lot. There are no applications currently under review for the development of the single-family lot, so the overall open space may change once the single-family lot is developed. It should be noted that the shoreland regulations require a residential PUD to have at least 50% open space. Any areas shown contributing to meeting that standard must be preserved in perpetuity and deed restrictions, covenants, permanent easements, or similar instruments must be in place. Thus, if the single-family lot is contributing to the PUD meeting the 50% requirement, preservation instruments will be required and the property owners will potentially need to be part of a homeowners association. The open space requirements also state that 70% of the shore impact zone (which is the area 25 feet from the OHWL must be preserved in its natural or existing state. Staff’s evaluation is that the proposed sand beach and retaining walls recently proposed do not meet this requirement and should be removed.

Landscaping

The applicant provided updated landscaping plans. Comments that need to be addressed include:

- Plans say that tree diameters are representative of diameter breast height (dbh); however, trees shown do not appear to be sized appropriately on the plan. For example, a 25" oak only appears to be shown at 12" wide, which is less than half the estimated size of its critical root zone. Many of the trees they are showing adjacent to retaining walls and pavement will have their root zones impacted more severely than these plans indicate, and these root zone impacts will likely result in the eventual death of those trees. Trees that should be labelled as removed based on root zone impacts include:
 - 3550
 - 3561
 - 1114

The applicant should also adjust the tree removal calculations accordingly.

- Applicant says the area west of the amenity building has been regraded to address runoff to neighboring property, but it still seems likely to head that way. Clarification is needed about roof runoff. In addition, the City Engineer has added that all grading tie in and any adjustments to wall heights should be clarified.
- Clarification is needed about the operations of the new Swale E, including how surface run off is directed to it and how it outlets. Rip rap or erosion control blanket reinforcement of the overflow route should be installed at the outlet to prevent erosion. Both plans and the SWMP should be updated.
- The applicant should consider how the 25" oak in the southeast edge of Swale E could be preserved.

Traffic

The project accesses County Road 110/Bartlett Blvd which is classified as an "A" minor arterial, the class of road designed for moving of traffic within the community rather than providing access to properties. Staff of both Hennepin County and the City of Mound have reviewed the proposed project and concluded that the additional traffic proposed is acceptable for this roadway. To improve traffic flow, Hennepin County did ask for additional turn lanes.

Snow Removal

The applicant was requested to provide information on how snow removal is to be handled. The response was "*The majority of the development has ample locations for snow storage due to its rural nature. The amenity building is the only one that is limited and if a lengthy snow event happens, some truck removal of snow will be needed.*" It is recommended that the plans be revised to more clearly show how snow removal can occur without affecting available parking spaces. In addition, the plans and the homeowners association documents should

clearly note that removal of snow from the site is the homeowners association's responsibility if it is needed.

Signage

The applicant has clarified that signage will be limited and meet all sign code requirements. At this time, it is anticipated that the development will have a small sign at the eastern entrance to the development and another at the amenity building.

Site Lighting

The applicant provided a lighting plan for the site. The applicant is proposing a total of 12 lights, 8 lights lighting streets, driveways, and parking lots and 4 lights located on the exterior of the amenity building.

Per Mound City Code, *“any light or combination of lights which cast light on residential property shall not exceed 0.4 footcandle as measured from said property line.”* All footcandle measurements along the eastern boundary of the proposed development meet this requirement.

Along the western boundary of the amenity building property, which is adjacent to existing residential uses, footcandle measurements range from 0.0 to 3.0, with an average of 0.9 footcandle along the property line. Given the close proximity of the existing adjacent house, the lighting plan should be adjusted to reduce the light levels along the western property line.

It should be noted that there are higher light levels shown on the plan associated with street lights being placed to illuminate the driveway and turn around areas. Given safety, these are acceptable.

Shoreland Protection

The proposed landscaping plan provides updated information on plantings and uses immediately adjacent to the shoreline. The proposed plans include native seed plantings 10 ft wide along the shoreline. Within the native seed planting area on the shoreline, there is a 15 foot x 50 foot proposed sand/beach area. Due to inconsistency with the open space requirements for the shoreland PUD, Staff is recommending the beach area improvements and retaining walls recently proposed be removed from the project.

Trail Surfacing

The applicant is proposing to use permeable pavers on the internal trail system within the development. Trails and stairways connect the 9-unit condominium building, 4-unit townhome building to the amenity building. The trails also connect to the 9-unit condominium building on the Minnetonka side of the development.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission is requested to discuss the land use and subdivision requests and recommend approval, recommend denial, or table the requests so that the applicant and Staff can provide additional information.

Staff recommendation is for approval of the requests to include conditions and findings of fact. At a minimum, Staff recommends the following preliminary list of conditions and findings of fact be considered with the Planning Commission's recommendations. Please note that the conditions and findings proposed are preliminary and subject to change as review and discussion of the development project continues.

Potential Conditions

Major Subdivision – Preliminary Plat

1. Concurrent approval of the comprehensive plan amendment, rezoning application, and conditional use permit application.
2. Applicant shall be responsible for payment of all costs associated with the preliminary plat application.
3. The applicant shall be responsible for recording the resolutions with Hennepin County. Applicant is advised that the resolutions will not be released for recording until all conditions have been met.
4. Applicant shall be responsible for procurement of any and/or all local or public agency permits including, but not limited to, the submittal of all required information for building permit issuance.
5. The MCES SAC charge for the project shall be determined as part of the final plat which shall be the responsibility of the applicant. The applicant is required to prepare and submit a SAC evaluation form to the MCES for the proposed project.
6. Sewer and watermain area trunk charges for the project shall be determined as part of the final plat. The current trunk charge for sewer and water, per unit, is \$2000.00 each.
7. Sewer connection and water connection fees shall be determined as part of the final plat. The 2024 sewer connection and water connection fees are \$240.00 each.
8. The park dedication fee amount shall be determined as part of the final plat as provided by City Code Sec. 121.121.
9. A development agreement shall be prepared as part of the final plat process.
10. Additional conditions from Staff, the Planning Commission and City Council.

Conditional Use Permit

1. All required public agency permits for approvals needed for the North Pointe at Halsted Bay project shall be obtained.
2. The sand beach improvements and retaining walls be removed from the project.
3. The use and design of the amenity building area shall be further refined to minimize impacts to surrounding properties and the lake.
4. Plans should be revised to address comments from Hennepin County.
5. Plans should clearly indicate that Lot 3 is limited in impervious surface coverage to 30%.
6. The applicant shall clarify the open space preserved in the project and how it will be managed in accordance with the City's shoreland regulations.
7. The applicant shall revise the plans to be acceptable to the Fire Chief.
8. Gate valves shall be placed on interconnected watermains between cities at the city boundary (or extension of).
9. A gate valve shall be added on the east end of the WM connecting to the existing main for testing.
10. The applicant shall show on a plan that snow can be stored on-site, outside of parking or turn-around areas. The plan shall include a note that if there is more snow to store then available space, then the homeowners association shall have it removed off-site. Homeowners association documentation shall reference snow removal as one of the responsibilities.
11. The applicant shall revise the landscaping plan to be acceptable to the City's landscape architect. In particular, the applicant shall modify the landscape plan to label the following trees as removed based on root zone impacts: 3550, 3561, and 1114. The applicant shall also adjust the tree removal calculations accordingly.
12. The applicant shall revise plans to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Landscape Architect to address revisions to the amenity area in plans dated December 22, 2025. These include:
 - a. Final construction should ensure no additional runoff, including from the roof, is directed at west neighboring property. Minor swale may be needed. Clarify all grading tie ins and any adjustments to wall heights as well. Some intermediate contour labels of this area would be helpful.
 - b. Update plans and SWMP to clarify whether there is any surface runoff directed at Swale E and how Swale E will outlet. Rip rap or erosional control blanket reinforcement of the overflow route should be installed at the outlet to prevent erosion.

- c. Consider how adjustments to Swale E could be made to preserve the 25" oak at the southeast edge.
- 13. The lighting plan should be revised to the satisfaction of the City Planner near the amenity building to reduce impacts on adjacent property owners.
- 14. The stormwater maintenance agreement should include any permeable pavers used in the project, including, but not limited to parking areas and trails.
- 15. The building materials and color scheme shall be subject to review and acceptance by the City.
- 16. Concurrent approval of the comprehensive plan amendment, rezoning application, and major subdivision-preliminary plat application.
- 17. This conditional use permit is approved for the following legally described property as stated in the Hennepin County Property Tax Information System:
(-legal descriptions to be provided in electronic form by the developer-)
- 18. A Development Agreement, to be prepared by the City Attorney, shall be required for the project and prepared as part of the final plat.
- 19. Applicant shall be responsible for payment of all costs associated with the conditional use permit application.

- 20. The applicant shall be responsible for securing all required local, state, and federal permits and approvals.
- 21. The applicant shall be responsible for recording the resolution(s) with Hennepin County. The applicant is advised that the resolution(s) will not be released for recording until all conditions have been met.
- 22. Additional conditions from Staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council.

Potential Findings of Fact

Comprehensive Plan Amendment

- 1. The proposed uses of the property align with the goals of the Mound 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
- 2. The proposed densities align with the definitions outlined in the Mound 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Rezoning

1. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the goals of the Mound 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed development will not negatively impact the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.

Major Subdivision-Preliminary Plat

1. The proposed major subdivision-preliminary plat is consistent with applicable development plans and policies of the City of Mound.
2. The physical characteristics of the site are suitable for the type of development and use being proposed.
3. The proposed development will not negatively impact the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.

Conditional Use Permit

1. The proposed use of the site is consistent with applicable development plans and policies of the City of Mound.
2. The physical characteristics of the site are suitable for the type of development and use being proposed.
3. The proposed development is providing adequate utilities and drainage.
4. The proposed development has sufficiently considered access and traffic.
5. The proposed development will not negatively impact the public health, safety or welfare of the community.
6. The proposed flexibility requested through the planned unit development allow for the site to be developed in a way that diversifies the types of housing available in the community.

CITY COUNCIL REVIEW

Once a recommendation is received from the Planning Commission and additional information is received from the applicant to address Planning Commission comments, a meeting date for City Council consideration of the applications will be set. Public hearings are required for the rezoning, major subdivision-preliminary plat, and the conditional use permit.

Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Sarah Smith, Community Development Director
Date: January 2, 2026
Re: Staff Memorandum for Tuesday, January 6, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting

Agenda Item No. 3 - Election of Chair and Vice Chair. As required by the Planning Commission Work Rules, the Planning Commission will elect a Chair and Vice Chair for 2026 from its members following nomination and is to be done by written ballot. A paper ballot will be provided at the meeting.

Agenda Item No. 7A- Annual Review of Planning Commission Work Rules. Review of the Work Rules is an annual task of the Planning Commission. Staff will further comment at the January 6th meeting.

Agenda No. – 7B Planning Commission Regular Meeting Dates Cancellation and Scheduling of Special/Rescheduled Meeting Dates:

- a. To accommodate the 2026 precinct caucuses, the Tuesday, February 3, 2026 regular meeting is recommended to be cancelled and a special/rescheduled meeting/workshop is recommended to be set for Tuesday, February 17, 2026 at 6:00 p.m. to include a concurrent special meeting workshop with the City Council to discuss 2025 projects/activities and the 2026 work plan.
- b. To accommodate the annual Night to Unite special event, it is recommended the Tuesday, August 4, 2026 regular meeting be cancelled and a special/replacement meeting is recommended to be set for Tuesday, August 18, 2026 at 6:00 p.m.
- c. Due to elections, it is recommended the Tuesday, November 3, 2026 regular meeting be cancelled and a special/rescheduled meeting is recommended to be scheduled for Tuesday, November 17, 2026 at 6:00 p.m.

CITY OF MOUND PLANNING COMMISSION WORK RULES

A. Organization

1. The Planning Commission Officers shall be:
 - a. Chair
 - b. Vice-Chair
2. Special assignment areas shall be:
 - a. Subdivisions
 - b. Zoning and Variances
 - c. Conditional Use Permits
 - d. Other areas of assignment
3. Duties of the Officers:
 - a. Chair:
 - 1) The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Commission.
 - 2) The Chair shall preserve order and decorum and shall decide questions of order
 - 3) The Chair shall appoint all assignment areas unless otherwise requested by a majority.
 - 4) The Chair may call special meetings stating the purpose of such meetings and be posted in accordance with State Statute.
 - 5) The Chair shall be responsible to have the staff report on the status of previous recommendations made to the Council, stating the Planning Commission's recommendation and Council action.
 - 6) The Chair will be responsible for identifying and resolving performance issues (including attendance) with Planning Commissioners. In the event the Chair determines a Planning Commissioner may need to be removed from his (her) position, the Chair will be responsible to recommend removal actions to the City Council.
 - b. Vice-Chair:

The Vice-Chair shall preside at all meetings in the absence of the Chair.
4. The Mound Planning Commission acts only as an advisory group to the Council to make recommendations in the best interest of the citizens and the City.

B. Work Rules

1. The first Tuesday shall be considered the regularly scheduled official meeting night.
 - a. In the event that there are more board of appeals cases than can reasonably be concluded by 10:00 p.m., the Chair and the Planning Staff shall be empowered to schedule a second meeting for another day during the same month to take care of the overload.
Formatted: Not Highlight
 - b. The Chair shall have prerogative to cancel or postpone any regularly scheduled or special meetings. So as to confirm that a quorum of the Planning Commission is available to hold a meeting, members are required to contact ~~the Chair and the~~ Community Development Director, ~~both~~ by email and telephone, not later than 9:00 a.m. the day of before the scheduled meeting, if they are not able to attend.
Formatted: Not Highlight
Formatted: Not Highlight
2. All meetings and public hearings shall be held at the Centennial Building unless an alternate format (*i.e., electronic or remote meeting, etc.*) or location is determined to be necessary. All meetings shall be called at 6:00 p.m. and shall conclude at 10:00 p.m. unless waived by the majority. All Planning Commission meetings are videotaped. Any business unfinished at the scheduled closing time shall be taken up at a subsequent meeting designated by the Chair.
3. The Commission, at the first regular meeting of the new year, shall elect from its group, a Chair and a Vice-Chair. After nominations, voting on the Chair and Vice Chair positions shall be done by written ballot. The votes for the Chair and Vice Chair positions shall be tallied and read aloud by the Planning Commission Secretary. Ballots will be kept in the journal of the Planning Commission containing meeting minutes.
4. A majority of seated members shall constitute a quorum. In the absence of a quorum, the minority shall adjourn any item of business requiring official Commission action, to a specified time.
5. A member may be excused from an individual meeting for reason of illness, work, or out-of-town trips.
6. In the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, the remaining members shall elect a Temporary Chair. The nomination process and procedures identified above Section B (3) above shall be used.
7. The Chair shall call the meeting to order and the Secretary to the Commission shall call the roll and announce a quorum.

8. The order of business shall be as follows unless amended by the Chair:

- a. Call to order
- b. Roll call
- c. Approval of the agenda with any amendments
- d. Approval of meeting minutes
- e. Board of appeals and public hearings
- f. Old and new business
- g. Information items
- h. Adjournment

9. The following statement shall be printed on all agendas:

MISSION STATEMENT: "The City of Mound, through teamwork and cooperation, provides, at a reasonable cost, quality services that respond to the needs of all citizens, fostering a safe, attractive and flourishing community."

The Planning Commission is an advisory body to the City Council. One of the Commission's functions is to hold public hearings and make recommendations to the City Council. The City Council makes all final decisions on these matters.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Italic

Mound City Ordinances require that certain documents and information be included in applications. The Planning Commission may postpone consideration of an application that is incomplete and may for other reasons postpone final action on an application.

For each agenda item the Commission will receive reports prepared by the City Staff, open the hearing to the public, and discuss and act on the application.

10. All recommendations shall be sent to the Council by means of written minutes, and shall include the record of the division of votes on each recommendation.

11. Minutes of the meetings shall be recorded and kept by the Planning Staff.

12. All meetings shall be public.

13. Any resolution or motion, except motion to adjourn, postpone, reconsider, table, or call the previous questions, shall be reduced to writing if requested by the Chair.

14. Any resolution or motion may be withdrawn at any time before action is taken on it.

15. When a question is under debate, no other motion shall be entertained except to table, or to call for the question, action on the question, postpone, refer to committee, or amend. Motions shall take precedence in that order and the first two shall be without debate.

16. All motions shall be carried by a majority vote of the members present, except call for the question. Any member of the Commission may call for a roll call vote on any issue.
17. Motions can only be made by members recognized by the Chair.
18. Speaking without recognition of the Chair shall be cause for another member to call "point of order" and the member speaking out of turn must relinquish the floor.
19. "Call for the question" or "previous question" is a motion and must be seconded. It is not debatable and must be voted upon immediately. A two-thirds majority is necessary to call the previous question. If the two-thirds majority is given, the motion or question on the floor must be immediately put to a vote without debate except for a motion to table.
20. "Question" is not a motion but only an indication to the Chair that the person making statement is ready to have the motion or question put to a vote.
21. The Chair may direct that a motion be divided if requested by a member.
22. Members must limit their remarks to the subject matter being discussed and shall not be repetitious. The speaking order shall be at the discretion of the Chair; however, all members shall be allowed to speak in their turn.
23. All members are expected to attend meetings and perform any pre-work required for these meetings. Members who have four or more absences in a calendar year will meet with the Chair, the City Council Liaison to the Planning Commission and Staff to discuss the matter to include the member's schedule and ability to continue as a member of the Commission. On-going absences of a member may be subject to discharge from the Commission by the City Council.
24. Any member having a direct financial and/or direct personal interest in an individual action under consideration by the Commission shall excuse himself/herself from the Commission and not vote on that particular matter. Said member will have the same rights as any citizen who has an interest in any action being considered by the Planning Commission.
25. These rules shall not be repealed or amended except by a majority vote of the Commission.
26. Robert's Rules of Order or standard parliamentary procedure shall govern any rule of order not covered by the work rules.

C. Candidate Selection/Interview Procedures shall follow the City Council Administrative Policy approved by Resolution No.25-87 on October 28, 2025 (see Exhibit A: Res. #89-139 and Exhibit B: Res. #92-136).

1. ~~It is the intent of the Commission to interview applicants and vote at the same meeting. The Mayor and City Council are to be included in the interviewing process. The vote will be conducted by the Commission and will not include visiting Council member. (Rev. 1/8/96)~~
2. ~~In the event there are (6) applicants or more, a preliminary review of applications may be scheduled, at the Chair's discretion, to reduce the number of interviews for formal consideration. The prescreening process will be undertaken in cooperation with the City Manager and/or his/her designee. The prescreening criteria will be based on, but not limited to, previous work experience in either the public or private sector, relevant training and education, past volunteer activities, and the candidate's submitted application materials. At its option, the prescreening team of the Chair and City Manager or designee may opt to hold a prescreening interview(s). The Chair, in cooperation with the City Manager or designee, will recommend the slate of candidates to the Planning Commission for the formal interview process to be undertaken in accordance with the City's established procedures. Nothing shall prevent the Planning Commission from interviewing all or a selection of candidates if deemed appropriate by the Chair and City Manager or designee following completion of the prescreening process.~~
3. ~~The applicant is to be advised of the interview at least ten (10) days prior to the date of the interview.~~
4. ~~If the applicant is unable to attend the scheduled interview, the Planning Commission may make the recommendation based on the information provided.~~
5. ~~Following the interviews and at the same meeting, a written ballot method of voting will be used (see Exhibit C). The secretary will have the candidate's names typed on the form and the form will be sent to Planning Commissioners in their packet. Ballots will be kept in the journal of the Planning Commission containing meeting minutes.~~
6. ~~The Planning Commission shall forward to the City Council, at their next regular meeting, a list of the candidates and the number of votes they received.~~
7. ~~Every seated member shall be eligible to vote.~~

D. Planning Commission Policy Regarding Use of Surveys for Land Use Applications

1. City policy requires the submittal of an updated survey including all necessary information and proposed improvements as part of its land use application requirements. The Planning Commission will allow administrative approval for use of an existing survey for a future land use application by Staff related to the follows:

 - a. Use of an existing survey which depicts the current location of a structure related to the affected property lines for applications which are within the building footprint or do not affect the setback. This includes but is not limited to, a request to allow

“use” of an existing structure (i.e. CUP) which does not involve building and/or site alteration activities.

- b. For applications related to placement of structures on the property line(s), an existing survey can be used as long as survey irons are evident in the field and depicted on the survey.
- c. If the survey shows existing structures and its relationship to affected property lines and an addition is proposed to be constructed and/or added, the existing survey can be used as long as irons are evident and/or are found in the field so as to evaluate proposed/final placement.

2. Staff reserves the right to forward any request to the Planning Commission for review and determination of survey acceptance due to extraordinary or unique circumstances.
3. In the event an existing survey is used as part of a land use application, the Planning Commission reserves the right to require the submittal of additional information as necessary including but not limited to the submittal of an updated survey.

Adopted December 10, 1984

Revised December 14, 1987

Revised January 23, 1989

Revised June 10, 1991

Revised March 25, 1992

Revised January 11, 1993

Revised January 8, 1996

Revised January 26, 1998

Adopted March 4, 2002

Revised February 24, 2003

Adopted March 1, 2004

Adopted January 24, 2005

Adopted May 14, 2007

Adopted May 5, 2009

Adopted April 6, 2010

Adopted May 3, 2011

Adopted May 14, 2012

Adopted June 2, 2015

Adopted March 15, 2016

Adopted March 7, 2017

Adopted April 16, 2018

Adopted June 4, 2019

Adopted April 7, 2020

Adopted February 2, 2021

Adopted May 3, 2022

Adopted March 7, 2023

Adopted December 3, 2024

Adopted January _____, 2026

Exhibit A

October 24, 1989

RESOLUTION #89-139

RESOLUTION APPROVING A POLICY ON APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS TO ADVISORY COMMISSIONS

BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Mound, Minnesota, hereby establishes the following policy:

Definitions of "Vacancy": A vacancy occurs when a term expires and the commissioner holding that term does not desire reappointment. A vacancy also occurs when a commissioner resigns his/her position prior to the term expiring.

1. When a vacancy occurs, the City Manager is directed to advertise in the City's official newspaper that there are positions to be filled on a commission(s). Such advertising shall be done in the form of a "news release".
2. Such news release shall include, but not be limited to, the number of vacancies, the length of the term, or request for letter of interest and/or resume, application deadline date, etc. The news release shall also state that prospective applicants will be required to interview with the city Council and respective commission jointly. Such interviews will be conducted as soon as possible following the application deadline. Each commission will formally recommend appointments following the joint interviews. The City Council will review those recommendations and will be responsible for making the appointments.
3. Current commission members who wish to be reappointed must indicate such and the reasons for being reappointed in writing a minimum of sixty (60) days prior to their term expiring.
4. If a member resigns during his/her term, such resignation must be in writing and submitted to the City Manager.
5. In the case of member resigning with less than ninety (90) days remaining, on his/her term, the City Council, at its discretion, may delay filling the vacancy until the term officially expires."

The foregoing resolution was moved by Councilmember Jessen and seconded by Councilmember Johnson.

The following Councilmembers voted in the affirmative: Jensen, Jessen, and Johnson.

The following Councilmembers voted in the negative: Ahrens And Smith.

Steve Smith
Mayor

Frances C. Clark
Attest: City Clerk

Exhibit B

October 13, 1992

RESOLUTION NO. 92-136

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE PROCESS OF INTERVIEWING CANDIDATES FOR ADVISORY COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

— **BE IT RESOLVED**, that the City Council of the City of Mound, Minnesota, hereby establishes the following policy as it pertains to the interviewing of candidates for advisory commission appointments:

— Candidates for appointment to advisory commissions will be interviewed jointly by the applicable commission and the city council at a regularly scheduled commission meeting. Following the interviews and at the same meeting, the commission will establish a ranking of the candidates, listing the candidates and the number of votes they have received. The results will then be submitted to the Council at the next regular Council Meeting. The Council will then make official appointments at that Council Meeting.

— **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that if candidates who wish to be considered for appointment cannot be present for the interviews that the commission and the city Council will base their decisions on the resumes submitted.

The foregoing resolution was moved by Councilmember Smith seconded by Councilmember Jensen.

The following councilmembers voted in the affirmative: Ahrens, Jensen, Jessen, Johnson and Smith.

The following councilmembers voted in the negative: None.

Skip Johnson

Mayor

Frances C. Clark

Attest: City Clerk

Exhibit C

**PLANNING COMMISSION
BALLOT**

NAME OF CANDIDATE _____ CHOICE # _____

CHOICE #: 1 — First Choice; 2 — Second Choice; etc.

~~The secretary will collect the ballots and total the choice points. The Candidate with the least amount of points is your choice.~~

Only ballots containing the initials of the voting member will be counted.

Initials