

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Huskins called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Huskins; Commissioners Holker, Magistad, and Braithwaite; Planning Director Griffiths; Planner Osowski; and, Council Liaison Maddy

Absent: Commissioner Longo

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Holker moved, Magistad seconded, approving the agenda for June 2, 2026, as presented. Motion passed 4/0.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. 05-05-26 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Braithwaite moved, Magistad seconded, approving the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for May 5, 2026, as presented. Motion passed 4/0.

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

No one wished to address the Commission.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. PUBLIC HEARING – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Applicant: Ross & Kathleen Simpson

Location: 5850 Boulder Bridge LN

Chair Huskins stated that this evening, the Planning Commission would consider a conditional use permit (CUP) for 5850 Boulder Bridge Lane.

Planning Director Griffiths reviewed the request for a CUP as found in the Agenda Packet.

Commissioner Magistad asked whether there were any deviations between the Planned Unit Development and the City's requirements. Planning Director Griffiths explained that there is no provision for accessory buildings. When the Boulder Bridge development occurred, there were unique requirements regarding lot sizes and dimensions. He noted that this property would have been allowed under normal zoning rules and that the Boulder Bridge Development requirements match the City Code for accessory dwelling units. He shared that the Applicant's request meets both the Boulder Bridge and City requirements.

Chair Huskins asked if the Applicant wished to address the Commission. The Applicant declined. Chair Huskins asked if the Commission had any questions for the Applicant. The Commission declined.

Chair Huskins opened the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:10 P.M.

Abigail Key, 27545 Brynmawr Place, stated that she is the president of the Brynmawr Association that borders Boulder Bridge. She shared that her property backs up to the property. She noted that it was difficult to tell from the map how far back the structure would come. She asked how far back the structure would be and if any of the tree coverage would be lost.

Planning Director Griffiths shared a slide showing the property and where the building would be located on it. He stated that the proposed garage would be built on the north corner of the property. The corner of the garage will be located 85 feet from the northern property line and will comply with all setbacks. He added that the Applicant will need to submit a tree preservation plan, along with the building permits, to the City. Still, based on the review, the Staff is not anticipating any significant impacts on vegetation or sightlines.

Chair Huskins asked whether the northern property line was the one Ms. Key was referring to. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the Brynmawr neighborhood is even farther north and will be even farther from that property line.

Chair Huskins closed the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:15 P.M.

Commissioner Holker shared that she did not see any issue with the application and supports it. Commissioner Magistad agreed. Commissioner Braithwaite stated that he did not see any issue. He appreciated going through the steps and seeing all the plans.

Chair Huskins stated that he had no reservations about the application.

Magistad moved, Braithwaite seconded, recommending approval of the Conditional Use Permit at 5850 Boulder Bridge Lane. Motion passed 4/0.

Chair Huskins confirmed that the matter would be brought before the City Council on June 22.

B. PUBLIC HEARING – VARIANCE
Applicant: HOLMmade, LLC
Location: 6145 Club Valley Rd

Chair Huskins stated that this evening, the Planning Commission would consider a variance for 6145 Club Valley Road.

Planner Osowski reviewed the variance request as found in the Agenda Packet. He noted that the matter would be taken up at the City Council on June 22.

Commissioner Holker asked about the setback on the north side of the property, whether that is what the variance is needed for, or if, even with the addition, the setback will fall within the required amount. Planner Osowski stated that the Applicant is requesting a variance to encroach 13 feet into the setback and that the addition would be 27 feet from the property line, rather than 40 feet.

Commissioner Magistad asked if the encroachment was 13 feet or 14 feet. Planner Osowski stated that the encroachment is 13 feet into the setback, so 27 feet from the lot line.

Chair Huskins asked whether the addition would affect the overall square footage of the accessory dwelling. Planner Osowski stated that he would have to look. Chair Huskins clarified whether the addition would exceed 1,200. Planner Osowski noted that the addition would not be anywhere close to that. Planning Director Griffiths shared that it would take a little bit to get the exact number, but the square footage is substantially under. He suggested going on to the next question if there were any.

Commissioner Magistad asked what the impervious surface calculation is. Planner Osowski explained that the impervious surface would increase by 3 percent to 18.3 percent, and that the limit is 33 percent.

Chair Huskins asked whether, in addition to building the structure, a modification to the driveway would be needed. Planner Osowski stated that it would need to be part of a separate permit, and not part of this variance application. He added that, in the survey, the Applicant notes that a gravel driveway will be added to accommodate the garage addition; there is currently a concrete driveway.

Planning Director Griffiths stated that the maximum allowed square footage is 1,200 square feet. With the addition, the Applicant would be at 900 square feet and in compliance with City Code.

Chair Huskins asked whether, if the square footage exceeded 1,200 square feet, the Applicant would need both a variance and a conditional use permit. Planner Osowski shared that the Applicant would then need both a variance and a conditional use permit for the encroachment into the setback and the increase in square footage. If that is what happened, but this application does not do that.

Commissioner Magistad explained that he is supportive of the application, but if the neighbor to the north attends the City Council meeting with concerns, that could change the Council's thoughts on the matter.

Kris Beck, 6145 Club Valley Road, shared that she spoke with the neighbors to the north when they moved in about a month ago. She asked the neighbors about doing the addition, and they were both in favor of it at the time. She added that the neighbors said to let them know if anything needs to be done. She shared that there is ample space between the two properties. The other neighbors across the street attended the meeting as well.

Chair Huskins opened the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:24 P.M.

Rob Wright, 6110 Club Valley Road, stated that he lives kitty-corner to the property. He shared that he was in discussions with the neighbors to the north as well, and they stated they had no problem with the addition. He added that there is a lot of room between the properties, and it is unfortunate how the property is disguised on the map. He explained that he and other neighbors have no problem with the addition. The neighbors would love for the Applicant to have another garage so they can get into their house safely and avoid getting hurt again.

Ed Sheridan, 6150 Club Valley Road, stated that he lives across the street from the Applicant. He added that he has spoken with all the neighbors, and no one is objecting to the addition. He noted that he is a former builder and has run into these situations before. This variance seems

fairly straightforward compared to some others he has seen. He explained that when the house was built, it faced the side yard. When looking at the drawing, the existing front yard, according to the original plat, was silly to have as the front yard. He added that the existing house is now a linear structure, with the house to the north, with nothing going in or out. There is no hardscape issue; nothing is being encroached on, even if a concrete driveway is put in. He noted that both residents living in the house are in good health but have mobility issues, which is the reason for the addition. He explained that there is an option for a variance to make the existing front the side. In many other communities, a similar situation has happened, and that was what was done.

Chris Capesius, 6120 Club Valley Road, stated that he had nothing to add but wanted to show his support for moving the application forward.

Chair Huskins closed the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:30 P.M

Commissioner Braithwaite stated that he was supportive of the project. He added that the variance is the simpler of the two routes rather than trying to change the plat. Chair Huskins agreed.

Braithwaite moved, Holker seconded, recommending approval of the variance at 6145 Club Valley Road. Motion passed 4/0.

C. PUBLIC HEARING – VARIANCE

Applicant: Tim O'Connor, Align Building & Remodeling, LLC/Jonathan Rienstra

Location: 23120 Summit Ave

Chair Huskins stated that this evening, the Planning Commission would consider a variance for 23120 Summit Avenue.

Planning Director Griffiths reviewed the variance based on the information found in the Agenda Packet.

Commissioner Holker asked where the neighbor's driveway goes through. She noted that in looking at the addition, it would be right up to the neighbor's driveway. Planner Director Griffiths shared that the addition does not do that. He showed a map of the area. He added that the City Engineer reviewed the application and had no concerns regarding drainage. When looking at the drainage patterns in the area, everything ultimately drains to Summit Avenue and then onto Murray Hill Road at the bottom of the road. He added that, with respect to the existing neighbor's driveway, the Staff had no comments or concerns.

Commissioner Holker asked what the distance would be from the addition to the neighbor's driveway. Planning Director Griffiths explained that the distance of the addition to the property line is 22 feet, and the edge of the neighbor's driveway is further than that. So, the addition would be at least over 20 feet away.

Chair Huskins asked about the impervious surface and the accessory building square footage. He assumed that since neither was commented on in the Staff report, they were a non-issue. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the total proposed hardcover is 22.8 percent, with the maximum being 33 percent. He added that the proposed garage addition would increase the area by 276 square feet, and the existing garage is about 500 square feet, so that is well under the 1,200-square-foot maximum.

Commissioner Braithwaite stated that the site plan shows a proposed addition at the back and a proposed deck. He asked if those were part of the variance. Planning Director Griffiths stated that those are not part of the application. The Applicant is proposing an addition to the back of his house. That addition meets all the zoning setbacks for the property, so it is not part of the application. He added that the only part of the variance is the proposed garage addition. Chair Huskins asked whether that addition is the one noted as a new dining room. Planning Director Griffiths confirmed that to be true.

Chair Huskins opened the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:39 P.M.

Tim O'Connor of Align Building & Remodeling in Excelsior stated that the plan is deceptive. He noted that, from driving by, it looks like the building would be within the side-yard setback because of the way the driveway runs. He shared that the garage was designed to be as narrow as possible, so there is room to store things while minimizing impact on the side yard.

Commissioner Holker asked to see the driveway again. Mr. O'Connor shared that the driveway runs parallel along the right-of-way to the property, so it is a unique situation. Commissioner Holker noted that the driveway is along the City right-of-way. She asked how close the addition would be to the City right-of-way. Planning Director Griffiths noted 22.7 feet.

Chair Huskins closed the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:42 P.M.

Commissioner Braithwaite stated that he is generally supportive of this application. He appreciated that the neighbor's letter was attached, as that neighbor is the most affected. Commissioner Holker stated that the neighbor's driveway is 23110, but the letter came from someone else.

Jon Rienstra, 23120 Summit Avenue, shared that the letter came from the neighbor in question. Commissioner Holker confirmed 23110. Mr. Rienstra explained that he had spoken with his neighbor, who was fully supportive of the project. He showed the neighbor where the garage would go.

Holker moved, and Magistad seconded, to recommend approval of the variance at 23120 Summit Avenue. Motion passed 4/0.

Chair Huskins noted that the application would be brought to the City Council on June 22.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Planning Commission Photo

Chair Huskins noted that Commissioner Longo was not present. Planning Director Griffiths shared that he had sent an email apologizing for his unexpected absence from the meeting. He suggested taking the picture in July. Chair Huskins tabled the matter for discussion at the next meeting.

6. REPORTS

A. City Council

Council Liaison Maddy gave a brief overview of recent Council discussions and decisions.

B. Staff

Planning Director Griffiths followed up on an email that he sent about the presentation at the last meeting on the Zoning Code update. The full draft language is on the website for review. He noted that the Commission should provide feedback. He added that Chair Huskins has provided a lot of feedback, but the Staff would like to hear from everyone, including community members. He shared that the feedback would be incorporated in the Zoning Code and be brought before the Commission at the next meeting on July 7 for a public hearing. He shared that, since the last meeting, the State of Minnesota's Legislative Session concluded, and no major bills the City was worried about were passed. He noted that one bill passed significantly limits Homeowners Associations (HOAs) in Minnesota. The Staff is tracking this because there are some minor implications for the City, the most notable being that cities will not be able to require a development to have an HOA. He added that a Code amendment will likely be seen around that, likely as an annual update to the Code at the end of the year. He noted that some space was left in the work plan for the third quarter to address legislative changes, but that will not be needed. He shared that the Staff anticipates those zoning preemption proposals back next year, so space will continue to be reserved for legislative updates in work plans.

Planning Director Griffiths asked for a liaison at the June 22 meeting to cover the three agenda items. Commissioner Holker stated that she could be the liaison.

Commissioner Holker noted that the lot next to the Legion was for sale. She asked if the plan to put townhomes in the space was no longer happening. Planning Director Griffiths explained that the developer had their plat approval expire, and decided to sell the property. He added that the sale of the property was not about the property itself or its design, but rather about internal matters the developer is working through in their business. He anticipated that the Commission would likely see a very similar proposal from a different developer in the future. He added that whoever acquires the property will need to start the process over because the City Council vacated the plat approvals at a meeting in May, after they expired.

Commissioner Magistad asked if there was anything that could be publicly disclosed about the status of Watton Ponds 2nd Addition. Planning Director Griffiths shared that not at this point.

Chair Huskins stated that the draft Zoning Code update is now in the public eye, and he wants to tie it to the Comprehensive Plan update and to the City's efforts to gather as much feedback as possible. He asked the Staff what their experience is with a review of the codes. He worried that there might not be many people who take the time to go through the Code and give feedback. He asked what would worry the Staff when reviewing the draft regarding finalizing the Code that all residents would be bound to. Planning Director Griffiths stated that nothing in particular worries him about the public engagement portion. He added that this is a lengthy section of the Code, but based on the presentation from HKGi, the first Phase is very technical and does not involve substantive policy changes. He noted that he does want to receive feedback, that the public notice went out, and that public comment will have been open for about a month by the time it closes. The Code will also undergo the full public hearing process before the Commission and the City Council. He shared that, to the extent that the comments get parceled out or the scope of who is involved is, it is the Commission and Council's role to legislate and sort through feedback. Chair Huskins explained that he would be interested in the date by which public comments close to get a general sense of how many people engaged with the Code and offered comments. Planning Director Griffiths stated that this could be provided in the memo for the next

meeting. He expected more engagement once the formal notice process began, before the matter went to the Commission during the July meeting. He added that, in addition to Chair Huskins, at least seven other people have engaged with the Code. He noted that people are reviewing the Code, and he hopes they find changes that align with the main goal of cleaning it up and making it more user-friendly.

Commissioner Magistad asked whether HKGi would do anything with the comments before they go back to the Commission. Planning Director Griffiths explained that the public hearing commentary will close on June 5, and there will be a few weeks between the closing and the Commission's next meeting on July 7. The comments will be reviewed, and adjustments will be made based on feedback. He added that there may be some responses in response to the feedback. He noted that the expectation is not to bring a laundry list of comments to the Commission, but that the Staff will present the Commission with an ordinance for adoption based on the comments received. Chair Huskins noted that the public is new to the process, so some of the comments may not be germane or feasible at this point. No one should expect that the comments given will be added verbatim to the new Code. Planning Director Griffiths stated that, for this update, he is most excited to see people using the draft and to see where the public is stumbling so the Code can be improved. He wants the Code to be a strong foundation in the future, so that when the Comprehensive Plan update is complete, it will be much easier to make future changes.

Commissioner Holker asked whether there was a reaction to the initial survey for the Comprehensive Plan. Planning Director Griffiths shared that there have been a fair number of responses. Out of several community events, information has been handed out. The Shore Report has included information on the Comprehensive Plan update survey, the Staff has been utilizing social media, and one more direct mailing to the community will be included with the next utility bill. He asked the Commission to share with their circles as well.

C. Commission

Commissioner Braithwaite noted that his employment would be changing and he would no longer be working with the City of Hutchinson, but has taken a position with the City of Orono as the Director of Public Works. He stated that during the interview process, he let them know he was on the Planning Commission and could resign if needed, but Orono did not have any problems with it. He shared that he had also informed Planning Director Griffiths to see if there were any issues with that, and the Staff let him know that Orono is far enough away and that there should not be an issue from the Staff perspective. He noted that the one issue is that the City of Orono's council meetings are on the same day and at the same time as Shorewood's Council meetings, which prevents him from attending as a liaison. He shared that if there is ever an item that would be an issue, he would let both parties know.

Chair Huskins mentioned that the Commission had lessened the reporting requirements in the bylaws. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the Commission is still reporting, but it has just been done elsewhere. The liaison still attends the meeting at the Council and now provides the report in context. He added that this was communicated to the Staff, and that Commissioner Braithwaite used to work for the City of Hutchinson; now it is Orono, so in the Staff's eyes, there is really no difference.

The Commission was okay with Commissioner Braithwaite staying on the Commission.

Chair Huskins suggested the Commission engage with the draft code.

Planning Director Griffiths shared that he will not be at the July 7 meeting, but Planner Osowski and HKGi will be there. Council Liaison Maddy noted that he would be switching with Councilmember Gorham.

Commissioner Magistad asked if anything else would be on the July 7 agenda besides the Code update. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the Commission photo would also be on the agenda.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Holker moved, Magistad seconded, adjourning the Planning Commission Meeting of June 2, 2026, at 8:09 P.M. Motion passed 4/0.