

4
5 **DRAFT MINUTES**
6

7
8 **CALL TO ORDER**
9

10 Chair Huskins called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

11
12 **ROLL CALL**

13
14 Present: Chair Huskins; Commissioners Holker, Longo, Magistad, and Ruoff (arrived at 7:03
15 P.M.); Planning Director Griffiths; and City Planner Osowski

16
17 Absent: None
18

19 **1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
20

21 Longo moved, Magistad seconded, approving the agenda for August 19, 2025, as
22 presented. Motion passed 4/0.
23

24 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
25

- 26 • **June 3, 2025**
27

28 Chair Huskins noted that he had passed along some minor edits to Planning Director Griffiths
29 before the meeting.
30

31 Holker moved, Longo seconded, approving the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of
32 June 3, 2025, as presented. Motion passed 4/0.
33

34 Commissioner Ruoff arrived at the meeting.
35

36 **3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR**
37

38 There were no comments.
39

40 **4. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

41 Chair Huskins explained that the Planning Commission is comprised of residents of the
42 City of Shorewood who are serving as volunteers on the Commission. The Commissioners
43 are appointed by the City Council. The Commission's role is to help the City Council in
44 determining zoning and planning issues. One of the Commission's responsibilities is to
45 hold public hearings and to help develop the factual record for an application and to make
46 a non-binding recommendation to the City Council. The recommendation is advisory only.
47

48 **A. PUBLIC HEARING – CANNABIS CITY CODE AMENDMENTS**
49

50 Planning Director Griffiths explained that this item was a housekeeping item to clean up the City's
51 regulations for cannabis. He gave some background regarding the State's legalization of
52 recreational cannabis sales, past discussions and actions the City has taken, additional legal
53 counsel related to the City's initial decision to delegate the registration authority to the County,

CITY OF SHOREWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

AUGUST 19, 2025

Page 2 of 5

1 and Council direction for rescinding that and taking over the registration process themselves. He
2 highlighted the proposed amendments to the Cannabis City Code. He noted that, to date, the City
3 had not received any public comments on this proposed amendment.

4
5 Commissioner Holker asked whether taking back the administrative side of the registration
6 process would be onerous or costly to the City. She asked if they might be able to hire an outside
7 consultant service to handle these duties for the City. She asked if the City had spelled out, within
8 the parameters, the areas where this use would be allowed, so they do not get a lot of applications
9 for places where people would not be allowed to have this use.

10
11 Planning Director Griffiths stated that they do have the parameters clearly outlined for the allowed
12 locations and noted that they have already received quite a few calls from people inquiring about
13 opening this type of business in the City. He stated that he believed it was likely that Shorewood
14 would have one locate in the City and briefly described the locations where this would be allowed.
15 He stated that the expectation is that this process would be handled similarly to the City's liquor
16 licensing, and there would be heavy involvement of the SLMPD. He stated that because the City
17 would most likely only have one business, he did not think the burden of the registration process
18 was going to be a substantial burden for staff.

19
20 Commissioner Longo stated that he had asked Planning Director Griffiths if having an unmanned
21 kiosk would be possible, but he told him that it would not be legal at this point.

22
23 Planning Director Griffiths confirmed that having an unmanned kiosk would not currently be legal
24 in Minnesota.

25
26 Commissioner Magistad referenced the anticipated demand for applications and asked how the
27 City would deal with competing registrations.

28
29 Planning Director Griffiths explained that it would be done on a first-come, first-served basis, but
30 noted that he did not believe that there would be many applications submitted at the same time,
31 due to the number of available sites being relatively low.

32
33 Chair Huskins stated that once the City has approved the one location for this type of business,
34 he would suggest they get the word out on the website, so they do not get a lot of other
35 applications when the City is not permitted to register a second business. He referenced two
36 paragraphs in the document and noted that he felt there was an inconsistency with them related
37 to Subd. 5, Suspension of Registration and item c., Length of Suspension, and d., Reinstatement
38 of Registration.

39
40 Planning Director Griffiths explained that this language had been taken directly from the State
41 Statute and gave a brief explanation of what these sections were saying and answered
42 Commission questions. He stated that the City's only role in this process was to certify zoning
43 compliance for the location because once the registration is issued, the State takes over
44 everything.

45
46 Chair Huskins opened the Public Hearing at 7:21 P.M. and noted that there was no one present
47 in the chambers, so he closed the Public Hearing at 7:21 P.M.

48
49 **Magistad moved, Ruoff seconded, recommending approval of the Cannabis City Code**
50 **Amendments, as presented. Motion passed 5/0.**

51

1 **B. PUBLIC HEARING – GRADING AND STEEP SLOPES CITY CODE AMENDMENTS**

2
3 Planning Director Griffiths explained that this was another housekeeping-type item for the
4 Commission to consider. He reminded the Commission that during the 2040 Comprehensive
5 Planning process, there was some discussion about the City’s protections for grading and steep
6 slopes. He explained that the City Code just was not clear on when permits were required and
7 reviewed the proposed amendment to the current language to address that issue.

8
9 Commissioner Longo asked if there was a risk that by raising the limit, they would compromise
10 the way the water flows into neighboring areas.

11
12 Planning Director Griffiths explained that when there is a grading permit request, applicants are
13 required to submit drainage plans to the City, regardless of the size of the project. He noted that
14 staff or the area watershed districts were not concerned about increasing this threshold.

15
16 Chair Huskins asked if any current projects may be affected by this change.

17
18 Planning Director Griffiths stated that there were no current applications working through the
19 process or any pending development applications. He explained that the only thing the City was
20 regulating with this was the short period of time when the construction was happening, and once
21 the grading project had been completed, it was over and done. He stated that the purpose of this
22 permit would be to set up haul routes for construction and make sure the streets were being
23 cleaned.

24
25 Commissioner Magistad asked if any of the numeric limits in the City’s proposed language were
26 different than the DNR language.

27
28 Planning Director Griffiths explained that the 100 versus 400 was not contemplated by the DNR,
29 but noted that the 10 or more cubic yards language within the amendment was from the DNR.

30
31 Commissioner Magistad asked how the City had arrived at these numbers.

32
33 Planning Director Griffiths stated that he assumed there were reasons when the ordinance was
34 originally adopted in the 1980s, but did not know what they were. He noted that a number of cities
35 have the 400 number as their threshold.

36
37 Chair Huskins opened the Public Hearing at 7:34 P.M., there being no one present in the
38 chambers, and he closed the Public Hearing at 7:34 P.M.

39
40 **Holker moved, Magistad seconded, recommending approval of the Grading and Steep**
41 **Slopes City Code Amendments, as presented. Motion passed 5/0.**

42
43 **C. PUBLIC HEARING – 2026 FEE SCHEDULE**

44
45 Planning Director Griffiths stated that the City reviews and updates its fee schedule on an annual
46 basis and noted that the Planning Commission was responsible for reviewing the planning-related
47 chapters of the schedule. He noted that the public was welcome to submit comments to the
48 Council when this item is brought forward by them at the September 8, 2025, meeting, since no
49 one was present tonight. He explained that the new fees would go into effect on January 1, 2026,
50 and highlighted the proposed changes for the zoning and land use fees. He explained that on

1 staff's list for the first part of 2026 would be consideration of hiring a consultant to do a
2 development fee study for all of their fees.

3
4 Commissioner Ruoff asked about the zoning verification letter fee and if the City had any
5 comparable information from other cities on what their fees were.

6
7 Planning Director Griffiths stated that he did not have those numbers with him at the meeting, but
8 explained that he used to work for Andover, and their fee is \$1,000. He stated that the proposed
9 change from \$50 to \$250 was probably on the low end, but was moving the City in the right
10 direction.

11
12 Chair Huskins opened the Public Hearing at 7:48 P.M., noted that there was no one present in
13 the chambers, and closed the Public Hearing at 7:48 P.M.

14
15 **Longo moved, Holker seconded, recommending approval of the 2026 Fee Schedule, as**
16 **presented. Motion passed 5/0.**

17
18 **5. OTHER BUSINESS –**

19 **A. Monthly Training Topic – Review July 28, 2025 City Council Land Use Planning**
20 **and Zoning Training**

21 Planning Director Griffiths explained that on July 28, 2025, the City Council received Planning
22 and Zoning training from him and City Attorney Shepherd. He gave a brief presentation of the
23 training materials and reviewed: Municipal authority to plan; the role of the Planning Commission;
24 Zoning – implementing the Comprehensive Plan; Conditional and Interim Use Permits; Variances;
25 Time limits; and Public Hearings.

26
27 Commissioner Magistad asked if Planning Director Griffiths could forward the slide deck of his
28 presentation to the Commission.

29
30 Planning Director Griffiths stated that he would send the presentation to the Commission and
31 answered some follow-up questions from the Commission.

32
33 **B. Upcoming City Council Liaisons**

34
35 Planning Director Griffiths explained that he needed volunteers to fill the calendar for the rest of
36 2025.

37
38 September 8, 2025 – Chair Huskins
39 September 22, 2025 – Commissioner Magistad
40 October 27, 2025 - Commissioner Longo
41 December 8, 2025 – Commissioner Holker

42
43 **6. REPORTS**

44
45 • **Council Meeting Report**

46
47 Planning Director Griffiths stated that there was not much to report on the planning side of things
48 because they had canceled the July Planning Commission meeting. He gave a brief overview of
49 agenda items expected to be on the September 8, 2025, City Council meeting.

50
51 • **Draft Next Meeting Agenda**

1

2 Planning Director Griffiths reviewed the application that the City had received that would be on
3 the September 2, 2025, Planning Commission meeting agenda.

4

5 **7. ADJOURNMENT**

6

7 **Magistad moved, Longo seconded, adjourning the Planning Commission Meeting of**
8 **August 19, 2025, at 8:43 P.M. Motion passed 5/0.**