

1 Commission discussion at the meeting indicated that the majority, if not all, of Commissioners
2 present had positive feedback on the design of the parking ramp. There was opposition
3 expressed by some Commissioners regarding the City building any parking ramp at Mill Street,
4 which resulted in the tie vote. At its September 20, 2016 meeting, the Council discussed the
5 matter and while recognizing the opposition of some Commissioners to a parking ramp, the
6 Council expressed concern that the Planning Commission was not providing any guidance or
7 recommendation on the proposed design. The Council asked staff to remind the Commission of
8 its limited but essential role of advising the Council on land use applications, and in this case,
9 making findings and a recommendation on the design of the ramp. At the Council's direction,
10 staff is bringing the matter of the proposed ramp design back to the Planning Commission for its
11 review, and has included a draft Report and Recommendation, which recommends approval of
12 the design based on the design critique completed by staff.

13
14 Commissioner Gonzalez asked what would be the determining factor for deciding if there would
15 be a partial roof or enhanced landscape.

16
17 Mr. Thomson stated the Council wanted to fully understand the costs associated with these
18 elements and in order to do this they requested the items be bid separately. When the Council
19 reviews the bids they will review the costs and the financing and make their final determination
20 at that time.

21
22 Commissioner Flannigan asked how the second level was accessible for ADA requirements.

23
24 Mr. Thomson reviewed the locations of the sidewalks and ramps.

25
26 Chair Iverson asked what the grade of this sidewalk would be, and if there would be problems in
27 the winter.

28
29 Mr. Thomson stated the grade along Broadway would remain the same as it is currently.

30
31 Commissioner Flannigan asked what the resident response was to the partial roof.

32
33 Commissioner Gonzalez stated a resident had been a part of the Steering Committee and they
34 were comfortable with the partial roof or enhanced landscape.

35
36 Chair Iverson stated she had received emails that stated they would prefer the partial roof
37 because they are not sure about the impacts from the lighting.

38
39 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the slope should be landscaped even if there is a roof on the
40 parking ramp.

41
42 Chair Iverson stated she had received a request that any trees that are planted should not go
43 above a set height because the residents do not want to lose the views they currently have.

44

1 Commissioner Gonzalez made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flannigan, to adopt the
2 draft Report and Recommendation of Approval of Design of Mill Street Parking Ramp as
3 presented. The motion carried 4 ayes and 2 nays (Iverson and Young).
4

5 **b.) Pflaum Home – 630 Bushaway Road**

6 **i. Variance and CUP**
7

8 Director of Planning and Building Thomson stated the property owner, Peter Pflaum, is
9 proposing to demolish the existing house and construct a new house on the property at 630
10 Bushaway Road. As part of the submitted development application, the applicant is requesting
11 approval of the variances from the R-1A zoning district requirements for the front yard setback,
12 rear yard setback, lot coverage, and impervious surface, variances from the Shoreland Overlay
13 District requirements for shoreland setbacks, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a fence, and a
14 CUP for non-conforming lot size and lot width. The Planning Commission reviewed the
15 development application and held a public hearing at its September 19 meeting. After discussion
16 the Planning Commission asked the applicant to provide additional information regarding the
17 justification for the requested variances, and to clarify the height of the stone wall that is being
18 proposed in the front yard. The Planning Commission also directed staff to prepare a Planning
19 Commission Report and Recommendation recommending approval of the development
20 application.
21

22 Commissioner Flannigan asked if the CUP was approved if they could include a condition that
23 the fence height is a maximum of 6-feet.
24

25 Mr. Thomson stated the Commission could make a condition that the maximum fence height is
26 6-feet, but this is already defined in the fence CUP in the Draft Report and Recommendation.
27

28 Commissioner Young made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gruber, to adopt the Planning
29 Commission Report and Recommendation of approval of Variances and Conditional Use Permits
30 for a new residence at 630 Bushaway Road as presented. The motion carried unanimously.
31

32 Commissioner Gonzalez stated this particular property fits the requirements for variances
33 because it could not be put to a reasonable use without the variances and CUP, and what they are
34 proposing to build does meet the standards of the City.
35

36 **c.) Enclave at Crossdale – 202-217 Byrondale Ave N**

37 **i. PUD Amendment**
38

39 Director of Planning and Building Thomson stated the property owner, Crossdale Development,
40 LLC, is proposing to amend previously approved PUD concept and general plans for the Enclave
41 at Crossdale development at 202 to 217 Byrondale Ave N. The proposed PUD amendment
42 would remove a portion of the public trail which runs along the south side of the cul-de-sac and
43 connects from Byrondale Avenue to Central Avenue. The Planning Commission reviewed the
44 development application and held a public hearing at its meeting on September 19. The
45 Commission discussion indicated varying opinions on whether the Commission should
46 recommend approval of the PUD amendment. After discussing the application, the Planning

1 Commission directed staff to prepare a draft Report and Recommendation recommending
2 approval of the development application for consideration at its next meeting when additional
3 Commissioners would be present.

4
5 Commissioner Gruber pointed out the letters of support from residents for amending the PUD to
6 remove the trial section for safety reasons.

7
8 Commissioner Flannigan stated he had considered that the applicant could include a gate at the
9 trial, but the access would be redundant and this trial section does present safety concerns. He
10 would support the request.

11
12 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the City Engineer had explained there were alternatives and these
13 were not explored in the application. The topography and conditions of the site were known to
14 the applicant prior to the original trail being proposed. She would not recommend approval of
15 this request because there was nothing new presented that would support the request.

16
17 Chair Iverson stated alternative options had not been presented to the Commission, and she
18 would not support amending the PUD at this time.

19
20 Commissioner Gruber made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Young, to adopt the draft
21 Planning Commission Report and Recommendation of approval with conditions for PUD
22 amendment for 202-217 Byrondale Avenue N as presented. The motion carried 4 ayes and 2
23 nays (Gonzalez and Iverson)

24
25
26 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Hearing Items:**

27
28 **a.) Floodplain Ordinance Amendment**

29
30 Director of Planning and Building Thomson introduced the City-initiated and required
31 amendments to the City's Floodplain Ordinance. He stated that on May 4, 2016, the Federal
32 Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) issued a Letter of Final Determination (LFD) to the
33 City. The LFD states that the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the City, as well as the
34 Hennepin County Flood Insurance Study, are complete and will become effective on November
35 4, 2016. The Flood Insurance Rate Maps and Flood Insurance Study updated the areas in the
36 City that are subject to the City's floodplain regulations. Letter of Final Determination states
37 that in order to continue the City's eligibility in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP),
38 the City is required to adopt or show evidence of adoption of floodplain management regulations
39 that meet the NFIP regulations by the effective date of the FIRMs. He reviewed the proposed
40 amendments to Sections 801.02 and 801.93 of the City's code. He reviewed the areas of the City
41 that would be affected by the changes.

42
43 Commissioner Gonzalez asked if this would replace the overlay district.

44
45 Mr. Thomson explained the action being taken would repeal the existing ordinance and put the
46 proposed ordinance in its place. It would remain an overlay zoning district.

1
2 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the Ordinance states that variance applications would be
3 reviewed in accordance with 801.05. This Section states practical difficulties must be
4 demonstrated, and Section 801.93.12.a has a different standard.

5
6 Mr. Thomson clarified procedural requirements must be met first, and the variance request
7 would have to meet the City's variance standards plus the more restrictive standard outlined in
8 the draft ordinance for the floodplain district.

9
10 Chair Iverson opened the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

11
12 There being no one wishing to address the Commission on this topic, Chair Iverson closed the
13 public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

14
15 Commissioner Gonzalez made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gruber, to adopt The
16 Planning Commission Report and Recommendation on an Ordinance amending Section 2 (Rules
17 and Regulations) and Section 93 (Floodplain Regulations) of City Code Chapter 801 (Zoning
18 Ordinance) regarding the City's floodplain regulations as presented. The motion carried
19 unanimously.

20
21
22 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Other Items:**

23
24 **a.) Review of Development Activities**

25
26 Director of Planning and Building Thomson stated the next meeting of the Planning Commission
27 is scheduled to include one development application for a new subdivision in the Holdridge
28 neighborhood. Staff is also working on putting a workshop together to discuss a work plan.

29
30 Commissioner Flannigan asked if anyone had gone to Meyer Dairy workshop presented by the
31 developer.

32
33 Chair Iverson stated she had attended. They had taken the feedback they received during
34 previous application review, and they are putting together a new proposal.

35
36 Commissioner Gonzalez reviewed the items discussed by the City Council at its last meeting,
37 including a proposal for Lake Street, downtown parking, and the JJ Hill event. The Council also
38 discussed the Institutional District Ordinance amendment for parking ramps, and they were not
39 pleased the Planning Commission had not been able to make a recommendation because of
40 abstentions. The Council did adopt the first reading of the Institutional District Ordinance
41 amendment, and they approved the Broadway Place application with the modifications the
42 applicant had made. The City Council did not approve the PUD subdivision on Bushaway Road,
43 and the applicant indicated they will be making modifications to the plan.

44
45 City Attorney Schelzel clarified there were concept plans for development on Lake Street
46 presented at the Council workshop, but there is not a pending application at this time.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

b.) Next Meeting is scheduled for October 17, 2016

AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.

Commissioner Young made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flannigan, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tina Borg
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.