

City of Excelsior
Planning Commission Meeting
MINUTES
Tuesday, December 7, 2010
Council Chamber, City Hall, 339 Third Street
7:00 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gephart called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Wallace, Busch, Craig, Gaylord, Jensen, Putnam, and Chair Gephart

Also Present: City Attorney Staunton, City Planner Richards, and City Planner Fuchs

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(a) Planning Commission Meeting of November 3, 2010

Gephart asked if anyone had any additions or corrections to the Minutes. One typographical change was submitted.

It was moved by Commissioner Putnam, and seconded by Commissioner Craig, to approve the Minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting of November 3, 2010 as amended. Motion carried 7/0.

4. PENDING ISSUES/PROJECTS

(a) Appoint Liaison to City Council (December 20, 2010)

Chair Gephart will serve as the Planning Commission liaison to the December 20, 2010 Council meeting.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS - (Continued)

(a) None

It was moved by Commissioner Putnam, and seconded by Commissioner Busch, to move Item 8(a) ahead of Item 6, Public Hearings. Motion carried 7/0.

8. NEW BUSINESS

(a) Design Standards Review, Congregational Church of Excelsior, 471 Third Street

Richards provided an overview of the staff report outlining the subject Design Standards and Site Plan Review Applications to allow improvements to the breezeway that connects the church and school at 471 Third Street. He explained that the existing flat roof will be replaced with a trussed roof and that the existing windows on the west side of the breezeway will be replaced to match the same style of window used in the church and breezeway. He informed them that a small open 8 feet by 15 feet portico would be added on the west entry of the breezeway that is designed to complement the existing church in materials, finish, and architectural style. He noted that the improvements require Site Alteration Permit review by the Heritage Preservation Commission.

8. NEW BUSINESS

- (a) Design Standards Review, Congregational Church of Excelsior, 471 Third Street –
(Continued)

Brad Bollmann, representing Congregational Church of Excelsior, explained the proposed project and noted that the existing flat roof breezeway connecting the church and school will be upgraded with the roof structure matching the pitch of the elementary school building. He elaborated that the windows will be replaced with windows that are 3 inches smaller in height.

Wallace asked how many windows are proposed to be replaced. Bollmann responded that a total of five windows are proposed to be replaced.

Richards inquired if the existing breezeway door will remain. Bollmann explained that no changes are proposed with the door.

Gephart asked for clarification of the proposed windows. Richards responded that the site is a non-contributing structure and that the Heritage Preservation Commission will discuss and comment on this in more detail.

Wallace asked for clarification of the roof changes. Bollmann explained that the pitch of the portico will be similar to the existing portico of the church and the proposed pitch of the breezeway will match the school.

Putnam asked about the shingle style. Bollmann said that the shingles will match existing.

Wallace and Gephart inquired on the design and style of the columns. Bollmann explained that the columns are designed in such a way that the detailing of the eaves and columns will match existing improvements.

Gaylord asked if the gable will match the existing portico or if lap siding is proposed. Bollmann responded that the gable will be smooth to match. He noted that the only difference will be that no crown molding will be used.

Putnam noted that the improvements replicate existing improvements.

Richards inquired if the Planning Commission had any other concerns with the proposal.

Gephart asked if the other Planning Commission members were comfortable with the proposed vinyl windows.

Richards reviewed the proposed conditions of approval with the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Putnam moved, Commissioner Gaylord seconded, to continue the item to the City Council's December 20, 2010 meeting and forward the recommendation to the City Council that it approve the Congregational Church of Excelsior Design Standards and Site Plan Review Application for property located at 471 Third Street. Motion carried 7/0.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- (a) Ordinance to Amend Article 45, R-3, Medium Density Residential District, to Allow Offices, Business, and Professional as a Conditional Use

Richards provided an overview of the staff report. He highlighted that on November 3, 2010, the Planning Commission discussed the options related to zoning and impervious surface coverage for the Galpin Lake properties. He noted that the Commission discussed the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process for a potential Galpin Lake development and revisions to the R-3 Medium Density Residential District to include additional uses by conditional use.

Craig stated that she missed the impervious coverage allowance as she had understood that 60% had been discussed. Richards explained that the Planning Commission had been concerned about the allowances for impervious surface that would be permitted to the office use and that an allowance of 60 percent would apply only to the office use. He said the existing 40 percent impervious surface allowance would remain for the other permitted and conditional uses in that district.

The Planning Commission discussed the allowance of 60 percent impervious surface coverage as drafted within the conditions specific to office use. They discussed how the proposed ordinance will impact any future development of the Ridgeview Medical site. Richards elaborated that any proposed expansion of the intensity site requires that additional parking be provided.

Busch asked about the status of the marine dealership. Staff stated that there has been no application submitted for development of the site.

Wallace stated that any regulations should protect the current uses of the site and their historical context.

Gephart opened the public hearing at 7:40 PM. Hearing no more comments, Gephart closed the public portion of the meeting.

The Planning Commission discussed the draft language and the 60 percent impervious allowance. Wallace stated that proposed standards appear to make a Conditional Use Permit process easier for commercial applications and more restrictive for residential applications. The Commission discussed the feasibility of applying the 60% allowance for churches.

Commissioner Putnam moved, Commissioner Busch seconded to continue the public hearing to the City Council's December 20, 2010 meeting and forward a recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed ordinance to amend Article 45 of Appendix E of the Excelsior's Code of Ordinances pertaining to proposed amendments to Article 45, Sections 45-4 allowing Offices, Business, and Professional as Conditional Use Permits and 45-7 Lot Requirements and Setbacks. Motion carried 7/0.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(a) Parking Update

Staunton provided a brief overview of the City Council's recent adoption of a parking impact fee ordinance and resolution setting the parking impact fee for 2011.

Wallace asked if it was a fee. Staunton explained that the resolution articulates a rationale for a fee based on the requirement in the ordinance wherein an annual parking impact fee is charged in an amount of \$1,500 per space. He said that the resolution took into account anticipated costs of future land acquisition and development of additional automobile parking facilities and the value to property owners of satisfying off-street parking requirements. He explained that the ordinance allows for expansion of parking spaces by requiring a developer to pay funds to cover proposed parking needs not provided on site. The basic rationale involved the following steps: the cost of each parking space provided by the City and the value for each space. The underlying concern has been and will continue to be that adequate funds are generated to pay for spaces.

Gephart asked what type of enforcement will be used. Staunton explained that the ordinance requires a Conditional Use Permit application and that through a Development Agreement the owner will be required to sign a waiver to any assessment.

The Planning Commission discussed how the ordinance impacts the Burdick development and how it may impact 200 Water Street.

Staunton elaborated that the City is a pioneer as he is not aware of any other communities that have this type of ordinance. He explained that funds generated through the use of this ordinance are to be used for parking.

Wallace asked what the status is on the Lyman property acquisition. Staunton responded that the City is still in discussions with Lyman.

Wallace inquired as to the design of the library on the Lyman site. Staunton explained that the purchase of site along with site and layout has not been finalized.

Putnam asked how large the proposed library will be. Richards noted that a building between 5,000 – 7,000 square feet has been discussed. He stressed that an application has not been submitted.

(b) Tree Management

Fuchs stated that the Tree Subcommittee met to discuss tree needs and is currently researching and making changes to the draft document. Busch and Putnam reported that the Subcommittee is still studying boulevard tree needs and placement. They elaborated on the City of Chaska's Shade Tree Program.

8. NEW BUSINESS

(b) Planned Unit Development – Discuss Requirements, Section 65-2. Eligible Parcels

Richards provided an overview of the staff report. He explained that City Staff recognized a need to review Article 65, Planned Unit Development (PUD) of Appendix E as it relates to the requirements for eligibility of parcels for a PUD. The City established specific requirements in Subsection 65-2 for the Zoning Districts and conditions for which a parcel would be eligible for a Planned Unit Development. He explained that to be eligible for a PUD, a project must include multiple buildings or uses and propose at least one use that is not allowed by the underlying zoning district or for a project proposing multiple residential units as part of an integrated unit.

Staunton stated that the Wyer-Pierce development was reviewed under the old Planned Unit Development standards and that the Stoddard development was reviewed through the new Planned Unit Development guidelines.

Gephart asked what happens if two buildings are approved and only one building is constructed. Staunton explained the two buildings were approved as part of the Stoddard Planned Unit Development residential proposal. He noted that the applicant had requested an extension of time in order to complete the approved improvements.

Putnam asked why a Planned Unit Development was required. Staff explained that the PUD ordinance allowed development of a multi-unit residential development.

Gephart asked staff to assemble additional examples of other PUD standards in varying complexities from strict to loose eligibility requirements.

Putnam asked what the rationale was for changing the standards in the old PUD to the current standards. Staunton responded that the old standards pre-date staff and would require a lot of research.

Craig stated that she would find it hard to approve or justify a use that is not a permitted use in the district where a PUD is proposed.

Jensen asked if a PUD use can be changed. Staunton responded that the use would need to stay as that use.

Gephart asked what would happen if the use doesn't work or is abandoned. Staunton said that the development would need to adhere to the conditions imposed in the development agreement.

The Planning Commission asked staff to continue to research standards.

(c) Dates for Additional Work Session(s)

The Planning Commission decided to hold off on scheduling any additional Work Sessions beyond the subcommittee meetings.

9. COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

(a) None

10. MISCELLANEOUS

(a) Recent City Council Actions

Staunton updated the Planning Commission on recent City Council actions.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Putnam moved, Commissioner Craig seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m. Motion passed 7/0.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald G. Fuchs
City Planner