

**SHOREVIEW PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2016**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Doan called the September 27, 2016 Shoreview Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following Commissioners were present: Chair Doan; Commissioners Peterson, Solomonson, Thompson and Wolfe.

Commissioners Ferrington and McCool were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Thompson to approve the September 27, 2016 Planning Commission meeting agenda as presented.

VOTE: **Ayes - 5** **Nays - 0**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Thompson to approve the August 23, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes as submitted.

VOTE: **Ayes - 5** **Nays - 0**

MOTION: by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Solomonson to approve the August 30, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes as submitted.

Ayes - 4 Nays - 0 Abstain - 1 (Thompson)

Commissioner Thompson abstained as she did not attend the August 30th meeting

REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

Presentation by City Planner Kathleen Castle

The following items were approved by the City Council as recommended by the Planning Commission:

- Site and Building Plan Review for River of Life Church Addition

- Comprehensive Sign Plan for Thomas Schuette of Tyme Properties, Gramsie Square
- Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Preliminary Plat, PUD Development Stage for Elevage Development Group LLC: The applicant did provide additional information about how the added parking lot will benefit commercial development. The parking is now located 33 feet from the north lot line. The result is a loss of 4 surface stalls but an overall, a gain of 2 stalls. The trail now follows the perimeter of the property, and there is a sidewalk that extends to the north property line.
- Planned Unit Development Concept Review for Woolpert, Inc. The City Council expressed concern about that type of use on the subject site and impact on adjacent residential properties.

OLD BUSINESS

VARIANCE/RESIDENTIAL DESIGN REVIEW - EXTENSION

FILE NO.: 2590-15-33
APPLICANT: JONATHAN GUSDAL & SONJA HAGANDER
LOCATION: 3194 WEST OWASSO BOULEVARD

Presentation by City Planner Kathleen Castle

The applicants received approval from the Planning Commission for a residential design review and variance on September 22, 2015. The proposal is to demolish the existing home and build a new home. Two variances were approved with the application: 1) reduce the minimum required structure setback from the OHW of Lake Owasso; and 2) increase the structure setback from West Owasso Boulevard. Approval expires within one year if a building permit has not been issued and work not begun on the project.

The applicants are preparing plans to submit for a building permit to begin construction within the next couple of months. An extension of approval has been requested. Staff recommends an extension for 9 months to June 22, 2017. Condition No. 2 will be changed to reflect the new expiration date.

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Thompson to adopt Resolution 15-86 approving variance requests submitted by Jonathan Gusdahl and Sonja Hagander to construct a new home at 3194 West Owasso Boulevard. The variances approved are: 1) To reduce the minimum 162.5-foot structure setback from the Ordinary High Water (OHW) of Lake Owasso to 105.4 feet for the home and 97.6 feet for the patio , and 2) to increase the maximum 134.5-foot structure setback from the front property line to 175.5 feet. These approvals are subject to the following conditions:

1. The project must be completed in accordance with the plans submitted as part of the Residential Design Review application. Any significant changes to these plans, as determined by the City Planner, will require review and approval by the Planning Commission.

2. This approval will expire after one year if a building permit has not been issued and work has not begun on the project.
3. Impervious surface coverage shall not exceed 25% of the total lot area as a result of this project. Foundation area shall not exceed 18%.
4. Seven landmark trees will be removed as a result of the development, and eight replacement trees are required. A cash surety to guarantee the replacement trees shall be submitted prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. A tree protection plan shall be submitted prior to issuance of a demolition permit. The approved plan shall be implemented prior to the commencement of work on the property and maintained during the period of construction. The protection plan shall include wood chips and protective fencing at the drip line of the retained trees.
6. A final site grading, stormwater management and erosion control plan shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit for the project. This plan shall include a phased, or sequenced, erosion control and stormwater management plan that details the methods that will be used during the phases of the project, and is subject to the approval of the City Engineer.
7. A permit from the Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District shall be obtained, if required, prior to the issuance of a building permit.
8. A Mitigation Affidavit shall be executed prior to the issuance of a building permit for the new residence.
9. A building permit must be obtained before any construction activity begins.
10. This approval is subject to a 5-day appeal period.

This approval is based on the following findings:

1. The proposed improvement is consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, including the Land Use and Housing Chapters.
2. The proposal is consistent with the City's housing policies regarding housing, neighborhood reinvestment, and life-cycle housing.
3. Practical difficulty is present as stated in Resolution 15-86.

VOTE: Ayes - 5 Nays - 0

PRELIMINARY PLAT, REZONING, VARIANCE

FILE NO.: 2630-16-29
APPLICANT: GOLDEN VALLEY LAND COMPANY
LOCATION: 0 GRAMSIE ROAD; PINS 26-30-23-13-0027; 26-30-23-13-0028

Presentation by Economic Development and Planning Associate Niki Hill

A preliminary plat, rezoning and variance applications have been submitted to develop 15.57 acres of vacant land for single-family residential lots. The property is north of I-694, west of Victoria Street, south of Gramsie Road and east of the tower properties.

The property would be subdivided into 7 lots for single-family detached homes with one outlet for future subdivision. Rezoning would be for R1, Detached Residential. The outlet would

remain zoned UND (Undeveloped). The variance would waive depth standards for five of the lots which are key lots and do not meet the required lot depth for a key lot.

This application was reviewed at the August 30, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. The matter was tabled for further investigation of the wetland buffer area.

The City Engineer's review states that the wetland classification is not protected but classified as a high management wetland. This means that Gramsie Pond is a moderate to high quality basin that receives some direct storm water runoff. Gramsie Pond is a natural body of water that is used for storm water runoff in the area. The Storm Water Management Plan encourages buffers from wetland and storm water ponds. The proposed buffer of 16.5 feet is consistent with buffers around similarly classified water bodies.

Jenifer Sorenson from the MN DNR submitted a letter and follow-up email on this issue. She states that approval should be on condition that the final plat will meet the City's shoreland standards for the percentage of impervious surface. She recommends that any steep slope or bluff areas be shown on the development submittal so it is clear where these are located within the proposed plat. She further stated that state shoreland rules do not have standards for buffer widths from wetlands if there is no DNR shoreland classification.

The Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD) states that there are no requirements for wetland buffer setbacks. Buffers are only considered with a proposal that has on-site mitigation. The applicants received a permit from RCWD on September 14, 2016.

Noting the amount of concern regarding future development of Outlot A, the applicants have approached the City about donating the land to the City. There have been preliminary discussions about accepting the land either in lieu of the park dedication fee or as a land donation. This would be finalized with the Final Plat. Should the City take ownership, the land would remain undeveloped. Research would be needed to determine potential use given the challenging access problems. The Comprehensive Plan would not change its guidelines and would not impose any restrictions on the outlot at this time.

Staff is able to make affirmative findings for the preliminary plat and rezoning as well as the variances to waive lot depth requirements for the five key lots. Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a recommendation for approval to the City Council with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if above the ordinary high water (OHW) mark of the pond would be taken out of the calculation for the buffer and whether there is a natural divide between Gramsie Pond and Island Lake. Ms. Castle answered that the OHW is in the calculation. Mr. Warwick added that the survey indicates that the OHW for Island Lake and Gramsie Pond are different and two distinct bodies of water.

Commissioner Peterson noted signage for the buffer recommended by the DNR. His concern is that at some time in the future the property owner may remove the trees and ground cover for the buffer and plant turf to the edge of the pond. Ms. Hill stated that the DNR does not have

regulations over the buffer. Signage has been suggested to help define the buffer so it is not disturbed. Ms. Castle added that the signage will specifically identify the buffer and require that it be maintained in its natural state. It would be an enforcement action on the part of the City if the buffer were disturbed in the future.

Mr. Matt Pavek, Project Engineer, stated that the work done since the last meeting is to clarify the wetland areas and buffer. Since that meeting the RCWD permit has been received. Lot 7 will work well with a walkout design. The slope is 3:1. The grading will make it look less dramatic, and the house will fit well. He noted that the outlot would be difficult to develop and serious consideration is being given to donate it to the City.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if the current high water is above the buffer area. **Mr. Pavek** answered that the low floor elevations are established at 2 feet above the 100-year elevation of Gramsie Pond. Any home will be well protected from flood issues.

Chair Doan opened the discussion to public comment.

Mr. Dave O'Neill, 815 Gramsie Road, asked if the grading will push dirt into the pond. Gramsie Road east of Victoria has flooded 3 of the last 4 years. It is difficult to judge a 100-year flood. There has always been a direct water connection between the pond and Island Lake. The neighborhood has spacious lots with moderate houses. The proposed lots will look squeezed in with 3-story homes that tower above surrounding houses. Big development on small lots is not what Shoreview wants. Neighbors have known that property would be developed, but what has previously been discussed is five lots at 100 feet in width. He would like the Planning Commission to recommend five lots with current setbacks and 100-foot lot widths with no variations.

Ms. Mary Hanson, 799 Randy Avenue, agreed with Mr. O'Neill. The lot sizes are too small. The lots should be 10 feet wider with no seventh lot. A variance would not be necessary if the lots were wider. There would also be more protection for the wetland. When trees are removed from Lot 7, water will flow onto the Tan property which will be flooded. Mr. Reiling requested the City to allow 75-foot lots 25 years ago and was turned down with a requirement for 85-foot lots.

Mr. Brian Hanson, 799 Gramsie, supported the comments of the previous two speakers. It makes sense to take width from Lot 7 to make 5 or 6 lots wider, or donate a portion of Lot 7 that would provide access to the outlot peninsula.

Mr. Joe Lux, 770 Randy Avenue, stated that the pond and lake are connected by wetland that is wet almost all the time, even in times of drought. He is encouraged that the outlot may be a donation.

Ms. Heidi Tan, 808 Randy Avenue, stated that the layout of the key lots is justification for the variance and based on the ghost plat. However, the ghost plat is only a concept sketch. A variance would not be necessary if the lots were widened. Chair Doan responded that his understanding is that the lots for development are key lots because the rear lot lines will abut the

side property line of the Tan property. Ms. Hill added that if the ghost plat were developed, the lots would no longer be key lots because the rear property lines would abut rear lot lines. The other justification for the variance is the 80-foot right-of-way on Gramsie Road. If that right-of-way were a standard width of 60 to 65 feet, the lots would meet depth requirements. The key lots will maintain 40-foot rear setbacks.

Ms. Tan requested that the comments from the DNR and City Engineer become requirements for the project.

Mr. Dean Hanson, Builder, clarified that City regulations for lot width is 75 feet. He agreed with residents that the 3-story homes he was originally proposing are too big. The homes he proposes to build will be smaller with a foundation area that ranges from 1100 square feet to 1450 square feet. It is important to be good neighbors and for the new development to fit in. No wetlands, including the buffer, will be touched during development. To help prevent interference with the buffer in the future, there will be signage with sprinkling systems that clearly mark the buffer line. There will be no water runoff onto neighboring properties. Runoff will be contained on each lot with rain gardens and other measures.

Commissioner Thompson asked what guarantee there will be for the houses to be smaller and whether a condition should be added to the motion. Ms. Castle responded that the City does not have maximum square footage requirements or authority to regulate the size of homes to be built. The controlling factors are lot width, buildable area and maximum impervious surface coverage. The developer could apply private covenants to the land. City Attorney Beck agreed that the City has no authority over the size home built. The size home would have to be determined between the purchaser and the builder.

Commissioner Solomonson referred to Section 209.065, Surface Water Management and asked whether the 16.5 foot buffer is a minimum or if the City could make it larger. Ms. Castle explained that a 16.5 foot buffer is a minimum. In order to require a larger buffer, a direct impact would have to be shown that creates a need for the larger buffer.

Commissioner Peterson stated that the delicate nature of the pond is different from other drainage areas. The steep slope may be grounds for making the buffer larger. If only six lots were developed, the buffer would be wider and the increased lot width would make the variance unnecessary. Ms. Castle further explained that there would have to be a direct connection to water quality to justify a greater buffer.

City Attorney Beck stated that the issue with the key lots is that the rear lot lines abut the adjacent side lot line. That is why depth is the issue, not width. Also, Code states that the required buffer width is 16.5 feet. If the Commission does consider increasing the buffer, he would strongly recommend a finding of fact to justify the reason for the increase.

Chair Doan requested staff to state the specific variance and deviations requested. Ms. Hill stated that the applicant has requested the City to waive the key lot requirement that depth be 15 feet deeper than the zoning district standards for the five eastern lots. The reasons for the request is that Gramsie Road has 80 feet of right-of-way, wider than the standard 60 feet, and when the

lot to the south develops, the rear lot lines will abut rear lot lines. The lots will no longer be key lots.

Commissioner Solomonson noted that if a right-of-way vacation request were made, the lots would meet the required depth. Also, as long as the Tan property remains in its current configuration, the new lots will be key lots. It is difficult to give rationale to increase the buffer, even though it is a shallow area to a steep slope, but his big concern is building on the seventh lot. It is difficult to see where a house would be built. Larger lots are needed. For this reason, he cannot support the proposal.

Commissioner Peterson stated that his concern is that justification for a wider buffer is not to be found in the information presented from expert resources. He would recommend adopting all DNR recommendations but would also suggest the City ordinance be reviewed for possible change. The application should be approved with the DNR condition.

Commissioner Thompson asked the reason six lots were not considered instead of seven since no variance would then be required. Ms. Hill stated that with six lots, there would still be the depth deviation. A lot width of 75 feet meets City Code. A decision cannot be arbitrarily made to require wider lots. Mr. Warwick added that the key lot width and depth requirements were adopted in tandem with increased setback requirements. The increased setback is the main priority. The area of lot is secondary to insure buildable area.

Chair Doan stated that the challenge with a 10-foot vacation to the right-of-way in order to not have a variance is that the houses would be shifted north, closer to the houses across the street, which is already a concern for neighbors. By not allowing the variance, a negative impact would result for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Peterson agreed. He also echoed the concern for building on the seventh lot, but without information from experts to provide a rationale for a wider buffer, the proposal should be approved.

Commissioner Wolfe stated that he agrees with Commissioner Solomonson's statements. He also has a big concern about building on the seventh lot.

Chair Doan stated that while he has concerns about the seventh lot, it does meet code requirements. It would be arbitrary to vote against something without justification. Ms. Castle clarified that the variance is only for lot Nos. 1 through 5. Lots 6 and 7 comply with the Code.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if the variance needs to be decided if there is not agreement on the preliminary plat. Ms. Castle explained that the Commission's discretion is with the variance and whether it meets the criteria to be approved. To request that lot Nos. 6 and 7 be combined when the lots meet Code requirements would exceed the Commission's authority.

City Attorney Beck agreed with staff and stated that the Commission's task regarding Lot Nos. 6 and 7 is to determine whether they meet Code requirements without a variance.

MOTION: by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Wolfe to adopt Resolution 16-79 approving the variances to waive the Key Lot requirements for Lots 1-5 and to recommend the City Council approve preliminary plat and rezoning submitted by Peter Knaeble, Golden Valley Land Co. to subdivide and develop the property at 0 Gramsie Road into 7 lots for single-family detached homes and 1 outlot. Said recommendation for approval is subject to the following conditions, with an additional condition No. 11 for the Preliminary Plat that the developer shall erect signs at the edge of the 16.5 wetland buffer area.

Rezoning

1. A Development Agreement must be executed prior to the City's issuance of any permits for rezoning.
2. Rezoning is not effective until approvals are received for the Final Plat, the development agreements executed.
3. This approval rezones the property from UND, Urban Underdeveloped to R1, Detached Residential.

Preliminary Plat

1. The approval permits the development of a detached residential subdivision providing 7 lots for single family residential development and 1 outlot for future development.
2. Final grading, drainage and erosion control plans are subject to the review and approval by the Public Works Director prior to approval of any permits or the Final Plat. Concerns identified by the City Engineer shall be addressed with the Final Plat submittal.
3. Final utility plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works Director.
4. Comments identified in the memo dated August 23, 2016 from the City Engineer shall be addressed with the Final Plat submittal.
5. A Development Agreement, Erosion Control Agreement shall be executed and related securities submitted prior to any work commencing on the site. A Grading Permit is required prior to commencing work on the site.
6. A Public Recreation Use Dedication fee and/or Land Dedication shall be submitted as required by ordinance prior to release of the Final Plat.
7. The landscape/tree-replanting plan shall be provided in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. Trees on the property, which are to remain, shall be protected with construction fencing placed at the tree driplines prior to grading and excavating. Said plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the City Planner prior to submittal of the final plat application.
8. The Final Plat shall include drainage and utility easements along all property lines. Drainage and utility easements along the roadways shall be 10 feet wide and 5 feet wide along the side and rear lot lines. Other drainage and utility easements shall be provided over the proposed bio-filtration area, future public infrastructure and as required by the Public Works Director.
9. The developer shall secure a permit from the Rice Creek Watershed District prior to commencing any grading on the property.
10. The plan submittal for the Final Plat shall identify areas that are classified as steep slopes and bluffs on Lots 1-7.
11. The developer shall erect signs at the edge of the 16.5' wetland buffer area.

This variance application is to reduce the minimum 10-foot setback for a 6-foot fence on a side yard along an arterial road. The proposal is for the fence to be set back 3 feet from the property line. Fences are permitted in residential districts at 4 feet in height. One exception is a corner lot with a side yard abutting an arterial roadway. Then the fence may be 6 feet as long as the setback is 10 feet from the property line that abuts the right-of-way or any pedestrian or road easement. Plantings (shrubs or trees) as approved by the City must be established and maintained between the fence and the right-of-way easement.

The applicants state that the 6-foot fence would serve as a sound, safety and privacy barrier for the home. The property has a unique circumstance in that there are a group of mature conifer trees in the back yard approximately 10 feet from the south property line. A 10-foot setback, as required, would mean removal of those trees. A setback of 3 to 5 feet would locate the fence between the conifers and existing deciduous trees. Other properties to the east with back yards on Lexington have 6-foot fences with setbacks from the nearest edge of the trail that range from less than 2 feet to approximately 8 feet. The 3- to 5-foot setback requested would be greater than most of the setbacks relative to the edge of the trail.

Staff finds that the proposal is consistent with the City's land use and housing policies and that practical difficulty is present. The 6-foot fence would address the concerns of the applicant in regard to sound, safety and privacy. Staff believes the reduced setback is reasonable. Unique circumstances exist with the proximity of the property to Lexington Avenue, development patterns of the neighborhood, topography and the location of the existing mature trees. There is a commercial use directly across Lexington, and this fence would buffer the single-family residence from that commercial use. The character of the neighborhood will not change because of the existing fences to the east and because this is the only residential lot with a side lot line abutting Lexington.

Notices were sent to property owners within 150 feet. No comments have been received. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions listed.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if the fence were connected to the garage, it could only be 4 feet in height. Ms. Castle responded that if the fence is in line with the garage, 6 feet in height is permitted. If the fence were in front of the garage, the height would be limited to 4 feet. Commissioner Solomonson asked if the fence is located outside the safety triangle for traffic visibility. Ms. Castle answered, yes.

Mr. Valley, Applicant, stated that he has no plans to extend the fence to the garage. This request is driven by noise from traffic. The setback range is 3 to 5 feet because he is not sure if the deciduous trees align along the property line.

MOTION: by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Solomonson to adopt the attached Resolution 16-90, including findings of fact, permitting the construction of 6-foot tall privacy fence with a reduced setback of 3 feet at 5891 Hamline Avenue, subject to the following conditions:

1. The approval permits a reduced setback for a 6-foot tall privacy fence in the side yard of the property.
2. Said fence shall be setback a minimum of 3 feet from the side property line.
3. The fence shall be maintained in accordance with the standards of the Development Code.
4. Landscape screening shall be maintained between the fence and the side property line.
5. The applicant shall obtain a building permit for the structure.

Said approval is based on the following findings of fact:

1. *Reasonable Manner.* The 6-foot tall fence addresses the concerns of the property owner in regards to sound, safety and a privacy barrier. In Staff’s opinion, the reduced setback reasonable due to the property and neighborhood characteristics and proximity to Lexington Avenue, an arterial road. The location of a fence between the deciduous and conifer trees is a reasonable use of the property.
2. *Unique Circumstances.* In staff’s opinion, unique circumstances are present due to the proximity to Lexington Avenue, an arterial road, neighborhood development patterns, the topography of the land, and the location of the existing mature trees.
3. *Character of Neighborhood.* Staff does not believe the variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood because of the existing fences to the east along Lexington, adjoining land uses and proposed screening with the existing deciduous trees. Since this property is the only residential lot whose side lot line abuts Lexington Avenue in this area, the character of the neighborhood will not be altered.

VOTE: Ayes - 5 Nays - 0

MISCELLANEOUS

Text Amendment for Building Height and Parking

City Planner Castle referred Commissioners to earlier discussion in April on building height and parking. This issue is a result of a number of multi-family developments requesting to exceed the City’s height limit of 35 feet. The first change would increase the maximum building height permitted except in the R1 and R2 zoning districts. With the proposed changes, the additional foot of setback for each additional foot of height would be eliminated, and a height transition area would be implemented.

Commissioner Peterson asked how the proposed regulation could be broadened to not only be applied along the freeways (I-694 and I-35W) but also for areas like Shoreview Hills. Ms. Castle explained that the R3 District would be allowed a height of 40 feet across the board. If R3 property is adjacent to I-694 or I-35W, 50 feet would be allowed. Other arterial roads such as Highway 96, Lexington Avenue and Hodgson Road are not included.

Chair Doan asked about allowing increased height on arterial roads where flexibility may be needed, such as the Town Center area.

Commissioner Peterson stated that there are many issues besides just an arterial road, such as topography and adjacent land uses. He asked if certain conditions can be stipulated for all arterial roads. Ms. Castle stated that she would recommend using the variance process rather than trying to define conditions for arterial roads.

Chair Doan agreed the variance process would better serve circumstances on arterial roads.

Commissioner Solomonson asked how height is measured. Ms. Castle showed the measurement to be from the mean grade to the mean point of the roof. Commissioner Solomonson asked if a greater setback would be required for shed and flat roofs that would have a greater impact to adjacent property. Ms. Castle showed a chart that identifies transition areas adjacent to residential areas and where buildings could be placed.

Commissioner Thompson stated that the proposal reflects the previous discussions and will go a long way to reduce the number of people seeking variances for height.

Minimum Structure Setback

Ms. Castle defined minimum setbacks within transition areas adjacent to low and medium density residential areas. A minimum setback from R1 or R2 with an adjacent R3 zone is 30 feet with a transition zone of another 10 feet. At the minimum setback, the maximum height permitted is 35 feet. Within the transition zone, the height can increase one foot for every two feet of setback which is up to 40 feet. Transition zones vary in width from R1 and R2 zones depending on the land use.

Commissioner Solomonson expressed concern about reducing the front setback to the street. He would not want to encourage development closer to the street but would prefer to use the variance process for individual circumstances. There is a difference when there is residential across the street. Potentially there could be a very tall building only separated by a street.

Commissioner Peterson agreed but stated that developers will use the PUD process and variances considered case by case. Residents will expect the City to hold setbacks to regulations when possible.

Chair Doan clarified that transition areas only apply to development adjacent to R1 and R2 districts. A development next to a street or office would not have a transition area.

Ms. Castle stated that using the corner of Tanglewood and Hodgson as an example, there is an office on the corner. The right-of-way of Tanglewood is at least 60 feet. With a required 50-foot setback, a building could be 55 feet in height with 110 feet between the building and the property line across the street on Tanglewood. There is residential use to the west which means a transition zone would have to be established to the west between the residential and hypothetical office development.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that he sees this as the worst case scenario. He would like to see the transition zone increased to 2 feet for every additional 1 foot of height.

Ms. Castle referred Commissioners to the zoning map to see where the R3, commercial and office districts are in the community. Generally, they are along arterial roads.

Commissioner Peterson stated that this change needs to be in the Code as soon as possible in order to address applications that come in for taller buildings.

Ms. Castle suggested taking some site plan reviews and applying them to the proposed regulations to get a feel of how it would work. Commissioner Thompson specifically suggested Lakeview Terrace, Applewood Point, Shoreview Senior Living, and Elevage.

Chair Doan stated the Commission also needs to review parking. Ms. Castle agreed as that is the other element that brings applications for deviation.

City Council Meetings

Commissioner Solomonson will attend the October 17, 2016 City Council meeting. No planning items will be reviewed at the October 3rd City Council meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: by Commissioner Thompson, seconded by Commissioner Solomonson to adjourn the meeting at 9:41 p.m.

VOTE: Ayes - 5 Nays - 0

ATTEST:

Kathleen Castle
City Planner