



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

3:00 PM December 3, 2019
2nd Floor Conference Room, City Hall

1. ROLL CALL

Council: Brent Lenssen, Jerry Kuiken, Kyle Strengholt, Scott Korthuis
Staff: Heidi Gudde, Dave Timmer, Steve Banham
Airport Board: Bob Weeks, Bill Stoelt
Chamber: Gary Vis
Residents (for RV Storage portion of the agenda): Doug Mather, Jeff McKenzie, Michael Protzler

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approved October CDC minutes as presented

3. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Residential Use Restrictions - RV Storage

Dave Timmer reviewed the changes made since the last time the CDC met about this topic. This included the removal of some subjectivity of whether the “code officer determines that an RV is detrimental”.

Discussion as to what would make an RV the “predominant feature” of a front yard. The group noted the visual impact of having RV’s parked within residential neighborhoods. The code rewrite is an attempt to balance the desire to park/store an RV in the front yard but also realizing a large RV filling up the driveway has a significant visual impact on the neighborhood. Could this be done by limiting the size allowed in the front (30 ft), requiring screening, separate parking pad, etc. There were questions on where is that 30 ft measured from, what if a property has a really big front yard, are there exemptions where a large RV in the front that wouldn’t negatively impact the neighborhood.

Mr. McKenzie noted that the code still seemed subjective in some areas and asked how residents will be made aware of the changes. Committee discussed that it may be appropriate to add a notice to utility bills and / or send letters to the neighborhoods that were previously notified.

Committee noted that the City has typically taken a reactive stance to code issues rather than a proactive approach. HG emphasized, however, that staff

seeks to implement a code that can be consistently enforced rather than one that is sporadically enforced.

Note that an RV and a boat are both considered recreational vehicles. This rewrite would only allow storage of one - either one boat or one trailer. The City is not interested in regulating where a utility trailer can be parked on a property.

Lenssen noted that residential use restrictions are likely an area that could be changed again.

Conclusions:

- Proceed as written with the changes which allow additional parking.
- Confirm to the CDC members the variance process associated with 19.31 and the application cost.
- Gudde noted that next steps of the code change would include a public hearing before the Planning Commission and a final approval with the City Council.

b. Pepin Creek Sub-Area Plan and All Projects Timeline

The plan went before the Planning Commission at a public hearing on November 21, 2019. HG described the PC recommendation of approval with conditions: Consider alternative routes for Pepin Parkway, city-wide funding mechanisms for the creek reroute, and focus on housing affordability.

BL noted that the division of the City-owned property on Benson by a road was not what he had envisioned when the property was purchased. He envisioned that 20 of the 40 acres would be park but that the park would remain connected to the Pepin corridor.

Banham noted that he had a “fish and transportation” problem even without considering the flooding issues that have been seen on property in the area. Double Ditch and Benson are substandard roads in need of improvements but improving DD is impossible without moving the creek. Benson is similar but the creek is only on one side.

The Committee discussed different options for the parkway.

- Park space along the Pepin corridor. Dividing the Benson property to have the event center / barn separated from the other park space.
- Bringing the creek into the park property
- Line up more with Sunrise Rd
- Go back to the 2 east/west roads, 2 bridges, etc concept. While the bridges are a significant cost, they are a fraction of the overall cost of relocating the creek.

CDC sees the Benson property as an investment to the City’s future. They don’t expect to see the property fully developed anytime in the near term but having the property in public hands provides significant opportunity (park, school, public facilities) for the City. Discussion on what exactly that might be will likely be the

topic of city/public conversations for a long time. Of course, they don't want the roadway design to prohibit the best use of that property for the City.

Bob Weeks, representing the Airport Board, stated that they would like to see this plan take the current and future use of the airport into account. This may be the time to consider how the runway could be extended, or Benson moved away from the end of the runway. This would provide additional economic opportunity for the City and address current safety concerns. Perhaps there is a circulation alternative that deadends Benson at the airport property? This would decrease the emphasis on Benson which is already substandard, unsafe for Isom School, and is seeing increased traffic.

The committee briefly discussed pocket parks. RM-PC is the only zoning category that requires common open space to be developed. Staff to determine if single family development also needs to create common open space.

Conclusions:

- Provide alternate exhibits for the December 16th meeting.
- Mention the runway extension as a possibility in a more obvious way.
- Possible decision on the 16th.

Next Meeting Date: December 18, 2019