

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ELKO NEW MARKET  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MAY 28, 2024  
7:00 PM**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Weber called the meeting of the Elko New Market Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m.

Commission members present: Weber, Hanson, Smith, Pipo, Heimerl, and Ex-Officio Member Anderson

Members absent and excused: None

Staff Present: Senior Planner Renee Christianson, Planner Jake Skluzacek, Planner Brandon Malecha, and City Engineer Rich Revering

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Weber led the Planning Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Weber asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Senior Planner, Renee Christianson, informed her that there were no changes.

A motion was made by Smith and seconded by Hanson to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion carried: (5-0).

**4. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

Senior Planner, Renee Christianson, informed the Commission that each year the Commission must elect a Chair and a Vice-Chair.

A motion was made by Smith and seconded by Heimerl to appoint Commissioner Weber as Chair and Commissioner Hanson as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission for 2024.

Motion carried: (5-0).

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

## 6. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

## 7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### A. Consider Approval of the April 30, 2024, Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Hanson and seconded by Smith to approve the minutes of the April 30, 2024, meeting as submitted.

Motion carried: (5-0).

## 8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

### A. Parkway Meadows, August Ventures, LLC and Winkler Land Co, LLC, applicants (CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

- Consider Application for Comprehensive Plan Amendment
- Consider Application to Rezone Property from R1 Single Family Residential and Urban Reserve to Planned Unit Development
- Consider Application for Preliminary Plat Approval of Parkway Meadows

Senior Planner, Renee Christianson, informed the audience and the Commission that there would not be a presentation on this item due to the thorough presentation that was presented at last month's meeting. The purpose of the continuation was to allow more time for the applicants to work with adjacent property owner to the south regarding neighborhood connectivity as well as to continue the public hearing from the April 30 meeting for those who still wish to address the Commission. Planner, Jake Skluzacek, refreshed the Commission on the three applications received for Parkway Meadows and displayed the preliminary plat drawing with minor changes including the re-orientation of Riley Road in the southwest of the property.

Chair Weber opened the public hearing at 7:08 PM.

Senior Planner Christianson read an email received by Staff from Jenny Kaehler, 506 Riley Road for the record. Kaehler wished to address her concerns related to traffic outlets, school enrollment, style and cost of homes, stop signs, and sidewalks.

Joe Sullivan, 66408 Shady Oak Eden Prairie, was present to provide public comment. Sullivan clarified that the slight change made to the concept plan was the straightening of Riley Road in the south which provides for more open space to the east of Riley Road. Sullivan reinforced that he is trying to hit an entry level price point for the lots in the development. Removing three lots for increased City public land dedication will increase the costs for the rest of the development as the infrastructure needed to serve the development remains the same with or without the three additional lots. Sullivan believes the layout presented has provided ample open space throughout the development. Sullivan thanked the Commission.

Chair Weber thanked Sullivan for his comments.

Dale Runkle, 19166 Randale Ct. Lakeville, was present to provide public comment. Runkle stated that he was a consultant for the Barsness Property located to the south and he had a question on the two temporary cul-de-sacs that border the southeast boundary of the property. Runkle stated that he did not agree with the plan proposed by the Applicant. Runkle would prefer permanent cul-de-sacs in these locations. Runkle was not in favor of connecting the two neighborhoods due to potential differences in housing styles. Runkle argued that removing the stub streets would allow more flexibility for how the property to the south may develop.

Chair Weber thanked Runkle for his comments.

Christianson mentioned that the public hearing was continued to give the two property owners a chance to discuss plans regarding the connections between neighborhoods. Commissioner Smith asked Runkle if he had talked with the applicants in the last month regarding the issue. Runkle stated that phone calls have been made but no communication was had. Runkle again stated that he was against the temporary cul-de-sacs for Streets A and C as presented on the plan.

Hearing no more public comment, Chair Weber closed the public hearing at 7:19 PM.

Planner Skluzacek wished to address some of the concerns presented in the email that was received by Staff prior to the meeting. Skluzacek stated that there would be no other outlets for this development until the surrounding properties develop and complete the necessary planned connections to CSAH 2 and CSAH 91. This development would make those connections more feasible to complete as other properties develop. City Engineer, Rich Revering, added that Riley Road and James Parkway have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.

The study referenced at the last meeting regarding expected pupil count for the development was out-of-date. However, it is the most recent student count information that New Prague School District has provided the City. Christianson stated that the study is based on an average across the District as well.

Christianson addressed the style of homes in the development. Based on the grading plans received by Staff, the proposed homes would all be split entry. The pricing of the homes could not be commented on by Staff at this time. Acreage lots are not allowed in the City based on the City's Subdivision Ordinance and density requirements which are determined by the Metropolitan Council. Any existing acreage lots within the City were developed before these requirements were in place.

Commissioner Smith had a question about Riley Road to the south. Smith wanted to know why part of the road was not included in the plat. Christianson stated that Staff has recommended the entirety of Riley Road be constructed within the plat and that the current

preliminary plat drawing does not show this. Smith also proposed a temporary cul-de-sac be put in at the southern tip of Riley Road to allow a spot for people to turn around if needed.

Discussion took place on sidewalk orientation along Riley Road and James Parkway. James Parkway requires sidewalks on both sides according to the City's new standards. Riley Road requires sidewalk on one side where it is a local road and two sides where it becomes a minor collector to the south. The Developer has proposed sidewalks on only one side of Riley Road (south) as part of the PUD.

Commissioner Pipo asked how streets A and C would be orientated compared with the Barsness property to the south. Christianson displayed an aerial image of the properties to better show how the proposed concept plan overlays on the property. Discussion took place on the planned access to the south on CSAH 2.

Commissioner Hanson stated that she was disappointed that the two parties [developer and Barsness] could not discuss the concerns over the temporary cul-de-sacs on Streets A and C of the proposed concept. Hanson added that is what the Commission was hoping for in continuing the public hearing. Hanson appreciated the realignment of Riley Road to the west and supported the dedication of lots 55, 56, and 57 to the City for public land dedication for PUD approval. Hanson had a question on how many additional lots are being created as a result of the PUD and decreased lot size requirements. Christianson estimated that 10-12 additional lots were being created but did not know exactly without doing more calculations.

Commissioner Smith had a question on the redlined plans relating to retaining walls. City Engineer, Rich Revering, responded that retaining walls should be located outside of any City owned easements. Revering added that retaining walls also should not be shared across multiple properties. These are concerns due to future maintenance of the walls and who the responsible party should be.

Commissioner Smith asked for an update regarding the property owner who requested a fence be installed between the proposed development and their property. Christianson stated that there was no update. At last month's meeting one of the property owners located to the east of the proposed development went on record to state they had farm animals and concerns about trespassing. There was no further discussion on the issue as that could be a factor for any development proposed next to existing rural or undeveloped property.

Chair Weber asked Christianson how she would like to go about discussing the conditions prepared by Staff. Skluzacek informed Weber that Staff is still seeking feedback on the last two conditions listed in the packet. These conditions include the construction of Riley Road to the southerly property line and additional public land dedication of lots 55, 56, and 57.

Christianson restated that City Council action is needed on this application by July 3<sup>rd</sup>. The review period has already been extended 60 days and cannot be extended any further. The City has provided ample opportunity for discussions between property owners to take place. The temporary cul-de-sacs on Streets A and C do not preclude development of the property to the south. Commissioner Pipo argued that the extra 30 days was not enough time for the

property owners to discuss the issue. Christianson reinforced that 120 days is the maximum review period for a City to process an application pursuant to Minnesota State Statute

A motion was made by Smith and seconded by Hanson to recommend approval of the following applications submitted by the applicants August Ventures, LLC and Winkler Land Co, LLC:

- Application for Comprehensive Plan Amendment
- Application to Rezone Property from R1 Single Family Residential and Urban Reserve to Planned Unit Development
- Application for Preliminary Plat Approval of Parkway Meadows

The Commission’s recommendation for approval of the request for Comprehensive Plan Amendment included the following reason:

1. The proposed re-guidance of approximately 17 acres from Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential will not have a serious or negative effect on the overall planned land uses within the 2040 growth area and will help achieve the housing goals contained in the Comprehensive Plan.

The Commission’s recommendation for approval of the request rezoning to PUD included the following minimum requirements:

	<b>Approved for Parkway Meadows</b>
<b>Minimum Lot Size</b>	7,800 square feet
<b>Minimum Lot Width</b>	65’
<b>Front Setback</b>	25’
<b>Side Setback</b>	7’
<b>Side Corner Setback</b>	20’
<b>Rear Setback</b>	20’
<b>Rear Deck Setback</b>	20’
<b>Wetland Setback</b>	40’
<b>Block Length (12-9-3)</b>	Northerly most block allowed to be 1,232’ in length
<b>Sidewalks (12-9-5-1 (Z))</b>	Sidewalk only required on east side of Riley Road, south of James Parkway

The Commission’s recommendation for approval of the preliminary plat included the following reasons:

1. Development of the property for single family residential homes is consistent with the guided land use for the property as contained in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
2. The preliminary plat is issued for a period of one year and shall become null and void without further action from the Planning Commission or City Council unless the final plat is filed within one year of the date of City Council granting preliminary plat approval.

3. Development of the property as single family residential is compatible with the adjacent land uses.

And with the following conditions:

1. The Developer must enter into a Developer's Agreement with the City of Elko New Market at the time of final plat approval
2. The preliminary plat is issued for a period of one year and shall become null and void without further action from the Planning Commission or the City Council unless the final plat is filed within one year of the date of the City Council granting preliminary plat approval
3. Preliminary plat approval is granted in accordance with the Parkway Meadows Preliminary Plat plans prepared by Pioneer Engineering and dated 5/17/24, and containing 26 sheets, and the Storm Water Management Plan prepared by Pioneer Engineering, dated 4/3/24 and containing 350 sheets
4. Preliminary plat approval is subject to conditions contained in the 5/28/24 Planning Commission report, conditions noted on the plans redlined by the City and dated 5/28/24, and subject to recommendations of the City Engineer as contained in memorandum dated April 15, 2024
5. The plans shall be amended to depict the required 10' wide vegetative buffer from high-water level of all stormwater ponds, and to show the stormwater ponds and buffers in Outlots to be dedicated to the City
6. Sanitary sewer shall be extended to the north end of Riley Road
7. "Future Road Extension" signs must be placed at the ends of Streets A, B, C, Riley Road and James Parkway
8. Wetland buffer sign markers are required along all lot lines at wetland buffer locations
9. Concrete driveway aprons shall be constructed from the curb to the property line
10. All boulevards shall be sodded by the Developer
11. The full Riley Road right-of-way located south of James Parkway shall be dedicated entirely within the plat.
12. Riley Road shall be constructed to the southerly property line of the plat and shall include a temporary cul-de-sac.
13. Proposed Lots 55, 56 and 57 shall be combined with proposed Outlot C and incorporated into the proposed public land dedication.

And noting that:

1. The preliminary plat meets the preferred development density identified in the City's Comprehensive Plan.
2. The Parks Commission has recommended public land dedication for Parkway Meadows.

Motion carried: (5-0).

## 9. GENERAL BUSINESS

### A. Concept Plan Review of Proposed Residential Development (FKA Pheasant Hills), Robert Machacek, applicant

Senior Planner, Renee Christianson, stated that the applicant and Staff were seeking preliminary feedback and recommendations on a concept plan. There has been no formal application made, Staff are holding these discussions for the benefit of the applicant as they decide whether to move forward in developing the property. The purpose of the presentation was not to hear public comment, that would come at a later public hearing if an official application for preliminary plat is submitted by the applicant. Christianson informed the Commission that Planner, Brandon Malecha, was going to present to them on the former Pheasant Hills development property located to the southwest of the City and the initial concept plan received from the applicant.

Malecha provided background on the 44.3-acre property and noted that the property was formally zoned PUD in 2005 and has remained zoned PUD since that time. The PUD predates the merger of Elko and New Market and is nearly 20 years old; therefore, Staff recommend rezoning of the entire property.

The land is currently guided to low density residential land use. This district is characterized by a variety of detached single family housing options and has a density requirement of 2.5-5 units per net acre. The proposed development has 89 units on 28.6 net acres for a total of 3.1 units per net acre. The single-family detached homes meet the intent of the currently guided land use for the property.

PUD zoning has been proposed to allow for a reduction in lot size, width, setback requirements, and various design standards within the development. Malecha reinforced the intent of PUD zoning. In exchange for the PUD zoning, the applicant is proposing the construction of off-site infrastructure.

Malecha referenced Section 11-3-8 of the Zoning Ordinance which identifies criteria to be considered as part of a request for zoning amendment (rezoning). Staff believes that the request to rezone the property to a new PUD meets the criteria for rezoning, except for the capabilities of the streets serving the property (Harvest Drive).

Malecha displayed a table which contained a summary of the deviations being sought by the developer as part of the PUD zoning. The table compared what was being requested and the City's existing R1 District requirements. Malecha noted that the proposal by the developer includes a decrease in standards related to minimum lot size, width, front setback, side setback, side corner setback, and rear setback. There were also deviations from street and sidewalk standards due to the location of the property and being nearly fully surrounded by large lot agricultural uses.

Malecha covered standard miscellaneous design requirements including landscaping, tree preservation plan, and easement requirements. The proposed development can be served with 8" water lines which can be extended south on Cedric Lane. Sanitary sewer service is

available on the north side of the property, along Cedric Lane via an 8” PVC sewer stub. A sanitary sewer lift station and force main will be needed in order to serve this proposed development. Since this lift station will serve a larger area than just the proposed development, it is considered a “system lift station” in which the City typically pays for the costs of the system. No preliminary utility plans have yet been submitted and will require approval from the City Engineer.

No stormwater plan has been submitted for review. Malecha covered additional stormwater related requirements including the access requirement to stormwater ponds. He noted that two of the conceptual ponds depicted on the concept plan are shown on top of potential wetlands. Should these areas contain delineated wetlands protected by the Wetland Conservation Act and/or Clean Water Act, these areas may not be used for ponding purposes. The stormwater plan will also require approval from the City Engineer.

The proposed development borders on two existing public streets, Harvest Drive to the west and north, and 270<sup>th</sup> Street East to the south. Harvest Drive is located entirely outside of the City limits and is under the jurisdiction of New Market Township. Staff have concerns with the conditions of the existing pavement on Harvest Drive; of particular concern is the condition of the pavement on the segment of Harvest Drive that would serve the proposed development, located between Cedric Lane and Webster Street/ Zane Avenue. Staff are recommending that this segment of Harvest Drive, approximately 1600’ in length and 26’ in width, be repaved as a condition of the development. Due to Harvest Drive being a Township road, any improvements to this road will require the coordination and approval of New Market Township.

The City would typically require that the Cedric Lane road connection be made to 270<sup>th</sup> Street, and that 270<sup>th</sup> Street be improved to major collector street standards, however, in this case Staff support the temporary cul-de-sac on Cedric Lane, and not connecting the development to 270<sup>th</sup> Street East because it is currently a gravel road and located entirely outside of the City limits. Staff still recommend dedicating enough right-of-way for 270<sup>th</sup> Street (50’ from section line) at the time of platting to improve the street in the future.

Cedric Lane is a north/south collector roadway and proposed to run through the entire development. The proposed alignment of Cedric Lane as shown on the concept plan depicts the street jogging with a 90-degree turn travelling south. Staff recommend that Cedric Lane be a continuous street as depicted in the City’s 2040 Transportation Plan. Malecha also covered additional high-level comments regarding streets including requirements for “future road extension” signs and temporary cul-de-sacs.

Based on the City’s Subdivision Ordinance, 2040 Transportation Plan, and 2040 Park and Trail Plan, the following is required for the development:

- Sidewalks are required on both sides of Cedric Lane
- Sidewalks are required along one side of all local streets within the development
- Sidewalk required along the north side of 270<sup>th</sup> Street
- Sidewalk required along Harvest Drive



There is currently no sidewalk on either Harvest Drive or 270<sup>th</sup> Street East, for this reason, Staff recommend that the sidewalk along 270<sup>th</sup> Street East and Harvest Drive be deferred to a future date when those roads are improved. Should the development proceed, Staff will be seeking a recommendation from the Parks Commission regarding the location of the proposed sidewalks within the development.

Public land dedication requirements shall be eight percent of the net area subdivided or cash-in-lieu of equal to 8% of the fair market value of the un-platted land. The cash fee would be collected and used to fund new park facilities within the City. Staff will seek feedback from the Parks Commission regarding public land dedication requirements if the development proceeds forward.

Staff asked the Commission if they had any feedback on the potential for another roadway connection to the north within the proposed development. Discussion took place. There was not a desire to add another roadway connection to the north by the Commission. Staff notes that the subject property is rolling and has nearly 100' of elevation changes throughout various portions of the property. The steep grades may present some design challenges if and when the property proceeds into final design. There is potential that some lots may require elimination during final design due to the steep grades. Lots 85 and 86 especially will require attention throughout the design process.

The Subdivision Ordinance prohibits the creation of reserve strips which may control access to adjacent properties, except under conditions approved by the City Council. There are a couple of areas within the concept plan that indicate the potential for property remnants, such as west of proposed Lot 60. Staff also question whether proposed Lot 47 is developable within the project limits or if additional land is needed for the creation of proposed Lot 47.

Malecha explained that based on the ITE Generation Manual, the development can be expected to generate approximately 890 new vehicle trips per day. Ingress/egress from the proposed development will be primarily from the existing segment of Harvest Drive on the north side of the property until other area roads are improved in the future and alternative connections to the development are made. Most recent traffic counts on Harvest Drive are from 2021 and indicated 469 average daily trips east of the proposed development. Adding the proposed development traffic to the existing vehicle trips results in less than 1,500 vehicles per day on Harvest Drive. Staff's opinion is that Harvest Drive has the physical capacity to handle the proposed increase in traffic, however, lacks structural capacity due to the degrading pavement surface. Staff recommend that Harvest Drive be improved as a condition of any proposed plat with the approval of New Market Township. Based on consultation with the City's Traffic Engineer, Staff are not recommending the completion of a Traffic Impact Study for the proposed development.

Malecha covered additional comments received from relevant City Staff. According to the New Prague Superintendent of Schools, the City of Elko New Market has an average of .55 students per household within the district. The current concept plans depict 89 lots. Using the school district statistics, proposed development would add 49 students to the school system once fully developed. New Market Township has not yet provided comments regarding the proposed development. Approval of the development would require

coordination with the Township because the proposed street access into the development would be provided from a Township road. Feedback from the Township will also be needed regarding the recommended improvements to Harvest Drive.

Malecha reviewed the following conditions being recommended by Staff related to the concept plan:

1. The developer must enter into a Development Contract with the City at the time of development
2. Drainage and utility easements must be dedicated at the time of final plat approval
3. A tree inventory will be required as part of any application to plat the property
4. A wetland delineation report and Mn RAM will be required as part of any application to plat the property
5. All proposed stormwater ponds must be located outside of any delineated wetlands or comply with the requirements of the Wetland Conservation Act
6. All wetlands and stormwater ponds must be located on Outlots and shall be dedicated to the City at the time of final plat approval
7. Access to the proposed pond on the east side of Cedric Lane must be provided for maintenance purposes
8. Maintenance access to the most southerly pond must be provided
9. A sanitary sewer lift station and forcemain are needed to serve the proposed development with sanitary sewer
10. Cedric Lane must be redesigned to be a continuous street as depicted in the City's 2040 Transportation Plan
11. Temporary cul-de-sacs must be provided where all dead-end streets exceed 150' in length
12. "Future Road Extension" signs are required at the ends of all temporary cul-de-sacs
13. Any remnants/reserve strips of land shown on the concept plan are not permitted by the City's Subdivision Ordinance
14. Harvest Drive must be improved/repaved as a condition of the plat
15. Sidewalks will be required on one side of all local/residential streets, and on both sides of all minor collector streets (proposed Cedric Lane)
16. The proposed street connection to Harvest Drive will require approval of New Market Township
17. There is potential that some lots may require elimination during final design due to steep grades, most notably, proposed Lots 85 and 86
18. Further input will be sought from the Parks Commission regarding the desire for public land dedication versus cash-in-lieu for the City's Park Fund.

Additionally, Staff notes that:

1. Staff recommend the 12" trunk water line along 270<sup>th</sup> Street East, as shown in the City's 2040 Water Plan, be constructed in the future and not be required as part of the proposed development
2. Staff recommend that the sidewalk required along 270<sup>th</sup> Street East and Harvest Drive be constructed in the future and not required as part of the proposed development

3. The cul-de-sac proposed at the southerly end of Cedric Lane is temporary and will ultimately connect to 270<sup>th</sup> Street East
4. Staff do not recommend the completion of a Traffic Impact Study for the proposed development

The Planning Commission was asked to make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the concept plan received by the applicant. Mostly, the Planning Commission was being asked if there was support for the proposed lot size, standards, and layout.

Commissioner Hanson had a question on the straightening out of Cedric Lane. Discussion took place on Staff's recommendation. Hanson added that a reduction in lot sizes seems to be the most requested item for PUD zoning applications and perhaps the Code should be changed to reflect the demand for smaller lot sizes.

Chair Weber discussed the typical lot sizes around the property noting that there were larger lots surrounding the property. Weber had concerns about development timelines for the surrounding properties. Discussion took place on the previous Pheasant Hills Development that was planned in the late 2000's. Christianson stated that the lot sizes for the original development were planned for 12,000 square feet.

Commissioner Pipo was of the opinion that the area was better suited for larger lots due to the surrounding area. Commissioners Smith and Weber shared Pipo's opinion. Commissioner Weber stated that 65 ft. lots are not conducive in this area at this time. Commissioner Heimerl agreed that lot sizes should be larger.

Commissioner Hanson compared the existing lots to the north in Rowena and noted the 80 ft. lot widths with the current standard lot width of 85 ft. Hanson was supportive of smaller lots for the property being proposed at 65 ft. but was also agreeable to anything less than the current standard.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Smith and seconded by Pipo to recommend R1 district standards be applied to the property at the time of development, and acknowledging the conditions recommended by Staff.

Motion carried: (4-1) Hanson dissented.

## **B. Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Detached Accessory Building Research**

Planner, Jake Skluzacek, presented background information and research to the Commission related to detached accessory buildings. Staff started researching possible Ordinance amendments following resident inquiries regarding constructing larger detached accessory structures than is currently allowed. Currently the City allows for a maximum floor area allowed without conditional use permit for structures 250 sq. ft. or less for lots 1 acre and under in size. That increases to 1,000 sq. ft. or less for lots 1 acre and over in size.

Research on other City's Codes was focused on size and number of structures allowed as well as specific standards relating to detached accessory structures in Commercial or

Industrial zones. Research did not take into consideration what may be allowed with the issuance of a conditional use permit. This discussion is meant to give the Commission and Staff a guideline for providing further feedback and recommendations on any potential Ordinance Amendments.

Skluzacek showed research comparing Elko New Market's standards relating to detached accessory structures compared to several other cities which included:

- Lonsdale
- Belle Plaine
- Jordan
- Lakeville
- Savage
- Shakopee
- Prior Lake
- New Prague
- Burnsville

Skluzacek noted that when compared to these other cities, Elko New Market is more restrictive on the total size and number of detached accessory structures which are allowed in residential districts. Elko New Market was shown to be equal to or more lenient than most other cities when it comes to the total size of accessory use structures in Commercial or Industrial zones.

Staff are recommending the Planning Commission consider amendments to the City's Detached Accessory Structure Ordinance due to the following reasons:

- Resident inquiries
- Past complaints and comments received
- Less restrictive standards in other cities
- Regular review and updating of the City's Zoning Ordinance

Skluzacek noted that if changes are recommended by the Planning Commission, Staff will draft an Ordinance Amendment for further discussion at an upcoming meeting. The Planning Commission was being asked to provide feedback and direction to Staff regarding any potential Ordinance Amendment related to detached accessory structures.

Commissioner Weber was in favor of looking at an amendment that would increase the size and number of detached accessory structures allowed in residential areas. Weber added that the change could also help reduce the amount of nuisance violations in the City for exterior storage and recreational vehicle violations.

Commissioner Hanson asked Staff if these changes would also affect the City's Ordinance on Accessory Dwelling Units. Senior Planner, Renee Christianson, confirmed that the Commission would also have to examine amendments to the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) Section of City Code because the size standards for ADU's are based on the size standards set for detached accessory structures.

Discussion took place on the examples provided by Staff in the packet. The Commission was in general agreement that the sizes of structures should be increased and a total square footage limit per lot should be enacted. The Commission was also in favor of increasing the total number of allowed structures from 1 to 2 in an effort to allow residents to keep their existing garden sheds in the event they wish to build a larger structure in addition to the existing structure. All structures would still need to meet the necessary setbacks which would limit some lots based on their buildable area.

Staff recommended leaving the standards as is for Commercial and Industrial zones as they were comparable to the allowable standards in other Cities.

Following discussion, the Planning Commission was in general agreement to recommend a 1,000 square foot limit without conditional use permit for lots 1 acre and less in size, 2,000 square foot limit without conditional use permit for lots greater than 1-acre in size and increasing the number of allowed structures from 1 to 2 for all lots.

## **10. MISCELLANEOUS**

### **A. Community Development Updates**

Senior Planner, Renee Christianson, informed the Commission that Staff had recently completed the Annual City-Wide Sweep for Code Enforcement. Planner Skluzacek noted that there were approximately 90 letters that were sent this year, which is higher than normal. Skluzacek attributed this to having two Staff members completing the City-Wide Sweep and being able to catch more violations. Planner Malecha added that conducting the Sweep with two Staff members also helped speed up the process.

### **B. Planning Commission Questions & Comments**

Discussion took place on the possibility for Commissioners to attend an open house for the Old Town Apartments. Christianson will reach out to the Commissioners who are interested in possibly attending.

Commissioner Smith asked if there was any update with the City's Water Appropriations Permit through the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR). City Engineer, Rich Revering, stated that a decision should be made by the DNR as early as next week, June 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Commissioner Smith stated that he thought it was important for a City employees to drink City tap water. Smith mentioned seeing the Culligan truck stop at City Hall to make a delivery. Christianson stated that she will pass on his concerns to the City Administrator.

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by Hanson and seconded by Heimerl to adjourn the meeting at 8:59 p.m.

Motion carried: (5-0).

Respectively submitted by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jake Skluzacek". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

Jake Skluzacek  
Planner 1