

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ELKO NEW MARKET  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
JUNE 28, 2022  
7:00 PM**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Vice-Chair Hanson called the meeting of the Elko New Market Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commission members present: Hanson, Smith, Pipo, Schroeder, Ex-Officio member Anderson

Members absent and excused: Kruckman

Staff Present: Planner Jacob Skluzacek, Senior Planner Renee Christianson, and City Engineer Rich Revering

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Vice-Chair Hanson led the Planning Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

A motion was made by Smith and seconded by Schroeder to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried: (4-0).

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**5. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

**6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. A motion was made by Hanson and seconded by Smith to approve the minutes of the May 31, 2022, meeting as submitted. Motion carried: (4-0).

**7. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

A. None

**8. GENERAL BUSINESS**

## **A. Concept Plan Review – August Ventures, LLC, Applicant**

Planner Skluzacek introduced the agenda item and provided an overview of the information contained in the Planning Commission report dated June 28, 2022. Skluzacek explained that staff have been meeting with August Ventures representatives over the past several months. They have purchased 33.34 acres and are interested in developing the property for single-family detached housing. The property is guided by the City's Comprehensive Plan to Low Density Residential, north of James Parkway, and Medium Density Residential, south of James Parkway. The property is currently zoned Urban Reserve. He explained that the area guided for Low Density would be eligible for R1 zoning, and the area guided Medium Density would be eligible for R3 zoning. August Ventures is seeking PUD zoning and is seeking Planning Commission feedback regarding the proposed layout and PUD zoning.

Skluzacek reviewed the purpose of and the minimum lot criteria for the R1 zoning district, noting that the minimum lot width is 85' and minimum lot size is 12,000 square feet. He also reviewed the purpose of and minimum lot criteria for the R3 district, noting that the minimum lot width is 60' and the minimum size is 7,200 square feet. He then stated that the developer is proposing 90 lots, with a proposed lot width of 65', and because the lots north of James Parkway are smaller than allowed, the developer is seeking PUD zoning. He reviewed the purpose of PUD zoning which is to provide comprehensive procedures and standards intended to allow flexibility in the development of residential neighborhoods that would not be possible under a conventional zoning district. He stated that the developer has not proposed any PUD elements or information to demonstrate how the purpose and goals of PUD zoning would be met. Skluzacek reviewed examples of items that have been used in other PUD's approved by the City to achieve the purpose and intent of PUD zoning.

Skluzacek displayed several sample home elevations which were provided by the developer; the elevations depict the size of home that could be constructed upon a 65' lot. He reviewed tree preservation requirements and requirements for dedication of easements, as contained in the City Code.

Skluzacek stated that utility plans have not yet been submitted, and he reviewed the location of existing sanitary sewer and water infrastructure along the west side of the property. He stated that dual trunk water lines will need to be extended easterly, in the James Parkway alignment. He reviewed buffer requirements for stormwater ponds and noted that the City Engineer has recommended a realignment of the southwesterly pond.

Skluzacek reviewed access to the site, which is via James Parkway and Riley Road. He noted that James Parkway is a minor collector street, and Riley Road south of James Parkway is also a minor collector street. He reviewed sidewalk and trail requirements associated with the plat. Skluzacek reviewed park dedication requirements contained in the City Code and stated that staff has recommended public land dedication on the southwest portion of the property, based on the adopted 2008 Public Facilities Master Plan. He mentioned that access to the proposed development will be only from James Parkway to begin with, and as more land develops to the east, more road connections will be constructed which will alleviate all of the traffic from entering on James Parkway. He also pointed out that two remnant properties on the west side of the August Ventures property are owned by another party, and developing the property as

depicted on the concept plan will require cooperation from that property owner. Commissioner Smith asked about the property to the south of James Parkway and Riley Road and asked if Riley Road would be constructed as part of the proposed development. Engineer Revering stated that staff is recommending Riley Road be constructed for approximately 210' south of James Parkway.

Skluzacek displayed the concept plan drawing and reviewed staff comments related to the concept plan. He noted that all of the lots proposed south of James Parkway do meet minimum lot criteria and this area would not require PUD zoning. Skluzacek stated that primary feedback needed from the Planning Commission is whether they support the proposed 65' wide lots for the area north of James Parkway and whether they would consider the use of PUD zoning for the development. If the Planning Commission supports the proposed lot size and standards, the developer should propose elements within the development to demonstrate how the purpose and goals of PUD zoning would be met. He asked if the Planning Commission had any feedback.

Vice-Chair Hanson stated that Commission Kruckman submitted written comments and questions which she read into the record, as follows:

- *What are the lot sizes of the existing adjacent homes [to the west]?*
  - Christianson stated that the lots to the west developed prior to the merger of the cities. She stated that the lots seem to meet 85' or greater at the building setback line.
- *Does it make sense to have 65' wide lots adjacent to the existing lot sizes?*
- *Should the lot widths be increased to 70' instead of 65' to create a more uniform flow with existing and proposed development?*
  - Pipo expressed support for this idea and suggested going to maybe 75' lots.
  - Schroeder stated that all house elevations presented were single story homes; she asked if that is what would be constructed in the development. She asked if two story homes could be constructed. Christianson stated two story homes could be constructed, unless a PUD mandated a single-story home.
  - Pipo asked what the approximate house sizes would be, and how much room would be on the sides of the home. Christianson stated that the developer is proposing 7' side setbacks.
- *Could the entire property be zoned R1 or R3, or does the property have to be split into two different zoning districts? If not able to zone R1 or R3 for the entire property, then she agrees that using a PUD to have smaller lot sizes, as having the north be 85' and the rest be 65' would not look cohesive.*
  - Christianson stated that the City's Comprehensive Plan depicts a clear difference in land use categories north and south of James Parkway. The City has guided for higher density south of James Parkway, and lower density north of James Parkway. Zoning the entire property R3 would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Christianson stated that she suggested to the developer that the lots south of James Parkway be 60' wide, but the developer is seeking 65' wide lots.

Joe Sullivan representing August Ventures, LLC addressed the Commission. He stated that they now own two properties in town, this parcel and another 80-acre parcel that he intends to develop. Regarding the 65' lots, he stated that they are trying to reach a compromise on the lot sizes. He stated that the R3 district allows a 60' lot and he is proposing 65'. He stated that builders that he has met with are seeking a 65' lot. He stated the primary goal is to build homes that are available to first time home buyers, young families, or empty nesters. They are trying to give people an opportunity to purchase a home and establish their families in Elko New Market.

Mr. Sullivan stated he understands the Commission has discussed the possibility of reducing minimum lot sizes but that discussion has not proceeded. With the current ordinances in place they are left to a PUD to achieve the lots they are trying to develop. He stated that 65' lots throughout the development will create continuity within the neighborhood and also helps achieve the density obligations the City has with the Metropolitan Council. Christianson added that the staff had been directed by the Commission to conduct research regarding minimum lot standards but has not yet completed that research. She stated that Mr. Sullivan was aware of this and waited several months before bringing the proposed concept plan to the Commission. Mr. Sullivan made a decision to proceed requesting PUD zoning.

Skruzacek reviewed the following thirty-one comments and conditions, which were also included in the Planning Commission report, as recommended by City staff related to the concept plan:

- 1) The developer must enter a Development Contract with the City of Elko New Market at the time of development approval.
- 2) Development of the property as single family residential is compatible with the adjacent land uses.
- 3) Development of the property for single family residential homes meets the intent of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
- 4) The portion of the proposed development located south of James Parkway is less than the density goals stated in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
- 5) The northern portion of the property would be eligible for R-1 zoning. The proposed lots north of James Parkway do not meet the minimum lot size, width or setback requirements for the R-1 zoning district.
- 6) The southern portion of the property would be eligible for R-3 zoning. The proposed lots south of James Parkway meet the minimum lot size, width and setback requirements for the R-3 zoning district.
- 7) If the Planning Commission supports the proposed lot size and lot standards as shown on the 4/24/2 concept plan, the developer should propose elements within the development to demonstrate how the purpose and goals of PUD zoning would be met.
- 8) If the Planning Commission does not support the proposed lot size and lot standards, the developer should redesign the lots north of James Parkway to meet R1 district standards, or other standards as recommended by the Planning Commission.
- 9) Drainage and utility easements will be required during the platting process.
- 10) A tree inventory must be completed which identifies the location of all significant trees on the property.

- 11) In order to develop the property, a gravity sewer system will need to be constructed within the development.
- 12) A 12-inch watermain will be required running east/west through the development, along the extension of James Parkway. The City will pay oversizing cost for the 12-inch watermain.
- 13) An additional 12-inch watermain will be required, running east/west through the development, along the extension of James Parkway. This additional watermain will be for raw water. The City will pay for 100% of the cost of the raw water line to be placed in the same trench as the potable water line.
- 14) Ponding areas must be combined where possible. City access to all ponding areas is required.
- 15) A 10' wide vegetative buffer from the high water level (HWL) is required around all stormwater ponds. All structures shall have a minimum 35' setback from the edge of the HWL of stormwater ponds, and low openings shall be at least one foot (1') above the emergency overflow.
- 16) The most southerly pond shall also be rotated 90 degrees.
- 17) Proposed impacts to wetlands must comply with the Wetland Conservation Act. Recommendations for support by the Planning Commission or City Council are conditioned upon approvals of any wetland replacement plan applications.
- 18) A functional assessment (MnRAM) report must be submitted to determine the required wetland buffer width.
- 19) Wetland buffer sign markers are required along all lot lines at buffer locations.
- 20) The right-of-way on Riley Road, south of James Parkway, shall be increased to 80' in width as required for minor collector streets.
- 21) Riley Road, south of James Parkway, must be constructed to the southern boundary of the existing city park on the west of the development.
- 22) Future road extension signs are required where streets stub into adjacent properties.
- 23) A temporary cul-de-sac will be required where any proposed local street is extended to an adjacent property line and exceeds 150 ft. in length.
- 24) Temporary cul de sacs shall be oriented such that they only impact one lot and they shall be constructed with curb and gutter. The preferred rotation would be away from the street side with the sidewalk so that the sidewalk can be constructed to the edge of the plat.
- 25) Sidewalks will be required on one side of all local/residential streets and both sides of James Parkway/minor collectors.
- 26) The most northerly block depicted on the concept plan exceeds the maximum block length allowed under City Code. Developer shall investigate if a northerly extension of Street B is possible.
- 27) Park land dedication is recommended as shown on the 4/24/22 concept plan.
- 28) A Traffic Impact Study must be prepared which identifies the impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding transportation system.
- 29) The concept plan includes two small properties that are owned by an adjacent property owner. Development of the property as shown on the 4/24/22 concept plan will require agreements between the developer and adjacent property owner.
- 30) The existing utility stubs should be considered when designing the lot layout along the east side of Riley Road, north of James Parkway.

31) Future submittals shall address comments as shown on “Concept Plan with City staff notes dated 6/22/2022”.

Skluzacek asked if the Commission had any additional comments. Commission feedback was as follows:

- Smith asked if two sidewalks were needed on James Parkway. Revering stated that the current City standards require sidewalks on both sides of minor collector streets.
- Smith stated that it would be nice to have Riley Road extend south to Main Street.
- Smith stated that he supported the concept plan, except that the parcels along Riley Road across from the existing development should be increased in size to match the lots on the west side of Riley Road.
- Pipo asked the Commission if 70’ lot width with a 10’ side setback would be supported. He stated that young families may live in this neighborhood and yard space is important.
- Schroeder asked what price range is being looked at. Sullivan stated +/- \$400,000.
- Pipo asked if there were other cities or neighborhoods that had lots of similar size that would be a comparison. Farmington, Lakeville, Blaine were cited as examples.
- Pipo asked if there would be a price difference between a 65’ or 70’ lot. Sullivan stated that the price point would be the same. Revering noted that the development costs would be the same regardless of lot size / width.

Christianson noted that Boulder Heights has 70’ wide lots with 7’ side setbacks. Sullivan stated that he is trying to hit a price point that is appealing to first time home buyers. This is a neighborhood where they could start and then move up to other neighborhoods. He repeated that it is impossible to meet the density requirements of the Met Council with the R1 district standards.

The Commission discussed the proposed park area, and what elements may be included in the park. Christianson stated that the area proposed for park / public land dedication would likely remain open space for the time being and likely would not be developed for park purposes.

Christianson asked if the Commission supported lot sizes smaller than the required 85’ north of James Parkway. The Commissioners responded that they did. Christianson then asked if the Commission supported lots that are 65’ wide north of James Parkway or if they were in support of something else.

- Hanson stated that she supported 65’ lots.
- Smith stated that he supported 65’ lots, except for the lots on Riley Road should be larger.
- Schroeder stated that she supported 65’ lots except for the lots on Riley Road should be larger.
- Pipo stated that the development is laid out nicely and he supports the layout.

Christianson advised the developer that feedback received from the Commission is informal feedback at this time and noted that the City Council will also receive the information and will provide informal feedback. Christianson asked the Commission if there were any elements

that they could suggest be incorporated as an offset for the PUD. One suggestion was to require a 3-car garage.

Christianson stated that the City's Transportation Plan shows a north/south collector street along the east property line north of James Parkway. She stated staff's thought was that this collector could be pushed further to the east, but asked for Planning Commission input on this item. Schroeder, Smith, and Pipo expressed support for moving this road to the east with future development.

Vice-Chair Hanson thanked the developer for their time and interest in Elko New Market.

## **9. MISCELLANEOUS**

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

The Commission asked about the status of the Project Horseshoe lead. Christianson stated that staff has been advised that they are proceeding with the Park I-35 site, that there is a letter of intent to purchase the property, but due diligence that needs to be completed.

Christianson advised the Commission that the plat of Ridgeview Estates is planned for construction after the fourth of July.

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

None.

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by Smith and seconded by Schroeder to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m. Motion carried: (4-0).

Submitted by:



Renee Christianson  
Senior Planner