

**CITY OF ST. FRANCIS
ST. FRANCIS, MN
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
April 20, 2016**

1. **Call to Order:** The Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chairman Steinke.
2. **Roll Call:** Present were Ray Steinke, Brittney Berndt, Todd Gardner, Joel Olson and William Murray.
3. **Adopt Agenda:** Motion by Olson, second by Berndt to approve the April 20, 2016 agenda. Motion carried 5-0.
4. **Election of Officers for 2016:** Motion by Olson to elect Steinke as Chair, Second by Berndt. No other nominations. Approved 4-0, Steinke abstained.

Motion by Steinke to elect Berndt as Vice Chair, Second by Gardner. No other nominations. Approved 4-0, Berndt abstained

5. **Approve Minutes:** Motion by Olson, second by Gardner to approve the October 21, 2015 minutes. Motion carried 5-0.
6. **Public Comment:** None
7. **Public Hearing:** Rum River Terrace PUD Amendment

Introduced by Nate Sparks, Northwest Associates Consultants, Hearing is to address specific changes to the Rum River Terrace PUD that was approved in 2004. This is an existing development, half of the development has been completed. The amendment addresses the second half of the development that has not had successful development.

- Request is to transfer twin home lots to Single-family detached.
- Setback – lots will follow 35’ front setback as originally proposed, request a change to side setbacks to 5’ on each side.
- Lot sizes are currently not equal, propose to adjust lot lines to 50’ width. One lot will be less due to drainage.
- Not seeking to continue Association guidelines on the applicable lots.
- Impervious surface will be capped between 40% to 50%, recommending 50% and consider open space
- House type is same/similar to the twin home styles. Five styles provided and city will watch when building permits applied for to verify meet
- Applicants want to adhere to 400 sq. ft. garage requirements and not meet current ordinance requirements of 440 sq. ft.
- Units would be required to meet R2 district building requirements beyond noted above changes.
- Snow and water drainage may be a concern with limited area.

PUD amendment is to assist the development in reasons of sale and get it going again. There are conditions of the approved as outlined in the staff memo.

Murray questioned guest parking and designated areas, Sparks noted that is not considered but was not arranged as part of the original approval.

Olson made an inquiry into 232nd verifying it was a private road.

Public Comment – Elisha Grams, 3571 232nd Ave NW – verified lots involved Lots 3-18, 21-30 of Block 3 and Lots 1-6 of Block 4. Noting nothing on the private road is part of the application. Per Sparks, the amended area will not be part of either of the existing associations.

Public Comment – Alyssa Newbury, 23289 Vintage St NW – Representing RR Terrace board, concerned about maintaining the visual appearance of the community. What will divide homes within or outside of the association, is there any physical barrier between the two? Any changes to the road? Can it be required that they continue as an association? Concerns in regards to the pump house/ irrigation well. This association is currently paying the costs for the pump house and street light electric. Per Sparks, he will speak to the engineer in regards to the well house. As it may make sense to place a fence between properties, noting is required. No change to the roads, using existing layout, as the applicant is seeking to eliminate the association, the Planning Commission could make it a requirement to hold it.

Public Comment – Barb Hanks, 3570 232nd Ct NW – main concern is in regards to the current two new builds, why didn't they have a public hearing? No copies of the homes like attached to this meeting, just building permits. Concerned as the two new homes do not represent the investments already in place. That area is under an association, where is the requirements upon new units? Per Sparks, the original plat was created in 2004. It would have gone through a public hearing at that time. The city does not enforce declarations that is the duty of the Association of that development. Association would be charged with responsibility of style, color etc. The City approves building permits, does not act as, or enforce declarations or Association rules.

Barb provided photos of the concerns and how the two new homes under construction do not match those that were originally placed in the development. Noted that residence are extremely disappointed as it is a nice area and being maintained.

General conversation between the Commission, Councilmember Rich Skordahl and the public in regards to the process in 2004, it was approved back then as a whole development and not the specifics we are looking at today in regards to styles. Public is concerned about issues related to maintaining the grounds, parking, street parking and that they were understanding when they purchased the development as a whole would be conforming to the same rules.

Steinke reminded the audience that this public hearing is to change an existing plan. That the land concerns they have were addressed in a public hearing before they purchased / when the development was established. There are no changes to their parcels within this hearing.

Olson addressed issues of the City ordinances in place in regards to lot width, currently an R2 district is 80', they are requesting 50' although there is room to create 80' lots. Garage requirements in place are 440 sq. ft., and they are requesting 400 sq. ft. Set back requirements are 10' house side and 5' garage, and they are requesting 5' and 5'. Olson does not support those requests as they are outside if the spirit of the code in which they were put in place to begin with. This development has the room and the ability to create conforming lots. If these codes are important to us now, does not support these differences.

Murray requested clarification in regards to yard buildings or sheds (accessory buildings), per Sparks, they will follow the standard code requirements. In regards to decks they will be allowed if they are able to meet setbacks.

Gardner questioned styles and the information provided, per Sparks, there are 5 different plans in place, any builder going forward would have to comply with those styles and be consistent with those styles.

Olson made motion to not recommend this application, Second by Berndt. Motion failed 2-3

Gardner made a motion to accept the application with the conditions set forth in 1-8 in the packet, Second by Murray with the request that the applicant strongly consider to hold the association. Passed 3-2, Nay Olson and Berndt

8. Planning Commission Discussion

Concerns that were brought up in regards to new home not conforming in RR Terrace along 232nd. Commission requested that staff review the concerns and report back.

- 9. Adjournment:** Motion by Berndt, second by Olson to adjourn. Motion carried 5-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Kate Thunstrom, Community Development Director

Date

Approved June 15, 2016