

City of Columbus
Regular Planning Commission Meeting
June 4, 2014

The June 4, 2014 regular meeting of the Planning Commission for the City of Columbus was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Garth Sternberg at the City Hall. Present were Commission members Mark Daly, Jesse Preiner, and Jody Krebs; City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko, Planner Dean Johnson, and Recording Secretary Karen Boland.

Also in attendance were Perry Wagamon, Frank Wagamon, and Pat Preiner.

AGENDA APPROVAL

Motion by Krebs to approve the Agenda as presented. Second by Preiner. Motion carried.

APPROVAL - REGULAR PC MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 21, 2014

Motion by Krebs to approve the minutes of the May 21, 2014 regular Planning Commission meeting as written. Second by Preiner. Motion carried.

PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP

I. Discussion

A. Alternative Lot Design Ordinance (pages 1-10)

PC members looked at illustrations, created by the Planner, of how alternative lot design might work in various types of 40-acre standard quarter quarter sections. He used a 2.5-acre minimum and 160-foot minimum lot width, as discussed by PC members at their last meeting. In one scenario the flexible design ability would result in the need for a much shorter road. In another scenario, with a significant amount of wetland, flexible design capability would allow for more comparable amounts of buildable land on each lot. In the third scenario of a section with wetland covering half of it, a flexible design would allow for maximum use of buildable land, but would require a road to be built. A developer may or may not pay for a road in order to get better building sites. In the last scenario, showing lots on an existing road, pencil-shaped lots with houses close together could result if flexible design is an option.

The Planner stressed that allowing alternative lot design would not increase density. The overall number of lots allowed on any given parcel, would not change. However, lot sizes could vary to allow for maximum use of buildable land.

There was discussion about whether common open space would be allowed. The issue then becomes its perpetual maintenance and ownership.

Planner Johnson went over a draft of proposed ordinance changes with PC members. The existing portion of the ordinance allowing Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) in the suburban residential district would be kept at the beginning of Section 7A-819, but would now be labeled as "A." Allowance for PUDs in the Rural Residential (RR) district would be added as "B."

At the end of the first paragraph of “B”, Johnson emphasized, there is language that reads, “PUD provisions are not intended to modify allowable residential density, minimum structure separation, principal structure design requirements, garage or parking requirements, private utility requirements, street construction standards or the quality of the appearance or construction of the housing units.” There is also language stating that the developer bears the burden of proof for identifying eligible dwelling units within a proposed development. A Concept PUD would be reviewed concurrent with the Preliminary Plat. The Final PUD would be reviewed with the Final Plat.

PC members agreed they do not want to allow outlots or remnants. Language allowing for outlots or remnants, and all references in the draft to homeowners’ associations, will be eliminated.

Under “Flexible Dimensional Standards”, PC members agreed to allow a minimum lot area of 2.5 acres, and a minimum lot width of 160 feet. All other standards are identical to conventional standards.

Johnson stated that his proposed draft has been sent to the City Attorney, but no comments have yet been received. The Attorney may have comments.

Motion by Daly to forward to the City Council the proposed amendments to Section 7A-819 of the City Code as shown in the City Planner’s draft ordinance below with changes noted, with a recommendation for approval, based on endorsement by the City Attorney. Second by Sternberg. Motion carried.

ORDINANCE NO. 14-___

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 7A – ZONING REGULATIONS IN THE COLUMBUS CITY CODE

The City Council of the City of Columbus ordains the following:

SECTION I. ARTICLE VIII GENERAL PROVISIONS AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, SECTION 7A-819. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) is amended by reformatting the existing provisions as Subsection A. and by adding new provisions as Subsection B. as follows:

SECTION 7A-819. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD).

A. Suburban Residential (SR) District

The purpose of the PUD provisions is to encourage high development design standards and alternative design opportunities in the Suburban Residential (SR) District. In exchange for higher design standards, site preservation techniques, other unique development considerations, and other public benefit, conventional dimensional criteria may be modified or varied. Examples of

variations to dimensional standards include reductions in minimum lot areas and lot widths and modifications to the density of residential dwellings. The PUD provisions are not intended to modify minimum open space requirements, landscaping requirements, minimum structure separation, garage or parking requirements, or the quality of the appearance or construction of the housing units.

The PUD provisions may allow for bonuses to the maximum average site density of three dwelling units per acre (3 DUA) and four (4) units per building, based upon the inclusion of any of the following bonus criteria. The City shall have complete discretion in approving or denying bonuses on the basis of the following criteria, below. In no case shall the total cumulative bonuses awarded exceed one hundred (100) percent of the maximum density allowed in any development, or result in structures with more than six (6) units.

Application must be made to the City for PUD consideration. The application shall include a sketch plan and written narrative of the proposed development. The application must include detailed descriptions of what the applicant believes qualifies the development as a PUD and specific examples of the bonus criteria that may be met. The Planning Commission and City Council must make a determination that the proposed project qualifies as a PUD and assign the appropriate bonus awards, if any, before the project proceeds. If the project is eligible as a PUD, a Concept PUD will be prepared along with a Preliminary Plat and be reviewed concurrently with the procedure established for platting. A Final PUD will be prepared and reviewed with a Final Plat.

1. **Bonus Criteria.** The Planning Commission shall recommend and the City Council shall approve any density bonuses in the SR District, based upon the accumulation of points awarded partially or totally within the following categories. Consideration for any bonus awards must include all of the mandatory categories identified in italics. A total of one hundred (100) points is required to achieve the maximum density bonus of one hundred (100) percent. A point total less than one hundred (100) shall result in a maximum density bonus of a percentage equal to the number of points awarded.

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Points</u>
Extraordinary architecture and exterior building materials.	10
Balance of housing opportunities and styles for all age groups.	10
Site design amenities, such as extraordinary landscaping, private Courtyards between buildings groupings, alternating building styles, and common indoor and outdoor use facilities.	10
Providing units for persons with disabilities, consistent with a number of units or percentage of units recommended by the Anoka County HRA.	10
Absorbing the costs of public core utilities, limited access collector streets, and off-site improvements that exceed typical cost sharing.	40
Addition of public recreation amenities, such as picnic shelters, pavilions, and playground equipment.	10
Additional public parkland dedication.	10
Unique trail and pedestrian circulation within the development and connections to other facilities.	10
Construction of extraordinary landscaped boulevards within public streets or landscaped islands within cul de sacs, according to City standards.	10
Construction of additional garage parking in attached residential units.	10
Additional design criteria determined by the City to warrant density bonus criteria.	10
MAXIMUM DENSITY POINTS	140

2. Private Streets. Whenever it does not contradict the provisions of this Ordinance as it relates to an adopted transportation plan or the protection of opportunities for reasonable development of surrounding land adjacent to a development proposed in the application, streets which are intended to be kept continuously closed to public travel or that are at all times posted as private streets may be retained as private streets and made a part of the PUD, provided a homeowner association agreement acceptable to the City contains provisions for street maintenance and replacement, and all private streets are constructed according to standards approved by the City.

3. Application Materials. All PUD applications for attached housing developments shall be accompanied by a series of site plans and data illustrating and/or explaining the following:

- a) Complete details of the proposed site development, including location of buildings, driveways, parking spaces, dimensions of the parking spaces, dimensions of the lots, lot area and yard dimensions, and sidewalks and trails.
- b) Complete recreation plans illustrating all recreational facilities and structures, including trails.
- c) Complete circulation plans for proposed pedestrian and vehicle traffic.
- d) Population and services required (kind and amount).
- e) Complete plans for screening, fencing devices, and landscaping.
- f) Preliminary architectural plans showing the floor plans and elevations of the proposed buildings.
- g) Complete plans and specifications for exterior wall finishes proposed for all principal and accessory structures.
- h) Complete data as to dwelling unit size and ratios of dwelling units to total lot space.
- i) A two (2) foot contour topographic map of the existing site. All wetlands must be delineated.
- j) A grading plan illustrating the proposed grade changes from the original topographic map. All site areas, when fully developed, shall be completely graded so as to adequately drain and dispose of all surface water, stormwater, and groundwater in such a manner as to preclude large-scale erosion, unwanted ponding, and surface chemical runoff. An erosion control plan consistent with best management practices must also be submitted.
- k) Estimates of solid waste disposal and provisions and facility plans for such disposal;
- l) Complete plans and documents of the homeowner association which explains:
 - 1) Ownership and membership requirements.
 - 2) Organization of the association.
 - 3) Time at which the developer turns the association over to the homeowners.
 - 4) Approximate monthly or yearly association fee for homeowners.
 - 5) Specific listing of items owned in common, including such items as roads, recreational facilities, parking, common open space grounds and utilities.
- m) Services and facilities plans. A services and facilities plan shall contain a map or maps setting forth the general location and extent of any and all existing and proposed systems for sewage, domestic water supply and distribution, refuse disposal, drainage, local utilities and rights-of-way, easements, facilities and necessary appurtenances, and a description of the ownership and maintenance of such services and facilities.
- n) Firefighting and other public safety facilities and provisions, such as hydrant locations and fire lanes.

[§ 7A-820, added by Ord. No. 03-03, effective June 19, 2003.]

[§ 7A-819, formerly 7A-820 amended (renumbered) by Ord. No. 04-04A, effective June 3, 2004.]

[§ 7A-819, reformatted as Subsection A. by Ord. No. _____, effective _____, 2014.]

B Rural Residential (RR) District

The purpose of the PUD provisions is to encourage alternative development design standards and alternative design opportunities in the Rural Residential (RR) District. In exchange for efficient design standards, site preservation techniques, other unique development considerations, and other public benefit,

conventional dimensional criteria may be modified or varied. Examples of variations to dimensional standards include reductions in minimum lot areas and lot widths. The PUD provisions are not intended to modify allowable residential density, minimum structure separation, principal structure design requirements, garage or parking requirements, private utility requirements, street construction standards or the quality of the appearance or construction of the housing units.

1. Application and Eligibility. Application must be made to the City for PUD consideration. The application shall include a sketch plan and written narrative of the proposed development. The application must include a calculation of eligible dwelling units within the proposed development based upon conventional platting requirements and conventional dimensional standards. The Planning Commission and City Council must make a determination on the total number of dwelling units allowed and that the proposed project qualifies as a PUD. The developer bears the burden of proof for identifying eligible dwelling units within a proposed development. The City shall have discretion in determining the PUD eligibility of the proposed development, as well as the total number of dwelling units to be allowed within the development. If the project is eligible as a PUD, a Concept PUD will be prepared along with a Preliminary Plat and be reviewed concurrently with the normal procedure established for platting. A Final PUD will be prepared and reviewed with a Final Plat.

2. Outlots or Common Open Space Remnants. ~~Unless a homeowners association is approved by the City that establishes common ownership and maintenance of common areas, n~~No outlots or other remnants of land shall be included in any plat.

3. 3. Lot Averaging. ~~Unless outlots or common areas are approved as a part of a PUD and are owned and maintained by a homeowners association, a~~All of the land within a development shall be subdivided into individually-owned parcels and the average lot size within every development shall be five (5) acres, less dedicated right-of-way.

4. Flexible Dimensional Standards. The following minimum dimensional standards shall be allowed as a part of an approved PUD. Unless identified below or expressly permitted by the City in the Final PUD approval, no other variations in dimensional standards, performance standards or other development requirements shall be permitted.

- a) Maximum density – one dwelling unit per five buildable acres
- b) Minimum lot area – 2.5 acres
- c) Minimum lot width – 160 feet
- d) Minimum cul-de-sac frontage – 60 feet
- e) Minimum front yard setback – 75 feet
- f) Minimum side yard setback – 20 feet
- g) Minimum rear yard setback – 20 feet
- h) Maximum structure height – 35 feet
- i) Lot coverage – 1:4 or 25% maximum

5. Application Materials and Procedure. All PUD applications for alternative rural subdivision design shall be consistent with the following submittal requirements and procedures:

- a) A Concept PUD, including a written narrative of the proposed development, a sketch plan illustrating conventional subdivision design and building eligibility, and a sketch plan of the proposed alternative rural design.
- b) A Preliminary Plat of the alternative rural design, consistent with the application requirements of the Subdivision Regulations (Chapter 8, Columbus City Code).
- c) ~~If applicable, preliminary plans and documents of the homeowner association which identifies:~~
 - 1) ~~Ownership and membership requirements.~~
 - 2) ~~Organization of the association.~~
 - 3) ~~Time at which the developer turns the association over to the homeowners.~~
 - 4) ~~Approximate association fee for homeowners.~~

- 5) ~~Specific listing of areas and facilities owned in common and the maintenance obligations of the association for common areas and utilities.~~
- d) The Concept PUD shall be presented at a City staff meeting to review preliminary PUD eligibility and consistency with City Code requirements.
- e) The Concept PUD and Preliminary Plat shall be reviewed at a combined public hearing process, consistent with the procedures for preliminary platting.
- f) After approval of a Concept PUD and Preliminary Plat, application shall be made for Final PUD, consisting of a sketch plan labeled Final PUD, consistent with the approved Concept PUD; ~~and any applicable homeowner association documentation in final form.~~
- g) After approval of a Preliminary Plat and Concept PUD, application shall be made for Final Plat, consisting of Final Plat documentation required in the Subdivision Regulations.
- h) Review and approval of the Final PUD and Final Plat do not require review and recommendation by the Planning Commission, unless the Final PUD and Final Plat are not consistent with the approved Concept PUD and Preliminary Plat.

[§ 7A-819, Subsection B. added by Ord. No. _____, effective _____, 2014.]

SECTION II. Effective Date. This Ordinance was adopted by the Columbus City Council on this _____ day of _____, 2014 and shall become effective after its publication.

David Povolny, Mayor

ATTEST:

Elizabeth Mursko, City Administrator

Published in the Forest Lake Times on _____, 2014.

Mursko said this will go to the City Council at their June 11th meeting. If approved at that meeting, a public hearing will be scheduled for July 16th. PC members agreed to attend the June 11th CC meeting in case of questions or need for further discussion after review by the City Attorney.

B. R-2 District

A new zoning district would create new densities and require a Comp Plan amendment. The PC will begin discussing this at a later meeting.

C. Lake Drive/Buffer Zone

PC members are looking at buffer zones between zoning districts. Mursko said commercial industrial property owners want to be able to use as much of their land as possible. Rural

residential property owners want something pleasant to look at. We need some standards for the transitions between zoning districts.

Johnson recommends adding a new provision under each zoning district, under design standards, that outlines screening options for areas abutting RR districts, through the CUP process. He said different conclusions may be reached in different zoning districts, for example, fencing, vegetation, berms, or some combination of things. The community retail district has much higher building design standards and virtually no outside storage. The City may be interested in a different buffer there than behind a business on Lake Drive. He believes the City should retain some discretion. Within the design standards of each individual district, identify acceptable options and make that part of the CUP process. He recommended that in 7A-800 a provision be added stating that design standards are to be accomplished through the CUP process within each CI zoning district. Within the conditional uses, list something about screening in transition areas abutting residential districts.

All districts could potentially abut a RR property. If something was allowed by permitted use, you'd still have a conditional use for the screening/buffer.

Mursko thinks the City needs to do a better job telling developers up front, what they are looking for. Most developers are pretty receptive to things on the front end, but when you start adding things later, they get frustrated. It can actually add expense too, to draw up new plans, for instance.

Johnson offered to bring in a sample of what an ordinance amendment on the basis of what he described would look like. It could reference the types screening/buffer options the City would like to see, and put it in a format to specific to what we would need to do.

PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

Frank Wagamon, of 6559 Pine Street, asked if the PC is going to address the issue of the City requiring a three-foot separation above mottled soil.

Sternberg said he did some research after the issue was raised by a builder at a recent meeting. He couldn't find any other community with that stringent of a requirement. He asked how that standard came about.

Johnson said he is not an expert, and would defer that question to the City Engineer and Building Official.

Wagamon believes it should be looked at, as the current 3-foot requirement may deter developers.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mursko reported that there will be two public hearings at the next meeting (6/18). One is a variance, and one is an IUP amendment.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORT

KREBS COMMENT

Krebs thanked the Planner and City Administrator for great work on gathering information and creating illustrations regarding alternative lot designs. She also reminded members that the Forest Lake High School commencement is Thursday, June 5th.

ATTENDANCE - NEXT CC MEETING

Sternberg volunteered to present at the City Council meeting on June 11, 2014, since Commissioner Wolowski was unable to attend tonight's meeting. Daly, Preiner and Krebs also plan to attend.

Motion by Preiner to adjourn. Second by Krebs. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Karen Boland, Recording Secretary