

Planning Commission

June 13, 2022 – 6:30 pm
Council Conference Room
Hybrid Meeting

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Planning Commission meetings are being conducted in a hybrid format with in-person and remote options for attending, participating, and commenting. The public can make statements in this meeting during the planned public comment sections. Some members of the Commission may attend virtually. Members of the public may attend virtually by following instructions below.

**Commissioner Ruby will be remote in another room at City Hall*

Remote Attendance/Comment Options: Members of the public may attend this meeting by watching on cable channel 16, streaming on CCXmedia.org, streaming [via Webex](#), or by calling 1-415-655-0001 and entering access code **2463 415 4356**.

Members of the public wishing to address the Commission remotely have two options:

- Via web stream - Stream via [Webex](#) and use the 'raise hand' feature during public comment sections.
- Via phone - Call 1-415-655-0001 and enter meeting code **2463 415 4356**. Press *3 to raise your hand during public comment sections.

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Agenda**
3. **Approval of Minutes** – May 9, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting
4. **Discussion** – Off Street Parking Update

– End of Televised Portion of Meeting –

To listen to this portion, please call 1-415-655-0001 and enter meeting access code 2463 415 4356.

5. **Council Liaison Report**
6. **Other Business**
 - a. Reports on Board of Zoning Appeals and Other Meetings
7. **Adjournment**



This document is available in alternate formats upon a 72-hour request. Please call 763-593-8006 (TTY: 763-593-3968) to make a request. Examples of alternate formats may include large print, electronic, Braille, audiocassette, etc.



Planning Commission

May 9, 2022 – 6:30 pm
Hybrid
Council Chambers, City Hall

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

This meeting was conducted in a hybrid format with in-person and remote options for attending, participating, and commenting. The City used Webex to conduct this meeting and members of the public were able to monitor the meetings by watching it on Comcast cable channel 16, by streaming it on CCXmedia.org, or by dialing in to the public call-in line.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by **Chair Pockl**.

Roll Call

Commissioners in-person: Ellen Brenna, Adam Brookins, Andy Johnson, Lauren Pockl, Chuck Segelbaum
Commissioner remote: Mike Ruby
Commissioner absent: Sophia Ginis
Staff present: Jason Zimmerman – Planning Manager, Myles Campbell – Planner
Council Liaison present: Denise La Mere-Anderson

2. Approval of Agenda

Chair Pockl asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

MOTION made by **Commissioner Brookins**, seconded by **Commissioner Johnson**, to approve the agenda of May 9, 2022.

Motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Johnson noted comments on the survey and there was a comment on adding a density question and would like to have that added to the minutes.

Chair Pockl asked for a motion to approve the minutes from April 25, 2022, pending edits.

MOTION made by **Commissioner Brookins**, seconded by **Commissioner Segelbaum** to approve.

Motion carried with **Commissioner Brenna** abstaining.

4. Informal Public Hearing – Preliminary Plan for Minor Subdivision of 7324 Harold Avenue South

Applicant: CityLine Homes

Myles Campbell, Planner, started the presentation by stating this subdivision would include demolishing the home that lays across two lots and the two lots would maintain their current R-2 Zoning. He reminded the group the subdivision request originally appeared before the Planning Commission in December 2020 and was approved. Due to the pandemic, the plat recording never made it through the county and the approvals from Planning Commission and City Council have



This document is available in alternate formats upon a 72-hour request. Please call 763-593-8006 (TTY: 763-593-3968) to make a request. Examples of alternate formats may include large print, electronic, Braille, audiocassette, etc.



lapsed. **Campbell** went on to describe the lot, its location in the city, and to describe the existing utilities. The minimum standards for a lot division in R-2 were reviewed, dimension requirements have been met for both lots but only to accommodate single family lots, not duplexes. Engineering staff requested a hydrologic analysis and that showed a low spot in the rear of the lots where water may collect in the case of a major 100-year storm event. Installation of a new public storm pipe will be required on lot 1 and the pipe would be part of the City's public storm sewer system. Installation and cost will be the responsibility of the developer and the City will select the contractor to ensure requirements are met. Staff reviewed other requirements: I&I, tree survey, park dedication fee. Met Council had no comments.

Recommendation

Staff recommends **approval** of the proposed minor subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall provide securities for the new 12-inch storm sewer pipe and needed easements.
2. The City Attorney will determine if a title review is necessary prior to approval of the Final Plat.
3. A park dedication fee of \$4,440 shall be paid before release of the Final Plat.

Staff and Commissioners discussed the building envelope, easements, and the hydrologic analysis. Commissioners and staff reviewed the tree survey process, legacy trees, and the final review during building permitting where the city forester goes to the property and confirms the analysis and proposed removal/replacement.

Chair Pockl invited the applicant to speak.

Eugene Borodin, applicant, stated staff's review was complete and the drainage pipe will be a tremendous improvement to the property.

Commissioner Segelbaum asked if the pipe placement was satisfactory to the applicant. The applicant responded that they worked closely with City Engineering Staff and are pleased with the pipe location. **Segelbaum** followed up by asking if both houses will be built simultaneously or what the proposed timeframe is. The applicant doesn't have a timeline at the time of this meeting, start time is based on the completion of the pipe installation.

Chair Pockl opened the public comments at 7:06pm

Larry Kueny
7303 Ridgeway Rd

When this project was proposed, most of the neighborhood was in support of it because the home needs to be removed. Nothing has happened to the house or lot in 18 months and the City had to mow the weeds because no one is caring for the yard. I support the plans but care for the lot in the interim needs to happen.

There were no callers.

Chair Pockl closed the public comments at 7:10pm.

Chair Pockl noted the applicant said it would take about 6 months to build the houses once permits are in place and asked how long it would be for the pipe to be complete and permits to be issued. Staff reviewed the process and Engineering is aiming to have the pipe complete by summer 2022 and suspects the demolition will occur the summer of 2022 as well. Council will review these plans and recommendation on June 7th.

Chair Pockl asked staff how property owners are held accountable for yard maintenance, especially in a situation where someone isn't living in the home. Staff responded with the general process however the timeframe may not be helpful so it may be better to address it with the developer. The applicant responded the lot is heavily wooded and they have not been able to find a company willing to maintain the yard in the interim. **Segelbaum** responded that it doesn't need to be perfect but as the lot owner, they are responsible for maintenance.

Chair Pockl reminded the applicant is a residential property owner in the Golden Valley and are beholden to City Ordinances regarding lawn care. The applicant responded in the affirmative.

Chair Pockl stated there didn't seem to be a concern regarding the minor subdivision, the regulations are being met, and she doesn't have concern with staff recommendation. **Commissioner Johnson** responded in the same, adding the clarity provided was helpful.

Commissioner Segelbaum would like it noted that Council address yard maintenance with the applicant in the time before demolition occurs.

MOTION made by **Commissioner Johnson** and seconded by **Commissioner Brookins** to recommend approval of staff recommendation, with conditions listed, adding the lawn care comment from Commissioner Segelbaum.

Staff took a roll call vote.

Motion carried

5. Informal Public Hearing – Outdoor Service Area Permit (OSA-1) to Allow for Outdoor Dining at 7345 Country Club Drive

Applicant: Paul Jacob

Jason Zimmerman, Planning Manager, reminded the group that this Outdoor Service Area permit is to allow for outdoor dining at 7345 Country Club Drive. This is generally allowed only as a restricted temporary use, which involves a public process with review by Planning Commission and City Council.

Staff reviewed the location, Schullers as an establishment, and added the area and lot are zoned Single-Family Residential – noting the irregularity being that the building is commercial. He also

reviewed the history of the applicant's attempt to rezone the property and Council's support of an OSA permit.

Staff reviewed the proposed use by the applicant: landscaping, pavers, and other site features. Some elements would otherwise be allowed by right in a single-family district and others would only be allowed with the OSA permit.

Proposed Use

- 1,200 square feet of patio, including a raised area to create accessible access from the building
- Capacity to seat approximately 50 people
- Landscaped berm would be created to the south to help provide a buffer – would include a 6-foot fence
- New connections from the patio to the public sidewalk to the north
- Other elements: pergola, fire pit, server station
- Requested 10 pm closure of patio and use of live music

Zoning Analysis

Patio

- Lot already over the usual 50% impervious coverage allowed in the R-1 zoning district
- In order to offset new impervious area, staff recommends the construction of a rain garden to capture water runoff

Fencing

- Four-foot fence would be allowed by-right; six foot fence is proposed
- Staff will require the top two feet be removable should the permit not be renewed in the future

Pergola

- As long as setbacks are being met, structure would otherwise be allowed by-right
- Would require inspections for footings

Landscaping

- Addition of perennials, shrubs, and trees would be allowed by-right
- Staff will require the applicant work with the City to design a plan for the north planting bed that does not impact snow storage

Evaluation

With approval of an OSA permit for the first time, a review for a potential extension is required after one year. Following that, the City Council may extend the permit term to two years

Recommendation

Staff recommends **approval** of Outdoor Service Area Permit 1, allowing for outdoor dining at 7345 Country Club Drive, subject to the following conditions:

1. The initial term shall be for one year.

2. A public bicycle rack able to accommodate eight bicycles shall be installed.
3. The fence must be constructed in such a way that any portion over four feet could be removed.
4. No amplifier or speaker may be used on the patio.
5. Use must conclude by 10 pm and lighting be extinguished.
6. A rain garden shall be design to address stormwater runoff.
7. Design of the north planting bed shall address snow storage.

Commissioner Brenna asked about the proposed location for a rain garden, staff reviewed location determined by engineering staff however they don't have a full analysis of soil and water flow yet.

Chair Pockl invited the applicant to speak.

Paul Jacob, Applicant, stated that it's rare the parking lot is full but if there is street parking it's due to convenience. The patio goal is to increase patronage in the summer as they lose 30-40% without a summer patio. From a business perspective, consistent patronage is helpful for Schullers and for staff who depend on that patronage. The applicant added they are members of the community and want to be a good neighbor, so while the patio is helpful for them, they are sensitive to creating accommodations to minimize neighborhood disruptions.

Commissioner Segelbaum asked about specific plans for music, lights, general noise and associated mitigation plans. The applicant went in detail on the desire to protect the neighborhood from noise and light amplification and the hard line on closing the patio at 10pm.

Commissioner Johnson asked what will be dismantled in the winter. The applicant stated most things will be stored but the patio will be closed in the off season.

Staff clarified what "temporary" means in this regard, the applicant is allowed to keep permanent structures and the temporary aspect means the permit will be reviewed annually.

Chair Pockl opened the public comments at 7:58pm

Peter Pluwak
510 Kelly Drive

My concern is the increase in traffic and decrease in safety - there is a group home nearby and folks walk up and down Kelly Drive, there isn't a sidewalk. I am also concerned with outdoor music and how the sound will carry.

Greg Wanzek
4755 Marie Lane E

We are frequent customers of Schullers and being able to sit on a patio will increase our attendance in the summer. I think the patio and landscaping will be an excellent addition to the lot and I've been waiting for a Schullers patio for a long time.

Matt Angleson
2401 Dresden Lane

I'm a Schullers patron and friends of the family. I know when they undertake a mission like this, the community interest is close to heart. I know they're trying to find an equitable solution for the community and the business. I echo the previous caller on my excitement for a patio at Schullers.

Sean Abernathy
210 Kentucky

I'm in full support of this plan, I think it will be a benefit to the community. I reviewed the plan and staff comments and it seems very reasonable.

Chair Pockl closed the public comments at 8:08pm.

Chair Pockl asked staff to comment on the traffic concern.

Staff responded that there doesn't seem to be additional traffic but rather the same amount as that in the winter. However, it's assumed that traffic will be on Country Club and not Glenwood. Staff can certainly encourage patrons to use the parking lot and adding a bike rack may increase non vehicle commuting.

Commissioner Segelbaum asked why staff encouraged a 6-ft fence when the applicant wanted an 8-ft fence. Staff responded that the zoning requires a 4-ft and they were afraid an 8-ft fence would eliminate the view for the neighbors to the south and so 6-ft felt like a good compromise. The applicant has discussed a "break-away" fence with their contractor so the top 2 feet of the fence could be removed if necessary.

Commissioner Johnson stated he agrees with staff recommendations but struggles with the aesthetics and the idea of temporary. He added that creating a temporary permit leads to misunderstanding of creating a temporary vs permanent structures on the patio. Staff responded that temporary means a set period of time not a temporary structure.

Commissioner Brookins added that the application is well done and isn't stuck on the temporary nature of the structures.

Chair Pockl added that the applicant took time to create an aesthetically pleasing plan that will also benefit the community. **Segelbaum** echoed these comments and added they are enhancing an area for the neighborhood.

MOTION made by **Commissioner Brookins** and seconded by **Commissioner Segelbaum** to recommend approval of staff recommendation, with conditions listed.

Staff took a roll call vote.

Motion carried

Chair Pockl ended the televised portion of the meeting at 7:23pm

6. Council Liaison Report

Council Member La Mere-Anderson provided a recap of the last City Council meeting, including a handful of recognitions and proclamations as well as a new fee schedule for Outdoor Service Area permits. She reported that the Council reviewed the Diversity and Equity Committee annual report and work plan at the last Council Work Session, and also discussed a land acknowledgement statement and policy. The Commissioners discussed the potential to create term limits for Boards and Commissions and some of the advantages that may go along with having Planning Commissioners serve for a longer period of time to create consistencies.

7. Other Business

None.

8. Adjournment

MOTION by **Commissioner Segelbaum** to adjourn, seconded by **Commissioner Johnson** and approved unanimously by roll call vote. Meeting adjourned at 9:10 pm.

Andy Johnson, Secretary

Amie Kolesar, Planning Assistant

DRAFT



MEMORANDUM

Planning Department

763-593-8095 / 763-593-8109 (fax)

Date: June 13, 2022
To: Golden Valley Planning Commission
From: Max Gort, Community Development Intern
Subject: Discussion – Amending Sec. 113-151 “Off-Street Parking and Loading” of City Code

Summary

Staff will present information and lead a discussion around the potential for amending the Off-Street Parking and Loading language (Sec. 113-151) to stay up to date with current use tables, modify minimum required parking spaces based on contemporary standards, add a requirement for electric vehicle charging infrastructure, and update front yard requirements within the chapter to be up to date with current building and yard setback requirements.

Background

Staff will be further researching and determining the possible outcomes of four major items related to the off-street parking chapter:

- Staff modified and revamped the city’s use tables in 2021, updating various land use types that have fallen inconsistent with the minimum parking requirements table. A major area to consider expansion within the parking table is in commercial use districts, with very broad categories such as “Retail store or service establishment” and “shopping center”
- The Minimum Parking Requirements table is out of sync with modern best practices. Staff will be examining whether certain use categories should have an increased or decreased parking minimum based on factors such as adequacy for use, level of service, and transit access. A particular area of examination will be the minimum for multifamily parcels, determining whether the current measurement by unit is the most adequate measure of parking demand.
- In order to keep up with the City’s values of sustainability and innovation, staff will be considering and likely recommending the introduction of electric vehicle charging infrastructure on new or current parking lot construction. The requirements would vary based on use and level of equipment service.
- The current parking chapter requirement for building setbacks and front yards, where parking is not allowed, is 35 feet. This is inconsistent with the reduction in the setback requirement from 35 feet to 25 feet for R-3 and R-4 zoned properties. Staff would be

recommending an update in the parking chapter to match the 25-foot setback requirement in these districts.

Minimum Parking Requirements Table

The current use table provides for many specific categories that are absent from the minimum parking requirements table, which itself presents several broad categories that could include many uses within them.

- Retail Store or Service Establishment (Parking Table)
 - Question whether this ought to be broken down, considering different establishments have different needs
- Sport and health club
 - Gyms
 - Gyms within strip malls may be smaller than traditional health clubs and may have different parking conditions from neighboring stores (i.e. 24 hour gyms)
 - Differentiation from fitness centers?
- Indoor Entertainment and Amusement (From current use chapter)
 - Parking table only refers to a few specific uses under this category (bowling alleys, pool halls, arcades), could stand to benefit from a generic category to include other facilities (indoor trampoline parks, laser tag, axe throwing)

Multifamily Parking Minimums

Staff is evaluating whether the current parking minimum for multifamily housing (1.5 spaces per unit) is adequate, and whether a different metric should be used to evaluate multifamily parking demand.

- Comparison with neighboring communities

City	Requirement
St. Louis Park	1 per Bedroom, plus 10% reserved for guests
Plymouth	2 per unit
Crystal	2 per unit
Robbinsdale	1.5 per unit
Edina	2 per unit
Hopkins	2 per unit
Minnetonka	2 per unit, visitor ratio varies based on relevant factors
Roseville	1 per bedroom plus .25 per unit for visitors
Richfield	2 per unit with reduction as unit counts increase

- Per Bedroom
 - Higher likelihood of adequately meeting resident demand, especially in units where multiple non-related people live together and work in separate places

- Encourages younger residents to move to the city who may be seeking housing outside the core cities
- Negative effects on overall reduction of vehicle miles traveled, encouraging heavier automobile usage and decreased alternative transportation methods
- Increase to 2 per unit, with progressive reduction as units increase
 - Could doubly provide for demand while meeting goals of increased walkability as density increases
 - Could incentivize developers to build more dense housing as their requirements will go down with size
 - The current breakdown that Richfield uses reduces the requirement to 1.5 spaces per unit when a property has 7 or more units, then 1.25 spaces per unit when a property has 10 or more units; the City does not zone for multifamily developments with greater than 20 units except for conditional uses.
 - Golden Valley would likely need to expand the levels for reduction due to zoning allowing for up to 50 units per acre in R-4 districts
 - Could negatively impact statewide objectives of reducing vehicle miles traveled, especially as proportionally higher parking is required in multifamily dwellings with low density

Other MPR Concerns

- Considering current best practices for minimum parking in commercial and industrial zoning districts, such as reduction in areas with higher transit access or walkability and with uses that see lower demand
 - Retail – examination into whether a broad category is the best option
 - Joint Uses that may exhibit special characteristics
 - Gyms in strip malls
- Ambiguity in hotel requirements
- Interested in other cases where the minimum requirements need to be adjusted

Electric Vehicle Charging

To make Golden Valley a sustainability-focused community and increase overall infrastructure availability, staff will be considering the implementation of Electric Vehicle Charging Stations (EVCS).

- [Great Plains Institute document](#) outlining best practices for EV infrastructure implementation, and highlights several cities throughout the country which have such implementations
- St. Louis Park is a notable city in our metro area that has already implemented EV Charging requirements in their off-street parking chapter. The important elements of this section are:
 - Definitions section, which is useful considering that a lot of the language surrounding EVCS is atypical for zoning ordinance
 - A breakdown of the three levels of EV charging
 - Level 1 – slow, 120V

- Level 2 – medium, 240V
 - DC – fast, above 240V
- SLP Minimum EV charging space requirements:
 - Under 14 spaces – EV equipment allowed but not required
 - 15-49 spaces
 - Multifamily – 5% of spaces with a level 1 charger, one of which must be handicap accessible
 - Non-residential – at least one level 2 charger
 - 50+ spaces
 - Multifamily – 10% of spaces with a level 1 charger and one level 2 charger in guest parking, one charger must be handicap accessible
 - Non-residential – at least 1% of spaces with a level 1 charger, and at least two level 2 spaces, one of which must be handicap accessible. DC is allowed as a replacement for level 2 spaces
 - New and reconstructed gas stations are to include one additional level 2 or DC station
- This is one example of what EVCS implementation in Golden Valley may look like. Staff would request input on alterations that may be appropriate from the Planning Commission.

Front Yard Requirements

The current parking chapter requirement for building setbacks and front yards, where parking is not allowed, is 35 feet. This is inconsistent with the reduction in the setback requirement from 35 feet to 25 feet for R-3 and R-4 zoned properties. Staff would be recommending an update in the parking chapter to match the 25-foot setback requirement in these districts.

Staff Request

At this time, staff is looking for feedback on the following questions:

1. Does the Planning Commission agree with Staff researching these 4 primary updates to Section 113-151?
2. What are some further areas that the Commission could recommend that Staff consider for updating Section 113-151?