

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

DATE: February 9, 2015

TIME: 4:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Davis, Commissioners Boettcher, Hahn, Buelow, Fritz, and L. Olson

ABSENT: Commissioners Porter, Ballard, and M. Olson

STAFF PRESENT: City Planner Mark Moeller

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m. by Chairperson Davis.

Approval of Minutes – January 26, 2015

Minutes from the Commission's meeting of January 26, 2015 were reviewed and upon motion duly made and seconded, were unanimously approved as submitted.

Proposed Amendments - Site Plan Ordinance

Chairperson Davis called on Mark Moeller, City Planner, to provide staff overview of this item. Mr. Moeller noted that this amendment process was started a couple of months ago with the concept of adding the Commission to the list of person's receiving copies of site plans, and authorizing Commissioners to request that the full Commission review site plans. Since then, other amendments have been included in the proposal, by both the City Attorney's Office and staff. As presented in this afternoon's agenda, other amendments would serve to require the implementation of a Site Plan approval within a defined time period. In this case, that period would be December 31st of the year following the year in which the project was approved. Modifications would also provide for an appeal of a Planning Commission site plan action to City Council. Such an appeal would be required within 10 days following approval of a site plan. Following brief discussion of this item, Commissioner Buelow suggested that a change be made to the implementation timeline requirement. In order to provide consistency between this, and other zoning code provisions, it was suggested that the timeline simply be 12 months following plan approval.

It was then moved by Commissioner Fritz, and seconded by Commissioner Hahn, to recommend approval of the proposed site plan amendment, as included in this afternoon's agenda package, subject to the changes referenced by Commissioner Buelow. When the question was called, the vote of the Commission was unanimous to approve the motion.

Mr. Moeller noted that since site plan ordinance is not part of City Zoning or Subdivision Ordinances, a formal Commission hearing would not be required. As such, the matter would be referred, directly to Council, for approval.

Proposed Amendment – Subdivision Ordinance

Chairperson Davis again called on Mr. Moeller to provide a summary of this item.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 9, 2015
PAGE 2

Mr. Moeller explained that following a recent review of the City Subdivision Ordinance, the City Attorney had prepared a proposed amendment to Final Plat provisions (Section 42.06), for clarification. In summary, amendments would serve to:

1. Define criteria to be met in Council's consideration of a final plat. In part, these criteria include references to required development agreements, Natural State Agreements, conservation (other) easements, or public donations/dedications to be submitted as part of a final plat application. Although the submittal and consideration of such agreements may now be required as part of "policy", this change would solidify requirements by way of ordinance. Additionally, part (c) (4) references the need for the plat to be prepared in compliance with platting provisions of State law, specifically Chapter 505. A reference to this law is presently lacking.
2. In accordance with recent changes made to the City's Conditional Use permit process, and the previous site plan proposal, identify a "drop dead" date for plat recording. Although approved final plats are presently not subject to a recording timeline, amended language would require this within 180 days of plat approval. The purpose of these deadlines is to encourage project implementation under the framework of the neighborhood generally existing at the time of plat approval.

Finally, evidence that plats had been recorded would be required prior to undertaking public improvements, or issuing building permits to a plat.

In concluding, Mr. Moeller noted that should the Commission concur with the proposed amendment, a formal hearing will be established for final consideration by the Commission.

Following brief review and discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Buelow, and seconded, to recommend tentative approval of the ordinance as submitted, and to authorize a Commission hearing date to consider final approval. When the question was called, the vote of the Commission was unanimous to approve the motion.

Other Business

Chairperson Davis then called for other business. There being none, she moved to Future Action Items.

Mr. Moeller noted that during the Commission's last meeting, a commitment had been made to return to the Commission with a tentative schedule to be followed in retaining a consultant for the Zoning Ordinance Update Project. At this point, he distributed a draft schedule that had been prepared by staff. As proposed, the schedule includes the following steps:

- The Mayor's appointment of a steering or Advisory Committee consisting of:
 - Planning Commission Chair
 - City Council Person
 - Community Development Director

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 9, 2015
PAGE 3

- Planning Staff

Initially, this Committee would serve to prepare the RFP, review consultant proposals, interview consultant finalists, and provide a consultant recommendation to Council.

Following consultant approval by Council, the Committee would facilitate an appropriate contract and could continue to serve as an advisory body through the update process. As an alternative, the Committee could be dissolved following consultant selection.

- A Request for Proposal (RFP) would be prepared by the Advisory Committee.
- The Planning Commission would review the RFP. At this point, the Commission could request additions or revisions to project scope.
- Council approves RFP. The Council would also be asked to authorize staff release of the RFP to potential consultants.
- Proposals would be received from consultants.
- All proposals would be reviewed by the Advisory Committee with the goal of paring a list to two finalists.
- The Advisory Committee would interview consultant finalists and provide recommendations to Council.
- The Council would approve recommendations and authorize the City to enter into a contract with the consultant, followed by project implementation.

Outside of this process, the Commission will play a vital part in helping to define the scope of work to be included in the RFP. Given this, he would like to devote portions of the next couple of meetings to developing a comprehensive list of issues or items that may be incorporated in the RFP. Again, although staff has been working on such a list during the past couple of years, the Commission may have additional items or concerns. If so staff would like to hear those prior to final preparation of the RFP.

Commissioner Fritz noted that an immediate concern of his was the potential development of some form of proper management code that could serve to promote a higher level of property maintenance throughout the City. An example of such a document might be the International Property Management Code. Mr. Moeller suggested that this item be discussed further during the next meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned.



Mark Moeller
City Planner