



Norwood Young America Planning Commission
Tuesday, November 17, 2015
Norwood Young America City Council Chambers, 310 Elm St. W.
7:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Craig Heher
Chairperson | 1. Call to Order
Pledge of Allegiance |
| Bill Grundahl
Vice-Chair | 2. Adoption of Agenda |
| Karen Hallquist | 3. Approve Minutes of October 20, 2015 meeting |
| JR Hoernemann | 4. Public Hearings |
| Cassandra Kemp | 5. Old Business
A. Accessory Dwelling Units
B. Review Zoning Map
C. Goals Update and City Council Goals Update Presentation (November 23 rd regular meeting) |
| Mark Lagergren | 6. New Business |
| Charlie Storms | 7. October Building Permit Report |
| | 8. Commissioner's Reports |
| | 9. Adjourn |

UPCOMING MEETINGS

- December 9th, 6:30 p.m. – EDC meeting – PC Rep. – Craig Heher
December 15th, 5:30 p.m. – Parks & Rec. Comm. Meeting – PC Rep. – Karen Hallquist
November 23rd, 6:30 p.m. – City Council Meeting – PC Rep. – Charlie Storms
December 15th, 7:00 p.m. – next Planning Commission meeting
December 14th, 6:30 p.m. – City Council Meeting PC Rep. – Charlie Storms

*Norwood Young America
Planning Commission Minutes
October 20, 2015*

Present: Commissioners Charlie Storms, Craig Heher, Cassandra Kemp, Bill Grundahl, and JR Hoernemann.

Absent: Mark Lagergren and Karen Hallquist.

Staff: Planning Consultant Cynthia Smith Strack.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Heher at 7:00 pm. All present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Motion – Motion Kemp, seconded by Grundahl, with all in favor to approve the agenda with the addition of item 2.5 an oath of office by Charlie Storms and item 6A relating to the appointment of a representative of the Planning Commission to the EDC. Motion approved 4-0.

2.5 Oath of Office

Charlie Storms took the oath of office and was welcomed to the Planning Commission.

3. Approval of Minutes from the Regular Meeting August 18, 2015 and Special Meeting August 25, 2015.

Heher introduced the minutes from the August 18th and August 25th meetings. Grundahl noted a spelling error on Page 5 of the August 18th minutes ('just' free surface should be 'dust' free surface).

Motion – Kemp to approve August 18, 2015 meeting minutes with the requested change and the August 25, 2015 meeting minutes as presented. Second by Hoernemann. With all in favor the minutes were approved 5-0.

4. Public Hearings.

None.

5. Old Business

A. Driveway Standards Draft Ordinance.

Chairperson Heher introduced the agenda item. Strack stated the Planning Commission held a public hearing on draft standards on August 18, 2015.

The draft ordinance presented at the public hearing included:

- A proposed five (5) foot setback from side yards.
- For residential uses, a maximum curb cut width of 24 feet, unless the subject lot is greater than 150 feet in width at the front setback line, then up to 32 feet.
- For multiple family, commercial, and industrial uses a maximum curb cut width of forty (40) feet unless the City Engineer finds a wider width is needed for traffic circulation purposes.
- A requirement for dust free hard surfacing for all driveways.
- Relief from parking lot surfacing requirements, under the proposed ordinance asphalt may be employed in parking lots and surfacing in side and rear yards of industrial zones may be compacted gravel.
- A standard relating to setback from side yards for residential parking pads. City Administrator Helget indicates this is consistent with what is currently recommended for parking pads.

During the public hearing public input and subsequent discussion occurred regarding:

- Residential curb cut maximum width standard. Discussion centered on whether a width standard was needed or if regulations regarding maximum impervious surface coverage per lot would sufficient curtail driveway width.
- Whether or not 'dust free' should be retained in surfacing standards. Some thought this was confusing as gravel or dirt could potentially be made 'dust-free' by applying dust coating material.
- Whether or not driveway surfacing requirements (concrete, asphalt) should be required for driveways accessed from public alleys versus public streets.
- The impact a proposed five (5) foot setback for driveways from lot lines could negatively impact residential base lots in the original townsites.

At the August 18th meeting the Planning Commission postponed discussion to allow additional research. Specific research requested related to how a proposed five foot side yard setback for driveways would impact lot widths in the original townsites and how proposed hard surfacing requirements would correlate with existing alley surfacing for lots with driveways from alleys versus front streets.

At the August 18th meeting the Planning Commission expressed support for removing maximum driveway width standards for single family residential uses, reasoning existing impervious surface maximums adequately addressed green space needs. The Planning

Commission also expressed support for removing a reference to 'dust free' surfacing preferring a reference to hard surfacing including asphalt, concrete, or brick/pavers.

Strack referenced a marked-up revised draft ordinance included in the Planning Commission packet which reflected the Planning Commission's preferences from the August 18th meeting.

Strack also reviewed requested research findings. She noted base lots in the north and south original townsites are approximately 6,000 square feet in area and 50 feet in width. She stated it appeared the lot width was adequate to accommodate a normal driveway width.

Strack reported research shows base lots in the original townsites are zoned either RC-1 Residential Neighborhood Commercial, R-3 Medium Density Residential, or C-3 Downtown Commercial. Structural side yard setbacks in the RC-1 and R-3 districts are five feet for interior lines, consistent with what is proposed for driveways. Side yard setbacks within the C-3 District is zero unless abutting residential, then it is five feet. Strack opined side yard setbacks for smaller lots in the original townsites appear to be consistent with that proposed for driveways. Finally, Strack noted several base lots in the original townsite feature garages accessed from public alleys versus public streets. The driveways from alleys are mix of surfaces including gravel, concrete, and asphalt.

Kemp inquired as to how the Commission could address driveways from alleys.

Strack noted the City could make hard-surfacing requirements only applicable to driveways from public streets versus alleys.

Grundahl suggested language that required hard surfaced driveways from alleys that were hard surfaced.

Grundahl then inquired as to how proposed standards would impact existing driveways. Strack stated the proposed Ordinance would only apply to new driveways.

Grundahl inquired as to whether or not surfacing standards would apply to parking pads. Strack noted the surfacing standards applied only to driveways.

Strack suggested Section 1(F) of the draft ordinance be revised as follows: "Residential, commercial, and industrial driveways shall be hard-surfaced with materials such as concrete, asphalt, or brick/pavers, *except that driveways accessed from non-hard surfaced alleys may be non-hard surfaced.*"

The Commission concurred with the suggestion.

Heher noted the Section should be renumbered to illustrate the removal of a standard relating to single family residential driveway width maximums.

The Commission concurred.

Motion. Grundahl to recommend the City Council approve an ordinance entitled "An Ordinance Amending Section 1250.07 of the City Code Relating to Access (Driveways) and Section 1250.09 of the City Code Regarding Construction and Maintenance of Parking Lots", second Kemp. Motion carried 5:0.

B. Accessory Dwelling Units.

Chair Heher introduced the agenda item. Strack stated one of the Planning Commission's goals for 2015 is to consider implementation of standards providing for the establishment of accessory apartments a.k.a. accessory dwelling units, granny flats, carriage houses. The Commission initiated discussion on the matter at its regular meeting on August 18th.

The Commission specifically discussed the role of public input including how and when to solicit public input. The Commission agreed to continue discussion at their next regular meeting after individual members had an opportunity to further reflect on the matter and perform independent research.

Strack inquired as to how the Commission would like to proceed.

Heher suggested the Commission attempt to gauge the public's level of interest in accessory dwelling units. He noted the Commission may need to educate prior to asking about level of interest.

Kemp agreed with CH. She noted she was unsure of whether or not an allowance for an ADU was needed in NYA at this time. She opined obtaining public input could be challenging.

Strack suggested reaching out to elected and appointed officials and staff members initially, perhaps with an informal survey.

Kemp suggested simplifying definitions and asking basic questions. Strack suggested a quick questionnaire perhaps ten questions maximum.

Heher agreed noting a quick check of the pulse of City leaders and board, commission, and committee members would be helpful.

Strack offered to put something together for the Planning Commission to review at the November meeting.

Grundahl suggested the Planning Commission not let the matter become a lesser priority or be something that goes by the wayside.

Strack inquired of Hoernemann whether or not Senior Committee would be interested in further discussing the topic. Hoernemann stated he felt the Senior Committee would be very engaged and helpful.

The Commission requested Strack prepare a sample questionnaire for the November meeting.

C. Conditional Use Permit Audit Findings.

Chair Heher introduced the agenda item.

Strack said the Commission held a public hearing at its regular meeting in August to verify findings of an audit of CUP permits. The public hearing was not required but rather recommended as a means of formalizing findings.

Following the hearing the Planning Commission approved Resolution PC 2015-01 stating audit findings. However, following approval it was brought to staff's attention that a CUP issued for 321 Elm Street West (contractor operations, woodworking) was active rather than inactive. As such the Commission is asked to consider an amended Resolution. She noted Resolution 2015-02 was included in the packet and offered for consideration.

Motion. Motion Kemp, Second Storms to adopt Planning Commission Resolution 2015-02. Motion carried 5:0.

D. Goals Update.

Chair Heher introduced the agenda item. Strack reviewed the goals/work list and requested input on the Planning Commission's review of the official zoning map. She noted she had the impression the Planning Commission wished to view the zoning map to familiarize itself with the locations and types of zoning classifications. She noted Administrator Steve Helget had the impression the Planning Commission wanted to review the map for updates.

Heher noted new members and recalled the Planning Commission's intent was to conduct a high level review of the map as a refresher to what districts were located in what areas. He requested the item be placed on the November Planning Commission agenda.

Grundahl inquired as to the status of a work assignment from a joint Planning Commission/Council meeting some time ago. Grundahl noted each Planning Commission member was to identify five properties that they felt were in need of attention due to non-compliance. He inquired as to the status of the assignment and whether the Planning Commission and Council would meet again.

Strack noted the assignment was likely somewhat lost in the shuffle of the nuisance ordinance update and the development of administrative review standards. She noted

some egregious non-conformance issues had been resolved. She further noted she expected a joint meeting with the Council sometime around the first of the year.

Heher agreed noting the Council has been discussing beautification efforts. He opined non-compliant properties were on the Council's radar.

6. New Business.

A. Appointment of Planning Commission Representative to Economic Development Commission.

Chairperson Heher introduced the agenda topic. He noted he could no longer serve as the Planning Commission's representative to the EDC as he was recently appointed to the City Council to fill Jim Keller's vacated seat. He requested nominations for the EDC representative.

Kemp noted her work schedule was quite intense at the present time but she may be interested in the future.

Grundahl suggested Storms consider being the EDC representative as he had years of experience as a successful business owner and entrepreneur. Storms noted he was listening a great deal and would need some time to get up to speed on operations but he did not object to being the Planning Commission representative to the EDC.

Motion. Motion Grundahl, Second Hoernemann to nominate Storms as Planning Commission representative to the EDC. Motion carried 5:0.

7. Commissioner's Reports

Hoernemann noted The Haven project was moving on very nicely, a bit ahead of schedule. A grand opening was being planned for March.

Grundahl noted he had attended the last few City Council meetings. He noted the home occupation ordinance update was approved as were standards related to accessory buildings and a revised nuisance ordinance.

Heher stated the preliminary 2016 budget was approved and the final budget will be approved by early December.

Grundahl inquired as to whether the City was conducting an alley improvement project. Strack and Heher were unaware of any such project.

Heher noted the Young America building had been sold. He also reported the Parks and Recreation Commission was discussing how to use a \$5,000 donation from YA Corporation. He noted 180 Collision was recently opened at 180 Industrial Boulevard.

Grundahl welcomed Storms to the Planning Commission.

8. Adjourn

Motion – Grundahl, seconded by Storms all in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Helget
Zoning Administrator

To: Chairperson Heher
Members of the Planning Commission
Administrator Helget

From: Cynthia Smith Strack, Consulting Planner

Date: November 9, 2015

Re: Discussion: Accessory Apartments, Granny Flats, Carriage Houses, etc.

BACKGROUND

One of the Planning Commission's goals for 2015 is to consider implementation of standards providing for the establishment of accessory apartments a.k.a. accessory dwelling units, granny flats, carriage houses.

The Commission has been specifically discussing the role of public input in the process, including how and when to solicit public input. At the October meeting the Commission requested the drafting of a brief survey instrument to be reviewed and potentially distributed to all elected officials, appointed board, committee, and commission members, and staff.

Attached please find a draft survey for discussion/comment.

ACTION

This item is for discussion purposes.

NYA Accessory Dwelling Unit Survey

City of Norwood Young America Accessory Dwelling Unit Survey

An accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is a second, smaller dwelling unit added to a lot where a house already exists. ADUs are permanent residences that are 'secondary' or 'accessory' to a primary residence on the same single family lot. ADUs can be attached to or separate from the main residence. An ADU must have its own bathroom and kitchen facilities including a sink, stove, and refrigerator. ADUs are commonly referred to as mother-in-law apartments, accessory apartments, 'granny' flats or carriage/guest houses. At this time ADUs are not allowed in the City of Norwood Young America. The NYA Planning Commission would like to know what residents think about allowing ADU's in the City. Please take a moment to answer the following few questions. Thank you in advance for your input!

1. If the City allowed accessory dwelling units would you be inclined to build one?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe (please explain)

2. For which of the following purposes would you consider establishing a ADU on your property?

- To earn extra income
- Place for a relative to live

Other (please specify)

3. If you were to establish and ADU how much rent would you likely charge?

- Less than \$500 per month
- \$500 to \$750 a month
- \$751 to \$1,000 per month
- More than \$1,000 per month

Other (please specify)

4. Do you have enough room on your property to provide off-street parking if an ADU is established?

- No
- Yes, (please specify where parking would occur)

5. What type of accessory dwelling units would be acceptable in your neighborhood? Check all that apply.

- A basement converted to an ADU
- An addition to an existing house
- A breezeway converted to an ADU
- A manufactured home
- A 'tiny' house (less than 200 square feet in area)
- An apartment over a detached garage/shed
- A second house
- An apartment above an attached garage
- ADU's are not acceptable in my neighborhood

Other (please specify)

6. What types of standards should apply to ADUs in your neighborhood?

- Parking for residents of the ADU should be off of the street
- At least one of the dwellings (either the existing dwelling or the ADU) should be occupied by the owner of the lot
- The size of the ADU should be smaller than the main dwelling unit
- A separate front door to the ADU should be required
- Both the ADU and the existing dwelling should be required to use the same front door
- Detached ADUs like a freestanding guest house or 'carriage' house should not be allowed
- People should not be able to bring a manufactured home in as an ADU
- A 'tiny' house (less than 200 s.f. in area) should not be allowed as an ADU
- Other (please specify)

7. Would you be 'ok' with an ADU next door to you?

- No
- Yes
- Maybe (please specify under what conditions)

8. Should notice be given to neighbors before an ADU is established?

- Yes
- No

9. Do you have an existing structure on your property that could be turned into an ADU?

- No
- Yes, please explain what structure could be turned into an ADU

10. What do you like or not like about the concept of ADUs?

Done



Powered by



See how easy it is to [create a survey](#)

To: Chairperson Heher
Members of the Planning Commission
Administrator Helget

From: Cynthia Smith Strack, Consulting Planner

Date: November 9, 2015

Re: Review of Zoning Map

BACKGROUND

The Planning Commission, when discussing goals for 2015, requested that at one meeting the official zoning map be examined as a means of reacquainting Commissioners with the various zones and locations of such zones.

The Commission confirmed its intent at the October meeting noting:

"Chair Heher introduced the agenda item. Strack reviewed the goals/work list and requested input on the Planning Commission's review of the official zoning map. She noted she had the impression the Planning Commission wished to view the zoning map to familiarize itself with the locations and types of zoning classifications. She noted Administrator Steve Helget had the impression the Planning Commission wanted to review the map for updates.

Heher noted new members and recalled the Planning Commission's intent was to conduct a high level review of the map as a refresher to what districts were located in what areas. He requested the item be placed on the November Planning Commission agenda".

Attached please find a copy of the official zoning map. A summary of each zoning district follows on the next page.

ACTION

This item is for discussion purposes.

SUMMARY OF ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS

T/A Transition/Agricultural District.

Intended to serve as the district which will allow suitable areas of the City and newly annexed land to be retained and utilized by low density residential, open space and/or agricultural uses until such time as the land on which these uses lie are ready for urban development.

R-1 Low Density Single Family Residential District.

Intended to provide and preserve areas within the City currently established or primarily designated for low-density residential development by the Comprehensive Plan.

R-2 Medium Density Single Family Residential District.

Intended to provide and preserve areas within the City currently established for low-medium density residential development by the Comprehensive Plan at densities slightly higher than the R-1 District.

R-3 Medium Density Mixed Residential

Intended to preserve the residential areas established with the City's original plat and provide for a variety of housing types to be developed at densities slightly higher than the traditional single-family dwelling as guided by the Comprehensive Plan.

R-4 Multiple Family Residential District.

Intended to provide for multifamily residential structures at a maximum net density of 18 dwelling units per acre on land guided for high density residential uses by the Comprehensive Plan.

RC-1 Residential/Neighborhood Commercial District

Intended to provide certain areas of the City for the development of specialty service and commercial focusing on neighborhood related business in areas where residential dwellings predominate. Intended to include primarily established residential areas where changing conditions have made certain commercial uses suitable and not incompatible with the basic residential character of the district. Also intended for certain residential areas which, by reason of proximity to existing commercial areas and major streets, would be suitable for limited office use. Furthermore, intended to assist in the preservation and stabilization of property values.

C-2 General Commercial District

Intended to recognize development opportunity and the need for commercial establishments fronting on or with direct access to major highways, a frontage road, or a major street intersecting a highway, serving area residents as well as vehicular traffic generated from the surrounding area.

C-3 Downtown Districts

Includes the original Norwood downtown, known as "Downtown Business" and the original Young America downtown, known as "Community Uptown", intended to serve as the specialized service, retail, employment, and public business district for the community.

B-1 Business Industrial District

Intended to provide an area identified for light industrial and large-scale office-park development.

I-1 Light Industrial District

Intended to create industrial areas within the City that will be acceptable and will not adversely affect adjacent business or residential neighborhoods. The overall character of the I-1 District is intended to have low-impact manufacturing/warehouse character.

P-1 Parks/Open Space

Intended to provide for recreational areas for enjoyment by the general public as well as preserve significant natural features and amenities such as lakes, rivers, marshes, steep hills, extensive woodlands and woodlands in their natural state in order to assure continuation of the existing natural drainage system, to prevent harmful soil erosion, and to maintain ecological balance to the greatest extent possible.

Shoreland Management Overlay District

Applicable to all five natural environment lakes and the creek/drainage ditch on west side of town. Area impacted is within 1,000 feet of the ordinary high water level of natural environment lakes and within 300 feet of the floodway of the creek/drainage ditch. As an overlay district the standards imposed for shorelands are in addition to those in the underlying zoning class. Where shoreland standards are more restrictive (e.g. lot size) the stricter standard applies.

PUD Overlay District

The Planned Unit Development Overlay District allows flexibility in developments, including modification of density and design standards as set forth in the underlying zoning classification in exchange for a public benefit.

To: Chairperson Heher
Members of the Planning Commission
Administrator Helget

From: Cynthia Smith Strack, Municipal Development Group, Inc.

Date: November 9, 2015

Re: 2015 Goals

The following are provided for Commission information and input:

1. 2015 Goals:

- A. Update of zoning language related to home occupations – COMPLETED.
- B. Update of zoning language relating to accessory structures – COMPLETED.
- C. Update of certain sections of the sign regulations, particularly those relating to volume of directional signage and number of wall signs per building face.
- D. Review of/familiarization with the Official Zoning Map. ON NOV. PC AGENDA
- E. Review of the NYA Greenway Plan.
- F. Establish dwelling unit minimum sizes – COMPLETED.
- G. Provide for aging in place through the use of accessory apartments. CURRENTLY DISCUSSING
- H. Driveway standards. COUNCIL WAS TO CONSIDER NOV. 9, 2015
- I. Landscaping standards. COMPLETED
- J. Nuisance Ordinance update. COMPLETED