



APPENDIX V

PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

**SHOREVIEW PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
October 23, 2018**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Doan called the October 23, 2018 Shoreview Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:20 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following Commissioners were present: Chair Doan; Commissioners Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe and Yarusso.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to approve the October 23, 2018 Planning Commission meeting agenda as submitted.

VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan
NAYS: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of September 25, 2018 Commission Meeting Minutes

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Peterson to approve the September 25, 2018 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented.

VOTE: AYES: Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: Anderson

Commissioner Anderson abstained, as he did not attend the September 25, 2018 meeting.

REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

City Planner Castle reported that the minor subdivision at 736 County Road I W. was approved as recommended by the Planning Commission.

NEW BUSINESS

COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PLAN

FILE NO.: 2706-18-26
APPLICANT: SHEPHERD OF THE HILLS LUTHERAN CHURCH
LOCAITON: 3920 VICTORIA STREET NORTH

Presentation by Associate Planner Aaron Sedey

The application is to add an electronic message center into the existing monument sign. Currently, the monument sign is handled manually. The stone monument would be retained.

The church property is located in the R1, Detached Residential District. Electronic message centers are allowed in residential districts for churches if there is a Comprehensive Sign Plan. The maximum height of the sign face is 6 feet; the maximum area is 40 square feet. Message centers are allowed to be 35% of the total sign or 30 square feet, whichever is less with a minimum of 20 square feet. The display color is required to be amber.

Deviations are allowed when the following criteria are met:

- The color, materials, size and illumination are consistent
- Practical difficulty is present
- The sign plan is unified and has aesthetic appeal
- Approval does not confer a special privilege for the applicant
- The sign is effective, functional, attractive and compatible with community standards.

The proposed sign meets all criteria for setback, height, sign face height, hours of display and color. The deviations requested are:

1. Sign area at 41.76 square feet over the allowed 40 square feet; and
2. Minimum land use area of 29.6 sf. or 70.97%, which is above the allowed 14.5 square feet at 35 % of the total sign area.

Staff finds that keeping the sign base will mean the sign continues to be consistent with the facade of the church. However, the full color and size of the message center proposed would be inconsistent with Code. Practical difficulty is not present. It is the preference of the church to have a full color sign and larger size. Staff does not believe the requested deviations result in a more unified sign package and are not consistent with community standards. Approving these deviations would confer a special privilege.

Notices were sent to property owners within 350 feet. Another church has registered support and plans to request something similar with a full color message center. Two citizen comments request the sign be dimmed or darkened at night with the use of electricity.

Staff supports an electrical message center but is recommending denial of the application based on the proportional size proposed for the message center and use of full color display.

Commissioner Solomonson asked the comparison size of the message center for Presbyterian Church of the Way. Mr. Sedey stated the sign area is 70 square feet. The message center

proportion of the sign area is 29%. St. Odilia also has a message center sign, the proportional area of which is 27% of the total sign area.

Commissioner Riechers asked if the amber color requirement is due to the sign being in a residential district. Mr. Sedey answered, yes.

Commissioner Anderson asked if variances would be needed for the deviations. Mr. Sedey explained that within a Comprehensive Sign Plan, deviations are allowed.

Chair Doan verified that there are no other message signs that have other than amber color in residential districts in Shoreview. He noted that as digital signs become more advanced, there will be more requests to communicate with images. He asked if there are light standards for brightness. Mr. Sedey stated there is a measuring device for light, and the manufacturing company can be contacted to get the specifications. He noted that the amber color would not likely give clear images. Chair Doan asked if the sign area restriction is meant to control the amount of light emitted from the sign. Mr. Sedey answered that it is meant to mitigate the size of the electronic portion.

Ms. Miranda Oliver, Director of Operations, Shepherd of the Hills Lutheran Church, and **Jim Hamilton**, Hamilton Signs in Rosemount, introduced themselves. **Ms. Oliver** stated that the goal of the church is to update its accessibility to the public and do a better job of outreach. The current sign must be changed manually, which takes approximately 2 hours. It takes longer in the winter with the snow. Changing the sign to a message center has been a goal for a long time. The text and/or images would change every 6 to 8 seconds. The signs at St. Odilia and Presbyterian Church of the Way are quite large in comparison. There is a full color message sign at Willow Creek on Lexington and Hamline. An effort is being made to reduce light pollution by using LED lights. Parking lot lights are turned off at night.

Commissioner Yarusso asked if full color images would be changed every 6 to 8 seconds. **Ms. Oliver** answered that text can easily be read in that amount of time, but images would not necessarily change that often.

Chair Doan asked the light level of the sign and if there is a trend toward full color signs. **Mr. Hamilton** responded that the lights do not shine out. The LED light pushes around its shape. There have been no problems with the full color sign at Willow Creek. All automatic adjustments work well. He offered to supply specific details from the manufacturer. Everything now is being sold in full color. The size of this sign is to be able to provide more information. The message area is being changed any more often than what Code allows.

Commissioner Peterson agreed that allowing this application would set a precedent for other churches. He asked the reason for the larger size and whether the sign area could be reduced to the allowed 40 square feet. **Mr. Hamilton** stated that the top portion is the name of the church. The church is working with other organizations, such as the food shelf. The message center is the most important area to relay event information. **Ms. Oliver** added that the sign area could be 40 square feet, but that reduction to the message center which reduce the amount of information

in messages. The message base could be made bigger to achieve the right percentage, but the church prefers to use what is there.

Chair Doan opened the discussion to the public.

Mr. Charlie Altman, member of Shepherd of the Hills, stated that he works with the food shelf. Demand for various items changes daily. The size of this sign would allow messaging on food shelf needs.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that the City has taken a conservative stand for signs to emit as little light in neighborhoods as possible. While he appreciates the trend toward color, he does not support full color signs in residential neighborhoods. The Commission spent a lot of time on this ordinance, and he would like this sign to be in compliance as the other two churches.

Commissioner Yarusso noted the letter that from another church that would like to apply for a full color sign. Allowing this application would set a precedent. Conveying more information can be served with amber light. Images is an advertising concern. That is a conflict in a neighborhood. The sign ordinance should be changed before allowing these deviations from Code.

Chair Doan asked when the ordinance was last updated. Ms. Castle stated that the ordinance was last reviewed in 2011. It was a big step to go from manual signs to message centers. There was a lot of concern about the impact to neighborhoods which is the reason for the size limitation and use of the color amber.

Commissioner Riechers stated that she understands the desire for full color, but maintaining the amber light because of the neighborhood location is in respect of the code and the residents. She agreed that perhaps the ordinance should be reviewed.

Commissioner Anderson stated he would be less opposed to the size deviation but agreed with other Commissioners that changes should be addressed through the ordinance. He suggested a color sign be allowed during the day that would change to amber at night before it is turned off.

Commissioner Wolfe noted that many churches across the nation are now using full color signs. He would advocate looking at this issue again through the ordinance process.

Chair Doan requested a review of this ordinance at a workshop meeting. The ordinance is seven years old and warrants another review.

Commissioner Yarusso asked if it is allowable to have a sign of a full color display but only utilized as amber. Ms. Castle stated that it is her understanding that a full color sign can be programmed to only show one color. **Ms. Oliver** responded that she would be open to all suggestions. She noted the existing light of the identification sign is bright and would be dimmer with the new sign.

Ms. Castle noted that the ordinance reads that only the message has to be in amber light.

Commissioner Solomonson recommended tabling the matter.

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Yarusso to table the Comprehensive Sign Plan submitted by Shepherd of the Hills Lutheran Church, 3920 Victoria Street N., for a freestanding monument sign with a message center until the November meeting. The review period will also be extended 60 days to a period of 120 days.

VOTE: **AYES - Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan**
NAYS - None

SITE AND BUILDING PLAN REVIEW

FILE NO.: 2707-18-27
APPLICANT: WOLD ARCHITECTS
LOCATION: 1141 LEPAK COURT (TURTLE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL)

Presentation by City Planner Kathleen Castle

An application was received for improvements to Turtle Lake School that include 4 small building additions, parking lot and site improvements. The applicant has requested this matter be continued because the storm water management plan is over budget. Significant modifications are being made to the application. The review period will be extended 120 days.

MOTION: by Commissioner Riechers, seconded by Commissioner Peterson to table the Site and Building Plan Review and Variance applications submitted by Wold Architects on behalf of Independent School District #621 for building and site improvements at Turtle Lake Elementary School, 1141 Lepak Court. The review period is extended from 60 to 120 days.

VOTE: **AYES - Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan**
NAYS - None

SITE AND BUILDING PLAN REVIEW

FILE NO.: 2708-18-28
APPLICANT: OAK HILL MONTESSORI
LOCATION: 4665 HODGSON ROAD

Chair Doan and Commissioner Yarusso recused themselves from discussion and a decision on this matter due to conflicts of interest. Chair Doan appointed Commissioner Peterson to take over as Chair.

Presentation by Niki Hill, Economic and Development Planning Associate

The proposal submitted is for an 18-foot diameter “Growing Dome” greenhouse structure on the north side of the school and south of the parking lot. The property is zoned O, Office, which allows private schools as a permitted use. City review and approval is based on finding no negative impacts that would conflict with the planned use of adjoining property.

Staff reviewed the plan in accordance with Comprehensive Plan policies and zoning standards. Surrounding land uses include: commercial to the south; low density single family residential to the west and north; high density senior residential to the northeast; and the City of North Oaks Institutional and Commercial uses to the east. The proposed use is consistent with the City’s 2008 Comprehensive Plan.

The structure location complies with the minimum 50-foot structure setback required from a front property line and 10-foot setback from a side property line. The structure will be over 200 feet from the nearest residential lot line with vegetation that will screen views of the structure from residential properties.

Property owners within 350 feet were notified of the request. No comments were received.

The Building Official requires that the spans of system be designed by a registered engineer or that an evaluation report be submitted from a nationally recognized agency. The foundation must be an engineered foundation system.

The Fire Marshal commented that verification is needed that the structure will meet fire code and meet the five listed criteria in the letter submitted.

Staff finds the proposal will not have an impact on adjoining properties or conflict with planned land uses in the area and is recommending approval with the three conditions listed and on the three findings of fact.

Commissioner Solomonson asked the height of the structure. **Ms. Erin Doan**, Head of School, Oak Hill Montessori, 4665 Hodgson Road, stated that the structure is 10 feet 2 inches in height at the center. She reported meeting with the Fire Marshal. The concern is coating on the structure and whether there are any flammable properties in the growing dome. Verification will be provided to the Fire Marshal from the manufacturer. This will be an important programming addition for children ages 16 months through 8th grade.

Chair Peterson opened the discussion to comments and questions from the public. There were none.

Commissioner Solomonson expressed his support for this educational tool that will have very low impact.

Chair Peterson agreed and stated it is part of the mission of the school. He noted that a condition of approval is full consultation with the Building Official and Fire Marshal.

MOTION: by Commissioner Riechers, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to recommend the City Council approve the Site and Building Plan Review application submitted by Oak Hill Montessori, 4665 Hodgson Road. Said approval is subject to the following:

1. A building permit is required prior to any construction activity.
2. The applicant shall address the comments from the Building Official and Fire Marshal prior to the issuance of a building permit.
3. Separate permits would be required for any electrical work done to the structure.

This approval is based on the following findings of fact:

1. The proposed land use is consistent with the designated Institutional land use in the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed development complies with the standards of the City's Development Code.
3. The proposed improvements will not conflict with or impede the planned use of adjoining property.

VOTE: AYES: ANDERSON, PETERSON, RIECHERS, SOLOMONSON, WOLFE
NAYS: 0
ABSTAIN/RECUSED: DOAN AND YARUSSO

PUBLIC HEARING – 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN*

FILE NO: 2709-18-29
APPLICANT: CITY OF SHOREVIEW
LOCATION: CITY WIDE

Presentation by City Planner Kathleen Castle

Minnesota law requires communities to update their Comprehensive Plans every 10 years. The City's last Plan was updated in 2008. Destination Shoreview 2040, the City's 2018 Plan is being presented to the Commission for review and comment.

The City approached revision of the Comprehensive Plan as an update and incorporated community engagement. This included Community Roundtable discussions to establish community vision, values and themes that are integrated throughout the plan. Community conversations were held to focus on key topics: Demographics, Land Use and Development, Economic Development, Housing and Neighborhoods, Natural Resources and Resiliency. Open houses were offered for property owners in areas where future land use designation change is proposed, as well as a number links on the City's website for resident participation. It is anticipated that the Comprehensive Plan will be presented to the City Council for adoption in December and then submitted to the Metropolitan Council.

The Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan are broken down into: 1) stating existing conditions; 2) identifying key issues; 3) presenting an analysis of the issues; and 4) listing goals, policies and recommended actions.

Key opportunities and challenges integrated throughout the plan include:

- To maintain quality neighborhoods and encourage reinvestment in older housing
- To provide a variety of housing choices to meet needs of older residents
- To retain business and promote expansion, adding retail services desired by residents
- To support redevelopment of older commercial/industrial areas that do not meet today's business needs
- To protect lakes, wetlands, natural environment
- To maintain public infrastructure

There are factors imposed by the Metropolitan Council that influence the Comprehensive Plan. Over the next 20-year period, the Metropolitan Council will look at average density, not that every development must be at 5 units per acre. The factors required by the Metropolitan Council are:

1. Shoreview is designated as a suburban community
2. Regional development framework requires an overall average density of 5 units per acre
3. A plan is needed for forecasted population and housing growth

The biggest chapter in the Comprehensive Plan is Chapter 4, Land Use. A number of planning issues are identified and discussed:

- Intensity of Land Use and Development - there is resistance to high density housing and different land use patterns, but development is changing. The difficulty is that with new development, there are higher land costs which requires a different development pattern than what residents are used to seeing, such as mixed use and higher density.
- Infill and Redevelopment shows how the City will grow. Less than 2% of land area remains in Shoreview for development. One of the key issues is how to protect established residential neighborhoods.
- Preserve and reinvest in neighborhoods.

The policy direction developed for land use recognizes the above-listed planning issues. Policy Development Areas (PDAs) will continue to be used a tool to guide future development. This tool has been used since the 1980s. PDAs provide guidance for areas that may see land use changes in the next 20-year period.

There are 19 PDAs that have potential for development or redevelopment that may impact adjoining existing land uses. PDAs identify possible future land use designations for development. An application that changes the existing land use requires a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. However, existing land uses may remain and zoning for a PDA is not being changed. The City is not promoting development in PDAs but is establishing policies for the future in the event a land use change is proposed. Three of the 19 Policy Development Areas received significant public comment.

PDA #6 is the Shoreview Commons residential neighborhood. The boundary of the PDA has been changed to only include properties north of Highway 96 and west of Dale Street. The current land use designation is RL, Low Density Residential. The Comprehensive Plan changes the land use to include RL, and also INST, Institutional; and RM, Medium Density Residential.

Future land use for this area is no longer guided for high density residential development. Overall density shall not exceed 8 units per acre with density to be concentrated in the western portion of the PDA. The PDA also addresses building height, size and buffer.

PDA #11 is Gramsie/Hodgson/Rice Street. Guided land use for the western portion has eliminated Mixed Use and replaced it with O, Office. Density is capped at 15 units per acre. High density residential is suitable due to the proximity of commercial, other high density residential land uses and frontage on Rice and Hodgson as well as the availability of transit. Land uses for the east side include INST, Institutional; C, Commercial; O, Office; and RM, Medium Density Residential. The west side land uses are RM, Medium Density Residential; RH, High Density Residential and O, Office. Recent tree removal has been addressed in the policy.

PDA #16 is new and includes the YMCA and Island Lake Golf Course. Land uses proposed are INST, Institutional; P, Park; and MU, Mixed Use. Ramsey County owns the golf course and is currently in the process of conducting a feasibility study of golf course operations. The County has a no net loss policy regarding any sale of County owned land to another party. While the City would prefer the golf course property be maintained as a park or open space, this property along with the YMCA property, may be attractive for development. Neither the YMCA nor Ramsey County are interested in selling at this time. Language has been added regarding traffic access and impacts to the adjoining residential area.

Chapter 5 - Transportation

Most transportation options fall within other jurisdictional authority—State, County and Metro Transit. Funding and resources for improvements is limited. Travel behavior is changing with changing demographics and societal and technological trends. This chapter addresses future infrastructure needs and assesses the gaps in the trail network. The City supports a multi-modal transportation system that provides safe and efficient movement throughout the community.

Chapter 6 - Economic Development

Business and industry do affect the City's quality of life. As a redeveloping community with limited land availability, new approaches are required to grow business, create jobs, provide services and expand the tax base. Redevelopment and reinvestment are key strategies. In the time span from 2010 to 2040, it is the City's goal to add approximately 3,000 jobs.

Policies to foster economic development include:

- Efforts to retain businesses and support expansion
- Attract businesses to provide employment opportunities and/or specific desired services
- Support redevelopment and reinvestment
- Strengthen Shoreview's competitive position
- Sustain and enhance economic strength of the community and overall quality of life.

Chapter 7 - Housing

Issues identified include aging in place, increasing housing choices for all levels of life cycle, encouraging reinvestment in housing and neighborhoods, and provide opportunity for mixed income housing. Shoreview housing is primarily a single-family residential. Affordable housing

is addressed and information included from the Metropolitan Council regarding the Area Median Income (AMI). This means that an affordable home at 30% of AMI would be \$82,500; 31% to 50% of AMI would be a home priced at \$145,000; and 51% to 80% of AMI would be a price range at \$235,000. The Metropolitan Council forecasts a growth in Shoreview of approximately 1,700 households from 2010 to 2030.

City policies in the Comp Plan for housing:

- Maintain quality of life in neighborhoods
- Strive for livable mixed income community
- Provide new housing opportunities
- Enhance access to housing for local workforce
- Partner with other organizations to maintain active role in affordable and mixed income housing.

Chapter 10 - Parks and Open Space

Issues in this Chapter identify the facts that demographics are changing and the possible need for different facilities and programs; the fact of aging park improvements that need reinvestment; the limited amount of land available for expansion; and that Ramsey County owns and maintains several parks and open space areas in the City.

Policy direction to address these issues:

- Enhancements to ensure park system meets needs of all residents
- Explore potential parkland acquisition to improve park system
- Continue and foster partnerships with organizations that add to the quality of the park system

Chapter 11 - Natural Resources and Resiliency

Issues in Chapter 11 are identified as protection of the urban forest from pests and diseases; recognizing impacts of development on the natural environment; conservation of natural resources; and recognizing the impacts of global warming.

Policies to address these issues:

- Support initiatives to conserve water supply
- Protect and replace plant species with diversified plants to address tree diseases/pests
- Enhance energy conservation efforts and sustainable practices for City operations and land development

Information for this public hearing was published October 10, 2018, and posted on the City website. Notices were mailed to those who participated in the process by submitting comments or signed petitions. Appendix IV has the comments received throughout the process. Staff is recommending the Commission hold the public hearing, make recommendations and continue the hearing to November 27th.

Commissioner Riechers asked if public comment is expected during the continuation of the public hearing. Ms. Castle stated that if there is further public comment, it will be presented at

the November meeting. It is important to allow public comment into the process as much as possible.

Commissioner Anderson noted that in the discussion of PDA #16, it is not noted that PDA #16 is currently zoned C1, Commercial. Ms. Castle explained that zoning is different from land use. The land use is INST, Institutional. The zoning is C1.

Chair Doan asked for clarification on the no net policy with Ramsey County. Ms. Castle stated that it applies to parks and open spaces. If the County is looking at disposing of land within the county park system, there is a no net loss policy that means if 10 acres are sold, another 10 acres needs to be found to replace what is sold. That policy is part of the County Charter. Notification to the municipality and property owners within 1000 must be made and a public hearing held before action can be taken to sell the property.

Chair Doan expressed great appreciation to staff for all their hard work and to residents who have participated and contributed to the process.

City Attorney Kelly stated that proper notice has been given for the public hearing.

Chair Doan opened the public hearing for Destination Shoreview 2040 for comments on all Chapters with the exception of Chapter 4, Land Use, comments of which will be taken separately.

Mr. Jeff Oldenauer, 4747 Hodgson, stated that in 2010, there were just over 10,000 households; Due to high density development, he questioned the number of households would only increase by 300 from 11,800 projected in 2020 to 12,100 in 2040. Ms. Castle explained that a number of housing developments have been recently approved. Based on the most recent development approved, the Metropolitan Council is projecting 12,100 households by 2040. **Mr. Oldenauer** stated that there are 19 PDAs and high density would add a high number of households. Ms. Castle stated that the Metropolitan Council takes into account the forecasted growth for the region and then applies that forecast to each community. It is not tied to the PDAs. As a community, the City needs to show it can meet the forecast of the Metropolitan Council.

Mr. Dave Roy, noted that the land at Gramsie and Hodgson is proposed for development. The traffic is terrible in that area. He asked how development can be proposed without addressing the roads and infrastructure around it.

Chair Doan explained that it would be impossible to answer all questions at this hearing. All comments and questions will be entered into the public record.

Chair Doan opened the hearing to public comment on Chapter 4, Land Use, PDA Nos. 1 through 5. There were no comments or public comment.

Chair Doan opened the public hearing for PDA #6, the Shoreview Commons residential area.

A resident from the corner of Dale and Highway 96, asked if homes will be taken away and change the density. Chair Doan explained that the Comprehensive Plan is a vision for the city to 2040. There is no intent to take anyone's home. There is no intent to use eminent domain for any reason.

Mr. Luke Bonawitz, 4053 Virginia Avenue, stated that it is shortsighted for residents to only focus on the PDA that might impact them without focus on the whole system. He asked if the Planning Commission took into consideration transportation and what is most suitable to get transportation for the proposed higher densities. Where he lives on Virginia Avenue it takes four hours on public transportation to reach Bethel University. How is the proposed density aligned with adequate transportation. Chair Doan stated that the Planning Commission takes seriously the intersection of land use and transportation. A few years ago there was an arterial study that looked at all the major corridors in the City, such as Highway 96, Hodgson, etc., and what is the most appropriate development in those areas that would be least impactful to neighborhoods. The McMillan at I-694 and Rice Street is at a location where there is a big transportation node. The same is true for the Shoreview Campus where the Loden is being built.

Mr. Bonawitz stated that he concurs with what is proposed at Gramsie and Hodgson.

Chair Doan opened the public hearing for PDA Nos. 7 through 10. There were no public comments or questions.

Chair Doan opened the public hearing to PDA #11, Gramsie, Hodgson, Rice Street.

Ms. Allison Rykken, 4025 Virginia Avenue, stated she is speaking on behalf of the neighborhood and read their statement which will be forwarded by email to the Commission for the record. Briefly, she stated it is a dream neighborhood both as parents and as individuals. The neighborhood has been meeting regularly since November 2017, when the land use designation for the property area was changed to high density and mixed use development. In May 2018, the property was clear cut to remove invasive species. The property is currently a black locust and buckthorn forest. Numerous residents adjacent to the property in Shoreview and Vadnais Heights have provided over 140 signatures raising their concern to remove high density designation on the property and restore low density development. In the 2040 proposal, high density is listed, but low density is not. The neighborhood is disappointed with the property owner and the response from the City. The neighborhood has had high turnover and all realized that the property at the end of Virginia Avenue would be developed at some point. At the time she and her husband purchased their property, the property at the end of Virginia Avenue was planned for medium density residential, 8 units per acre. Now high density is proposed, although capped at 15 units per acre instead of 17. And mixed use has been removed, for which the neighborhood is grateful. The neighborhood wonders why low density is not an option and why high density is needed. She requested consideration for property values, safety and quality of their neighborhood. Residents feel strongly that low density residential would impact these factors in a positive way. Building high end single family homes could increase property values, keep children safer, and would have the lowest impact on traffic and access to Hodgson. The neighborhood supports low density residential or office space. It is requested that high density

residential and medium density residential be removed from the plan and add low density residential.

Chair Doan opened the public hearing for PDA Nos. 12 through 15. There were no public comments or questions.

Chair Doan opened the public hearing for PDA #16, the YMCA/Island Lake Golf Course.

Mr. Merrill Morris, 1016 Island Lake Avenue, stated that he speaks for himself and for a group called Advocates for Island Lake. There are traffic concerns, especially with Arden Hills constructing Lexington Square with a new hotel and 500 more cars per day at the intersection of Red Fox Road and Lexington, which is already designated by Ramsey County Public Works as a “no capacity intersection.” The idea of further development behind Target and other businesses is a concern. There is also concern about the loss of the County park and potential loss of trails, pier and walking paths along the lake. Although the Comprehensive Plan expresses a preference to maintain a park area, residents are not convinced the City would be able to enforce that if it is sold to a developer. There is concern about the Island Lake and Milton Street neighborhoods that do not have sidewalks. If Milton Street were opened as proposed, it would create a danger for walkers from Deluxe, local schools and people who use the trails. This is a neighborhood with a lot of children. There is also concern about the YMCA. There are no plans to sell the property, but it is his understanding that if an offer too good to refuse were to come along, the property would be sold. The building is old, filled to capacity and no room to expand. The YMCA would like to have more use of the park space, but a good offer may lead them to look at another location. It may not happen in the next 2 or 5 years, but putting a land use designation of MU (Mixed Use) on the property is putting a “For Sale” sign on the property. It also impacts the County golf course. With another Comprehensive Plan in another ten years, there is time to further consider impacts of Mixed Use to this area, the YMCA and hold off on this designation.

Mr. Nick Thompson, 3446 Chatsworth Street North, stated that he and his wife were drawn to Shoreview because of the parks, trails, lakes, Community Center, YMCA. He is disappointed that the Metropolitan Council and City would try to change the land use designation that would change those amenities. This vision is not one he is interested in. This Plan does not represent the social values that he and others would like to see for Shoreview.

Ms. Robin Meyer Thompson, 3446 Chatsworth Street North, stated that the trails, the YMCA and open spaces are very important to her. She would oppose the change to a Mixed Use designation. She would also oppose the “no net loss” policy. Although other acreage may be designated for parkland, it likely would not be within walking distance for her and her husband.

Mr. Mark Connick, 996 Island Lake Avenue, stated his concern is about extending Milton Street and the increased traffic that it will bring to Island Lake. His children go up the street to see their grandmother. He is a biker and fully intends to use the existing trail in 2040. He requested no designation of Mixed Use, that it remain park. He fully supports the comments presented before him.

Mr. Steve Olson, 3680 Milton Street North, asked if the “not net loss” policy of Ramsey County means that if the golf course were developed, the new parkland would be kept in Shoreview. Also, Lexington traffic is becoming heavier and heavier all the time.

Chair Doan asked for any further comments on the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Kent Bergh, 259 Hanska Ct, stated that it appears society is at a real transportation shift with electric vehicles. He asked if development has been sufficiently thought through where development will be how it will be when everyone wants to be instantly connected to the internet and those with enough money or government can bring things down. When the electric grid goes down, has Shoreview thought about some type of self-generated power to keep things running.

Mr. Blake Ryan, 534 Tomlyn Avenue, asked the ramifications if the City does not meet the guidelines set by the Metropolitan Council. He and his wife grew up in Shoreview and knew they wanted to live in the City because it is largely single family homes and not so many apartment buildings. A year after purchasing their home, they were unhappy to learn that the property behind them might be rezoned for a high density development. His question is what are the ramifications of this decision.

Ms. Ann Thomas, 688 Highway 96, asked how residents will know the Commission’s and City’s responses to what has been said at this public hearing. Chair Doan stated that as the public hearing will be open until November 27, public comments will continue to be taken. There will be a Commission discussion at this meeting. If needed, a Commission workshop meeting can be held. It is important to get it right, and if there are lingering issues, the City can request an extension of the December 31st deadline. Ms. Castle stated that any changes recommended by the Planning Commission will be posted online.

Chair Doan added that neighboring cities have reviewed the Plan and provided comments. There is a process to make sure everyone’s voice is heard. The City Council will also hold a public hearing and make the final decision.

Mr. Charlie Altman, 5282 West Beach Court, expressed his appreciation to Ms. Castle for holding all the open forums and the tremendous amount of work it has taken for this process.

Mr. Bonawitz asked if the City ends up with more units than projected by 2040. In the 2008 Plan, did the City surpass the number of units for housing? If housing does not meet projected housing goals, what happens with a closed school district?

Chair Doan continued the public hearing to November 27, 2018. Public comment can continue to be taken during this period.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Yarusso stated that the reason to put high density development at Gramsie and Hodgson is because that is one of the few corridors in Shoreview where there is a bus, although

it is only once an hour. Where existing transit is currently is part of the decision. Putting a PDA on the map does not mean there are plans in the works. The PDA responds to a “what if” scenario. An example would be the Shoreview towers. There is no thought that the towers would be abandoned, but technology is changing and the towers might go away. The Island Lake Golf Course depends on action by Ramsey County. There are no legal consequences if the density target is not reached. However, there will be no transit development without achieving the density target. Transit decisions are based on density to serve the most people. One of the few opportunities the City has to increase affordable housing units in the City is when working with a developer on medium or high density development. Affordable housing is needed to bring people to work at the retail services residents want. The PDAs are an opportunity for the City to be able to influence the type of development that occurs rather than just zoning. Without a PDA, a developer who meets zoning criteria could build the development.

Commissioner Solomonson thanked everyone who has participated in this process. He was surprised to hear that the YMCA in West St. Paul is being sold. Also, there are a number of golf courses being sold. The PDA allows the City to be proactive and protect the neighborhood to the south when development occurs. There have been corridor highway studies. The discussion of density in PDA #11 makes it difficult to envision what would be developed and whether high density would be appropriate. High density should be next to busy streets.

PDA #11

Commissioner Peterson stated he does not recall why there is not an option for low density in PDA #11. There would be more options if low, medium and high density were all options. The cap of 15 units per acre would make it less dense than Shoreview Estates. Adding low density would add more flexibility. If there is no vision, the YMCA could sell to anyone rather than complying with the City’s preference. He would not want to do anything to encourage the sale of the YMCA. In PDA #16 he would want it to be clear that only medium or low density would be allowed behind the YMCA. Also, there should be clarification on the park and access to the trail on the eastern portion.

Commissioner Anderson asked the schedule for Hodgson Road improvements. Castle stated that it is scheduled in 2021, but there are no design plans at this time. Commissioner Yarusso added that the County has identified the need for Hodgson Road improvements, but there is no money available. It cannot be predicted when funding will be available.

Commissioner Riechers agreed with Commissioner Peterson on the idea of adding low density to PDA #11. In looking at PDA 11 and 16, language has been added to the draft plan to protect lower density neighborhoods from added traffic. The higher density would bring more traffic. She would like to see the separation of high density from low density residential clarified in the plan for PDA #16.

Commissioner Wolfe agreed with the comments of other commissioners. He expressed appreciation to those who spoke for their ideas. He would be interested in seeing low density as an option for Gramsie. He thanked everyone for their views.

Chair Doan stated that in PDA #11 he would be open to adding low density. Density does not necessarily define height. It depends on design and placement on a parcel. When the Commission deliberated The McMillan, the developer was asked to move the footprint and orient the high density apartment building toward the highway. Regarding the “no net loss” policy of Ramsey County, it is his understanding that there is no requirement that the lost parkland would be replaced within the City. He stressed the role of the County. The City in this process is trying to guide what could happen there. There needs to be guidance for land use because there is no guarantee on market development. What is being done in PDA #16 is prudent. It is not a “For Sale” sign that would generate interest in the site. He asked about coordination with the school district on this plan. Ms. Castle stated that the school district received the plan and for comment, but no comments have been received.

Chair Doan noted that it is very difficult to predict the future in terms of transportation, but increased use of electrical vehicles or vehicles that can just be called at will may become a reality. Mobility of service is a new offer that will be coming and people will be buying a transportation subscription like any other service rather than having the asset of having car. He anticipates that by 2040, human driven cars will be prohibited in certain areas because people are too dangerous. For now, the present document forms a well developed, well engaged and well informed that represents the values of the community and will lead to good things in the future.

Commissioners noted corrections to the plan: the number of households do not agree in Chapters 3 and 7; PDA #16 needs to be changed in the Plan to reflect density in the western portion. PDA #11, add low density.

Commissioner Yarusso asked if adding low density means the entire property could be developed as low density, or there could be a blend of density and establish a target as part of a transition. Any number higher than 4 would need a mixture.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that the easiest thing would be to just add low density as an option. Commissioner Yarusso suggested that low density not be oriented toward Hodgson because a single family home would require a driveway.

Commissioner Riechers stated that regardless of density, access will be needed. Her concern with high density is traffic in the neighborhood. She would support medium density with language on each level of density as to how traffic would be managed.

Commissioner Yarusso responded that a common driveway for high density is more manageable than a driveway for each single family residence. Added language is needed so a property is not purchased and the City not able to influence how development occurs. Ms. Castle stated that if low density were developed, the City would look for a network of interior roads.

Chair Doan stated that to attract and maintain transit density is needed. The higher density use is already there for PDA #11. It would be prudent to add low density with a floor, such as 5 so it is not just straight low density. He noted that high density at 15 units per acre would be 90 units on the six acres that would generate approximately 450 trips per day. Hodgson alone generates over 11,000 trips per day. High density will not overflow or saturate Hodgson or Gramsie with

traffic. It is a bit of a misconception about what traffic high density generates. The increase on this site would be marginal. Low density makes sense but with an allowance above 4 units per acre.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that a floor of 5 is higher than the maximum 4 units per acre of low density. He would prefer to just state low density. His question is whether to keep high density with the cap of 15.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he would prefer medium density in PDA #11 with no cap. If high density is allowed, guidelines are needed on how density will be spread across the site.

Commissioner Peterson agreed with adding the low density designation to PDA #11 but with no specification of the number of units. There already is language in the plan regarding management of traffic.

Ms. Castle summarized that the Commission agrees low density should be added to PDA #11 with policies and guidelines regarding traffic and access. Staff will draft options on language for PDA #11.

PDA #16

Commissioner Riechers requested that high density not adjoin low density and that there be a transition between the two.

Commissioner Peterson suggested deleting the option for high density on the strip of land east of the YMCA and indicates low density. The second sentence in F. would be removed. Low density would also be designated for the golf course property. There is no reference to an option if the YMCA were removed. High density would be better close to Lexington, if the YMCA closed.

Commissioner Solomonson requested language to address the church expansion.

MISCELLANEOUS

City Council Meetings

Commissioners Wolfe and Peterson to respectively attend the November 5th and November 19th meetings. Commissioner Wolfe requested being scheduled in a different month next year.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to adjourn the meeting at 10:12 p.m.

ATTEST:

Kathleen Castle, City Planner

**SHOREVIEW PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 27, 2018**

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Peterson called the November 27, 2018 Shoreview Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following Commissioners were present: Vice Chair Peterson; Commissioners Anderson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe and Yarusso.

Chair Doan arrived a few minutes late.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to approve the November 27, 2018 Planning Commission meeting agenda as submitted.

VOTE: **AYES:** **Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan**
 NAYS: **None**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of October 23, 2018 Commission Meeting Minutes

The following changes were made:

Pages 4 and 14: Correct spelling of Charlie Oltman

Page 15: Under PDA 11, line 4, strike the word "to."

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Yarusso to approve the October 23, 2018 Planning Commission meeting minutes as amended.

VOTE: **AYES:** **Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan**
 NAYS: **None**

REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

City Planner Castle reported that the City Council approved the Site and Building Plan for the growing dome at Oak Hill Montessori School, as recommended by the Planning Commission at the November 5, 2018 City Council meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

STANDARD VARIANCE

FILE NO: 2710-18-30
APPLICANT: SANDRA MORGAN
LOCATION: 4895 CHURCHILL STREET

Presentation by Niki Hill, Economic and Development Planning Associate

The property is a corner lot on Churchill Street and Robinhood Place. The application is to locate a shed 10' x 16' in the side yard adjacent to the street. If the shed had to be moved to the rear yard, landscaping in the rear yard would have to be moved. The size of the shed totals 160 square feet. The applicant has already placed the shed north of the residence, which has triggered the variance application.

The property and surrounding properties are zoned R1, Detached Residential. Sheds of 200 square feet or less are permitted in a rear or side yard with a setback of 10 feet from the rear lot line and 5 feet from the side lot line.

The applicant states that the shed is placed in its current location due to the fact that there is no other space for it. There is landscaping on the north side that screens the shed.

Staff finds that practical difficulty is not present. The location is reasonable, but there are other locations in the yard which would comply with City Code. The existing landscaping is not a unique circumstance to prevent the shed from being located in the rear yard. Also, the landscaping does not sufficiently screen view of the shed. Granting this variance would change the character of the neighborhood. Other residents have expressed interest in locating sheds in similar locations. Staff is recommending denial of the application.

Notices were sent to property owners within 150 feet of the subject property. Three responses were received in support and two received against the application.

Commissioner Riechers asked to see where the shed could be located. Ms. Hill explained that on corner lots there are two front yards, that portion of yard that is on the two streets. There is room behind the garage for the shed.

Chair Doan asked other circumstances when the Commission has approved a structure in a front yard. City Attorney Kelly cautioned that each variance must be judged on its own set of circumstances. Prior decisions cannot be used to justify approval or denial of a variance. Ms. Hill added that she can think of only one instance when a structure was allowed in a front yard.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if the property owner could extend the garage from a two-car size to three cars. Ms. Hill responded that there would be enough room for such an expansion.

Mrs. Sandra Morgan, Applicant, stated that when the house was built, an error was made with the property line. The house is 10 feet further south, which allows sufficient setback for the shed from the street. The shed is for storage and is in a convenient location. The colors and shingles

of the shed match the home. If the shed has to be moved, plantings on the north side of the garage would have to be moved for lack of sunlight. If additional landscaping is needed for screening, that can be done.

Mr. Robert Morgan stated that the house should have been positioned in alignment with the neighboring home. He noted that the back yard has a slope approximately 15 feet from the house. From the house to the curb is approximately 45 feet. If the shed were moved to the back yard, it would take one-third of it, and there are plans to expand the back yard patio. The purpose of the shed is for storage of yard equipment to make room for a second vehicle in the garage.

Chair Doan opened the discussion to public comments. There were none.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that if the garage were expanded, it would be a different view from the street than an accessory structure. A third stall to the garage would be in compliance. It is difficult to find hardship when the shed could be placed in the back yard.

Commissioner Yarusso asked if the shed is in conformance with City standards other than the location. Ms. Hill answered, yes. Commissioner Yarusso stated that even though the shed was in its current location when the Morgans purchased the property, no one is allowed to place a shed next to a garage on the street side.

Commissioner Peterson stated the shed is attractive and well maintained and fits where a third stall for a garage would fit. However, since there is adequate space in the back yard for the shed, he believes the code should be enforced.

Commissioner Anderson stated that as a property owner of a corner lot, he sympathizes with the applicant. However, he agrees with staff to enforce code.

Commissioner Riechers asked if there is a time line to move the shed if required. Ms. Castle stated that a permit would be required with a permit review process. Commissioner Riechers noted the desire to keep plantings from Mrs. Morgan's parents who planted them. Ms. Castle stated she believes an alternate location could be found.

Mrs. Morgan stated that they did not know the shed was in a location that was not allowed. She was informed that the variance application had to be done before a building permit and asked if a building permit needs to be done at this time. Chair Doan explained that staff will help them through the process.

Commissioner Yarusso stated that the reason for a building permit is to find out that a project will meet Code and will not have to be changed or moved.

MOTION: by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Solomonson to deny the variance request, submitted by Sandra Morgan, 4895 Churchill Street, to locate a shed in the front yard of a corner lot

VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan
NAYS: None

OLD BUSINESS

COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PLAN*

FILE NO: 2706-18-26
APPLICANT: SHEPHERD OF THE HILLS LUTHERAN CHURCH
LOCATION: 3920 VICTORIA STREET NORTH

Presentation by Associate Planner Aaron Sedey

The property is developed with a church and zoned R1, Detached Residential. The existing monument sign has a manual message center. At the last meeting, the Commission was divided on the proposed size and proportion of the digital reader board with full color display. The applicant states that the amber color will be used until the City ordinance is reviewed and changed. The proportions of the sign have not changed. The deviations requested are: 1) sign area of 41.76 square feet; Code requires 40 square feet; and 2) reader board area of 29.6 square feet or 70.97%, which is above the 14.5 square feet or 35% allowed. Staff continues to be concerned about the proportion of the message center to the overall sign.

New notices were sent to property owners within 350 feet. No responses were received.

Commissioner Anderson clarified that the sign would have the capacity to be full color display, but only the amber color would be used until there is a change in Code.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if there would be an enforcement issue with the color amber as opposed to similar shades that may be brighter and if pixelation makes a sign brighter. Mr. Sedey answered that the Code has regulations for brightness but does not distinguish between amber and yellow and whether the pixelation will add to the brightness.

Commissioner Solomonson asked the City Attorney if, by allowing a full color display sign, it is an indication to the applicant that the Code will be changed. City Attorney Kelly responded that any change to the Code is possible, but there is well established law that the City cannot held liable by indicating there may be a change to Code if it does not happen. Although the Commission has discussed a change, it is not a promise or a foregone conclusion.

Ms. Miranda Oliver, Director of Operations, Shepherd of the Hills Lutheran Church, stated that technology allows selection of the print color on the sign display. A color as close to amber as possible will be chosen. The sign proposed has a clear viewing area from 15 feet. This means that 15 feet from the sign the dots will not be seen.

Commissioner Peterson asked how the sign would be impacted if the size were reduced to 40 square feet. **Ms. Oliver** stated that LED panel signs are made in 24-inch widths. A reduction would mean almost half the current size for the message portion.

Chair Doan opened the discussion to public comments. There were none.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he would prefer to see a larger message sign as proposed rather than an addition to the structure to make the whole sign more proportionate.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that his concern is light pollution and he would like to make sure the impact to the neighborhood is minimized. He would prefer to see the message display sign area at 20 square feet.

Commissioner Riechers asked if the background to the amber message would be black or white and if that would impact brightness. Ms. Hill responded that Code allows 0.3 foot-candles above ambient light as measured from a certain distance. Whether black or white, brightness would have to comply with the Code standard.

Commissioner Peterson supported the deviations because the existing sign base is being used that is consistent with the building. The deviation is less than 5%, and being located on busy Victoria Street gives justification for the deviation.

MOTION: by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Wolfe to recommend the City Council approve the Comprehensive Sign Plan Amendment submitted by Shepherd of the Hills Lutheran Church, with an amendment to No. 3., Condition f. changing the end of the first sentence to “services of the church,” and subject to the following conditions:

1. The sign shall comply with the plans submitted for the Comprehensive Sign Plan application. Any significant change will require review by the Planning Commission and City Council.
2. The applicant shall obtain a sign permit prior to the installation of any signs on the property.
3. The message center sign shall:
 - a. Display text shall be use a minimum 6-inch character height to be readable by passing motorists without distraction.
 - b. Messages shall be displayed in their entirety to allow passing motorists to read the entire copy.
 - c. Messages shall not include telephone numbers, email addresses or internet urls.
 - d. Messages shall be displayed for a minimum of 8 seconds, and shall change instantaneously.
 - e. Messages be presented in a static display, and shall not scroll, flash, blink or fade.
 - f. Advertisement is limited to the goods and services offered at the church. Text shall be the dominant feature of the display.
 - g. The message center sign shall not be operated between the hours of 11:00 pm and 6:00 am.
 - h. Said sign shall comply with the City’s standards regarding brightness and dimmer control.
 - i. The sign message or display shall be amber in color as to reflect code.

Approval is based on the following findings:

1. *The plan proposes signs consistent in color, size and materials throughout the site. The retained brick of the sign compliments the natural colors of the church building. The sign design is intended to provide a modernized look while simplifying the sign graphic so the message is easily read.*
2. *Approving the deviation is necessary to relieve a practical difficulty existing on the property. The deviation is to exceed the maximum 40-square foot sign area permitted since the proposed sign has an area of 41.76 square feet. In Staff's opinion, the practical difficulty relates to the character of Victoria Street an arterial roadway, the sign location, and separation from adjoining residential land uses.*
3. *The proposed deviations from the standards of Section 208 result in a more unified sign package and greater aesthetic appeal between signs on the site. The existing brick base will be retained and the color complements the church building. The replacement of the readerboard with an electronic message center sign is intended to visually improve the look of the monument sign and improve advertising for church events and services.*
4. *Approving the deviation will not confer a special privilege on the applicant that would normally be denied under the Ordinance. The type of sign proposed is permitted on public/quasi public properties located in residential zoning districts. Staff does not believe the proposed deviation of overall sign size will provide the applicant with a special privilege.*
5. *The resulting sign plan is effective, functional, attractive and compatible with community standards. The proposed sign package is effective, functional and compatible with the quasi-public use. The intent of the sign is to provide a more efficient method of communicating special events and services offered by the church.*

Discussion: Commissioner Solomonson offered an amendment to add item j. under No. 3 that the message center portion sign size would not exceed 20 square feet. There was no second to the amendment. The motion was not so amended

VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Wolfe, Yarusso, Riechers, Doan
NAYS: Solomonson

STANDARD VARIANCE/SITE AND BUILDING PLAN REVIEW*

FILE NO: 2707-18-27
APPLICANT: WOLD ARCHITECTS
LOCATION: 1141 LEPAK COURT (TURTLE LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL)

Presentation by City Planner Kathleen Castle

The property consists of 12.94 acres and is developed with an elementary school. Access is from Lepak Court. The property is zoned R1, Single-Family Residential. Surrounding land uses

include INST, Institutional and R1. As residential standards are not applicable to the school which is a permitted use in the R1 District, office standards are used in considering this application.

The application includes:

1. Expand the school building with 4 small additions for 3 classrooms and a custodial room
2. Construct a new parking area north of the school with 55 stalls
3. Expand the storm water pond which would eliminate on recreational ball field

A variance request is to reduce the required 40-foot structure setback from the Lexington Avenue right-of-way to 7.9 feet for Addition C, which is a classroom building Addition D will maintain the existing setback from Lexington of 35.9 feet. All additions will be one story and compliment the existing building with brick, metal and glass.

Buses access the site from Lepak Court and exit onto Lexington Avenue. The parking lot to the south will be divided with the east portion modified with drive lanes for picking up and dropping off students. The west side of the parking area will have 28 stalls for parking. The parking required is 65 stalls; proposed is 126 stalls. The 10-foot setback from Lepak Court will remain.

Expansion of the storm water pond will be north of the proposed new parking area. It will capture runoff from the northern part of the building, including Addition C and the north parking areas. Storm water from the southern part of the building flows to the sewer system on Lepak Court. The storm water plan complies with Rice Creek Watershed District requirements. A permit is required. The City Engineer has reviewed the plans and finds them consistent with required standards.

The applicant states that the variance is due to the existing site improvements and lot configuration. The classroom additions will distribute students evenly among grades and work with internal circulation, as well as with existing parking and driveway areas.

Property owners within 350 feet were notified. One phone call was received requesting clarification about the setback from Lexington. One written response opposes the proposal because of the reduced setback to Lexington, added noise, and that storm water ponding that will mean loss of recreation space.

Staff finds that the proposal is a reasonable use of property to address school needs. The expansion classrooms are near existing classrooms and designed to meet student needs. The Lexington Avenue right-of-way is extensive on the west side with a large boulevard next to the school. The character of the neighborhood will not be impacted because of the large boulevard and retention of vegetation in the right-of-way. Although the building would be 7.9 feet from the right-of-way, the distance from the building to the paved road surface is over 100 feet. The proposed improvements are consistent with the INST land use and development standards, except the requested variance setback from Lexington Avenue. Staff is recommending approval of the variance and forwarding the application to the City Council for approval.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if the County has considered vacating right-of-way. Ms. Castle stated that typically the County would not vacate right-of-way.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the school could put plantings in the boulevard. Ms. Castle answered that would have to be with permission of the County. It would be reasonable to ask the applicant to work with Ramsey County on additional plantings.

Commissioner Peterson asked if, because of the wetland and Lake Marsden, Lexington could ever be expanded. Ms. Castle stated the soil is poor, which is the reason for the expanded storm water pond. Infiltration is not an option. Whether Lexington could be expanded is a question for the County.

Commissioner Riechers asked if there are safety requirements with a pond on the school property. Ms. Castle responded the applicant is planning an 8-foot fence around the pond.

Mr. Paul Evakowsky, Wold Architects and Engineers, confirmed that the pond will be fenced and offered to answer any questions.

Commissioner Peterson noted the impact to outdoor recreational because of the pond and asked how that would be replaced in the community. **Mr. Evakowsky** responded that the school district believes that space is not critical to the education provided and is pleased to trade the recreational area for a safer environment in front of the school. He noted the softball field is not a regulation field, and there is another field.

Commissioner Yarusso asked about runoff that will drain into the pond. **Mr. Evakowsky** stated that the pond will bring the site up to current standards of Rice Creek Watershed District. Consideration was given to putting the pond in the right-of-way area, but Ramsey County did not show any interest. He added that he would contact the County about adding additional screening on the boulevard.

Commissioner Solomonson asked the depth of the pond. **Mr. Evakowsky** answered, 8 feet.

Chair Doan opens the discussion to public comment.

Mr. Ken Gaylor, 5560 Lexington, stated his house is directly across from Addition C of the application. He stated the play ground area must be on Ramsey County right-of-way because the fence extends to the bike trail. If Ramsey County took the right-of-way, there would be a big loss of playground space. This is a big school trying to expand in an area where there is not room to expand. An addition closer to the street does change the character of the neighborhood.

Mrs. Gaylor stated that as neighbors, they have concern about the school. They have to take extreme care in backing out of their driveway, not just because of cars but because of children and pedestrians. It is one of the largest schools in the state. The playground is usually crowded. It may appear as a small expansion, but it definitely changes the neighborhood.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that the expansion is reasonable, but he would like to see the school petition Ramsey County to vacate some right-of-way. If the setback is 7 feet, the County would be able to build up to that 7-foot setback line.

Commissioner Yarusso stated that she most favors the parking changes and believes it will help alleviate the bus traffic issue.

Commissioner Peterson stated he supports the application but would request that additional vegetation be added to the motion. The safety and size improvements are very much needed.

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Yarusso to adopt Resolution No. 18-80 approving the setback variance for Building Additions “C” and “D” and recommend the City Council approve the Site and Building Plan Review for the proposed improvements at Turtle Lake Elementary, 1141 Lepak Court. The approvals are subject to the following three conditions under variance and the addition of a fourth condition:

Variance

1. The structure setback from the Lexington Avenue right-of-way for Building Addition “C” is approved at 7.9 feet and for Building Addition “D” is approved at the current building setback of 35.9’.
2. Existing vegetation within the Lexington Avenue right-of-way shall be retained and not disturbed by these improvements.
3. The approval is subject to a 5 day appeal period.
4. The applicant is encouraged to work with Ramsey County to provide additional landscaping in the Lexington Avenue right-of-way on the east side of the school.

Site and Building Plan Review

1. The project must be completed in accordance with the submitted site and building plans. Any significant changes to these plans, as determined by the City Planner, will require review and approval by the Planning Commission and the City Council.
2. The approval will expire after one year a building permit has not been issued.
3. Obtain a Rice Creek Watershed District Permit and submit a copy to the City prior to the City prior to the issuance of a building or grading permit.
4. Any work in the Lexington Avenue right-of-way will require a permit from Ramsey County.
5. Approval of the final grading, drainage, utility, and erosion control plans by the Public Works Director, prior to the issuance of a building or grading permit for this project.
6. The applicant is required to enter into a Development and Erosion Control Agreement with the City. Said agreement shall be executed prior to the issuance of any permits for this project.
7. The Building Official is authorized to issue a building permit for the project, upon satisfaction of the conditions above.

VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan
NAYS: None

**PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION – 2040 DESTINATION SHOREVIEW
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

FILE NO: 2709-18-29
APPLICANT: CITY OF SHOREVIEW
LOCATION: CITY WIDE

Presentation by City Planner Kathleen Castle

Based on comments received at the last public hearing on October 23rd, revisions have been made to three of the Policy Development Areas (PDAs):

PDA 6 is located east of the Commons along Highway 96 and Dale Street. One change was made in policy B1 where the word “eastern” was changed to “western.”

PDA 11 is Gramsie/Hodgson and Rice Street. Three options are presented. In Options 1 and 2, the reference should be Virginia Street, not Vivian. Policy A confirms that a church is an appropriate use. Policy D addresses the change in grade elevation, the impact development would have on drainage and utilities due to topography and that significant changes to topography may not be supported.

On the west side of Hodgson Road, the RL (low density residential) designation was added to RM (medium density residential), RH (high density residential) and O (Office). Policy B was added to require a landscaped buffer from medium or high density residential or office uses for the low density residential. Policies J and K address access for low density residential use with the requirement of interior residential streets and that access not be from Gramsie or Hodgson.

Option 2 replaces RH with RL. Land uses allowed under Option 2 would be RM, RL and O. Policies B and F address site and building design and buffering to reduce impacts on low density uses. Policies J and K address access to low density through an interior public street system.

Option 3 is the original language with RM, RH and O uses.

PDA 16 has an added Option 2. Option 1, Policy F addresses low and medium density residential uses. There was consensus among Commissioners to only allow low density residential adjacent to single-family homes.

Option 2, Policy A excludes industrial use from mixed use. Policy G adds language to address the area immediately north of the existing low density residential. RLand RM would be permitted. Should the YMCA ever move or change, a mixture of uses would be permitted on that site, including RM, RH, Commercial and Office.

Policy H addresses uses adjacent to low density residential. If medium density would be appropriate, structures would not be permitted to exceed two stories in height with no more than 4 units per building. A buffer would have to be provided.

Policy I refers to the expanded width of the trail along County Road I and changes “should be replaced” with shall be replaced.”

Chair Doan opened the continuation of the public hearing for general comments not related to any specific PDA. There were no comments.

The public hearing was opened to further comments on PDA No. 6. There were no comments.

The public hearing was opened to further comments on PDA No. 11.

Ms. Allison Rykken, 4025 Virginia, referred to a letter from her neighborhood. Thank you to the Planning Commission and Staff for the many opportunities for input. The options provided show that they have been heard. The neighborhood would prefer Option 2, adding RL and retaining RM and O. She highlighted neighborhood concerns for a use other than low density residential that include: 1) frequent traffic accidents at the intersection of Rice Street, Hodgson and Gramsie; 2) lack of turn lanes from Hodgson to Demar Avenue; 3) lack of sidewalks and trails along Rice Street and Hodgson Road; 4) congestion on Rice Street and Hodgson; 5) continuous flooding at the corner of Virginia and Hodgson; 6) morning and afternoon bus stops that coincide with rush hour; 7) potential of non-residential traffic along Virginia Avenue and Hanska Court; 8) lack sidewalks along Demar Avenue, Virginia and Hanska Court; 9) recurrent flooding on Snail Lake Park trails. The rebuilding of Gramsie Road has not been tested in a rainy season and may still need modification. Any development would need to wait until Ramsey County rebuilds Hodgson Road, which is not now scheduled until 2022.

Mr. Perry Hackett, 4071 Virginia, stated that when County Road F was made into a cul-de-sac, it transformed the neighborhood into a cohesive close neighborhood with young families that Shoreview values. However, when County Road F was closed off, only two egress points remain to Virginia. There are traffic concerns for anything other than low density. The neighborhood was created with the cul-de-sac on County Road F and now meets all City goals. After just a few years, higher density development would upset the remarkable outcome that was approved. The City has signatures from almost everyone in the neighborhood. He strongly urged staff and the Commission to listen to these concerns.

Mr. Tom Schutte, Tyme Properties, LLC, stated that his company manages the undeveloped property in this neighborhood for the family that has owned since the neighborhood was platted. The vacant parcel was retained for possible future commercial or office development. He would favor the high density recommendation based on the staff report that redevelopment is supported by the intensity of adjoining land uses. High density is recommended because the cost of a viable project and proposed rents do not work with medium density. He would recommend a senior building of approximately 72 units.

Mr. Luke Bonawitz, 4053 Virginia, stated that he concurs with his neighbors' earlier statements. When he bikes, he does not go through the intersection at Gramsie because it is not safe. If high density were developed, pedestrians will want to go to the parks. The added number of people will take cars instead of walking because there are so few sidewalks. There is limited development potential because of the configuration of the roadways, which speaks to lesser density in the area.

The public hearing was opened to further comments on PDA 16:

Option 1

Mr. Rolph Oliver and Mrs. Oliver, 1024 Island Lake Avenue, stated that PDA 16 is very complicated. There is Arden Hills activity on the west side of Lexington. The congestion of Lexington is an issue with a railroad line on the south side with approximately 6 trains per day. There is a complicated intersection with I-694. This process is proceeding too fast and needs more conversation with Arden Hills. Ramsey County is planning a study on Lexington in June, which has now been extended to January 2020, and so will not be in time for this document. The intersection at Red Fox Road far exceeds its capacity and needs to be corrected. The YMCA is a revered institution and cannot easily be recycled. These are troubling factors because a vision is projected for people yet unborn.

A planning project needs to first focus on context. It is important to understand all the contextual opportunities. There is a new population emerging with the development at TCAAP and Rice Creek Commons. Shoreview has three main arteries with I-35W and I-35E on the west and east border and I-694 to the south. Highway 96 is a good commute connection from White Bear Lake to I-35W. Lexington is a key north/south access that will only become more congested. The land and traffic need to be integrated. The undeveloped area in the neighborhood is in a box with I-694 to the south, Highway 51 north, the railroad tracks to the west and Island Lake Avenue to the east. Lexington is the only egress. Arden Hills is adding 419 cars with their Lexington Station strip mall and big parking lot. Marriott is building a new hotel further down Red Fox Road and near the Arden Hills Clinic. That will be another 100 cars. They all have to come off Red Fox Road which is already over capacity. Another stop light is proposed at Target. That will mean between I-694 and County Road E there will be five stop lights, making a difficult situation. There is no way to easily access the golf course property. The hope is to maintain the existing land uses of INST Institutional and parkland.

PDA 16 is a circle of itself with a lake. It feels private. The golf course is very successful. Ramsey County does not want to sell land to Shoreview. He would like to see existing zoning maintained and no mixed use, commercial or warehousing. Mixed use would bring unintended consequences. He requested a continuation of consideration of PDA 16 and meetings with representatives from Arden Hills and Ramsey County. What will be decided will be forever, and it needs to be done right.

Ms. Mary Lou Klinkhammer, 1015 Island Lake Avenue, stated she has lived on Island Avenue for 63 years. Of the 51 families on the street, 12 have parents who grew up in the neighborhood and 4 have lived in other homes on the street. It is unique, supportive neighborhood that does not want to be overrun by development. The neighborhood has been involved with this process

since April 2018, and has met with officials from the YMCA, Ramsey County and the City. Appendix 4 shows that 100 people support the YMCA and parkland and requesting that mixed use be dropped from PDA 16. The only changes have been small tweaks in language. If this document is accepted and forwarded to the City Council, it is important that the neighborhood be protected. It is requested that the document clearly state intentions for future Shoreview leaders, developers and governmental agencies. She submitted copies of the PDA policy statements from the November 14, 2018 document with revised language and her highlighted comments.

Ms. Klinkhammer requested the following policies be clarified:

Policy A, the east part of County golf course property to be preserved needs to be identified specifically, whether it includes the existing trail, fishing pier, boat launch and parking lot. The language needs to be less ambiguous and open to interpretation.

Policy C and D refer to the access off Red Fox Road and the south access Target Road. Both Milton and Island Lake are dead end streets that provide a place for pedestrians and bikers. It would make sense for the south access Target Road and Red Fox Road be the access point for the development area. Milton Street should not be opened to any development, although it is stated it would only open to low density residential. The question is how long would that last?

Policy E conflicts with Policy F. Will the existing residential land uses be screened by landscape and buffering, or will low density housing be developed adjacent to the existing residential use. It cannot be both.

Policy F refers to the land use adjoining the existing homes on Island Lake. The desired land use is low density residential. However, the next leaders may think otherwise and be able to change the development to mixed use because the mixed use designation is allowed. She does not understand the reference to medium density, when a number of Commissioners expressed support for low density at the October 23, 2018 public hearing. She asked how the YMCA property came to be designated for Office or Commercial. The golf course has been built up far above the existing elevation. In order to have a flat driving range, the course was built up two stories above existing homes. If medium density three-story town homes were allowed, such as in the McMillan development, the new units could be 4 to 5 levels above the existing homes. She believes the only option for development that adjoins existing back yards is low density.

Policy G refers to a trail that continues from Victoria to the north end of Island Lake, the parking lot, the boat launch, fishing pier, through the woods and to Milton Street. There is a conflict between the words “shall address” and “should be explored.” In Appendix 4, 31 people supported the trail. Stronger language is needed.

Policy H is supported regarding wetlands and Island Lake. There are nine wetlands on the golf course property and two on the YMCA property. She is pleased to see the language that supports maintaining these wetlands.

The neighborhood supports Institutional and Park use. The focus on this PDA is residential use. While not a first choice, but with restrictions, low, medium and high density may be doable.

Mixed use is unacceptable because of traffic, limited access, negative impact on wetlands and Island Lake, and survey results.

Ms. Kari Connick, 996 Island Lake Avenue, stated that PDA 16 champions business development without adequately protecting existing neighborhoods. The quiet street and trail around the lake provide safe exercise for children and adults. The woods provide an appreciation for nature and wildlife. Altering the land use to mixed use for the YMCA property and golf course would irreparably harm the Island Lake area. The vision of Destination Shoreview Plan indicates the City strives to be an environmental steward and quoted, "Shoreview takes great pride in the lakes, woods and wetlands that provide healthy wildlife habitat, recreational locations, scenic retreats and long-term community resiliency. The community is a leader in improving water and air quality, ecosystem, biodiversity and open space preservation." Why is the City opening parkland to development by changing the land use to mixed use? The Destination 2040 draft chapter states, "parks and open space are a key asset to the community and contribute to the quality of life residents experience." The parks and open space system is a result of proactive planning by the City, County and Metropolitan Council. Both the 2015 Shoreview quality of life and the subsequent destination Shoreview surveys reveal that the park recreation system is a favorite of community enjoyment. Residents express a strong preference to maintain the parks and open spaces. There is a desire to minimize development on the local natural environment. Residents identify neighborhood preservation as optimums rather than overdevelopment. The recommendations in PDA 16 are problematic and in direct conflict with the stated desires of the residents of Shoreview. The City received over 100 responses, including letters from Ramsey County expressing alarm for mixed use. No counter arguments have been provided to justify placing PDA 16 in mixed use.

The Commission is strongly urged to listen to constituents and demonstrate the value of neighborhood opinion. Only by removing mixed use can quality of life be maintained for future generations.

Chair Doan opened the public hearing for comments on either Options 1 or 2 for PDA 16.

Ms. Mary Lou Klinkhammer stated that in Option 2, Policy A, mixed use would be allowed industrial use would not.

Policy G allows low or medium density with not much change to protect the neighborhood.

Policy H is written as though development will be medium density rather than stating it as an option and no mention of low density. Under No. 1 the specifications of a 4-plex building would mean that because of the elevation, residents would be looking at a 4-story building adjoining back yards. To stated that increased setbacks for parking, reduced height and enhanced landscaping will constitute a buffer means residents could be looking at parking lots. Stronger language was added that the trail "shall be..." is the only stronger language that she sees for the neighborhood.

Chair Doan thanked everyone for their comments that the Commission will take seriously.

City Attorney Kelly stated that if the Commission deems that it has received all public comment, it would be appropriate to close the public hearing. Ms. Castle stated that all comments have been received. An extension of the public hearing has not been requested.

MOTION: by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Solomonson to close the public hearing at 9:09 p.m.

VOTE:

AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan

NAYS: None

Commission Discussion

PDA 6:

It was the consensus of the Commission to accept PDA 6 with the word change from “eastern” to “western” in item B1.

PDA 11:

Commissioner Solomonson stated that he favors Option 2. He noted that a prominent request on the Community Survey is the opportunity for affordable housing. The property is unique with an uncertain design of roadway. Removal of RH makes sense which is why he would favor Option 2.

Commissioner Peterson noted that the first six items listed by neighbors in their comments relate to the long-term delay for improvements on Hodgson Road. High density should not occur until Hodgson Road is improved. The Comprehensive Plan is reviewed every 10 years and can be reviewed more frequently. He would like to wait for Hodgson Road to be improved before high density is allowed and would support Option 2.

Commissioner Anderson stated that because of the access issues and not knowing what an improved Hodgson Road might entail, he would support Option 2.

Commissioner Riechers stated that she has concerns about Virginia Avenue and the traffic flow and would favor capping development at medium density. Although she would like to find options for affordable housing, the road limitations leads her to believe Option 2 would be the best choice.

Commissioner Yarusso clarified that affordable housing is not the federal definition of subsidized housing. It means that units are offered at more affordable rates than are typically found in Shoreview. Medium density provides more options to direct the traffic flow than the need to put streets in for single family homes. There would be more leverage to address traffic. She does not share the aversion of single-family homes bordering medium density homes. There is a medium density development between her neighborhood and Highway 96 which provides a transition from the highway to single family homes. It is not possible for every single family home to have only single family homes next to it, unless there is a lot of vacant land. Housing options are desirable. She would not be averse to high density but could support Options 1 or 2.

She very much prefers Option 2 over Option 3 because this is a good place for a little higher density because it would be close to transit and some commercial development.

Commissioner Wolfe agreed that Option 2 is the best.

Chair Doan stated that it is a question of where are the locations that can be used for different housing options? He would like to see more options for seniors as well as for younger families who cannot afford the single family starter home at \$300,000 to \$400,000 in Shoreview. This PDA has good access to Hodgson which has transit. It makes sense to have higher density. The developments to the north and south of this area have 17 units per acre. It is important to not shy away from density to gain diversity of housing options. There is an acreage owned by one owner that could be developed. Some level of high density is warranted.

Commissioner Peterson stated that he would be more supportive of higher density if Ramsey County would accept access from Gramsie Road.

Ms. Castle noted that under Options 1 and 2, Policy A states that primary access from Gramsie Road is preferred, and Virginia Avenue is not the desired access. Policy C states that traffic impacts have to be determined and not have an adverse impact to adjoining single family residential neighborhood.

Commissioner Solomonson stated it is concerning to try to design development without knowing what will happen to Hodgson and without a development to review. The wording should give guidance without trying to design specifics.

Ms. Castle noted that if Option 2 is the favored option, it does not preclude a developer from applying to the City to rezone to high density through the Comprehensive Plan review process.

Chair Doan called for a straw poll of preferred options for PDA 11:

Anderson: Option 2
Peterson: Option 2
Yarusso: Options 1 or 2
Doan: Option 1
Wolfe: Option 2
Riechers: Option 2
Solomonson: Option 2

The overall consensus is to adopt Option 2.

PDA 16

Chair Doan stated that the main issues are opposition to mixed use and buffer areas to single family homes.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that throughout the City an effort is made to have good transitions. In this area, there is a golf course, commercial with Target, Institutional with the YMCA. His goal has always been to protect the neighborhood to the south and maintain the trail next to the lake. Option 2 excludes industrial. It could be tweaked to address medium density and residential along the south side. He believes medium density is a transition to Target to the north. Industrial and mixed use should not be allowed. He would favor Option 2 with low density and medium density adjacent to the south. In reference to Policy H, low density should clarify that low or medium density would be allowed.

Commissioner Yarusso noted a comment about the height of the golf course. The language to restrict development to 2 stories in height is sufficient because if it were restricted to low density, those buildings could be 2 stories. A home of \$600,000 or \$700,000 is as big as small townhome structures. It is important to realize that that 2-story townhomes are not necessarily more imposing than a single family home in the same space.

Commissioner Peterson stated that putting something in the Comprehensive Plan does not mean there will be change anytime soon. He noted the PDA for the tower property that has been in the Comprehensive Plan for 30 years. The manufactured home community has been in the Comprehensive Plan for close to 30 years. It looks like the County does not want to change the use of the golf course, nor does the YMCA anticipate a change. Putting in other uses in the Comprehensive Plan recognizes potential, but it may be 10 or 20 years before there is a change. He would support Option 2 with the trail being preserved. It will be the County who decides what will be sold and what parkland will be kept, and there are many years before that happens.

Commissioner Yarusso noted that development that would bring in hundreds of cars per day might not be too scary since the YMCA daily brings in many cars.

Commissioner Anderson stated that the YMCA is currently zoned Commercial, which could be developed as such tomorrow. The park is zoned R1, which could be developed with single-family homes. His concern is a buffer of protection for the neighborhood. Milton Street should not be opened. He would favor Option 2.

Chair Doan stated that he would add low or medium density residential at the end of the first line in Policy H to capture the possibility for both.

Commissioner Yarusso stated that the language could be added in the opening statement and not in No. 1. Chair Doan agreed.

Commissioner Riechers stated that she understands the fear residents are feeling not knowing what might come from Comp Plan changes. It is a balance of identifying uses without putting too many restrictions on options for a developer. She is not ready to support one option or another. She is happy to see industrial uses not allowed but is still concerned about what mixed use does allow. If mixed use is allowed, there should be further limitations.

Commissioner Yarusso stated that the City is limited in saying what can happen. Everything is subject to change and possible future amendment. One thing is that the Plan need to be fair for

existing landowners, an important charge for the Planning Commission. It is a tight rope. It is not possible to say the property will sit vacant if the YMCA is taken down because the City would be taking value away from the property owner.

Chair Doan called a 5-minute break for the tape to be changed at 10:00 p.m.

Chair Doan reconvened the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

Commissioner Wolfe asked the reason for mixed use and suggested medium density or low density. He has seen residential adjacent to Target in other communities. He asked if mixed use opens up possibilities or if it helps the future potential for protecting neighbors.

Commissioner Yarusso responded that with frontage on Lexington, it would not be compatible to put single family homes along Lexington with driveways and more streets. Without mixed use, the City would have to decide how to divide the land for separate zoning classifications.

Allowing mixed use allows the City to consider different types of development brought forward through the planning and review process.

Chair Doan added that there is also frontage to I-694. Mixed use would provide a buffer on the back side of Target which is loading docks. He stated that he does not want to see the YMCA or golf course go, but the Planning Commission would be shirking its responsibility to not include this PDA in the Comprehensive Plan. He requested a straw poll of Commissioners on options for PDA 16.

Solomonson: Option 2 because it excludes industrial, and he would like to see Policy H strengthened. Mixed use makes sense to protect property to the south. It is all about transition from residential to a non-residential use.

Riechers: Appreciates low or medium density included in Policy H but still has concerns about mixed use near residential properties.

Wolfe: Also concerned about mixed use and would prefer not to have it. If he has to choose an option, it would be Option 2.

Doan: Option 2 with added low density and prohibition of industrial use.

Yarusso: Option 2

Peterson: Option 2

Anderson: Option 2

Commissioner Peterson stated that there is so much in the Comprehensive Plan other than the three PDAs discussed. He expressed his appreciation to staff for all the work that has been done to put it together.

Commissioner Yarusso acknowledged all the citizen input and participation through public hearings, focus groups. It is part of what makes Shoreview great.

Chair Doan thanked everyone who has participated through the whole process. The involvement is why everyone loves Shoreview. It is not just the schools and amenities but our neighbors. Even with heated issues, the process has been carried out in a very civil manner. He thanked staff for clarifying, modifying, listening and making every effort to have the Plan respond to the issues brought forward.

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to recommend the City Council approve Shoreview’s Comprehensive Plan, Destination Shoreview 2040 - Comprehensive Plan subject to the following changes: PDA # 11- Option 2 removing RH and adding RL; and PDA #16 – Option 2 amending Policy H to add low density residential use.

Discussion:

Commissioner Anderson noted the word change in PDA #6 from eastern to western in B1. Commissioner Solomonson accepted that as an amendment.

VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Wolfe, Yarusso, Doan
NAYS: None

MISCELLANEOUS

City Council Meeting Assignments

Commissioners Anderson and Riechers will respectively attend the December 3rd and December 17th City council meetings.

Planning Commission Chair/Vice Chair Appointments for 2019

Anyone interested in serving as Chair or Vice Chair should notify staff. Appointments will be made by the City Council.

2019 City Council Assignments

A calendar of dates and assignments for Commissioners was provided. Ms. Castle asked Commissioners to check the dates.

Commissioner Peterson noted the Planning Commission meets the 5th Tuesday in January, when he plans to be out of town.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Wolfe to adjourn the meeting at 10:33 p.m.**ATTEST:**

Kathleen Castle
City Planner