



**City of Newport
Planning Commission Minutes
September 8, 2011**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson McElwee-Stevens called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL -

Commissioners present – Katy McElwee-Stevens, Susan Lindoo, Janice Anderson, David Engfer, Daniel Flood

Commissioners absent – None

Also present – Brian Anderson, City Administrator; Renee Helm, Executive Analyst; Tom Ingemann, Council Liaison; Sherri Buss, TKDA Planner;

3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

A. Planning Commission Minutes of June 9, 2011

Janice Anderson – I have a couple items regarding the June 9, 2011 minutes. On page 5 of the minutes it states that Ed Schwartz said “They say it will block my view, but it will block my view, you know.” Is that what he said? It sounds a bit confusing.

Executive Analyst Helm – That is what Mr. Schwartz said at the meeting.

Janice Anderson – In the last paragraph on page 5, “the” appears twice in the third sentence. I believe the first “the” can be taken out.” Finally, on page 6 it states that Hay Dobbs gave their Station Area Planning presentation, wasn’t that the Developer’s Forum discussion? Please change it to “Hay Dobbs gave their presentation for the developer’s forum discussion.”

Motion by Anderson, seconded by Engfer, to adopt the June 9, 2011 minutes as amended. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.

B. Planning Commission Minutes of July 21, 2011

Janice Anderson – Please insert Katy McElwee-Stevens to the present list on the July 21, 2011 minutes.

Motion by Anderson, seconded by Engfer, to adopt the July 21, 2011 minutes as amended. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.

4. APPOINTMENTS WITH COMMISSION

A. **Public Hearing** – To consider an amendment to Chapter 8, Section 811, Building and Property Maintenance, and Chapter 1300, Section 1330, General District Regulations, of the City of Newport Code of Ordinances.

Admin. Anderson – This amendment is a follow-up to a request from a resident who requested that this be amended to exclude residents who reside on non-paved roadways from being required to pave their driveways at the time of sale.

David Engfer – When was the ordinance originally adopted?

Katy McElwee-Stevens – This was originally adopted in 2007 because when it rains the gravel goes into the sewer.

David Engfer – Was there a grandfathered position on it?

Katy McElwee-Stevens – Yes, the grandfathered position is that the driveways do not need to be paved until the property is sold.

David Engfer – Is the 40 feet from the garage or street?

Katy McElwee-Stevens – Street

David Engfer – The reason I ask is that I drove around this morning and counted several properties who have non-paved driveways.

Chairperson McElwee-Stevens opened the Public Hearing at 7:13 P.M.

Daniel Flood – I have a question between the two sections. Why are we making people who have a paved road pave the parking area when a non-paved road does not require it? This is different from the driveway.

Susan Lindoo – Is there a distinction between parking areas and driveways?

Sherri Buss – Section 1330.05 pertains to new development.

Susan Lindoo – I'm wondering if this is explicit enough. Was this what was meant?

Daniel Flood – I think the wording is off in regards to parking area and parking space. I would recommend that parking area be removed for residential properties.

Susan Lindoo – Can I request that this be reviewed by staff again to determine the definitions?

Sherri Buss – This also needs to coincide with engineering standards.

David Engfer – I think Dan brought up a good point as well in regards to outdoor parking spaces. We still might want some portion of the driveway paved for parking spaces so that vehicles don't leak chemicals into the soil. What do other communities do in regards to this?

Janice Anderson – The first paragraph in the resolution does identify what this is for.

Susan Lindoo – That was only added for the proposed amendment but it doesn't make sense from the original ordinance.

Sherri Buss - This item should be tabled for staff to review in regards to engineering standards, definitions and what areas should be paved.

Motion by Engfer, seconded by Flood, to table Resolution No. P.C. 2011-8. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.

B. **Public Hearing** – To consider an amendment to Chapter 1300, Section 1380, Signs, of the City of Newport Code of Ordinances.

The public hearing remained open to consider an amendment to Chapter 1300, General, and Chapter 1300, 1380, Signs, of the City of Newport Code of Ordinances.

Admin. Anderson and Sherri Buss presented on Resolution No. P.C. 2011-9 as outlined in the September 8, 2011 Planning Commission packet.

David Engfer – Do you see any risk that we may begin to look like the City of Las Vegas?

Sherri Buss – Well I believe this ordinance will prevent that from occurring due to the limitations.

Motion by Flood, seconded by Anderson, to approve Resolution No. P.C. 2011-9 recommending City Council approve a zoning amendment to Chapter 1300, Section 1380, Signs, of the City of Newport Code of Ordinances. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.

Chairperson McElwee-Stevens closed the Public Hearing at 7:41 P.M.

Susan Lindoo – This last ordinance and a public hearing in June has made me think that I would like to discuss the borders on two different zones and how do we not infringe on the right of those individuals/properties on each side of the zone. I think it would be beneficial for us to discuss this.

Sherri Buss – There are a couple items in the ordinance that prevents this already such as buffers. This is also addressed when you review site plans for development.

C. Discuss the future land use and zoning maps for the Red Rock Gateway site. At this time the video portion of the meeting was completed.

Sherri Buss presented on the future land use and zoning maps for the Red Rock Gateway site as outlined in the September 8, 2011 Planning Commission packet. The Planning Commission discussed several options for land use at the Red Rock Gateway site and is proposing that the City create three new districts: Mixed Use Transit-Oriented District, Mixed Use River-Oriented District, and a River District Overlay. The Planning Commission reviewed zoning approaches and districts that several other communities have used around new commuter rail stations, particularly communities along the North Star Commuter Rail corridor and the City of Saint Paul. The Commission also utilized information from the developer forum and market study completed for the Red Rock Gateway area to develop its proposed zoning for the area.

The Planning Commission's description and rationale for the new districts and overlay district include the following:

Proposed MX-T (Mixed Use Transit-Oriented) District

- The proposed MX-T District includes the Red Rock Station area and areas along Maxwell and 7th Avenue to the south (to 2nd Street, south of City Hall).
- The District would be a compact, pedestrian-oriented district, that permits the following uses:
 - Variety of multifamily residential uses near the transit station and in redeveloped areas along 7th Avenue, including townhomes, condominiums, co-ops and apartments
 - Variety of commercial uses, neighborhood and transit-oriented retail uses, services (dry-cleaners, barber shops, salons, etc.), financial services
 - Office uses, including general office, medical office, etc.
 - Hotels and conference centers
 - Fitness and recreation centers
 - Civic and semi-public uses such as the transit station, city hall, library, parks and trails
- The District would encourage a mixture of residential, commercial, office and civic uses in proximity to the commuter rail station at densities and intensities that support and increase transit use.
- The District would extend to the south along 7th Avenue to guide potential redevelopment in this area with the same uses as the area close to the commuter rail station.
- A strong connection should be developed to the new park along the river, to encourage potential redevelopment in that area.

Proposed MX-R (Mixed Use River-Oriented) District

The Planning Commission wants to take advantage of the proximity of the Mississippi River, and make a strong connection to it. They are proposing a new district to replace the southern

portion of the existing I-1 district (the area that is south of Newport Cold Storage, and north of the Holiday Tank Farm) that would emphasize a variety of river-oriented uses:

- Marina
- Residential uses, such as condos, co-ops and townhomes
- River-oriented retail and commercial uses
- Restaurant and entertainment
- Parks and trails

Proposed River District Overlay Zone

The Planning Commission understands that Newport Cold Storage and the Holiday tank farm may remain for the foreseeable future. However, they wanted a way to indicate that those properties could redevelop in the future with other uses that are “river-oriented” and compatible with the new MX-R zone.

The Commission is proposing a River District Overlay Zone that would allow the existing Industrial Use to remain. The Overlay Zone could require that if these areas are redeveloped in the future, the owners/developers would need to present a redevelopment plan for approval by the City that is compatible with the MX-R zone and standards.

This information will be presented to the City Council at its September 15, 2011 meeting.

5. COMMISSION AND STAFF REPORTS

No reports

6. NEW BUSINESS

No new business

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

City Council Meeting	September 15, 2011	5:30 pm
City Council Meeting	October 6, 2011	5:30 pm
Muster in the Park	September 23- 25, 2011	

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Flood, seconded by Engfer, to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting at 8:56 P.M. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.

Signed: _____
Katy McElwee-Stevens, Chairperson

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Helm
Executive Analyst