



**City of Newport
Planning Commission Minutes
December 8, 2016**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Mahmood called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present – Anthony Mahmood, Kevin Haley, Marvin Taylor (arrived at 5:33 p.m.), David Tweeten

Commissioners absent – Saengmany Ratsabout

Also present – Deb Hill, City Administrator, Renee Eisenbeisz, Asst. to the City Administrator, Sherri Buss, TKDA Planner,

3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

A. Planning Commission Minutes of the November 10, 2016 Meeting

Motion by Haley, seconded by Tweeten, to approve the November 10, 2016 Meeting Minutes. With 3 Ayes, 0 Nays, 2 Absent, motion carries.

4. APPOINTMENTS WITH COMMISSION

A. Public Hearing - To consider amendments to Section 1340, Section 1360 and Rezone

Sherri Buss, TKDA Planner, presented on this item as outlined in the December 8, 2016 Planning Commission packet. The 50 acres required for development is gross acres, not net.

The public hearing opened at 5:46 p.m.

Peter Knaeble, Proposed Developer - We've been working on the George Reiling parcel for a number of months. We've reviewed the staff report and think that they are satisfactory for what we're trying to do. We think our concepts would easily fit into those. I do have a couple questions for points of clarification. Can you please make sure that the definition of density is clear in the ordinance? If it's gross or net?

David Tweeten - Is that clear in Met Council?

Ms. Buss - Yes, they mean net. I'll look at our definitions and see if that's clear.

Mr. Knaeble - Also, this area has an overlay district, is that still here?

Ms. Buss - No, that would be gone.

Mr. Knaeble - I do have some suggestions, first, the front setback, we would suggest 25 feet instead of 30 feet.

Ms. Buss - That's doable. Also, for maximum lot coverage, we should have 40% for single-family dwellings and 50% for multi-family dwellings.

Mr. Knaeble - We would actually suggest 50% for single-family and 60% for multi-family.

Ms. Buss - That's fine.

Steve Sandell, 4639 Wild Canyon Trail, Woodbury - This is the first public hearing I've been made aware of. I do have concerns about our entire neighborhood. I hope I'm not being identified as a "not in my backyard" type of guy because I'm not. It sounds like these discussions have been going on some time. I'm concerned about the traffic and safety. I've lived here for 15 years and the traffic has increased dramatically. It seems to me that putting in that many people would consider further investments in roads, traffic control, and maintenance. Personal safety is also an issue with that traffic. Many of the driveways along Military Road are personal driveways and it takes five minutes to get out of them. Also, I have environmental concerns. The traffic would generate air pollution and there would be a ton of runoff from that development. There's significant wildlife in that area and it's diminished as well. Getting rid of that natural area tells me that you have no respect for the wildlife or natural area. I'm not sure how many people we're talking about, how many cars, etc. I can't believe that that type of additional impact on the environment will be sustainable. My major concern this evening is the way that this discussion has been represented tonight. We've talked about how many units we can put on there and how we can bring utilities to it, but we haven't talked about what we would like this area to be like in the future and how can we get to that and if we can afford it. I think we're all very lucky to live here, our neighbors are dedicated to the environment. I frequently use the parks in Newport and I think we should put those values in front of us and then decide if additional development would work.

Vice-Chair Haley - You have told us all of the reasons that you wouldn't do this here, you haven't addressed a single thing about all of the people that need homes. It sounds a lot like "not in my back yard." There is a need for people to live in the metro.

Mr. Sandell - I'm not sure I agree with you. It seems to me that I've lived here for 60 years and there are opportunities for redevelopment where high density is a little more attractive and utilities are available already. I'm not suggesting that we put walls around this area but we do need to talk about what we want here.

Vice-Chair Haley - I'm looking for answers. I have people come into my business and tell me what we can't do, which is what you've said. You're just saying you don't want it in your backyard.

Mr. Sandell - That is true because I don't think it's good for the area. I think Newport and Woodbury would lose their appeal. I'm not sure what the requirements are for open space.

Ms. Buss - It's 10%, which is a norm across the metro. Newport has many more acres of park per capita than is needed. There's no interest in obtaining more open space.

Chairperson Mahmood - I'm going to step in here because there are a lot more people here. I appreciate your opinion and concerns.

Andy Nielsen, 6060 Military Road, Woodbury - I'm right on the water of Ria Lake and was told that we couldn't change the footprint of the property. I just want the assurance that the lakefront property won't become a drainage ditch with mowed lawns right down to the water. There is someone on the north edge of the lake who clear cut their property right down to the water edge and it's an eyesore.

Vice-Chair Haley - I'd like that not to happen too.

Ms. Buss - There are protections against that. There's watershed requirements and your own Shoreland ordinance. I think it's a good comment because you'll have a chance to look at a future development and what happens around that lakefront.

Chairperson Mahmood - I wonder how that person got it cut then.

Ms. Buss - It's different for new development. The ordinance says that anything above 6 inches shouldn't be cut down.

Mr. Nielsen - When I saw them clearing out the vegetation I did call Woodbury. I don't know if there are any repercussions for him.

Ms. Buss - It shouldn't have been allowed. Did you call Newport?

Mr. Nielsen - No. I didn't want to turn them in.

Vice-Chair Haley - Staff is taking notes and will take care of it.

Chairperson Mahmood - In this plan, we do have setbacks from Ria Lake?

Ms. Buss - The Shoreland ordinance has setbacks. Additionally, there are watershed requirements that would apply. We can also work with the developer about open space and what we'd like to see around the lakefront.

Marilyn Palmer, 1042 Catherine Drive - I'm being impacted by this decision. I like it up there because I don't have to see the police force. If I'm understanding you correctly, when you're talking about 4-20 units per acre, you're talking about homes. We're going to end up looking like the Newport down here. I don't want that up there. I'm not in favor of you expanding this area and putting in so many homes. You say you want concrete suggestions. There are lots of areas that are being developed in Washington County. I cannot believe that we wouldn't meet that criteria to have homes. I don't see that as an issue. I don't believe you're going to get the revenue from the homes. You develop commercial if you want revenue. Why didn't you solicit commercial for the transit area? Now you're working with another government agency and the funds are getting lost. I don't see this area being conducive to commercial. What are you going to charge me to do this? I like my well water. I may be drinking chemicals but they taste good. I'm happy with my septic system, I haven't had any issues with it.

Ms. Buss - You wouldn't have to hook up if you didn't want to.

Ms. Palmer - Is that absolute?

Ms. Buss - There's no city policy or ordinance that would require you to hook up there. You would only have to if your septic system failed and you couldn't fit a new one there.

Vice-Chair Haley - The County regulates septic systems. I'd be surprised if you could get a new system on your property if yours failed. It's all about your safety.

Ms. Palmer - When I moved in there, I could count 20-30 deer in my yard, I don't see any anymore. I believe we were put on this earth to coexist with the animals and I hate to see that we are exterminating all of the wildlife for new homes.

The public hearing closed at 6:20 p.m.

Chairperson Mahmood - Do we need to make changes for the density, front yard setback and lot coverage?

Vice-Chair Haley - Yes.

Ms. Buss - The maximum density is 20 units per acre, you can reduce that. The developers we've talked to wouldn't go up to 20.

Chairperson Mahmood - Most likely, the developers aren't going to go up to 20?

Ms. Buss - Correct, the developers we've talked to see this as a single-family development.

Vice-Chair Haley - So we could do 4-10? Or leave it as is and let them lower it.

Ms. Buss - The comment from the Council has been to allow for some flexibility. Each of the developers we've talked to said they would do their own market study but they see single-family or detached town homes here.

Ms. Palmer - If you're the Planning Commission and talking with the developers and they're alluding to the fact that 10 would be the highest number, why wouldn't you say 10?

David Tweeten - What's the opportunity for public input during the PUD process?

Ms. Buss - There would be a public hearing and we recommend that the developers hold a neighborhood meeting.

Vice-Chair Haley - I understand the suggestion for a higher density to allow for flexibility.

Marvin Taylor - To me, it's impractical that there would be 20 units up there. I think 10-12 would work and be high density in that area. I don't see a reason for having 20 up there.

Ms. Buss - You could do 12 and still have higher density.

Asst. to the City Administrator Eisenbeisz - So the amendments are maximum density is 12 per acre, 25 feet for the front yard setback, and the maximum lot coverage is 50% for single-family and 60% for multi-family.

Motion by Haley, seconded by Mahmood, to approve Resolution No. P.C. 2016-13 as amended. With 4 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Absent, the motion carried.

B. Comp Plan Amendment

Sherri Buss, TKDA Planner, presented on this item as outlined in the December 8, 2016 Planning Commission packet.

Motion by Haley, seconded by Tweeten, to recommend sending the Comp Plan Amendment as presented. With 4 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Absent, the motion carried.

5. COMMISSION AND STAFF REPORTS

6. NEW BUSINESS

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Upcoming Meetings and Events:

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| 1. Holiday Train - Cottage Grove | December 9, 2016 | 5:45 p.m. |
| 2. City Council Meeting | December 15, 2016 | 5:30 p.m. |
| 3. City Offices Closed for Christmas | December 26, 2016 | |

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mahmood, seconded by Haley, to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting at 6:48 p.m. With 4 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Absent, the motion carried.

Signed: _____
Kevin Haley, Chairperson

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Eisenbeisz
Assistant to the City Administrator