

Planning Commission

February 22, 2021 – 7 pm

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

This meeting will be held via Webex in accordance with the local emergency declaration made by the City under Minn. Stat. § 12.37. The public may monitor this meeting by watching on Comcast cable channel 16, by streaming on CCXmedia.org, or by calling 1-415-655-0001 and entering the meeting code **133 839 0117**. The public may participate in this meeting during public comment sections by calling 763-593-8060 and following the automated prompts.

Additional information about monitoring electronic meetings is available on the [City website](#). For technical assistance, please contact the City at 763-593-8007 or webexsupport@goldenvalleymn.gov. If you incur costs to call into the meeting, you may submit the costs to the City for reimbursement consideration.

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Agenda**
3. **Approval of Minutes**
February 8, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting
4. **Public Hearing** – Zoning Text Amendment to Modify the Moderate Density Residential (R-2) Zoning District to Allow Rowhouses
Applicant: City of Golden Valley
5. **Discussion** – 2020 Land Use/Zoning Study: Institutional Uses

– End of Televised Portion of Meeting –

To listen to this portion, please call 1-415-655-0001 and enter meeting access code 133 839 0117.

6. **Council Liaison Report**
7. **Reports on Board of Zoning Appeals and Other Meetings**
8. **Other Business**
9. **Adjournment**



This document is available in alternate formats upon a 72-hour request. Please call 763-593-8006 (TTY: 763-593-3968) to make a request. Examples of alternate formats may include large print, electronic, Braille, audiocassette, etc.



Planning Commission

February 8, 2021 – 7 pm

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

This meeting was held via Webex in accordance with the local emergency declaration made by the City under Minn. Stat. § 12.37. In accordance with that declaration, beginning on March 16, 2020, all Planning Commission meetings held during the emergency were conducted electronically. The City used Webex to conduct this meeting and members of the public were able to monitor the meetings by watching it on Comcast cable channel 16, by streaming it on CCXmedia.org, or by dialing in to the public call-in line.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 by **Chair Blum**.

Roll Call

Commissioners present: Rich Baker, Ron Blum, Andy Johnson, Noah Orloff, Lauren Pockl, Ryan Sadeghi, Chuck Segelbaum

Commissioners absent: Adam Brookins

Staff present: Jason Zimmerman – Planning Manager, Myles Campbell – Planner

Council Liaison present: Gillian Rosenquist

2. Approval of Agenda

Chair Blum asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

MOTION made by **Commissioner Sadeghi**, seconded by **Commissioner Baker**, to approve the agenda of February 8, 2021. Staff called a roll call vote and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chair Blum asked for a motion to approve the minutes from January 25, 2021.

Jason Zimmerman, Planning Manager, noted an error on page 6, 7 months should change to 7 weeks. **Commissioner Johnson**, noted on page 11 his point wasn't about a litter ordinance but rather if there is a medical waste issue there are other avenues than the City of Golden Valley Planning Commission to direct those concerns to.

MOTION made by **Commissioner Baker**, seconded by **Commissioner Pockl**, to approve minutes pending changes as noted. Staff called a roll call vote and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Continued Informal Public Hearing – Motion to Table PUD 74 Major PUD Amendment

Applicant: Regency Hospital

Address: 1300 Hidden Lakes Parkway, Golden Valley MN



This document is available in alternate formats upon a 72-hour request. Please call 763-593-8006 (TTY: 763-593-3968) to make a request. Examples of alternate formats may include large print, electronic, Braille, audiocassette, etc.



Jason Zimmerman, Planning Manager, reminded the group that this public hearing item was tabled due to deadlines and items to be reviewed. Since the previous meeting, the applicant and Hidden Lakes HOA are continuing conversations and the applicant requested an extension to allow those conversations to continue. The applicant will also revise any plans as needed and provide them at a later date. Timing is unclear as of the date of this meeting but residents will be sent a letter within 60 days with an update.

MOTION made by **Commissioner Baker**, seconded by **Commissioner Johnson**, to table the Hidden Lakes PUD discussion to a later date. Staff called a roll call vote and the motion carried unanimously.

5. Discussion – Modifying the Moderate Density Residential (R-2) Zoning District to Allow Rowhouses

Jason Zimmerman, Planning Manager, reminded commissioners of previous discussions on this topic and items the Commissioners wished to discuss further.

Zimmerman reviewed the definition of a rowhouse and how it would be added to definitions of other dwellings. **Zimmerman** revisited the R-2 Purpose Statement and reminded members of previous conversations about possibly editing the R-2 purpose statement and if that should be done alone or in conjunction with the purpose statements for other zoning districts.

At a previous meeting, Commissioners asked about residential facilities/group homes and how they would be included in the R-2 zoning code. A rowhouse with 3-4 rental units might be considered a multifamily structure, this would likely require allowing higher density group homes on these lots, if not on all R-2 zoned properties. The City Attorney is looking into this particular situation.

Staff revisited minimum lot width and initially opted to follow an approach used for single-family homes and duplexes. After discussion on whether that was excessive, staff had proposed a 150-foot width for 3-unit rowhouses and a 200-foot width for 4 unit rowhouses.

As of this meeting, architectural and Material Standards have not been applied to R-1 and R-2 zoning districts. Standards could be added to rowhouses and staff listed possibilities for both categories.

There are area limitations for accessory structures and staff reviewed that each single-family or two-family lot is limited to a total of 1,000 square feet and suggested each rowhouse lot be limited to a total of 2,200 square feet for accessory structures. Staff reviewed what that included, what it didn't include, and that no accessory structure shall occupy a footprint larger than that of the principal structure. How this specifically relates to rowhouses and changes based on number of units was further discussed.

Commissioner Baker asked staff about underground parking and if that was going to be revisited. Staff responded that they were not going to prohibit underground parking but would likely encourage attached parking. Requiring underground parking with units this small can get very expensive and challenging to construct.

Chair Blum opened the discussion on the presentation and staff started with asking Commissioners for questions around definitions. **Baker** mentioned that the rowhouse definition doesn't explicitly say "side-by-side" and should in some capacity otherwise the intention to avoid under/over is lost. The discussion around language in the definition continued.

Commissioner Segelbaum mentioned that it makes sense to leave the definition to define the structure and not how it's occupied. **Blum** added that if the goal is to introduce this particular model to increase variety of housing, then it may be useful to define how the building is owned and occupied. **Blum** added that this language could ensure each unit is occupied as single-family and avoid potential group home housing next to other R-1 housing. Staff added that occupancy as single or multi-family has not been considered yet within the R-2 definition for a lot. There may be increased density, a group home, or a residential facility as part of the lot use within the R-2. **Baker** asked **Blum** to clarify if he wanted to exclude residential facilities and **Blum** responded that he wasn't opposed to the facilities but rather the potential jump in density for a future R-2 district.

Staff added the City Attorney is reviewing these potential classifications for a single-family use or a multi-family use in a district like this.

Staff moved on to the next item, and mentioned the Chair was curious about how to leverage the purpose statement to strengthen the evaluation of variance requests. **Chair Blum** stated the goal was to meet community needs that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. **Commissioner Baker** added that he sees this as a good opportunity however prefers staff's approach in the memo to consider this as a separate policy discussion and address it in all zoning districts. **Baker** added it should be on the to-do list to address and ask Council for support; it should not be done here to only address rowhouses. **Commissioner Sadeghi** expressed support for the proposed purpose statement and pointed out that it adequately addresses density. Policy and code language can be addressed later. **Commissioner Segelbaum** echoed this sentiment. This discussion continued and **Commissioner Johnson** asked if they need to wait on direction from the City Attorney before moving forward. Staff said they will wait on direction from the City Attorney before presenting specific code language to the Planning Commission for a vote.

The next item to address was regarding Residential Facilities but folks felt it was already addressed.

Staff moved on to lot width.

Staff asked if the minimum lot width requirement was necessary or if they could utilize the minimum setback and unit width requirements already built into this section of code. **Commissioner Johnson** stated utilizing the built-in setbacks seems more practical. He stated his support for this option. **Commissioner Sadeghi** and **Commissioner Baker** echoed support for this statement.

Staff moved on the Architectural and Material Standards.

The items listed are pretty standard for requirements in other zoning districts but staff wanted to know if Commissioners felt these standards should be applied to rowhouses. **Commissioner Baker** stated the standards listed were practical however these standards are not placed on single family homes in this district so he's not sure it's needed. **Commissioner Segelbaum** stated the standards for rowhouses should mirror those for single family homes. Staff clarified there weren't any so **Segelbaum** stated they

should line up with R-1. **Commissioner Pockl** asked if screening standard and entrance location would be included if the other standards weren't. Staff confirmed that screening was covered in the code elsewhere and the entrance could be in the definition of a rowhouse. **Commissioner Johnson** stated support for these standards so the definition of a rowhouse is clear and deliberate. **Commissioner Sadeghi** echoed this comment and added that being too prescriptive with materials may create a burden and decrease feasibility for developers and builders.

Staff moved on to Accessory Structures and specifically detached garages. **Commissioner Baker** asked if a detached garage increased the impervious surfaces and staff responded that it depends on the structures. Staff doesn't have a blueprint in hand as an example so that possibility would be dependent on many factors. The discussion continued and Commissioners discussed parking, garages, number of stalls per unit, and vehicles outside.

6. Discussion – 2020 Land Use/Zoning Study – Office Uses

Myles Campbell, Planner, reminded Commissioners the goal of this item is to update the zoning code to match the land use policies of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. This will also help modernize the code and make it more approachable and accessible for residents/business owners. Staff is currently revising Office zoning code language and uses.

The purpose of the Office Zoning District is to provide areas for the offices, clinics, day care centers, financial institutions, and other compatible uses that serve local and regional needs. The District fosters employment opportunities and encourages transitions between land uses. The District is not intended to serve as an area for the sale of or handling of goods, wares, merchandise, or commodities.

Staff presented a preliminary use table for economic and business activities in the following districts: commercial, light industrial, industrial, and office zoning districts. **Campbell** described the table and defined the language.

Staff is looking for direction on the preliminary table regarding use of sub-categories, where in the zoning chapter this table should be located, and if Mixed-Use districts should have their own land use table. **Commissioner Baker** suggested staff utilize the Communications department to navigate ease of use within the code. **Commissioner Johnson** added that location is important but adding hyperlinks to direct users to specific areas would be beneficial. **Commissioner Pockl** spoke in favor of sub-categories.

Commissioners and staff discussed uses and categorical differences for clarification.

Televised portion of the meeting concluded at 9:00 pm

7. Council Liaison Report

Council Member Rosenquist invited the Commissioners to the Joint Boards and Commissions event at the end of February to hear about the City Council's 2021 goals. She updated them on the Legislative Priorities, including an effort around fiscal disparities. **Rosenquist** provided quick updates on the

Facilities Study and a use agreement with the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. She also noted the City's efforts around a reduction of speed limits on local streets and a kick-off call related to a push for Highway 55 Bus Rapid Transit.

8. Reports on Board of Zoning Appeals and other Meetings

None.

9. Other Business

None.

10. Adjournment

MOTION by **Commissioner Johnson** to adjourn, seconded by **Commissioner Segelbaum**, and approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:18 pm.

Adam Brookins, Secretary

Amie Kolesar, Planning Assistant