

APPROVED MINUTES

EDEN PRAIRIE PLANNING COMMISSION

MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 2018

**7:00 PM—CITY CENTER
Council Chambers
8080 Mitchell Road**

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

John Kirk, Charles Weber, Ann Higgins, Andrew Pieper, Ed Farr, Mark Freiberg, Michael DeSanctis, Christopher Villarreal, Carole Mette

CITY STAFF:

Julie Klima, City Planner; Rod Rue, City Engineer; Matt Bourne, Manager of Parks and Natural Resources; Jonathan Stanley, Housing & Community Services Manager; Janet Jeremiah, Com. Dev. Director; Kristin Harley, Recording Secretary

I. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Farr called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – ROLL CALL

Absent were commission members DeSanctis, Higgins, Pieper, and Weber.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Kirk moved, seconded by Villarreal, to accept the agenda. **Motion carried 5-0.**

IV. MINUTES

MOTION: Villarreal moved, seconded by Freiberg to accept the minutes of Monday, July 23, 2018. **Motion carried 5-0.**

V. INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS

VI. PUBLIC MEETINGS

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

ABRA AUTO BODY & GLASS

Location: 13045, 13075 & 13105 Pioneer Trail

Request for:

- Guide Plan Change from Community Commercial to Industrial on 2.98 acres

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 2

- Zoning District Change from C-COM to I-2 on 2.98 acres
- Site Plan Review on 2.98 acres
- Preliminary Plat of three lots into one lot on 2.98 acres

Klima presented the staff report. The site plan shows the construction and site development of an approximate 18,000 square foot Abra Auto Body building. The plan, as proposed, met or exceeded applicable City Code requirements. No waivers were being requested for the proposed development. Staff recommended approval

Farr asked if the site plan had changed; a secondary curb cut identified as fire department access at the July informational meeting appeared to be closed off. Klima replied this was the same site plan with a few improvements to the landscape plan. Farr asked Klima to reiterate why this property was encumbered by the MAC property to the south when there was already a curb cut off Pioneer Trail. Klima replied this was to be a shared access rather than having multiple curb cuts, as per the original plan review.

Paul Tucci of Oppidan Incorporated gave a brief PowerPoint presentation of the site plan and the application, answering questions which had come up at the informational meeting. He displayed the revised elevations and the material types. The revised site plan displayed the secondary access. The applicant would negotiate easement in the future. The revised landscaping plan moved some native plant screening outside the fence. He again displayed the office floor plan, the paint booths, and exits. The material board had been provided at the informational meeting. The roof units would not be visible from the walkway; however, staff would ensure compliance if screening would be needed. He briefly showed the sustainability features such as shielded LED lighting, rain sensors, door heaters, and automatic openers/closers. The regulated material handling inside would include spill kits and Safety Clean was the national contractor retained. He offered to answer any more questions from the commission.

Farr commented this would be a good addition to Eden Prairie and the applicant had made a great effort to cover all concerns. Other commission members agreed.

MOTION: Villarreal moved, seconded by Mette to close the public hearing. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

MOTION: Villarreal moved, seconded by Kirk to approve the ABRA Auto Body and Glass project based on the staff recommendations, information contained in the staff report dated August 9, 2018, and plans stamp dated July 10, 2018. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

VARIANCE 2018-03

Location: 6810 Shady Oak Road

Request to:

- Allow parking setback of 21 feet from the street. City Code requires a 50 feet front yard setback

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 3

Klima presented a PowerPoint and the staff report. The revised plan provided 14 parallel parking stalls with a setback of 21 to 26 feet to accommodate the curve in the road. This allowed green space in front of the building. The majority of the existing parking would be located behind the building. The plan showed a sidewalk and parallel parking near the front of the building with landscaping between the parking lot and Shady Oak Road. Staff recommended approval of the variance.

Matt Van Slooten, President of CSM's commercial group, gave a brief presentation of the changes to the application submitted two months previous. The setback had been increased to allow for 14 new stalls for 144 stalls, just shy of the 150 overall anticipated as a need. The second floor office would have added value. Farr asked if the applicant agreed to the conditions in the staff report, and Van Slooten replied he did. Farr asked if an updated architectural rendering could be provided. Van Slooten replied an approval of the application with the revised parking design put CSM in a better position to improve the building's architecture as a future action.

Freiberg reminded the applicant of his suggested compromise at the earlier meeting and complimented the applicant's flexibility. Villarreal asked if there was any idea when the expansion of Shady Oak Road was planned. Rue replied there was no timeline but it was planned in the Comprehensive Plan to be a three-lane road, so anticipating the amount of traffic also informed this design. Villarreal asked if in exhibit A, letter C the word "not" ("the plight of the landowner is not due to circumstances unique to the property") was previously in a different part of the sentence than in the text above and beneath it. Klima replied staff would double-check the language to ensure it was consistent with the City Code; the intention was to say this was due to circumstances unique to the property. Farr asked for and received confirmation if the road was expanded the city would have to acquire property, which was solved by the increased setback; Shady Oak Road could be widened with minimal disruption. Rue explained the potential land acquisition would have replaced the loss of parking due to the expanded roadway and trail; under the current application, this would not be needed. Kirk added there was a greenway aspect to Shady Oak Grove he thought important and this was in his opinion a good compromise. Mette agreed while this was one of only a few buildings on the road with parking in front, the setback and landscaping and future improvement of the façade was a huge improvement.

MOTION: Kirk moved, seconded by Freiberg to close the public hearing. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

MOTION: Kirk moved, seconded by Mette to approve variance 2018-3 based on staff recommendation and information contained within the staff report dated August 9, 2018 and the plans stamp dated August 2, 2018, with review of the language in findings C to ensure consistency. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

LION'S TAP SITE IMPROVEMENTS

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 4

Location: 16180 Flying Cloud Drive

Request for:

- Guide Plan change from Neighborhood Commercial to Rural on .22 acres, and from Rural to Neighborhood Commercial on .01 acres
- Planned Unit Development District Review with waivers on 2.2 acres
- Zoning District Change from Rural to Highway Commercial on .25 acres, from Highway Commercial to Rural on .12 acres, from right-of-way to Highway Commercial on .51 acres, and from right-of-way to Rural on .03 acres
- Site Plan Review on 2.2 acres
- Preliminary Plat reconfiguring two lots on 11.69 acres

Klima presented the staff report and gave an overview of the history of the PUD Concept Plan, approved in 2014. The proposed site improvements for Lion's Tap, located at the intersection of Spring Road and Flying Cloud Drive, included the addition of a 110-square foot vestibule onto the Flying Cloud Drive entrance to the building and a reconfiguration and expansion of the parking lot. Due to the realignment of and reconstruction of Spring Road, Lion's Tap would have more area for parking. The plan showed 112 parking stalls, an increase of 42 stalls. The proposed parking would be located on the west, northwest, and north sides of the building with access from Spring Road.

Staff recommended approval. There was some shifting of zoning and Comprehensive Plan lines. The Met Council advised there did not have to be a formal process to approve the Comprehensive Plan amendment because the City was in the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan and could fold in the amendment.

Several waivers were being requested. This business has been in operation for decades and was a known destination in the community. The front setback and parking waivers were due to existing conditions. Some parking was off-site; with this proposal, all parking would be provided on site. Conditions of approval included providing the small vestibule building materials and the trash enclosure building materials meeting City requirements, and minor changes to the landscaping plan.

Farr asked if there would be other jurisdictional approval for the off-site grading of the right of way to the south, which had steep slopes requiring retaining walls. Rue replied the grading on the south side, which was a two-to-one slope between the parking lot and the trail, was timed along with this project. Hennepin County was grading only to the existing parking lot as a compromise to avoid constructing a wall within the draining and utilities easement. Farr asked if the County would permit a two-to-one slope, and Rue replied most county slopes were in fact two-to-one.

Farr asked if there were two vestibules being added, as evidenced on the plan. Klima replied to her understanding there was only one vestibule. The applicant, John Shardlow of FAICP Stantec Consulting Services, displayed a PowerPoint and replied this was the same vestibule as seen from two different views. The vestibule created an airlock and

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 5

was the minimal size needed. The vestibule elevation was increased by 6 inches to accommodate ADA requirements. He introduced Bert and Bonnie Notermann, the owners, and Jack Perry with Briggs & Morgan, their attorney.

Shardlow further explained the site plan. The parcel had changed shape and the “triangles” and “slivers” added to the back parking area were an attempt to “square off” the site and create more parking on the west side of the site, allowing for turning radiuses of emergency vehicles and for ADA access. He described working with City staff, the County, and with the Highway Department. The objective was to create, as much parking as possible and the grading would be substantial, as the slope was 12 feet above the elevation of Flying Cloud Road. The new property line included some area from Spring Road and the adjacent residential property. There would be a buried system for storm water treatment and construction of this plus the grading would result in the loss of trees, but the applicant was working with staff on a landscaping plan. He displayed a cross-section of the grade and explained MnDOT will not mow but would use its sandy-soil seed mix. A “living wall” would be constructed along the back and the applicant would work with staff to use sumac or other natural screening materials to block the light from oncoming headlights. The drainage utility and easement might require a small wall. Farr asked if the scale was a one-to-one scale horizontally and vertically, and Shardlow replied it was actually a shorter scale vertically than horizontally. Mette asked for an idea how the drawing would look with a one-to-one scale, and Farr explained the dotted 45-degree slope indicated on the cross-section indicated the correct degree of slope.

Retention block walls would be put in, but the applicant was planning to use a “living wall” to create a completely green, attractive façade to retain and stabilize the soils. There would be 112 parking spaces plus 12 motorcycle parking spaces. The façade would be face brick and permanent finished materials. The vestibule addition would be a seven-foot, six-inch ADA-compliant structure, which would not affect the building’s setback but did have a six-inch easement encroachment on the west side. The abandoned gas pumps raised the possibility of contaminated soil and water in the drainage system. American Engineering Testing did a Phase II analysis and did find contaminated soil near the door, but the land closer to the filtration is clean. These findings have been reported to the State Duty Officer and will be reported to the Pollution Control Agency, and the contamination will be cleaned up.

Farr stated the applicant was urged in the staff report to reconsider the amount of pavement in parking area. He approved of the parking stalls being wider than code minimum at their angles, but suggested the applicant change both western and southern loops to one-way circulation 60-degree parking and nine-foot, six-inch wide stalls, which would reduce the amount of pavement and increase safety. He also stated he could not reconcile the front yard variance with the amount of land the owner’s held—nine-and-a-half acres behind the building. A variance could be avoided by pushing back the retaining wall.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 6

Shardlow replied the steepness of the slope behind the facility, in some sections requiring a 20-foot retaining wall, became difficult and a cost issue. Thirteen different parking layouts had been explored, including angled parking, but he agreed to revisit Farr and staff's suggestions.

Freiberg noted increasing the parking made sense for the turnaround of an emergency vehicle, given the narrow access at present. He understood Farr's objections but supported the concept, and wished to see the applicant explore other parking options as advised in the staff report. Mette asked what was directly south of the property, and if the lighting would be LED. Shardlow replied the lighting was all LED lighting and the south parcel was privately owned farmland and wetland.

Villarreal asked for and received clarification there would be 12 motorcycle spaces. He added he would love to see at least two EV (electric vehicle) charging spots.

Farr asked if the walls along the north property line accompanying the five-foot drainage & utility easements for utilities to navigate throughout the property were recommended, or if the easement should be widened. Rue replied the easements were typical and it was standard to have no retaining walls in them. In this case, the amount of utilities in the easement had not been addressed; it could be part of the encroachment agreement or in the development agreement. Farr asked for the materials of the two retaining walls and asked if it was acceptable to have two different styles. Rue replied in the tight property compromises were made, and the living wall provided more green than a block wall, but he had not seen details. The design would be outlined in the building permit. The easement would be addressed as a part of the ongoing approval process.

Kirk asked what could be the downside to the variances, given the history of the property, its iconic status, its particular configuration, and no real neighbors but wetlands and farmland in proximity. Farr replied he had thought about this; his concern was not more variances, but the lack of screening on the busy road in a site plan was attempting to be an improvement to the site. Given nine-and-a-half acres, he wondered if there was not an alternative for more parking behind the building to avoid the setback variance, which also prevented compliance with the screening requirements, *also* requiring a variance. Mette stated she had no issue with the parking variance given the unique characteristics of the slope, and since there were no real neighbors, the parking screening was not intended to screen drivers in cars from seeing cars. Therefore, she was inclined to approve both variances. Villarreal stated having a ninety-degree turn would solve the issue of headlight glare at the top of the slope. Kirk asked if a creative screening solution could be utilized. Shardlow replied he was willing to work with staff and was completely confident would be able to screen the row of cars close to Flying Cloud Road and in the western parking lot. He suggested plants rather than a fence, which could prevent snow removal. Mette agreed a landscape screening was preferable to a fence. Farr noted since the applicant was asking permission to grade, landscaping was a good solution. Mette added the southern row of parking could comprise smaller, compact-size parking stalls, which would allow more room for screening.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 7

Farr summarized the suggestions from the commission: the applicant would look at landscape screening in these areas of concern, and entertain a parking reconfiguration if possible to address the concerns of the staff report. Mette replied rethinking the parking configuration would be a substantial change, perhaps requiring the applicant to come back and submit a new parking plan. Farr replied he was satisfied with the commission's discussion and suggestions to the applicant, and would ask only staff to review before moving onto the City Council, and would not require the applicant to come back before the Planning Commission with another parking design. Klima replied the commission could make this final review before approaching the City Council a condition of approval. Villarreal noted the staff report stipulated working with the City regarding screening, but he did not see one for parking. He stated he was comfortable with the parking plan as proposed. Discussion followed on appropriate wording of a motion regarding parking given the conditions in the staff report.

MOTION: Freiberg moved, seconded by Kirk to close the public hearing. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

MOTION: Villarreal moved, seconded by Kirk to approve the Lion's Tap site improvement project, based on staff recommendations and information contained in the staff report dated August 9, 2018 and plans stamp dated July 30, 2018. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

CODE AMENDMENT CHAPTER 11 TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD)/TOWN CENTER (TC)

Request to:

- Amend City Code Chapter 11 to address the TOD and TC zoning districts. Proposed amendments provide consistency between the districts where appropriate

Klima presented a PowerPoint and explained the proposed amendments to the TOD and TC zoning districts. These were primarily housekeeping items and provided more clarity with the current regulations. Amendments proposed in the TOD zoning district included minor modifications to definitions included within the code. In the TC zoning district, more substantive amendments were being proposed including the addition of regulations for supplemental analysis or studies may be required to address traffic impacts, traffic demand management, and parking as deemed necessary. Other proposed amendments to the TC zoning district included the addition of regulations for pedestrian and off-street bicycle facilities standards, and revisions to the landscaping regulations to provide clarity and consistency with the TOD district where appropriate.

Staff conducted outreach to the representatives of the Liberty Property Trust and the Evine Live properties since both representatives spoke during the public hearing process for the TOD ordinance in 2016. Staff recently provided both representatives draft copies of the proposed code amendments. In response, staff received a comment letter dated August 6, 2018 from Richard Weiblen, representing Liberty Property Trust. The letter

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 8

was included for reference as an attachment with this staff report. Most of the comments included in the letter reflected existing city code regulations and did not pertain to the proposed code amendments. Staff recommended approval.

Kirk noted he was on the Planning Commission for the Town Center ordinance, which broke new ground, and found this review particularly applicable, and agreed the code needed a clean-up. Farr suggested discussion the code amendments topic-by-topic. Farr noted a floor-to-floor height instead of a floor-to-ceiling height, seemingly implied by Weiblen's understanding of the amendments, would allow for the thicknesses of floors, and suggested this be redefined to ensure ceiling height consistency. Klima replied staff also wished this to be clarified and worked with the building official to ensure it was defined and consistent.

Farr noted Subdivision one, paragraph E mentioned "the need for parking" yet also mentioned "off-street parking" which did not decrease "the need for parking." Mette suggested the "need for parking" was at the specific commercial site, with off-site parking perhaps being a parking ramp across the street, etc. Klima replied Mette had the correct interpretation. The original language was parking needs and requirements," which was the same thing. The intent was to create more precise language.

Farr noted Subdivision 2; Definitions mentioned the "building break." Farr asked why it was not a choice between a recess and a protrusion, but only a recess, and how staff arrived at a two-foot deep dimension instead of a four-foot deep one. Klima replied once one provides a recess a protrusion is also provided. The dimensions were a reference back to the Town Center and the City design guidelines; the minimum was set to enforce consistency.

Mette asked about the neighborhood-commercial definition. The zoning definition was also "neighborhood-commercial," and she asked if that could be confusing and if it should be called something slightly different. The point was to avoid an IKEA in a residential neighborhood, but most Walgreens, for example, are over 10,000 square feet and would be appropriate for a residential neighborhood.

Klima replied this terminology "neighborhood-commercial" term was already in the TC and TOD, as well as in the City Code. There was language in both districts which limit application to the TC and TOD only. The dimensions were not a new regulation, but the amendments were carrying this forward to be more explicit about what is already expected. Kirk asked if the PUD process allow for flexibility of waivers, and Klima, replied it did.

Farr asked for and received confirmation the drive-thru prohibited in the language were always prohibited. Villarreal pointed out "drive-thru" was inconsistently spelled. He asked for a clarification this did not include a "drive up" such as at a Jerry's Grocery. Klima replied staff would look at this to ensure "the intent of the Ordinance is maintained. Farr urged other types of drive-thru services be allowed, such as for

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 9

pharmaceuticals and coffee. Kirk replied to his understanding all were meant to be prohibited for banks. Klima replied staff would like the opportunity to look back at the code to ensure it is clear. Villarreal noted a “drive up” was a tradeoff for parking; one had to have sufficient parking, or some alternative such as a drive-up. Mette agreed.

Farr observed on page 11-21 the statement of policy under “Development standards for TOD residential” said “building shall be located and designed to take advantage of views of nearby natural amenities and where significant shading of lower buildings will not occur.” This language seemed vague to him. Klima replied the language was a carryover from the purpose statement of the TC to provide consistency between the two. Staff could require a shading analysis be done, depending on the site’s specific proposal. Klima replied the PUD process would allow for such flexibility.

Farr noted on page 11-36, Paragraph K, the language “visitor parking does not include all-day or long-term parking engaged in loading or unloading goods” could affect Fed Ex, Uber, or Jimmy Johns. Klima replied this language was created with the TOD area because of concerns of property owners who wished to limit such parking to visitors, and prohibit business vehicles parked there all day. Mette proposed: “parking of delivery vehicles engaged in short-term deliveries,” instead. Farr replied it would be difficult to police short-term delivery drivers. Freiberg remarked the spirit of the language would not be that restrictive.

Villarreal asked for the rules regarding food trucks. Klima replied they are allowed in industrial districts but not commercial districts, and there was an additional licensing requirement. Villarreal argued for a greater allowance of food trucks in residential and commercial areas, such as farmer’s markets, to create and participate in a sense of community. Klima replied the food trucks were not specifically mentioned here being they were licensed through other entities, but staff could research the language, located elsewhere, and report to the commission members. Kirk expressed support for a broader discussion regarding allowing food trucks. Discussion followed on the benefits of food trucks as an amenity.

Farr asked if the office category was still a sliding scale. Klima replied it was in the industrial office category, the commercial office category was still a set standard. Villarreal asked if there would be a place to recommend solar on top of parking structures. Klima replied there was not a lot of discussion of solar in this chapter, but also nothing would prohibit the construction of solar. The City’s design guidelines approved in 2016 allowed for a PUD process here as well.

Farr noted in 11-40 and 11-41 there were requirements for parking ramps adjacent to buildings, and saw “must include architectural elements,” then “shall include” and “may also include.” Klima replied this language was carried over to the TC from the TOD. Farr emphasized having clarity in the code.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 10

Villarreal urged there be some language for EV parking and charging. Mette expressed reservations as to how it could impact the City in the future; for example, what if in the past cities had required gas pumps in parking areas. This merited further discussion to avoid putting in well-intentioned requirements, which could become outdated. Farr suggested this belonged in the sustainability section of the code.

Mette asked for and received clarification the language in subdivision 14 was mirrored between the TC and TOD.

MOTION: Freiberg moved, seconded by Kirk to close the public hearing. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

MOTION: Villarreal moved, seconded by Freiberg to approve the code amendment Chapter 11 Transit Oriented Development (TOD)/Town Center (TC) based on recommendations and information contained in the staff report dated August 9, 2018. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

VIII. PLANNERS' REPORT

A. ASPIRE 2040 UPDATE

HOUSING

Klima introduced Jonathan Stanley, Housing and Community Services Manager. Stanley presented a PowerPoint and summarized the Housing chapter. The goals of this chapter are 1) to incentivize attainable and affordable housing options for lower-income households so they can move to and remain in Eden Prairie; 2) to work with public and private sectors, other government entities and the community to envision the finance innovative demonstration projects and developments; 3) to promote senior housing opportunities which would increase choice and enable seniors who choose to downsize to age in the community; 4) to address the aging housing stock to prevent loss of naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH); and 5) to prioritize housing around public transit with access to services, jobs, parks, and more.

Eden Prairie undertook a housing study in 2017. The City has a number of housing implementation strategies in its toolkit, including the use of TIF (Tax Increment Financing), tax abatement, Consolidated "Super" RFP, housing choice vouchers, capitalizing on TOD areas, and more. The minimum expectation is to have 5 percent of units at 50 percent AMI and 5 percent of units at 80 percent AMI.

Stanley presented four questions for the commission. The commission members discussed each question in turn.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 11

Question 1: Should the policy have flat amounts or a range of options—e.g., 5 percent at 50 percent and 5 percent at 80 percent of AMI, or developer choice of 5 percent at 30 percent, 10 percent at 50 percent, or 15 percent at 80 percent?

Discussion followed on the advantages of having a starting point as a guide and a choice or a range of options instead of fixed absolute percentages. Mette suggested having a limit to the size of project this would affect, along with an “opt-out” option including the possibility of funding other amenities.

Question 2: Should the policy apply to all development activity—e.g. new construction, rehab, renovation, adaptive reuse, non-residential use to residential conversion?

Discussion followed on applying this policy evenly to all residential activity. Farr suggested an exclusion for simple remodeling.

Question 3: Should the affordability threshold(s) be the same for rental and for-sale housing (other municipalities use a single 80 percent AMI threshold for for-sale product)?

Discussion followed on why having the threshold be the same for both would not be a benefit. Mette noted affordable housing is difficult to make “work” for the reason artificial deflation of property unjustly affected those who, say, received a raise or improved their homes and raised the value. The whole point of owning a home and building equity is lost. Freiberg agreed, and stated the financing of both were quite different.

Question 4: Term of affordability—is perpetuity always feasible (e.g. should affordability in perpetuity be required in every circumstance)?

Discussion followed on why a perpetuity goal could actually hamper the goal of providing affordable housing in the future. Freiberg objected to the word “every.” Mette suggested the category have a cap of up to 40 years, after which it becomes naturally occurring affordable housing. Farr agreed, and suggested creating a metric around this. He suggested an opportunity every ten or so years to petition to City for a change. Kirk agreed. Farr asked for a different way to ask Question 4 to allow for a revisit (say, every 10 years) of the perpetuity clause.

Mette suggested integrating the goals on the attainable and affordable housing slide with market rates, and to include in the NOAH goal to help and incentivize property owners to improve their properties, not just maintain them. Discussion followed on the definition of “environmental resilience” on the attainable and affordable housing slide. Villarreal asked for definitions of “passive and active solar.” Discussion followed on examples of both. Villarreal noted Generation X

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 12

was not referenced in this document. Klima offered in each case to look at the language. Stanley thanked the commission members for their feedback.

LAND USE

Klima presented the Land Use chapter. Land use categories were being modified to respect existing development and reflect evolving patterns and trends. The goals were 1) to continue to develop the City in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan; 2) to focus on creating a more dynamic mix of land uses throughout Eden Prairie, and 3) to instill in residents, visitors, and others the value of Eden Prairie's history. Klima displayed and explained the proposed added land use categories (mixed use, commercial, industrial flex tech, flex service, and eco-innovation).

Farr asked how the contour line on the Development Areas Map and MUSA slide was set. Rue replied most of it was based on the gravity line boundary, set when the City put in the Red Rock Interceptor. Kirk replied he was also under the impression—this was the protection of the bluff slope. Farr asked if there was a small hotel in the southwest corner near the auto salvage. Rue replied there was; these properties were in Chanhassen. Farr asked for an identification of the upper red area in the map. Klima replied it was the Shady Oak strip mall center. This was guided TOD due to its proximity to the train station as well as other factors. Farr asked if landowners would be contacted when this is published to inform them of the land use change. Klima replied the City would follow its legal obligations with a notice in the newspaper and a news blast on the website, as well as via City Connect, etc. Farr asked if there was historical precedence for appraisers changing appraisals of these properties because of these changes. Klima replied there could be land value changes; whether or not this plan triggers a reappraisal on individual properties was not a question she could answer.

Villarreal asked if the existing electric transmission line corridors were required to be turned into pollinator plantings. Klima replied this was likely a strategy or implementation action rather than an overall policy plan. Villarreal stated the commercial and industrial areas would likely be optimal areas for DC fast chargers for electric vehicles, and asked if this would be an appropriate use of an industrial site. Klima replied that was a zoning question rather than a higher-level policy question of land use on the guiding map. Villarreal remarked the Pollution Control Agency was looking at putting in DC chargers right now as well as electric buses, and he wanted to be proactive in looking at such aligned land uses and including them in the land use designation.

IX. MEMBERS' REPORTS

X. CONTINUING BUSINESS

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 13, 2018

Page 13

XI. NEW BUSINESS

XII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Kirk moved, seconded by Villarreal to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.** Chair Farr adjourned the meeting at 10:27 p.m.