AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION
WEBEX VIDEOCONFERENCE
6:00 P.M.
NOVEMBER 18, 2020

All meetings of the St. Louis Park Planning Commission will be conducted by telephone or other electronic means until further notice. This is in accordance with a local emergency declaration issued by Mayor Jake Spano March 16, 2020 in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. This is in accordance with the local emergency declaration issued by the city council, in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic and Governor Walz's “Stay Safe MN” executive order 20-056.

All members of the St. Louis Park Planning Commission will participate in the November 18, 2020 planning commission meeting and planning commission study session by electronic device or telephone rather than by being personally present at the planning commission’s regular and study session meeting place at 5005 Minnetonka Blvd.

Members of the public can monitor the regular meeting by video and audio at [https://bit.ly/watchslppc](https://bit.ly/watchslppc) and on local cable (Comcast SD channel 17, or CenturyLink SD channel 8117 and HD channel 8617) or by calling +1-312-535-8110 meeting number (access code): 372 106 61 to monitor the audio only of the regular meeting and study session. Cisco Webex will be used to conduct videoconference meetings of the planning commission, with planning commissioners and staff participating from multiple locations.

Those who wish to provide comments during the public hearing at this meeting can do so by calling 952-562-2888, and calls will be taken and heard by the commission in the order received.

AGENDA

1. Call to order – Roll Call

2. Approval of minutes

   October 21, 2020
   November 4, 2020

3. Hearings

   3a. Pennsylvania Park Apartments conditional use permit
       Applicant: Patrick Juetten, on behalf of Waypoint Development LLC
       Case No.: 20-24-CUP

4. Other Business: None

5. Communications

6. Adjournment
STUDY SESSION

1. Miscellaneous zoning code amendments

Auxiliary aids for individuals with disabilities are available upon request. To make arrangements, please call the administration department at 952-924-2525 (TDD 952-924-2518) at least 96 hours in advance of meeting.
UNOFFICIAL MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
ST. LOUIS PARK, MINNESOTA
OCTOBER 21, 2020 – 6:00 p.m.
WEBEX

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Beneke, Lynette Dumalag, Imran Dagane, Matt Eckholm, Courtney Erwin, Jessica Kraft, Tom Weber

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jacquelyn Kramer, Jennifer Monson, Gary Morrison, Sean Walther

1. Call to Order – Roll Call

2. Approval of Minutes of September 16, 2020

Commissioner Weber made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Dumalag seconded the motion, and the motion passed on a vote of 7-0.

3. Public Hearings

A. Comprehensive plan and zoning amendments to allow for a new zoning district for the Historic Walker Lake district

   Applicant: City of St. Louis Park
   Case Nos: 20-19-CP; 20-20-ZA

Laura Chamberlain, consultant from HGKI presented the staff report. She gave a history of the area and the revitalization plan intended to revitalize and preserve the area. The plan was accepted earlier this year with input from businesses and residents in the area. The guidance includes parking, mix of uses, building form and public realm. With this guidance, the city prepared a new zoning district paired with design guidelines, used as guidance vs. requirements, for the area. A comprehensive plan amendment is needed for the new zoning district.

She explained the amendment in detail to the planning commission. She noted the public outreach included a presentation to the Walker Lake Business Association and a virtual neighborhood meeting, both with overall support.

Commissioner Beneke asked for review on the vertical mixed-use requirement. He asked if both MX-1 and MX-2 mixed use areas can both have businesses. Ms. Monson stated that non-residential uses are required on the ground floor for street facing facades in both districts. She explained that the MX-1 district requires another use above the ground floor use but that MX-2 does not.
Commissioner Beneke asked for a summary of the parking requirements. Ms. Monson stated the parking requirements have already been approved by city council. The new requirements now require much less parking in the district because of the presence of ample public parking.

Commissioner Weber asked if there are any other development anticipated that might fall into MX-2 in the future. Ms. Monson stated there are none at this time but could easily expand if needed at a future time and be more specific to each area within the city.

Chair Kraft opened the public hearing.

There were no callers on the line.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Beneke made a motion, Commissioner Dumalag seconded, recommending all staff recommendations approving the comprehensive plan and zoning amendments to allow for a new zoning district for the Historic Walker Lake district. The motion passed on a vote of 7-0.

B. Nordic Ware amendment to special permit

Applicant: Dalquist Properties, LLP - 5005 Highway 7
Case Nos: 20-23-SP

Ms. Kramer presented the staff report. The applicant requests an amendment to a special permit. She noted the applicant proposes a 21,220-square-foot building addition with a new loading dock and parking area. She added an existing water main will be relocated as it serves a public need so the city retains access. An additional easement will be added for the relocated water main.

Ms. Kramer stated the amendment meets all zoning requirements and no public feedback has been received at this time.

Commissioner Erwin asked if the parking lot required any traffic study. Ms. Kramer stated the proposal did not require this and staff found this did not preclude any potential improvements to the CSAH 25 corridor in the future. Mr. Walther added this parking replaced off-site parking that was used in the past; demand is not increasing significantly and did not warrant a traffic study.
Commissioner Weber asked if the road to the east of the addition is public or private for the easement and relocation of the water main. Ms. Kramer stated it is public and is Quentin Avenue. One of the conditions of the approval will be that Nordic Ware take over maintenance of this road. Mr. Walther stated the road is predominately private due to previous right-of-way vacations, but a small portion near the frontage road remains in public right-of-way. It will be treated as private driveway as stated by Ms. Kramer.

Chair Kraft opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dahlquist, the applicant, thanked the commission and noted this is their 75th year in business. He stated they continue to grow, including unprecedented growth during the Covid-19 pandemic and continued growth of online sales. This project will allow for additional capacity for the building. He added the building on the site is metal and has been used as storage. This new addition will remove the metal shed and help the facility to look better and will be a nice addition to the community.

Chair Kraft closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Eckholm made a motion, Commissioner Erwin seconded, recommending approval of the amendment to the special permit as subject to conditions recommended in the staff report. The motion passed on a vote of 7-0.

4. Other Business - None

5. Communications

Mr. Walther stated the city council adopted accessory dwelling unit, signs and architectural materials ordinances, with strong support from the city council. He also noted the planning commission still does not have a youth commissioner; the city will continue to recruit.

Mr. Walther added the next meeting is November 4 and will be a study session only. The topics will include scale of single-family houses and home occupations.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m.
STUDY SESSION

The study session commenced at 6:25 p.m.

1. Single-family building scale related to affordable housing

Mr. Morrison presented the report. He noted the council is looking for planning commission feedback. He stated council is concerned about scale of housing, affordability, impact on neighbors, neighborhood character, supporting move-up in the park, however they do not want to regulate style of design, such as architectural style, windows style/quality, etc. of single-family houses.

Chair Kraft asked where the two examples fall related to the ground floor ratio. Mr. Morrison presented one specific block that staff identified that included buildings adjacent to one another with low, middle and high ground floor ratio. He stated on this block that most lots are the same size, but floor area ratios of the buildings are very different. He noted there is much variation on floor ratios within the city and showed various examples of this.

Commissioner Beneke asked about ground floor elevation and what the current standard is now. Mr. Morrison explained and stated some cities set rules on this but St. Louis Park does not have a standard currently.

Commissioner Eckholm asked if the roof height issue might be looked at with compromises in mind and that adjusts based on the first-floor elevation and floor to ceiling heights. Mr. Morrison stated houses do have a maximum height allowed in St. Louis Park and depending on how a main floor might be raised, the grade might not be changed, or it may, thereby affecting the overall height. He added there are various ways this can be worded.
Commissioner Beneke asked about adding an egress window and what options are available for that. He asked if that might be a motivation for raising the grade or first floor elevation. Mr. Morrison stated that most do not raise a house height to add an egress window, they usually excavate to provide a window well.

Commissioner Weber asked if staff discussed whether raising first floor elevations or impacts of that change relates to climate change and more rain or flash floods. Mr. Morrison stated staff is sensitive to impacts upon the water table and drainage patterns.

Mr. Walther added staff has done a lot of modeling on this as well as part of the comprehensive plan and surface water management to reflect the latest rainfall data.

Chair Kraft asked if there is any thought of changing setbacks. She asked if there was a limit on the number of permits that can be issued and added that kind of approach seems not to encourage the Move Up in the Park program. She wondered how this might encourage limitations.

Mr. Walther stated staff could look at this.

Commissioner Beneke asked if ADU’s in the basement might be looking to increase ceiling heights and recognized this might affect the affordability of the home and ADU. Mr. Morrison confirmed that ADUs could be located in the basement and increasing the ceiling height would add cost but would also make them more desirable.

Commissioner Eckholm asked about ADU’s or duplexes and if folks want to build huge homes, people should also be able to build larger buildings to be used for duplexes or ADUs. He added this is one strategy to include climate considerations and affordable housing.

Mr. Walther stated that the comprehensive plan housing strategies does say the city will explore allowing duplexes in low density residential areas on appropriate-sized properties. He anticipates this will be in the commission’s 2021 work plan.

Commissioner Weber agreed with Commission Eckholm’s statements.

Mr. Morrison addressed Chair Kraft’s comments on heights and setbacks. He stated of the city’s current side setbacks, many existing homes already don’t
meet the requirements for various reasons. A change to the setbacks would not have much impact to change the current house locations, as existing houses can remain in their current location and would become non-conforming. It is only when a house is completely torn down and a new house is built that it is required to meet side setbacks. He also explained the city’s current rules regarding the side yard setbacks for longer walls. He explained that the side walls of a house up to 40 feet in length can be placed at the minimum setback. If a house is longer, the side yard increases two inches for every foot the side of the house exceeds 40 feet in length. The code already includes some dynamic yard requirements to avoid long, flat side wall elevations.

Mr. Walther added the city has about 10-15 teardowns per year vs Edina which has 150+ each year. He added this is a relatively small number compared to other cities and compared to the approximately 15,000 single family houses in the city.

Mr. Walther referred to the staff report and added that Edina had an upper story side yard setback requirement but eventually they eliminated it as it was difficult to administer and it added significant costs to projects because it required changing the location of load-bearing walls or installing beams to support the upper wall.

Commissioner Weber noted the tear downs in Edina and asked if St. Louis Park has any policy to discourage tear downs. Mr. Walther stated the city has no stated policy that discourages tear downs. Some practices are in place that may indicate that because we require notifications to neighbors and neighborhood meetings before the city issues a building permit. Also, our incentive programs do not fund tear downs.

Mr. Walther stated we want to encourage residents to build and stay here in St. Louis Park and provide housing for families. Staff’s understanding of this discussion is not to get into the detailed style and look of houses but rather focus on mass and scale and how that might affect housing affordability, as well. Many of the city housing programs are tailored to help low and medium-income homeowners. He asked if the commission has further recommendations for staff to explore in more depth that might better touch on these aspects.

Commissioner Eckholm asked about maximum ground floor elevation is one to look further into as well as the side yard setback adjustments. He added he is not offended by larger homes and encouraged promoting expansions vs. teardowns.
Commissioner Beneke asked if there is a case where a larger built home might shade a home next door. Mr. Morrison stated the homes in St. Louis Park are less than 10 feet apart so shading neighboring homes is common. He added this is partially the intent with the larger setbacks for long side walls. Mr. Walther added that it would be impossible to prohibit shadowing of neighboring houses with them being built in such close proximity and especially on north-south streets and blocks.

2. Home occupations

Mr. Morrison presented the report. He noted this is a priority discussion topic in the 2020 work plan for the commission and for the city council.

He noted several previously raised topics for discussion lifting the prohibition on barbers/hairdressers as a home occupation allowing one or more outside employees, allowing home occupations in accessory buildings, allowing them occupy more than 10% of the principal building, and allowing residents of ADUs to conduct home occupations in the ADU they occupy.

Mr. Morrison stated discussion about the uses and character of the residential neighborhood should also be discussed to provide context for other decisions.

Commissioner Weber asked if the registration of land use requirement applies to people working from home now during the pandemic, such as home offices. Mr. Walther stated the registration of land use is required only when there are customers or students that come to the home. It does not apply to a home office if people living there are using the office.

Commissioner Eckholm asked about machinery and/or equipment uses within the home. He stated this may need to be re-worded to be more permissive.

Commissioner Weber noted the animal handling occupation and asked if this would be allowed as long as they stay within the city’s allowable three animal/pet limit. Mr. Morrison stated this can be discussed further.

Commissioner Weber stated there would seem to be many examples of people who would be surprised they are breaking city rules with their home occupation. He stated he thinks about this being a first interaction with the city and the impression that would leave for them.

Mr. Morrison stated staff typically will not contact the person unless a city staff person witnesses the violation. Mr. Walther added, in practice, staff is not out
doing house calls and aggressively searching for these types of violations but noted the city does regularly receive complaints from neighbors about home occupations that run afoul of the rules. A common one is car repair service; there are multiple cars being repaired or stored outside on a property in various states of repair.

Commissioner Weber asked if the city has specified the language in the ADU ordinance that says the actual ADU is actually used primarily or only for the home occupation. Mr. Walther stated this was one of the reasons raised by city council for having this discussion. He stated right now it is a bit grey in this area as to how to interpret the code, so more clarity will need to come of this.

Commissioner Beneke stated he is unclear as to what he would want to do with the ADU/home occupation, and this warrants more discussion.

Chair Kraft stated she is in alignment with most of what has been discussed. She would have concerns with noises or odors but has no concerns about barber/beauty salons, daycares, or a 3D printer in a house.

Commissioner Weber would also support some research into barber/beauty salons, as it serves a path of entry into business ownership, especially for communities that may not have access to commercial space. Commissioner Beneke added he agrees with this idea in general.

Commissioner Dagane agreed with the comments made in the discussion as well and would have concerns also with what kind of business it was and traffic issues.

Mr. Walther stated this topic will be researched further and brought to the council for input before the discussions are concluded with the commission. This will allow the commission to discuss after council and incorporate council comments in their deliberation.

3. Miscellaneous zoning amendments

This topic will be brought back at the next study session since there was not time to consider it at this meeting.

4. Communications
Commissioner Lynette Dumalag resigned from the commission and has been appointed to the city council to represent and 2nd ward after Anne Mavity’s resignation form the city council.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.
3a Pennsylvania Park Apartments conditional use permit

**Location:** 1349 and 1357 Pennsylvania Avenue South

**Case Number:** 20-24-CUP

**Applicant/Owner:** Patrick Juetten, on behalf of Waypoint Development LLC

**Review Deadline:** 60 days: December 19, 2020  120 days: February 17, 2021

**Recommended motions:**
- Chair to open the public hearing, take testimony and close the public hearing.
- Motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit (CUP) subject to the conditions recommended by staff.

**Summary of request:** Patrick Juetten on behalf of Waypoint Development LLC requests a conditional use permit in order to construct a studio apartment in the existing apartment building at 1349 Pennsylvania Avenue.

**Site information:**

- **Site area (acres):** 0.69
- **Current use:** multi-family residential
- **Surrounding land uses:**
  - North: single-family residential
  - East: park/open space
  - South: park/open space
  - West: single-family residential
Current & proposed 2040 land use guidance

RM - medium density residential

Current & proposed zoning:

R-4 multiple-family residence

Background: The applicant requests a conditional use permit in order to add a 400-square-foot studio apartment to the existing apartment building at 1349 Pennsylvania Avenue South. The studio would occupy a space previously used for laundry and storage. The washing machines in the space would be relocated to another area on the same floor.

The two properties included in the application are owned by the same entity and share a drive aisle, surface parking lot, and outdoor recreation space. No modifications to the 1357 building, building exteriors, parking lot or site plan are proposed at this time.

Present considerations: Conditional use permits (CUP) are required for multi-family residence uses in the R-4 zoning district, where the project is located. There is no CUP on file for this property, so in order to build the additional dwelling unit, a new CUP is required.

Zoning analysis: The following table provides zoning information for the project. Further details on some of the zoning requirements are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>30 units per acre</td>
<td>26 units per acre</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>30 stories or 40 feet</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>Class I 60% Class II 30% Class III 10%</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street parking</td>
<td>1 per bedroom: 33 parking spaces</td>
<td>33 spaces</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>21 spaces required</td>
<td>16 provided</td>
<td>Yes; see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>Front (west): 30 feet Rear (east): 25 feet Side (north and south): 15 feet, half building height</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.O.R.A.</td>
<td>12% of building lot (3,613 square feet)</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping- # of Trees &amp; Shrubs</td>
<td>No changes to landscaping are proposed as part of this project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Replacement Calculation</td>
<td>No tree removals proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architectural materials: Prior to the formal CUP application, the property owner painted the
western brick elevations of both buildings. Painted brick is classified as a class 3 material according to the zoning code, which only allows up to 10% class 3 materials on each building elevation. The applicant intends to request a variance in order to retain the painted brick. Staff will present the request to the board of zoning appeals (BOZA) when the city receives a complete application.

Parking and landscaping: No changes are proposed to the exterior amenities or landscaping at this time. Prior to submitting the formal CUP application, the property owner made a number of improvements to the site, including new parking lot lighting, updated building entries, bike racks and raised planter beds for use by the residents.

Conditional use permit zoning analysis: The project must meet the following general requirements for conditional use permits.

1. Consistency with city plans. The use of this property as an office use is consistent with and supportive of principles, goals, objectives, land use designations, redevelopment plans, neighborhood objectives, and implementation strategies of the comprehensive plan. This condition is met. The site is guided for medium density residential and the additional dwelling unit will not exceed the density maximum allowed in the R-4 zoning district.

2. Nuisance. It is not detrimental to the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the community as a whole. It will not have undue adverse impacts on the use and enjoyment of properties, existing and anticipated traffic conditions, parking facilities on adjacent streets, and values of properties in close proximity to the conditional use. This condition is met.

3. Compliance with code. It is consistent with the regulations, intent and purpose of city code and the zoning district in which the conditional use is located. With the exception of the painted brick facades, which will be resolved in a future variance application, all proposed changes as part of this project meet zoning requirements.

4. Consistency with service capacity. It will not have undue adverse impacts on governmental facilities, services or improvements which are either existing or proposed. Services will not be adversely impacted by the proposed additional dwelling unit.

5. Site design. It is consistent with the design and other requirements of site and landscape plans prepared by or under the direction of a professional landscape architect or civil engineer registered in the state and adopted as part of the conditions imposed on the use by the city council. No changes to the site plan are proposed as part of this project.

6. Consistency with utilities. It is consistent with the city’s stormwater, sanitary sewer and water plans. The project is consistent with all city utility plans.

Multi-family residences must also meet the following conditions in the R-4 zoning district:

1. Access shall be to a roadway identified in the comprehensive plan as a collector or arterial or shall be otherwise located so that access can be provided without generating significant traffic on local residential streets. This condition is met.
2. **At minimum of 12% of the building lot shall be developed as designed outdoor recreation area.** The existing site does not meet this rule. Both properties currently contain approximately 2,750 square feet of outdoor recreation area, or approximately 9% of the total site. Staff recommends the site be allowed to remain as a legal nonconformity. No changes to the site plan are proposed as part of this project that would create a nexus to require compliance with this rule at this time.

3. **The minimum spacing between buildings shall be the average heights of the buildings.** This rule applies to principal buildings on the same lot. The buildings are on separate lots and it is not applicable to the property. The project does not include any changes to the buildings’ placement or exteriors.

4. **All buildings shall be located a minimum of 15 feet from the back of the curbline of internal private roadways or parking lots.** The existing site does not meet this rule. Staff recommends these be allowed to remain as legal nonconformities. No changes to the buildings are proposed as part of this project that would create a nexus to require compliance with this rule at this time.

5. **If parking is accommodated on the required public or private road system, it must meet minimum public street width requirements of this chapter to allow on-street parking.** This condition is met.

6. **Sidewalks with a minimum width of five feet shall be provided along all sides of the lot that abut a public street. Sidewalks shall also be provided between the public street and parking areas to all building entrances.** This condition is met.

**Neighborhood meeting:** The applicant held a virtual neighborhood meeting on November 10, 2020. Three people attended. Residents asked the applicant questions about on-street parking, particularly during snow emergencies, and the affordability of the units. The applicant noted there are no housing choice vouchers used in the property at this time, and that the owner has voucher holders in other properties and would be open to renting to voucher holders in the future.

**Next steps:** The city council will consider the CUP application at the December 7, 2020 regular meeting. BOZA will likely consider a variance request to allow more than 10% class III exterior materials, painted brick, to remain on the building elevations that have already been painted when a complete application is submitted.

**Recommendations:** Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit subject to the following conditions:

1. The site shall be developed, used and maintained in accordance with the conditions of this ordinance, approved Official Exhibits, and City Code.

2. Prior to starting any land disturbing activities, the following conditions shall be met:
   a. The developer shall sign the city’s assent form and the official exhibits.
b. BOZA approves a variance application to allow greater than 10% class III exterior materials, painted brick, or the paint is removed.

c. A preconstruction meeting shall be held with the appropriate development, construction, private utility companies and city representatives.

d. All necessary permits shall be obtained.

3. The developer shall comply with the following conditions during construction:

   a. All city noise ordinances shall be complied with, including that there be no construction activity between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. Monday through Friday, and between 10 p.m. and 9 a.m. on weekends and holidays.

   b. The site shall be kept free of dust and debris that could blow onto neighboring properties.

   c. Public streets shall be maintained free of dirt and shall be cleaned as necessary.

   d. The city shall be contacted a minimum of 72 hours prior to any work in a public street.

   e. Work in a public street shall take place only upon the determination by the city engineer (or designee) that appropriate safety measures have been taken to ensure motorist and pedestrian safety.

   f. Temporary electric power connections shall not adversely impact surrounding neighborhood service.

4. In addition to any other remedies, the developer or owner shall pay an administrative fee of $750 per violation of any condition of this approval.

5. The conditional use permit shall be revoked and cancelled if the building or structure for which the conditional use permit is granted is removed.

**Supporting documents:** site plan, proposed floor plan

**Prepared by:** Jacquelyn Kramer, associate planner

**Reviewed by:** Sean Walther, planning and zoning supervisor
1 Miscellaneous zoning amendments

Recommended motions: No action is required at this time. The purpose of this report is to discuss various zoning amendments and provide feedback.

Summary of request: Periodically staff propose an ordinance to amend various sections of the code for the purpose of making changes that are consistent with current policy, correcting errors, and making clarifications. The following is a list of items included in this amendment:

1. Requiring a conditional use permit for excavation only if the excavation is not covered by another permitting process. This change will reduce redundancy in review process and application fees.
2. Clarify that the window transparency requirements of commercial buildings also apply to existing buildings. The intent of the code recently passed was to limit when existing properties had to add transparency to comply with the new ordinance. It did not intend to allow existing buildings that meet the new rule to reduce transparency to an extent that they no longer comply. The amendment will state this more clearly.
3. Signs located at residential properties containing four or fewer dwelling units cannot be illuminated. This request is made to reduce the nuisance potential of illuminated signs on small residential properties.
4. Create a definition for marijuana dispensary. Marijuana dispensaries are currently not permitted in the city. The definition will clarify this by distinguishing them from pharmacies and retail uses. Changes to the code would be required to allow this use in the future.
5. Clarify the procedures for amending planned unit developments that were established prior to the current PUD rules which require a rezoning to a PUD district. It is often unnecessary to rezone properties to allow site plan and building changes and especially complicated when multiple owners control property within a PUD.
6. Amend the bright accent color limitations. City code currently allows up to five percent of each building elevation to be a bright accent color.
7. Clarify side yard setback requirements for accessory dwelling units.

Staff also identified some suggested policy amendments to consider in this ordinance.

1. Increasing the threshold for when a conditional use permit for excavation is required. This change was requested by city council.
2. Allow restaurants with intoxicating liquor in the C-1 neighborhood commercial district as a conditional use permit.

Next Steps: Staff will review and incorporate the planning commission comments into the proposed amendment and schedule the amendment for a public hearing at a future planning commission meeting this fall/winter.

Prepared by: Gary Morrison, assistant zoning administrator
Reviewed by: Sean Walther, planning and zoning supervisor