

CITY OF MEDINA PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Charles Nolan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Planning Commissioners John Anderson, Kathleen Martin, Charles Nolan, Robin Reid (arrived at 7:20 p.m.), Victoria Reid and Kent Williams.

Absent: Beth Nielsen

Also Present: City Council member Elizabeth Weir, City Planner Dusty Finke and Dan Edgerton from Bonestroo.

2. **Public Comments on items not on the agenda**

No public comments.

3. **Update from City Council proceedings**

Council member Elizabeth Weir presented a report of recent activities and decisions by the City Council.

4. **Planning Department Report**

Finke provided an update of upcoming Planning projects and noted that there will likely be more ordinances for reviews in coming months as well.

5. **Approval of the April 12, 2011 Draft Planning Commission meeting minutes.**

Motion by V. Reid, seconded by Martin, to approve the April 12, 2011 minutes with minor modifications to pages four and five. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **Public Hearing - Ordinance Amendment - Chapter 8 of the Medina Zoning Code to codify the City's stormwater management regulations.**

Edgerton presented the staff report. He summarized various types of stormwater improvements which are commonly constructed to meet objectives, such as are included in the ordinance. Edgerton stated that the ordinance is intended to implement the City's Surface Water Management Plan. The primary objectives of the ordinance are to control the rate and volume of stormwater runoff and to improve

water quality by reducing phosphorus. The ordinance establishes the thresholds that determine the type of projects which will trigger the requirement to install improvements. Edgerton stated that the Stormwater Manual is meant to describe how to complete necessary calculations and also to describe the types of improvements allowed by the City. This Manual will be updated often to include new technologies in stormwater improvements which are constantly improving.

Edgerton described the approximate construction costs of various stormwater improvements which could be installed if a project triggered the ordinance. He stated that most of the ordinance and manual were very technical in nature. He summarized two primary policy questions which the Planning Commission needed to provide direction: 1) the scale of the project which would require improvements; and 2) whether volume control requirements on expansion projects should apply to the whole site, or just the new hardcover.

Commissioners discussed the differences between residential and commercial projects. Commissioners discussed if rural projects which may disturb over an acre would actually bring up less of a need to treat runoff than work in a denser neighborhood.

Nolan suggested the possibility of a less onerous review process which could apply to individual homeowners. Commissioners expressed support for a system by which improvements could be installed without hiring an engineer to complete modeling.

Edgerton stated that he believed it would be possible to include a calculation of rain garden size within the Stormwater Manual so that a property owner could avoid the modeling and design costs.

Nolan stated that it seems like the cost of design and improvement should be linked to the cost of the proposed construction, perhaps a “not to exceed” exemption. Finke stated that staff would not like to utilize actual project cost, but attempt to address this concern by setting a reasonable threshold for when improvements are required.

Public Hearing opened at 8:18 p.m.

Martin stated that a homeowner should also not be expected to prepare the Maintenance Agreement. Finke noted that the City would prepare a template to use. Finke stated that the maintenance, and the City’s enforcement of the maintenance, was very important so that they are successful at improving water quality for the amount of money invested in them.

Public Hearing closed at 8:27 p.m.

The Commission discussed state and watershed water quality mandates. Edgerton stated that the City has set a goal to reduce phosphorus loading by 20%.

Finke stated that an important discussion point in the ordinance is related to expansion projects. The current language would require a property owner who wished to expand their parking lot by 10 stalls to treat the stormwater for not only the 10 stalls, but also for all of the existing hardcover.

Martin stated that it appears that the Surface Water Management Plan says that the volume control requirement should only apply to the disturbed area.

Edgerton described the potential cost impact of an expansion project.

Williams inquired if the ordinance couldn't require a 30% reduction over the disturbed area to improve water quality, but still link the amount of improvement to the scale of the project.

Commissioners discussed the potential impacts to a property owner of requiring a 20% reduction for the whole site or a 30% of a reduction over the new hardcover.

Martin stated that she believes a requirement to reduce the phosphorus by 30% of the disturbed area seems inconsistent with the language in the Surface Water Management Plan which states 20% over the disturbed.

Williams inquired what language would help resolve the language inconsistency.

Finke read language under the volume control requirements of the Surface Water Management plan that stated that sites should maintain runoff volume to the extent practical.

The consensus of the Commission was to require the 20% reduction over only the disturbed portion of the site during an expansion project.

Martin inquired if it would be possible for a Planning Commissioner to assist with proofreading of ordinances. She stated that when she reads an ordinance, she often gets distracted by clerical and grammatical changes that she sees are needed.

Commissioners discussed options by which Planning Commissioners could assist the process.

Nolan inquired if there was any additional feedback for the stormwater ordinance before the Commission would table it and have staff prepare revisions.

Motion by V. Reid, seconded by Anderson, to table discussion of the ordinance and to direct staff to make the changes discussed. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioners discussed the threshold for smaller residential projects.

Finke noted that the discussion had still left alone the acre of disturbance.

Nolan stated that the threshold for him is related to how streamlined the design and administrative review process was.

V. Reid stated that she was concerned with making the process too onerous for smaller projects.

7. City Council Meeting Schedule

May 17, 2011 – Williams

June 7, 2011 – Anderson and Nolan

8. Adjourn

Motion by V. Reid, seconded by R. Reid, to adjourn the meeting at 9:27 p.m.

Motion carried unanimously. (Absent: Martin)