

**CITY OF MEDINA**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday July 11, 2017

1. **Call to Order**: Chairperson White called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Planning Commissioners Todd Albers, Aaron Amic, Dino DesLauriers, Kim Murrin, Kerby Nester, Robin Reid, and Janet White.

Absent: None.

Also Present: City Planner Dusty Finke.

2. **Public Comments on Items not on the Agenda**

No comments made.

3. **Update from City Council Proceedings**

Finke provided an update on the last two meetings of the City Council.

4. **Planning Department Report**

Finke provided an update from the Planning Department, noting that two new applications had been received. He stated that one application is a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from the Excelsior Group for property north of Chippewa Road and west of Mohawk Drive and the second is a variance request from McDonald's for relocation of their trash enclosure, which is being moved by Hennepin County for the CR 116 road improvements.

5. **Public Hearing – Lunski, Inc. – Rezoning, Preliminary Plat, and Site Plan Review for a 90-Unit Senior Assisted Living/Independent Living Community and Office Building located North of State Hwy 55, South of Chippewa Road and West of Mohawk Drive (PID #03-118-23-32-0007)**

Sparks provided a summary of the request. He highlighted the changes that had been made to the plan since the Commission last saw the request in the Concept Plan review phase. He noted that there is some overlap in the commercial and business districts and therefore the rezoning could be appropriate. He reviewed some of the comments from the Park Commission in regard to park dedication and trails. He highlighted the proposed access and private street. He stated that there was a lot of discussion with the proposed access point at the Concept Plan review and the applicant has then moved the access point as far to the east as possible to create additional spacing between the neighboring parcel. He explained that an easement would be required for the trail to allow users of the sites to travel between the sites on the trail. He noted that larger than typical drainage and utility easements would be required for the private street. He stated that the private street falls within the outlot and therefore the outlot would need to be owned by the association to ensure the road would remain safe and up to standards. He stated that the City Engineer provided comments and requested additional information on the traffic study that was completed. He stated that a fire truck turnaround would be provided in lieu of a second emergency access. He reviewed the proposed mix of the units which would include independent living, assisted living and

specialty/memory care units. He noted that the uses would need to be related with a minimum age for the independent living as regular multi-family housing would not be allowed in this zoning with the mix of assisted living. He reviewed the proposed parking which would include a mix of underground parking and surface parking. He reviewed the proposed building materials and design elements. He reviewed the proposed setbacks and tree removal. He reviewed the landscaping plan proposed, which would restore some of the trees removed. He noted that ornamental plants and shrubs would not count as replacement trees. He stated that there are screening requirements and therefore they may want to see that for the mechanical equipment and parking area. He noted that the landscaping plan would need to be modified in order to meet the tree replacement, if that is the desire. He reviewed the proposed signage, noting that you are not able to have a freestanding sign on an otherwise empty lot. He noted that the specifications for the lights proposed to be used for the signs would need to be known as well. He stated that there are not different demand times for medical office and assisted living and therefore there should be sufficient parking for each use and not a shared parking.

Reid stated that she believes the peak time for assisted living would be holidays and weekends and during the daytime the number of residents and staff would remain static.

Sparks provided additional details on the engineering standard, and noted that because the residents are retired, they are often home during the day and a higher number of staff is on hand as well. He noted that there is not an ironclad number for the number of units designated for independent/assisted/specialty units. He stated that the parking proposed would likely be a workable number.

Reid asked if the office complex and senior living building would have separate owners.

Sparks believed that the developer would own both and have people run each business, but noted that the applicant could provide that clarification. He provided details concerning the wetland area on the site and the buffer that would be required. He noted that the Watershed District and City Engineer have requested additional clarifications and modifications. He stated that because the site is being built up, that would create additional slope and therefore the Watershed District would require additional buffer. He noted that an average buffer method could work in this situation, but that methodology would need to be provided. He stated that the Watershed District has requested revisions to the plan which may cause changes to the site. He noted that the City Engineer is also requesting additional information for the WCA requirements and permitting. He stated that they would like the parking and access drive to be controlled by the association. He stated that there are three different requests that must be considered in a specific order. He noted that the rezoning would be the first item to consider, with the Preliminary Plat to follow and then lastly the Site Plan review with details provided for the Commission to consider for each step of the request.

DesLauriers asked what can be done to ensure there is an association.

Sparks stated that the City Attorney reviewed the draft association documents and made suggestions for changes that would make the association strong.

Reid asked and received confirmation that the items recommended to be changed are included in the proposed conditions.

Albers asked concerning the minimum number of surface parking stalls needed.

White stated that it would seem the City would have to know the ratio of mixed uses in order to determine the appropriate parking requirements.

Reid noted that could be difficult as residents could begin as independent and transition to assisted living within the same unit.

Albers stated that he has a lot of confusion with the parking. He asked if the City should review their zoning requirements to determine a better standard.

Sparks noted that Medina does not have this specific use within their zoning ordinance which can make it tricky. He explained that staff worked with the applicant using the parking required for independent living apartments and then using the engineering study for ratios as well. He explained that the parking requirement is designed to handle peak times.

Albers asked how many units were counted with the 2.2 requirement.

Sparks replied that one half of the senior living building was calculated as that ratio, explaining that the office building was calculated with its own ratio.

Albers asked if the staff parking is included in the parking requirements. He stated that he did not foresee more than one car per unit for the senior living facility and therefore it seems like too many stalls.

Sparks explained that the calculation is not based on the residents having those vehicles, but also includes staff and visitors.

Albers asked if there is a concern with the impervious surface.

Finke provided additional information on parking and proof of parking that could be provided in lieu of providing the actual additional parking. He explained that the proof of parking would need to be identified on the site and if additional parking is required, that area could then be built out. He stated that it is in the best interest of the owner to ensure necessary parking is being provided for the residents and guests. He noted that the larger assisted living units may require more parking than the .4 slated as well, which may create a balance between the independent and assisted living parking.

Dean Lunski, Lunski Inc., stated that they did incorporate the comments from the Commission and Council during the Concept Plan to reduce the number of units from 135 to 90. He noted that a 5,000-square foot building was removed and the medical office building was scaled down to better fit into the site.

Craig Hartman, Momentum Design Group and project architect, stated that they have looked extensively into the parking for this site and with the different ratios, as the ordinance does not address this type of use. He stated that the ownership has put a lot of time into the issue of parking because he is most affected if the parking is not adequate. He stated that the independent living units will be half of the senior living facility. He stated that the goal is for residents to age in place and therefore the assisted living ratio will increase as time moves on and the independent living residents age into assisted living. He reviewed the calculations that they used to determine the parking number they believe to be sufficient, which is 111. He stated that there will be documents through the association which allow the parking to be shared between lots, but explained that the shared parking does not include a reduction in parking. He explained that the shared parking would allow visitors to park in the medical office parking area on high peak times, such as Christmas.

Jay Hill, Hill Engineering and civil engineer for the project, stated that there are some wetland impacts associated with the project. He stated that this project would be the lowest impact to the wetlands of the designs that they originally reviewed. He noted that a majority of the wetland impacts would be for the access road on the west side. He stated that the City and Watershed District have a variety of rules and regulations, noting that the two sets of regulations do not always agree and therefore they are trying their best to meet the requirements of both the City and Watershed District. He stated that they are proposing to use wetland buffer averaging for their methodology.

Lunski stated that they do not believe that any of the comments would substantially impact the project as designed and therefore they would ask the Commission to approve the project with the recommended conditions.

Reid referenced the skyway connection, noting that the skyway appears to be white from the south view. She stated that her concern is the visual integration between the two different styles of buildings and would like to see the skyway less conspicuous.

Hartman agreed that the skyway materials would be in line with the rest of the development and would be an approved material. He noted that the same masonry material from the senior building would be used on the medical office building and the stucco colors would be similar as well in order to integrate the two concepts together.

Murrin referenced the medical office building and the 100 parking stalls allocated. She noted that a lot of the customers for the medical office building would be coming from the senior living building and asked if that was considered in the parking calculations.

Hartman stated that the parking for the office building was designed per ordinance and did not take that factor into account as the ordinance does not allow that. He stated that this would be unique in that the two uses would connect through the skyway. He stated that there will be crossover between the uses, but the medical office building would also see other clients as well. He stated that it would be hard to gauge the percentage of crossover because of insurance and preferences.

Lunski stated that the crossover design will be trending more now as that provides comfort to the residents in the senior living portion to have medical clinics close by. He provided additional details on how residents would be allowed to age in place in their unit as they move away from independent living and towards assisted living.

Reid asked if there would be communal dining.

Hartman noted that the residents would have the choice of a full kitchen in their unit and then would also have the ability to order in meals.

White opened the public hearing at 8:38 p.m.

No comments.

White closed the public hearing at 8:39 p.m.

Albers asked if the Commission felt comfortable pushing this forward to the Council with the number of changes recommended or whether the applicant should address the changes and come back to the Commission.

Murrin stated that she is comfortable with the item moving forward with the conditions, as the applicant could address those items prior to City Council. She stated that she does like the option for proof of parking.

Reid stated that the revisions should be made prior to going to City Council, as that will be a thorough review.

DesLauriers stated that he was guessing and there was not a lot of time for the engineering study as that came back July 6<sup>th</sup> and there were 43 comments. He stated that there are another 20+ comments from the Watershed District. He stated that there is a lot of work to do and perhaps the applicant cannot do that prior to the Council.

White stated that she would like to table the request to see the changes come back before the Commission. She stated that she thinks it is a great plan and she would like to be able to comment on the items once the revisions are made, providing an example of the tree preservation ordinance and wetland setbacks. She stated that there is a lot to preserve in Medina and those are important issues that she would like to see prior to passing the item to the Council.

Reid agreed that if the changes were made, that would allow the project to move quickly to the City Council following the next review of the Planning Commission.

Murrin stated that if the applicant could make all the changes prior to the next Council meeting, she would be in favor of passing this item forward.

Finke stated that these changes would need to be made prior to the Council review.

Albers stated that he would be in favor of tabling the request to allow the applicant to make the changes as recommended prior to the approval of the Planning Commission.

Finke stated that a lot of the discussion is related to the Site Plan review. He noted that there are three actions requested and the Commission could discuss the rezoning request tonight. He noted that the current zoning is commercial and under the draft Comprehensive Plan the zoning would be business. He stated that there is a reasonable overlap in the two zonings and therefore it could be considered that business is not a huge jump from commercial. He noted that in the past few months when the Council has considered rezoning ahead of the draft Comprehensive Plan those requests were drastically different zoning requests.

Reid stated that she is okay with this request as the senior living would not be clearly visible from Highway 55.

DesLauriers agreed in support of the rezoning.

Amic also agreed with the rezoning as this will create an opportunity for residents of Medina to age in place in the community.

Murrin and Nester also confirmed their consensus with the rezoning request.

**Motion by Reid, seconded by Albers,** to recommend approval of the rezoning. Motion carries unanimously.

Finke noted that a change in notification would take place on August 1<sup>st</sup> and therefore the Commission taking action on the rezoning will help the application move forward even if the

Commission decides to table the remaining two requests. He stated that staff would tend to link the Preliminary Plat and Site Plan together.

Murrin stated that if the Commission is going to table the remaining two actions, she would suggest waiting to discuss in further detail until the additional details are provided by the applicant at the next meeting.

Reid stated that she likes that the applicant included the comments about the density of the site in their review between the Concept Plan, and then adjusted their plans accordingly.

**Motion by Albers, seconded by Reid**, to table the Preliminary Plat and Site Plan review and recommend that the applicant update plans to be consistent with the staff comments.

Further discussion: Amic noted that he would be in favor of allowing the item to move forward with the conditions and therefore will be voting against the motion.

Motion carries 6-1. (Opposed: Amic)

White briefly recessed the meeting.

White reconvened the meeting.

6. **Public Hearing – Buddy and Kim Snow – 2402 Hamel Road – Conditional Use Permit to Construct a Second Principal Home on Rural Residential Property Over 40 Acres**

Finke presented the request, reviewing the current conditions of the site through an aerial photograph and reviewing the surrounding uses. He identified the proposed location for the second home, noting that the home would share the existing driveway of the home already on the site. He noted that a ghost plat is also required and included as that would show how the property could be subdivided in the future should a future owner wish to do so. He stated that the second home of the site would be limited in use to family members, employees or as a guest house. He noted that primary and alternate septic sites are provided for both the existing home and second home.

White opened the public hearing at 9:05 p.m.

No comments.

White closed the public hearing at 9:05 p.m.

Reid noted that the request exceeds all of the conditions.

**Motion by Reid, seconded by Albers**, to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit request of Buddy and Kim Snow for a second principal dwelling at 2402 Hamel Road, based upon the findings noted in the staff report and subject to the conditions in the report. Motion carries unanimously.

7. **32 Hamel Road LLC – 32, 36, and 42 Hamel Road – Preliminary/Final Plat to Combine Three Lots into One**

Finke presented a request to combine three relatively small lots into one lot in the Hamel area. He stated that the property is zoned Uptown Hamel 2 and identified the adjacent uses. He stated that the applicant would like to combine the lots in order to provide additional

flexibility and improvements to the area. He stated that the City approved the lot combination in 2009, but the previous landowner never filed the paperwork to finalize the combination. He noted that the proposed lot combination would exceed the minimum lot size. He stated that staff believes that the request meets the requirements and therefore should be approved.

The applicant stated that he does not have any current plans, but is instead “paving the road” for the future in order to provide more flexibility without crossing lot lines.

**Motion by Murrin, seconded by Amic,** to recommend approval of the Plat of Hamel Thirty Two, subject to the conditions noted in the staff report. Motion carries unanimously.

8. **New Email Address Check-In**

Finke asked if there has been any trouble in making the conversion for email addresses.

Albers noted that he was successful in making the transition, but then had trouble linking it to his phone.

Finke asked the Commissioners to attempt to make the change this week and ensure that they were able to get access. He noted that there are additional options, such as forwarding emails to a more used account, should they desire.

9. **Approval of the June 13, 2017 Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.**

**Motion by Albers, seconded by DesLauriers,** to approve the June 13, 2017, Planning Commission minutes with the noted correction. Motion carries unanimously.

10. **Council Meeting Schedule**

Finke advised that the Council will be meeting the following Tuesday and White volunteered to attend in representation of the Commission.

11. **Adjourn**

**Motion by DesLauriers, seconded by Murrin,** to adjourn the meeting at 9:21 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.