

**CITY OF MEDINA**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday October 9, 2018

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

Present: Planning Commissioners Aaron Amic, Kerby Nester, Cindy Piper, Robin Reid, Janet White, and Rashmi Williams.

Absent: Planning Commissioner Todd Albers.

Also Present: City Planning Director Dusty Finke.

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

No comments made.

3. **Update from City Council Proceedings**

Finke reported that Celebration Day was a success and thanked everyone that volunteered or donated towards the event. He stated that the Council reviewed the OSI request and directed staff to prepare a resolution to rezone lot one to the Business Zoning District, as recommended by the Planning Commission. He stated that the Council also directed staff to prepare a resolution approving the Griffin Conditional Use Permit and reviewed a lot line rearrangement for the property that the Wayzata School District is looking to purchase. He stated that the Council reviewed the Mixed Residential Zoning District, suggesting a few changes and noted that item will reappear before the Council in November. He reported that the Council adopted the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and therefore the City is within the nine-month period of updating its official controls to become consistent with the Plan. He noted that the Council also reviewed the Comprehensive Plan proposed by the City of Corcoran and will continue to review plans from neighboring communities to provide input. He stated that on November 13<sup>th</sup> at 8 a.m. the Council will hold its fall business tour and welcomed any Planning Commissioners that would like to attend.

4. **Planning Department Report**

Finke provided an update.

5. **Continued Public Hearing – Open Systems International (OSI) – PID 03-118-23-41-0005 – Preliminary Plat and Site Plan Review for the Construction of a 123,454 Square Foot Office Building – North of 4101 Arrowhead Drive**

Finke stated that this is a continued hearing for the OSI proposal that the Commission reviewed at the previous meeting. He stated that the Commission recommended rezoning to the Business District at the last meeting, which the Council also supports. He reviewed the adjacent land uses and development near the subject site. He provided a rendering of the proposed building, noting that it is similar to the existing building to the south in scale and design. He stated that the Preliminary Plat was changed in order to accommodate shifting the access point to the north to support better sight lines. He stated that lot one and the outlot

would both meet the dimensional standards, noting that the outlot would be zoned to the Business Park District in the future. He provided information related to transportation and recommendations from the City Engineer. He noted that the Park Commission recommends a trail easement along future Chippewa and the remainder of park dedication to be provided in the form of cash in lieu. He stated that staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat request subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. He provided details on the proposed Site Plan, including information on the proposed setbacks and 75 percent opaque buffer on the eastern boundary line. He stated that additional parking has been provided on the plans since the last meeting and provided details on the parking calculations. He stated that the building design meets the minimum standards of the Business Zoning District. He provided information on proposed tree removal and replacement as well as the suggested exemption. He explained that staff would suggest active management of the other woodlands on the site as part of the exemption. He provided details on the proposed lighting, noting that additional work will be done to ensure that the light does not spill outside of the property. He stated that staff recommends approval subject to the conditions noted in the staff report.

Piper referenced the landscaping plan, which shows a future building addition to the northwest. She asked if elements for that future building would be addressed at that time.

Finke confirmed that a future request would need to be reviewed in the same manner.

Nester asked if there is a threshold at which a gravel road is no longer acceptable.

Finke confirmed that there is a threshold but noted that the number is higher than you would typically think. He stated that the City tends to pave roads for various reasons prior to the threshold being met but noted that there are challenges for that roadway because of a lack of right-of-way at this time. He stated that the improvement is planned in future as right-of-way is acquired with development north of Bridgewater.

White reopened the public hearing at 7:19 p.m.

Reid stated that at the last review her main concern was shielding the residential properties across Arrowhead. She asked if there is berming or whether it is all landscaping.

Finke replied that there is a small berm in addition to the landscaping.

Reid asked for details on the landscaping element marked "CI" which appears to contribute to the buffer.

Finke provided details on the landscaping elements, noting that the plan will need to be changed a bit to match the 70 percent opacity requirement.

Reid stated that was her main concern as she believes that the lighting has been addressed. She stated that if the landscape buffer meets the opacity requirements, she would have no concerns.

Amic asked the elements of the parking that would be delayed as proof of parking.

Steve Oliver, Mohagen Hansen, representing the applicant, replied that they are not exactly sure but believed that it would be a portion of the easterly parking along Arrowhead.

Nester asked the advantage of delaying paving at this time.

Finke replied that the benefit would be to delay additional hardcover that may not be needed. He stated that for various reasons it would be easier to incorporate additional parking into this Site Plan compared to the existing facility. He stated that the City process has become more streamlined.

White closed the public hearing at 7:23 p.m.

Williams asked if there are plans for paving the gravel road north of Bridgewater.

Finke replied that there are no plans within the City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan. He explained that it would be difficult without the necessary right-of-way that would be gained as the property develops along that roadway. He stated that the lack of improvements can act as a disincentive for traffic, as people may avoid a gravel road but would choose to take the road if it were paved.

White asked for details on the active management suggestion for the woodland areas.

Finke stated that there are not specific suggestions at this time. He noted that on the other site owned by the applicant there is a large woodland grove that could be improved. He stated that the City has natural resource experts that would provide feedback on the management. He stated that physically you cannot replace that many trees on the site and so the alternative would be to have a cash payment that could be used to reforest other areas of the City. He noted that the exemption requiring active management could be done in conjunction with cash payment if desired. He confirmed that there are limited opportunities to do more planting in the City. He stated that active woodland management has been found to be a good use of the reforestation funds. He noted that storm damage or Emerald Ash Borer damage in the future could also be good use of the funds.

Nester referenced the future walking path and asked when that would be constructed.

Finke stated that is not anticipated to be a public amenity.

Ron Abrams, OSI, explained that the trail may not be executed exactly in that format or as part of the building but would likely be a part of the site early.

Williams stated that she drives the gravel road and noted that if there is going to be increased traffic she would ask the City to keep it on the radar because of the pedestrian traffic on the roadway.

Nester asked if the requirement for the trails could be a condition of the approval.

Finke stated that if the City wanted to require that private amenity, there would have to be credit towards park dedication.

Reid asked the concern of Nester.

Nester stated that her concern would be increased foot traffic through the Bridgewater neighborhood.

Reid stated that it sounds like there are plans to construct the trail, although it may not be part of this project.

White stated that is going to be a private amenity and would not be open to the public. She stated that she would not be in favor of using park dedication funds for a private improvement.

Amic stated that he understands that the concern that additional foot traffic would go through the neighborhoods but also understands the point that the Commission would not want to use park dedication to support the private trail.

Abrams provided additional details on the trail system within the site that has already been constructed and the plans for the new trails.

Finke stated that the new trail would be similar to the existing trail system on the site and therefore he was unsure that would prevent people from utilizing the City sidewalks or trails.

Nester stated that there is a lot of employee foot traffic in the Bridgewater neighborhood on the sidewalks.

White stated that it appears that employees are using the Bridgewater neighborhood for walking rather than using the OSI trails.

Williams agreed that the same things happens in her neighborhood with Polaris employees and agreed that there is some concern with strangers in the neighborhood from the standpoint of a parent.

Mike Kuklok, OSI, stated that the current trail system dead-ends and the addition will continue from that point.

Nester asked if the employer has polled employees about whether they like the crushed rock.

Kuklok replied that it was a condition of the City as it was less hardcover.

Finke stated that it is also a matter of distance, employees appear to like to walk further than the current trail system.

White suggested that the Commission strongly recommend that the applicant provide a looped trail for employees.

Amic stated that it does not sound like the request is outside of what the business wants to do and does not think park dedication should be used to require the element. He stated that he would prefer to ask the applicant to follow through on what they already appear to be planning.

Finke stated that language could be added that the trail be constructed in conjunction with other site improvements.

**Motion by Reid, seconded by Nester,** to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat and Site Plan subject to the conditions noted in the staff report and the additional condition related to the timing of the trail completion. Motion carries unanimously. (Absent: Albers)

Finke stated that this could move forward to the City Council at its next meeting or in November.

6. **Public Hearing – Ordinance Amendment – Chapter 8 of the City Code Regarding Planning Commission Membership Requirements**

Finke stated that a resident had requested that the City consider removing the residency requirement in the code for serving on the Commission. He stated that the topic was discussed by the City Council and noted that the Council supported reducing the residency requirement from three years, but not removing the requirement.

Reid asked the residency requirement of the Park Commission.

Finke replied one year.

Piper asked if there is history on the residency requirement.

Reid replied that the interest was simply from one resident and therefore there was not a large movement.

Finke replied that the Commission has turned away interested residents that have not met the residency requirement.

Amic stated that he was first denied because he has been a resident for only 2.5 years.

Reid agreed with the two-year term.

Williams stated that she was concerned with the 30-day requirement for City Council.

Amic replied that the City Council is an elected position and therefore that is governed by statute.

White opened the public hearing at 7:48 p.m.

No comments made.

White closed the public hearing at 7:48 p.m.

Nester asked if there has been more turnover on the Commission than there has been in the past.

Finke stated that the City has experienced some shorter terms in the past five years. He stated that in terms of interest, he has never not had applicants.

Reid stated that there have been some unusual activities, with members moving to the Council and people moving that have caused vacancies within the past five years.

Piper stated that the danger of having new residents on the Commission is that those people may have an agenda and have not lived in the community long enough to understand the process and the community at large.

It was the consensus of the Commission that two years would be an adequate residency requirement.

White stated that she would like to see applicants actually attend two Commission meetings prior to applying as well.

Finke stated that there is an appointment process where questions of that nature are asked.

Williams asked if representation of different areas of the community is considered during the appointment process.

White stated that it is attempted to have representation from different areas, but it also depends on whom is interested in applying.

Williams asked if there are demographics on the age range within Medina.

Finke replied that is updated with the American Communities survey. He noted that some of those demographics are in the Comprehensive Plan but noted that the data continues to change.

**Motion by Amic, seconded by Reid,** to recommend approval of the ordinance regarding Planning Commission membership requirements. Motion carries unanimously. (Absent: Albers)

7. **Approval of the September 11, 2018 Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.**

**Motion by Piper, seconded by Amic,** to approve the September 11, 2018, Planning Commission minutes with the noted change. Motion carries unanimously. (Absent: Albers)

8. **Council Meeting Schedule**

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

9. **Adjourn**

**Motion by Reid, seconded by Piper,** to adjourn the meeting at 7:57 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.