

COON RAPIDS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF MAY 20, 2010

The regular agenda meeting of the Coon Rapids Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Naeve at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Chairman Naeve, Commissioners Jenny Geisler, Michael Haag, Margaret Murphy, Theo Peterson and Julia Stevens.

Members Absent: Commissioner Denise Hosch.

Staff Present: Community Development Director Marc Nevinski; Planner Scott Harlicker; City Engineer Doug Vierzba and, Assistant City Attorney Doug Johnson.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER MURPHY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER GEISLER, TO ADOPT THE AGENDA AS AMENDED MOVING ITEM 7 TO ITEM 4B. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 15, 2010 REGULAR MINUTES

Commissioner Murphy requested a correction on Page 3, changing Louis to Louise.

Commissioner Stevens asked that her name be spelled correctly in the motion at the bottom of Page 1.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER MURPHY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STEVENS, TO APPROVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2010, AS CORRECTED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

4A. PLANNING CASE 10-08 – BENJAMIN LOPEZ – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A CHURCH AT 1557 COON RAPIDS BOULEVARD – PUBLIC HEARING

It was noted the applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to use 1,000 square feet of an existing office building as a church. The property was granted a conditional use permit for a church in the past and additional parking was available on site.

Commissioner Murphy stated she was a neighboring property owner for this Conditional Use Permit. After speaking with the City Attorney about this issue, she would participate in the discussion of the conditional use permit but would not be voting.

Chairman Naeve opened the public hearing at 6:35 p.m.

Gladys Bandimere, 1547 Coon Rapids Boulevard asked what kind of church was being proposed at this location, how large the congregation was and if there would be evening meetings. She explained Egret was somewhat congested in the evening and did not want to see additional traffic in this area.

Chairman Naeve stated she was not certain of the denomination but that the congregation presently had 25 members. She thought there would be evening meetings at this site.

Chairman Naeve closed the public hearing at 6:40 p.m.

Commissioner Murphy wondered what times the services would be held. There were windows and an exit door approximately 10 feet from residential homes. She questioned if outdoor activities would be planned at this location and if so, could the neighboring properties be notified.

Planner Harlicker stated the permit would allow for outdoor services.

Commissioner Geisler explained the noise ordinance would be in place for this location. She did not feel additional restrictions were necessary as this would be covered under Title 11.

Commissioner Haag agreed stating the church should be allowed the same flexibility as a local business for the hours of operation.

Chairman Naeve felt the rear door would be used more for emergency situations and that access to the building would be from the front of the building.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER STEVENS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PETERSON, TO APPROVE PLANNING CASE 10-08, THE PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, BASED ON THE FINDINGS THAT IT MEETS THE STANDARDS OF CITY CODE SECTION 11-316 WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE 11, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, BUILDING AND FIRE CODES.
2. THE CHURCH WILL OCCUPY NO MORE THAN 1,000 SQUARE FEET. EXPANSION INTO ADDITIONAL SPACE WILL REQUIRE AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT.

THE MOTION PASSED (MURPHY ABSTAINED).

This is a decision made by the Planning Commission and shall stand unless appealed to the City Council within ten days after notification of the decision.

- 4B. PLANNING CASE 10-09 – ZONE CHANGE FROM CONSERVANCY TO LDR2 (LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL), 12031 PARTRIDGE STREET – PUBLIC HEARING

It was noted City is requesting approval of a zone change of 38 acres from Conservancy to Low Density Residential 2 (LDR2) for the property located at 12031 Partridge Street. This request is being made due to updates made to the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. State Statute requires that zoning be consistent with the underlying land use designation. Private property was not to be zoned Conservancy which led to the Low Density Residential 2 request.

Chairman Naeve opened the public hearing at 6:49 p.m.

Victoria Williams, 2000 121st Lane indicated all the neighbors adjacent to this lot, except for one have signed a petition opposing this zone change. She stated the rezoning would allow for houses to be built on this site. The residents are also concerned about additional traffic on 121st Lane. She explained the wildlife on the 38 acres would be lost if opened up for development.

Ms. Williams presented her petition to the Commission.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER STEVENS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MURPHY, TO ACCEPT THE PETITION FROM VICTORIA WILLIAMS ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND HER NEIGHBORS OPPOSING THE ZONE CHANGE. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Richard Rick, 2084 121st Lane stated he lived at his property for 17 years and questioned if the LDR2 rezoning would change the floodplain designation.

Planner Harlicker explained the majority of the site was within a floodplain and it would be extremely difficult to develop most of this site.

Greg Benfet, 2096 121st Lane was not in favor of the rezoning as it would open up the site for housing developments. He felt the City had enough housing in foreclosure that additional housing was not necessary. Mr. Benfit encouraged the City to put efforts into revitalizing current housing neighborhoods before taking on additional housing developments.

Community Development Director Nevinski stated it would be extremely difficult to build any housing within the floodplain and the City has no proposed development for the site at this time.

Eugene Rogers, owner of the parcel, stated he did not request the zoning change and was somewhat surprised by the City's request. He has lived in the City since 1962 at 12031 Partridge Street. Mr. Rogers explained that he purchased the 38 acres for the sole purpose of maintaining access to his home due to the vacation of 121st Lane near his home. His home became landlocked but the land purchase allowed him proper access based on the actions of the City.

Mr. Rogers suggested the City allow for townhomes or single family homes on the 18 acres to the north of the parcel. He requested the Commission consider this option for the future while also including the two acres his home was located on to allow his parcel to be useable.

Chairman Naeve explained that the two acre parcel was zoned single family residential at this time and could be redeveloped. She explained the change for the additional 38 acres from Conservancy to LDR2 to align the zoning designation with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Rogers asked if it would be unreasonable to zone this property to better serve the City.

Chairman Naeve indicated the zoning designation was set a year and a half ago when the 2030 Comprehensive Plan was discussed and approved.

Chairman Naeve closed the public hearing at 7:13 p.m.

Commissioner Geisler noted the Comprehensive Plan meetings thoroughly reviewed each parcel in the City and how it should be guided through 2030. At that time, the City felt single family homes would be the least invasive to the adjacent properties, keeping in mind this property would be difficult to develop. She felt that LDR2 was the right designation for this property.

Commissioner Haag sympathized with the neighboring properties and the wildlife enjoyed on this property. He did not foresee this property being developed in the near future due to the state of the economic market. Any potential developments would be brought before the City with adjacent property owners notified.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER GEISLER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HAAG, TO APPROVE PLANNING CASE 10-09, THE PROPOSED ZONE CHANGE FROM CONSERVANCY TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 2 (LDR2) FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 12031 PARTRIDGE STREET, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE PROPOSED REZONING TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 2 IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATION TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL.
2. THE PROPOSED REZONING IS COMPATIBLE WITH THE ADJACENT LAND USE DESIGNATION AND LAND USES.
3. THE PROPOSED REZONING TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL 2 WOULD NOT HAVE AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE ADJACENT PROPERTIES.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

This is a recommendation to the City Council that will be considered at the June 1, 2010 City Council meeting.

5. SITE PLAN APPROVAL
- 5A. PLANNING CASE 10-07 – RKL LANDHOLDINGS – PORT EVERGREEN MIXED USE MULTI-FAMILY AND SENIOR HOUSING, 94TH AVENUE AND SPRINGBROOK DRIVE – PUBLIC HEARING

It was noted the applicant is requesting site plan approval to construct a 204 unit apartment building and 181 unit senior housing facility. The site plan includes 484 parking spaces,

between the outdoor and underground parking lots. City Code requires 676 total parking spaces. Based on ITE Parking Generation Manual, the parking demand for the senior center is 120 spaces and 245 spaces for the apartments. While the proposed 484 spaces do not meet the City's requirements, it does align with the ITE parking generation standards and the developer's previous experience with other projects. Additional parking could be added in the center area of the development but would remove open space.

Staff explained lot coverage was not to exceed 80% and the proposed development was at 59%. The maximum density allowed within Port Evergreen was 32 units per acre and the applicant is requesting 37 units per acre. Staff recommended flexibility to allow for the increased density as the required open space requirements were exceeded within the site plan. The landscaping plan meets the intent of the Ordinance as the applicant has proposed 1,013 shrubs. Flexibility is being requested for the location of these shrubs as only 456 shrubs are required. Overstory and evergreen trees were in compliance as well, with 30 mature trees being maintained in the development. Additional ornamental trees could be added to the landscaping plan. Planner Harlicker reviewed the building elevations and building materials with the Commission.

Commissioner Geisler asked if both buildings would be built at the same time or if each would be built separately.

Planner Harlicker stated the buildings could build one at a time. One of the conditions for approval would be a developer agreement which would define all the parking requirements, setbacks, etc.

John Harris, Harris Architects thanked the City staff for the direction and guidance provided to his team through the site plan process.

Dennis O'Donnell, vice president of Walker Elder Care Services a division of Walker Methodist presented a brief history of Walker to the Commission. He explained he has entered into an agreement to manage the senior housing facility with Port Evergreen. Walker has been in business since 1896 and manages a number of facilities across the metro area. Mr. O'Donnell explained Walker had a similar facility to the one proposed for Port Evergreen in Lakeville and he encouraged the Commission to tour this building. He reviewed the services that would be offered at the senior housing facility and indicated approximately 100 people would be employed by Walker Elder Care.

Ed Terhaar, Traffic Engineer with Wenk Engineering gave a brief summary of the trip generation, traffic flow and parking spaces. He indicated the proposed development will generate 137 trips during the weekday AM peak hour and 187 during the PM peak hours. A total of 1,866 trips would be generated in a 24 hour period. Based on these numbers, the traffic flow was within the range and available capacity of the adjacent signalized intersections. Mr. Turhar stated the peak demand for parking would require 365 spaces and 484 stalls were available.

Commissioner Geisler felt the parking numbers were a bit low as she could not make the math work to come up with the same numbers.

Mr. Terhaar stated the ITE database surveys existing facilities throughout the country and provides a summary of the average peak rate. This information was then compared to the number of senior housing and apartment units proposed for this development to develop a number of spaces required.

Chairman Naeve asked if the parking requirements took into account the spaces need for the employees for the senior housing.

Mr. Terhaar indicated this information was included, along with additional visitor parking.

Chairman Naeve opened the public hearing at 7:56 p.m.

Gary Anderson, 224 94th Avenue expressed concern with the increased traffic volumes that will be created by this development. He stated the residents currently in this neighborhood would have a very difficult time with the increased traffic flow. Mr. Anderson suggested the traffic flow in a different direction and not onto 94th Avenue. He questioned who RKL Landholdings was and if this was a local company. Mr. Anderson also asked if recreational vehicles could be parked in the apartment complex lot.

Mr. Anderson questioned how the water would run off of this development and if it would flow into the adjacent neighborhood, as there were already stormwater flooding concerns.

City Engineer Vierzba explained a new drainage storm pond would capture the water runoff on the southeast corner of the site. The water would not be running into the adjacent residential neighborhood.

Chairman Naeve closed the public hearing at 8:05 p.m.

Mr. Harris explained RKL Landholdings was the name of a company owned by Emad Abed out of Minneapolis, Minnesota. He is the developer and has developed retail projects throughout the metro area.

Joel Cooper, Jim Hill & Associates addressed the stormwater concerns stating the site was engineered to handle a 100 year event. He indicated the runoff water would be piped to the pond on the southeast corner of the site. A rain garden was located in the center of the development.

Chairman Naeve asked how deep the stormwater pond would be.

Mr. Cooper estimated the pond to be four feet deep at the deepest point with an average depth of three feet.

Commissioner Stevens questioned if the pond should have fencing due to the number of children that could be living in the apartment complex.

City Engineer Vierzba explained the City did not require fencing around the stormwater pond, or any holding pond in the City.

Mr. Harris stated the recreational vehicle issue has not been addressed, but this clearly would impinge on the rights of others. He felt the parking spaces would have to be available and could be addressed with the City in the development agreement.

Chairman Naeve suggested the development agreement stipulate this issue and not allow recreational vehicles in the open parking lots.

Chairman Naeve asked that the traffic flow concerns be addressed and if there could be an additional access point.

Mr. Harris indicated the developers have looked at a lot of different alternatives for the design and flow of traffic. He stated the only other entrance would be on Flintwood which would shift the building location. The proposed location allowed for the preservation of a great deal of mature trees while providing separation between the uses. A driveway off of Flintwood would compromise the open area.

Commissioner Haag asked how the garbage would be handled for each facility.

Mr. Harris stated the garbage would be contained in the underground parking facilities with several garbage truck trips anticipated each week.

Commissioner Stevens questioned if there would be speed bumps within the parking lot to control the speed of traffic flow.

Mr. Harris noted this had not been discussed but could be added if speed became a concern.

Chairman Naeve asked where the trails and crosswalks would be located on the site map. She suggested a crosswalk be added near the playground structure.

Planner Harlicker reviewed the crosswalk locations.

Commissioner Geisler stated the flexibility requested by the developers requires some give and take. She questioned how the developer was going over and above code requirements within this plan.

Mr. Harris stated the open space provided in the plan far exceeded the City's requirements and preserves the mature trees on the site. In addition, the landscaping plan was putting in a great deal more trees and shrubs than required by the City. He added that the buildings would be highly energy efficient and sustainable as well.

Commissioner Murphy asked how the memory garden would be accessed.

Mr. Harris stated the memory garden would be accessed from the memory care area and would be fenced. It was for the sole purpose to provide a healing outdoor environment for those suffering with memory loss and dementia.

Commissioner Murphy questioned if both buildings would be constructed at the same time.

Mr. Harris indicated it would be his hope that both buildings would be constructed simultaneously, with the senior building beginning first.

Commissioner Murphy asked why the developer was not being charged a park dedication fee for the senior housing.

Planner Harlicker explained the City does not have a specific park dedication fee for senior housing facilities. The park dedication requirements would only be for the apartment complex.

Chairman Naeve asked if the pond was part of the open space and if it would be landscaped.

Mr. Harris indicated the pond was included in the open space calculations. He stated the plans do not show landscaping at this time, but he would be willing to have the area heavily landscaped to create a natural looking environment to attract wildlife.

Chairman Naeve questioned if the development would be irrigated.

Mr. Cooper explained the development would be irrigated and the developers were going to explore using rainwater for the irrigation.

Commissioner Stevens requested benches be located around the stormwater pond.

Chairman Naeve asked what type of play structure would be located in the open area.

Mr. Harris stated the playground equipment would be commercial grade with ramps and slides. The area would not be fenced entirely but could be fenced on the sides butting up to the parking lot.

Chairman Naeve questioned if the outdoor basketball court was going to be provided as it was not in the site plan.

Mr. Harris suggested the Commission add this as a condition for approval as this would be an appropriate use for the space.

Commissioner Stevens asked if car lights would be shining into the first floor apartments when parking next to the building.

Mr. Harris stated shrubs would be provided to prevent the light wash and the windows were three feet off the ground.

Chairman Naeve indicated there was a shortage of ornamental trees and she suggested these be added along the walking path.

Mr. Harris had no objection to this request.

Commissioner Geisler stated the increased density with this development required an increased amount of parking. She stated the senior side of the parking requirements were adequate but questioned if the apartment complex would have enough parking. She did not want to see parking flow from the apartment complex over to the senior housing or into the adjacent neighborhood. Commissioner Geisler requested the senior housing building have a set number of visitor spaces assigned and that employee's park underground whenever possible.

Mr. Harris stated visitor parking would have signage next to the building and felt six spaces would be appropriate.

Mr. O'Donnell indicated the underground parking could be recommended for employees to keep the outdoor lot free and clear to visitors.

Commissioner Geisler asked if apartment vehicles could be parked in the underground senior housing parking lot. And if not, would there be an adequate number of parking spaces for the apartment vehicles.

Mr. O'Donnell explained this would not be allowed as it would become a security risk.

Chairman Naeve questioned if the underground parking would require additional fees for the apartment vehicles. She stated if this were the case, the outdoor parking lot would be overflowing with vehicles.

Mr. Harris indicated typically there was a minimal fee but that this would be handled by the management company.

Commissioner Geisler asked if the City could set a requirement within the development agreement to require parking be pushed underground before it is allowed to spill over to the senior housing or adjacent neighborhood.

Community Development Director Nevinski stated this would be a reasonable request and that language could be added to the development agreement. He stated the developer has enough parking spaces for the development and the management company would handle the fees to assure the underground spaces were utilized.

Mr. Harris reviewed the developer does own two adjacent lots where additional overflow parking could be constructed to accommodate another 44 parking stalls. This would be a second phase as the developer would have to purchase another lot to connect the parcels to the development.

Commissioner Geisler suggested the development agreement provide language that would allow for review of the parking situation on an annual basis to assess the number of stalls and if a significant problem is found, the City could then discuss where additional parking should go.

Chairman Naeve commented that the specific annual review would not be necessary but instead, any parking concerns should be addressed by the City immediately. She did support language in the development agreement to request the management company encourage underground parking.

City Engineer Vierzba recommended there be no parking allowed on 94th Avenue or Springbrook as this would become a concern for emergency vehicle access.

Chairman Naeve indicated she was not happy with the idea of apartments on this site; however, the City now has a site plan to evaluate. Most of the flexibility issues were reasonable. The traffic on 94th Avenue could be a concern at peak hours for neighboring properties. She felt the City had options to deal with the parking concerns and suggested staff review the City's parking codes to address future developments.

Commissioner Geisler explained she was not in favor of the rezoning either but stated the buildings were very nice with the materials meeting the City code requirements.

Commissioner Stevens was thankful the developer was willing to give and take on the site and felt the site plan was presented quite nicely to the City.

Commissioner Geisler asked if additional park dedication should be required for the 181 units of senior housing. This would be an additional \$246,140. She did not see the difference between senior units and apartment units.

Community Development Director Nevinski stated the code does not decipher between senior apartments and regular apartments.

Mr. Harris interjected stating the 90 congregate apartments for memory care and assisted living were completely different entities. He urged the Commission to consider these units different from typical apartment units.

Chairman Naeve asked if there were other assisted living units in the City that had paid park dedication.

Planner Harlicker noted the condos that were converted to assisted living would have paid park dedication up front for the multi family use as condos. He indicated Epiphany had assisted living units, but he was uncertain how the park dedication was assessed.

Mr. Harris requested the park dedication be further researched and negotiated in the development agreement.

Community Development Director Nevinski stated a recommendation could be made to Council by the Commission on this issue and be considered with the final approval.

Commissioner Geisler indicated the Commission may not have the leeway to determine differences between apartment units and suggested this issue be addressed under condition 7, changing the total number of units from 204 to 385. The Council could be made aware that 181 of the units were senior housing should the Council choose to waive it.

Community Development Director Nevinski agreed with this recommendation stating it would be an appropriate way to handle the recommendation. Staff could complete additional research on the issue as well before addressing Council.

Chairman Naeve noticed the development had no accent lighting and asked if this was required by code.

Planner Harlicker explained it was not required by code. A photometric plan was submitted and the lighting met the City's requirements.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER STEVENS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER GEISLER, TO APPROVE PLANNING CASE 10-07, A SITE PLAN FOR RKL LANDHOLDINGS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS PROVIDED BY STAFF AND AS DISCUSSED ABOVE:

1. THE OWNER PETITION FOR EXTENSIONS OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS TO BE INSTALLED UNDER CITY CONTRACT WITH COSTS ASSESSED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OVER A 5-YEAR PERIOD AND RELATED UTILITY EASEMENTS BE DEDICATED TO THE CITY BY THE DEVELOPER.
2. DEVELOPER MUST INSTALL A SIDEWALK ALONG 94TH AVENUE AND SPRINGBROOK DRIVE. THE SIDEWALK ALONG 94TH AVENUE MUST BE EXTENDED TO THE WEST PROPERTY LINE.
3. CROSSWALKS WILL BE INSTALLED WHERE SIDEWALKS CROSS DRIVE AISLES AND TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO THE PLAYGROUND AREA.
4. VEHICLE BARRIERS MUST BE INSTALLED AT BOTH ENDS OF THE WALKING PATH PER THE FIRE DEPARTMENT'S DIRECTION.
5. A CROSS ACCESS AND PARKING AGREEMENT IS REQUIRED BETWEEN THE TWO LOTS.
6. AN AGREEMENT ALLOWING BOTH LOTS USE OF THE OPEN SPACE MUST BE RECORDED.
7. PARK DEDICATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$523,600 (\$1,360/UNIT X 385) SHALL BE PAID AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION. COUNCIL MAY CHOOSE TO WAIVE THE 181 SENIOR UNITS. (STAFF TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO COUNCIL ON THE HISTORY OF PARK DEDICATION WITH SENIOR HOUSING UNITS).
8. APPROVAL OF PLANNING CASE 10-06 (PRELIMINARY PLAT).
9. THE PLAN MUST BE REVISED TO SHOW FIVE TREES ALONG SPRINGBROOK DRIVE.
10. EXECUTION OF A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY.
11. LANDSCAPE THE POND WITH NATURAL PLANTS.
12. ADD BENCHES AROUND THE POND.
13. ADD FENCING ALONG THE PARKING EDGES OF THE CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA.
14. INCLUDE ½ BASKETBALL COURT THAT CAN DOUBLE AS A FLEXIBLE HARDSCAPE PLAY AREA.
15. THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WILL INCLUDE THAT IF THERE IS PHASING ALL SITE AMENITIES MUST BE COMPLETED IN THE FIRST PHASE.

16. PROVIDE FOR REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING MATURE TREES AND TRANSPLANTS, IF DEAD WITHIN TWO YEARS.
17. NO STORAGE OF RECREATIONAL VEHICLES OR TRAILERS IN THE OUTDOOR PARKING LOTS.
18. ORNAMENTAL TREES WILL BE PLANTED AND APPROPRIATELY SPACED ALONG THE WALKING TRAIL.
19. INCLUDE BIKE RACKS ON SITE.
20. RESERVE SIX SENIOR PARKING SPACES FOR VISITOR PARKING NEAR THE SENIOR HOUSING BUILDING ENTRANCE.
21. HAVE LANGUAGE WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT TO ASSURE THE UNDERGROUND PARKING IS UTILIZED BY BOTH APARTMENT VEHICLES AND SENIOR HOUSING EMPLOYEES.
22. NO PARKING ON 94TH AVENUE AND SPRINGBROOK DRIVE NORTH OF COON RAPIDS BOULEVARD.
23. A STOP SIGN SHALL BE ERECTED TO CONTROL TRAFFIC AT 94TH AVENUE.

Discussion:

Commissioner Geisler stated this would be a very nice development adding interest to the area.

Chairman Naeve thanked the developers for working with the City to meet the codes and City requirements.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

This is a recommendation to the City Council that will be considered at the June 1, 2010 City Council meeting.

6. PRELIMINARY PLAT

- 6A. PLANNING CASE 10-06 – RKL LANDHOLDINGS – PORT EVERGREEN, 94TH AVENUE AND SPRINGBROOK DRIVE – PUBLIC HEARING

It was noted the applicant is requesting approval of a preliminary plat of Port Evergreen. The applicant proposes to subdivide 10.43 acres into two lots. Lot 1 will be 6.05 acres and Lot 2 will be 4.38 acres.

Chairman Naeve opened and closed the public hearing at 9:12 p.m., as no one wished to address the Planning Commission.

Chairman Naeve indicated this plat would erase the original lot lines and create new lots.

Planner Harlicker stated this was the case and reviewed the new lot lines with the Commission.

Commissioner Geisler requested the park dedication fees be consistent with the previous recommendation for Planning Case 10-07.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER GEISLER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STEVENS, TO APPROVE PLANNING CASE 10-06, THE PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR PORT EVERGREEN BASED ON THE FINDINGS THAT THE PROPOSED PLAT COMPLIES WITH SECTIONS 11-2223 AND 11-2224, AND THE LOT DIMENSIONS MEET CITY REQUIREMENTS, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE 11, CITY CODE OF COON RAPIDS.
2. PARK DEDICATION FOR THE TWO LOTS SHALL BE PAID AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION PER PLANNING CASE 10-07.
3. ALL COMMENTS FROM THE CITY ENGINEER MUST BE ADDRESSED.
4. REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURES ON THE PROPERTY PRIOR TO RELEASING THE PLAT FOR RECORDING.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

This is a recommendation to the City Council that will be considered at the June 1, 2010 City Council meeting.

8. OTHER BUSINESS
9. TENTATIVE JUNE AGENDA

Noted.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER HAAG, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MURPHY, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:16 P.M. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recorded and Transcribed by,
Heidi Guenther
Planning Commission Recording Secretary