

TO: Planning Commission Members  
Honorable Mayor and City Council Members  
FROM: Shawn Wetterlin, Building/ Zoning Official  
DATE: May 3rd, 2017  
RE: Meeting Minutes,  
Tuesday, May 2nd, 2017

The Planning Commission met at 5:30 p.m., on Tuesday, May 2nd, 2017 in the City Council Chambers, at City Hall. The Following members were present: Donald Smith, Jerry Steffes, Dave Hanifl, Patti Dockendorff, and Mani Edpuganti. Richard Wieser and Linda Larson were not present. Building/ Zoning Official, Shawn Wetterlin and City Council Member Brian Krenz were also in attendance.

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Smith. The meeting minutes of April 4<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017 were approved as distributed by consensus of all present Planning Commission members.
2. Planning Commission of the City Zoning Authority held a public hearing at the La Crescent City Hall, 315 Main Street, in said City on Tuesday, May 2nd at 5:35 o'clock P.M. to consider the application for a conditional use permit to allow for an "Alternate elevation method other than the use of fill to elevate a structure's lowest floor above the Regulatory Flood Protection Elevation" in a flood fringe area in an R-1A zoned district. The conditional use request concerns certain premises situate in said City described as follows, to wit: parcel number 25.1834.000 more commonly identified as 790 Shore Acres Road, La Crescent, MN.

The applicant Jeff Houghtaling was not present at the meeting having asked that the topic be tabled. Don Smith gave a review of the recent discussions with the applicant and a letter from the DNR received shortly before the meeting and the potential need for a variance. There were several topics raised that require clarification.

Motion by Steffes, seconded by Hanifl to table the CUP request until June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017

Upon a roll call vote, all members present voted in favor of the motion as proposed.

3. The Planning Commission reviewed the March 21<sup>st</sup> Park and Recreation meeting minutes. The committee urged a public meeting prior to finalizing the plan. It would be good if the final plan could be included in the Downtown Plan and then one meeting could suffice for both.

4. Don Smith gave an update on the Downtown Planning process. The preliminary Downtown Planning boards were reviewed with each member being asked to offer suggestions or concerns. Then Chairman Smith reviewed the list along with other topics from the City Council meeting and the meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup>. The comments and concerns will be consolidated to provide direction to MSA for the next phase of the project. For the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting we will be receiving revised display boards, text, street scape renderings and consideration of traffic flows. The list following is not inclusive of all comments but serves as the basis of the direction. The comments following were reviewed and direction to MSA was adopted by consensus and will be delivered by the Chair to MSA.

Below are the comments from the Planning Commission members while viewing each display board:

- Label boards with three options
- Add classes of use to boards
- Get the process started new City Hall/ Office buildings
- If City is unwilling to invest in itself why would anyone else
- Police vehicle parking. Perhaps there are some ideas for integration with the fire department that can be incorporated.
- Parking
- Reverse angle is getting very few negatives.
- General discomfort. Flow. Locations. Major central parking? Walking. Conflicts pulling in and out of the many lots a concern.
- Lack of plaza gathering space.
- Lack of landscaping/usable space at the bike head in the City.
- Traffic flows. The 3rd and Walnut, out from town is an issue. Signage may be important.
- City Hall is important. Location at Oak and Main favored.
- Getting on with implementation with a goal in mind---there is a healthy sense of urgency.
- Commercial site/grocery on 4th understood and accepted.
- The bike ramp that has no switch backs or spirals was a surprise. That we adequately provide for 'handicap' access and parking was also noted. We might want to note 'grade' on the bike ramp and show designated handicap access. This is detail but reflects listening to a valid comment.
- KC suggestion that the grocery go on 3rd street where commercial is shown.
- Showing traffic flows at 3rd south and 4th north and other critical places is important. How do we get people into the downtown was a council person's question.
- We discussed CBD as a part of branding.
- Want to display a row of normal city size lots with the alley on the 'school site'. As examples for future urban infill. A new urban building profile or two would be good so as not to appear as similar track homes. The idea of the two structures? Are these a community room or apartment structures. Perhaps they can be removed (or understood). Not to spend much time...just should be varied.
- No bike lanes on Walnut and Main.
- Integrate traffic design/access from hotel.
- Suggestion of integration of Commercial site at third south into the drawing with a label.

- Outdoor eating demonstrated.
- Did not discuss a 'rendering' location.
- Rules/Standards for 'back of buildings' especially from the HWY.
- The use of the CBD to emphasize 'brand' was discussed. Reminder that this topic is important for next year's budget.

It was the consensus by committee to accept the draft language below as describing the purpose the Downtown Planning project. This will be the language:

The City Council hereby adopts the Downtown Development Plan "Planning for the La Crescent Downtown of the future".

The plan is recommended by the Planning Commission and supported by the Chamber of Commerce and the Economic Development Commission.

By adopting this plan the Council recognizes the importance of a general plan to guide development. Concepts of density, downtown housing, street profiles, locations, concentration of commercial development in a single CBD, parking policy and direction, replacement city hall location, bike trail 'take-off' over the highway, gathering places and commercial uses are confirmed as future direction.

Specific city actions will be property acquisition, future street reconstruction design, and active work with developers on specific parcels and projects. The plan also provides guidance in the negative by identifying property that the city is not interested in acquiring and for reference in denial of incentives for development projects inconsistent with the plan.

5. Don Smith reviewed the updating process of the Shoreland and Floodplain Ordinance. With addition work that needs to be completed in the Shoreland, Flood Plain and General Ordinance the Planning Commission made the recommendation to the City Council to accept Stantecs proposal not to exceed \$ 3,000.00, to complete the need changes to the Shoreland, Floodplain and General Zoning ordinance.

Motion by Hanifl, seconded by Edpuganti to accept Stantec's proposal to complete the updating of the Shoreland, Floodplain, and General Ordinances not to exceed \$ 3,000.00.

Upon a roll call vote, all members present voted in favor of the motion as proposed.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully, Shawn Wetterlin