



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, October 5, 2022 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Kimble called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.

2. Roll Call

At the request of Chair Kimble, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Julie Kimble, Vice Chair Michelle Pribyl, and Commissioners Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Pamela Aspnes and Erik Bjorum.

Members Absent: Karen Schaffhausen

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, and Community Development Director Janice Gundlach.

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Organizational Business

a. Swear-In New Commissioner: Pamela Aspnes

Chair Kimble administered the Oath of Office to new Commissioner Aspnes.

5. Review of Minutes

a. September 7, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to approve the September 7, 2022 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

6. **Communications and Recognitions:**

- a. **From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update.*

None.

- b. **From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already on this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update process.*

Member McGehee updated the Commission on the Community Visioning process.

7. **Public Hearing**

- a. **Consideration of a Request by Launch Properties, In Conjunction with Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust (Property Owner), for a Conditional Use to Allow a Drive-Through for a Proposed Starbucks at 2020 Twin Lakes Parkway (PF22-009)**

Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF22-022 at approximately 6:38 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. She advised this item will be before the City Council on October 24, 2022.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated October 5, 2022.

Chair Kimble thanked Mr. Paschke for the presentation and thought this had a very generous landscaping plan and looked really nice.

Member Pribyl noticed the fence is eight foot high and thought it was unnecessarily high given that the site is already a little bit elevated.

Mr. Paschke thought that as well and Code states six feet and would not need to be eight feet tall. He thought six feet should work because that area is raised as well.

Mr. Dan Regan, Launch Properties, addressed the Commission.

Member McGehee thanked Mr. Regan for the landscape plan and thought it was very interesting and nice. She thought the choice of plants was also diverse.

Chair Kimble asked if there was any opportunity for seating in that area.

Mr. Regan did not know how closely seating was looked at in that area and thought it might be an operational issue for Starbucks. There is a seating area for Starbucks that is adjacent to the store already and he thought that is the primary place Starbucks would like their customers to be when outside.

Public Comment

No one came forward to speak for or against this request.

Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 6:56 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

None.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend to the City Council approval of a Conditional Use for 2020 Twin Lakes Parkway, allowing a drive-through on the subject property based on the comments, findings, and the conditions stated in the October 5, 2022 staff report. (PF22-009).

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

8. Other Business

a. Discuss Phase Two Zoning Code Amendments

Community Development Director Janice Gundlach summarized the Phase Two Zoning Code Amendments.

Mr. Jeff Miller of HKGi who presented Phase Two Zoning Code Amendments.

Member Pribyl indicated on the first chart she had a question on the primary and secondary materials. She asked if primary and secondary are the only options so if the amount of primary materials is decreased the amount of secondary materials is increased. She wondered if there was a third tier.

Mr. Miller indicated there are only two.

Member McGehee thought this was a good idea however she was not sure that the impervious surface, to increase impervious surface in a City where there already is so much impervious surface seems to be moving in the wrong direction from the standpoint of sustainability. She thought in general planning, what is the vision for a sustainable community. How does this all fit together because right now it is just looking at pieces and she was not sure how this will all fit together. She indicated she did not have any problem with a point system but struggled with what makes sense for the incentives other than cash. She did appreciate that some of these do not apply to the residential lots.

Mr. Miller explained to clarify all three of them, if seen as not supporting sustainability, they would be attained by doing something that is promoting sustainability. He thought there were different ways to obtain sustainability. The impervious surface right now only applies to residential districts so that is why it is being done in residential districts.

Chair Kimble explained to her it seems like they are always on a journey and can never go from zero to one hundred right away and they have talked about the fact that this needed to be tested and it is being kept outside of the Code to see what works and what does not work and to Mr. Miller's point, she thought there has been a lot of careful thought to what staff has applied the different incentives to and how much that range has been but staff is also going to find out from developers if it is interesting enough. She thought staff is going to have to keep looking at it as various projects come through and test it but she thought it is hard to have everything perfect so there will be some tradeoffs and there will be some things that are more important now for sustainability and she thought it is a really good start.

Chair Kimble asked in looking at all of these that there is enough opportunity also for industrial product in sustainability.

Ms. Gundlach indicated the City should make this an option for Employment Districts. She was not sure if there was any conversation on why this was not included because she thought there is an opportunity to make a major improvement if the City were to include those Employment Districts being those are large buildings or intensely developed sights. She thought this should be added in.

Member Pribyl indicated she had comments on potential sustainable building features and points earned. She agreed on the certification and would probably split those because LEED is more expensive just to go through the certification process is more rigorous. She could see why Green Star is related to single family but more people will go for Green Star over LEED if they have the same points. Green Communities is for affordable housing and those projects are already typically required to follow Green Communities base on funding sources. It will not be an incentive to do more than what is already expected to be done with that program. She thought that would be a good thing to tie to City financed projects.

Ms. Gundlach thought the Commission was suggesting instead of having a five for all of these, maybe have the most points be for LEED and then reduce it down from there. She asked if it was accurate to say that LEED receives the most points. She indicated she does not work with these systems enough to fully understand how easy or hard it is to achieve these. She asked for recommendations on what should be next.

Member Pribyl thought LEED would be the top and then B3, she would even say for Green Star, she did not work with that often but thought it would be more for

low-density housing and it could be even distinguished that Green Star is specifically for those types rather than making it a blanket approach.

The Commission discussed with staff the different sustainability levels and point values assigned to each.

Member McGee asked regarding the non-traditional stormwater system, if there is a bio-retention area or rain garden it would receive 2 points but if a buffer is put in or if the shoreland is restored it would receive 1 point. She thought those were similar things unless there is a reason that these two things are not.

Mr. Miller explained that could be considered.

Member Bjorum thought the only reason he would think that would not be true is in some of the non-traditional water systems there is an additional cost in there that might not be carried in a shoreland component so the project is getting that extra point because of the additional cost associated with it. He did not think it necessarily says one is more important than the other, rather, it is how points would work themselves out.

Member Pribyl wondered if it would make sense to have a lower point threshold for lower density project because they probably would not be as likely to do EV charging stations or a green roof or a publicly accessible family garden. She thought it might be worth considering that.

There was further discussion between the Commission and staff on the point system and how to implement it.

Ms. Gundlach explained when staff drafts the language in sections 1011, Property Performance Standards, she thought the intent there is to make sure it is clarified that this is new development or redevelopment. This is not for a single family home.

Mr. Miller indicated this worksheet is a work in progress. He noted the next step is to refine this further with a public hearing in December for this and the Shoreland Ordinance and City Council adoption after that.

9. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Kruzel, seconded by Member Pribyl, to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

