

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ST. CLOUD PLANNING COMMISSION

A meeting of the St. Cloud Planning Commission was held on November 8, 2011, at 6 p.m. in the St. Cloud City Hall Council Chambers. Members present were Anderson, Andzenge, Chirhart, DeVine (arrived at 6:07 p.m.), Holtberg, Radaich and Thometz. Council representative Goerger was present.

Open Forum: No one was present to speak at the open forum.

Consent Agenda: Chirhart moved to approve the consent agenda as follows:

Acceptance of staff reports for November 8, 2011, as part of the official record.

Approval of minutes from the October 11, 2011 Planning Commission meeting.

Radaich seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

PUD Amendment Request/David Larson on Behalf of St. Cloud Hospital (CentraCare

Plaza): Chairperson Anderson announced the request from David Larson on behalf of St. Cloud Hospital (CentraCare Plaza) to amend the Highway 15 Planned Unit Development (PUD) General Development Plan to include Administrative Services as an allowed use, the construction of a two story building, and an update of the master plan for the CentraCare Plaza campus (Location: 1900 CentraCare Circle, 1564 & 1586 County Road 134, 3820 County Road 120, and 4200 White Drive) (DPA-2011-04). Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, stated that the property under consideration is located at the far south end of the CentraCare Plaza property adjacent to the Sleep Center and Clara's House. He explained that at the time of the original rezoning in 1999, the site plan focused on the main building with some acknowledgment of future uses. However, the PUD only allowed construction of the primary buildings and required another zoning action for any further development. The new site plan is for the larger site. Glaesman pointed out an error in staff's memo which stated

that the new building would be 75,000 sq. ft.; that figure should have been 52,000 sq. ft. The reduced square footage does not change staff's recommendation. The proposed building is in compliance with shoreland setbacks and other environmental regulations. Holtberg asked staff to address traffic configuration. Glaesman stated that in the initial phase, the project would not be connected to the campus' inner private roadways. The only access would be off of Co. Rd. 134. The three-lane section of Co. Rd. 134 provides southbound movement with a dedicated center turn lane. Staff is recommending a dedicated right turn lane for northbound movements. Chairperson Anderson opened the public hearing. There being no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed. (DeVine arrived - 6:07 p.m.) Chirhart moved to recommend to the City Council approval of the PUD amendment. The motion was seconded by Andzenge and carried by a vote of 6-0-1 (DeVine abstaining).

Rezoning Request/Kristen Stebbins on Behalf of Jonathan and Tamme Seelen and Comprehensive Plan Amendment/St. Cloud Planning & Zoning Dept.: Chairperson Anderson announced the request from Kristen Stebbins on behalf of Jonathan and Tamme Seelen to rezone the property located at 1988 County Road 134 from R1, Single Family Residential District to C1, Business Office District. The applicants are proposing to remodel the existing single family home into an insurance office. In addition, the St. Cloud Planning and Zoning Department is requesting to amend the 2003 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map from Low Density Residential to Commercial for the property located at 1988 County Road 134 (CPA-2011-06). Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, stated that the property under consideration is in the southeast quadrant of the CR 134/120 intersection. He pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan guides this property toward low density residential land uses. The 2003 Comprehensive Plan update was not a parcel specific analysis but an attempt to match existing zoning and future land use in most areas. Applicant is requesting rezoning to C1 to use the parcel for commercial development. The C1 zoning district allows only office use. However, the C1 zoning would allow full redevelopment of the site, including removal of existing buildings and new construction to the maximum potential of the site. Therefore, staff

recommends denial of the request. Glaesman noted that the area will be undergoing some road construction work in the next few years. Staff supports a compromise to rezone the property to PUD allowing the applicant to utilize the existing building for professional office use, but not accommodating redevelopment of the site. Glaesman stated that staff believes the use of the site as an insurance office would have limited impact and would be similar to the impact of a rental or owner occupied home. Chairperson Anderson opened the public hearing, and the following persons testified:

Bonnie Kutzera
4204 Co. Rd. 120

Her home is one property west of the property in question. She and her husband have lived in their home for 33 years and are vested in the neighborhood. She and her husband are opposed to the rezoning request as they do not want the integrity of the neighborhood to change one property at a time. There is sufficient office space in St. Cloud; therefore, it is not necessary to turn a single family home into office space.

Art Erickson
1809 Co. Rd. 134

He lives a block south of the intersection. He objects to rezoning the property and wants it to remain a residential area. He questioned the location of the driveway for a business that close to the proposed roundabout.

Matt Glaesman

He showed the proposed roundabout design. The medians as originally designed prior to rezoning discussions provided for continued access to the driveway for this property onto CR 134.

Jerry Kutzera
4204 Co. Rd. 120

He is opposed to the rezoning. He is in favor of the roundabout. This is a nice neighborhood. He would be concerned that if this house is used for a commercial use, it may have a domino effect. He wants the property to remain residential. There is available office space in the area to locate the insurance office.

Patty Zirbes
1041 Plainview Dr.

She and her husband moved into that area 28 years ago because it was on the outskirts of the City where one side of the road was country and the other side was City. They would oppose anything other than residential use.

Ray Leyendecker
1852 Co. Rd. 134

He would oppose rezoning as he believes it would set a precedent for future rezoning requests to commercial. He opposes a roundabout at that location.

There being no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed. Chirhart moved to recommend to the City Council approval of the rezoning request. He stated that he is not in favor of the rezoning to commercial or to PUD. He stated that this is a residential neighborhood. There is a

buffer between residences along CR 134 and CentraCare. Any other commercial uses are to the east. The Comprehensive Plan guides this area for residential, and he doesn't understand the need for the rezoning. The motion was seconded by Holtberg. Holtberg asked Glaesman to explain the roundabout and the anticipated traffic flow in that neighborhood. Glaesman explained that an extensive process is undertaken to determine the most appropriate intersection control given future land use in St. Cloud and Sartell. The study indicated that the best control for this intersection is a roundabout as they function well in high traffic corridors. Radaich announced that he lives within 500' of the property proposed for rezoning. He stated that he lives about one block to the west at the corner of Plainview Dr. and Plaza Lane. He agrees with those who testified against the rezoning as this is an established residential neighborhood. He is concerned that if this request is approved, it may bring about further rezoning requests. He believes signage for this office would change the character of the neighborhood, particularly if it would be a 24/7 lighted sign. DeVine would not support straight C1 zoning because of lack of control. She would be more in favor of a PUD because it provides for some control over what happens on the property relative to signage, changing the footprint of the property, etc. There is ample available office space; therefore, she questions the need to rezone residential property. DeVine said the PUD option would be more favorable than C1. She expressed concern about access from that property being so close to the roundabout. Glaesman commented that the intersection analysis indicated that the median for the southerly leg is adequate and that the number and types of trips generated by the proposed insurance office would not be excessive for the intersection. However, full redevelopment of the property may be a concern. Thometz agreed there is plenty of available office space and would want the neighborhood to remain residential. Chairperson Anderson asked if the property across Co. Rd. 120 is in the City of Sartell, and Glaesman answered that the land north of 120 is either LeSauk Township or in Sartell. Recent discussions indicated that in the future, the roundabout at CentraCare would incorporate a northern leg extending to commercial office space in Sartell. Chairperson Anderson said he opposes the rezoning as it could be the beginning of the deterioration of the residential neighborhood. Andzenge

asked applicant to address concerns expressed by both the neighbors and staff. Kristen Stebbins, 2241 Roosevelt Rd., stated there are large office buildings for sale, but very few small offices for sale. She said she is a small business owner with 3 full time employees and a part time employee. She looked at the property across the street in Sartell; however, they were 8 acres and 3 acres in size. The raw land is very expensive. Stebbins said she would like to own the building in which her office would be located. She and her family live in Sartell, and many of her customers are from the Sartell and northern St. Cloud areas. Relative to signage, State Farm has strict standards; the sign would not be lighted and would not be large. She added that much of her business is done over the phone or by e-mail, and she often visits her customers at their homes. On an average day, she may have three to four customers visit her office and has no concerns with the future roundabout. Andzeng asked if she would live in the home. Stebbins responded that it would be for her business only; it is a small home with less than 1,000 sq. ft. Holtberg said that initially he favored a rezoning to PUD because of anticipated traffic; however, this has been a residential neighborhood for some time and should stay that way. The motion to recommend rezoning failed by a vote of 1-6 (Andzeng in favor; Anderson, Chirhart, DeVine, Holtberg, Radaich and Thometz opposed). Because the request to rezone failed, the Comprehensive Plan amendment was not considered.

Land Development Code (LDC) Amendment/Length of Stay for Temporary Shelter

Facilities: Chairperson Anderson announced the request from the St. Cloud Planning Commission to amend Article 21 - Definitions of the St. Cloud Land Development Code to increase the maximum length of stay permitted for temporary shelter facilities (LDC-2011-06). Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, reviewed the options developed by the Task Force to address maximum stay standards for TSFs. One option would be to remove the temporary shelter provision from the LDC. Staff and the Task Force did not favor that option because it would remove the neighborhood protection afforded by the ordinance. The second option would maintain the current standard, which was not supported by staff as it would result in continued violations and not meet the current demand. Staff and the Task Force concurred that some type of change is needed. The first option for change was to incorporate a

sunset provision for an amendment. Staff generally does not support sunset provisions within the ordinance. Staff would also object to an across the board extension because it may not be appropriate for all clients. It should not be used for those who have not made an honest attempt to find employment and long-term housing. However, the task force agreed that an extension for a percentage of residents was appropriate at the discretion of the provider. Staff would be comfortable with an extension of stay up to 90 days for up to 10% of residents. The task force also discussed requiring a level of professional services (counseling, etc.) for TSF, but that concept was not recommended. Chairperson Anderson opened the public hearing, and the following persons testified:

Karen Sundquist
P. O. Box 352
Foley, MN

She was a resident of the Salvation Army. She stated that 30 days is not enough for a family in particular. Stress of trying to get everything together is harder on the residents if they have a 30 day timeline. She said the Salvation Army is the only provider that is willing to help families. She suggested the possibility of building apartments or taking over apartments that are not being utilized for families needing help.

There being no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed. Holtberg asked if staff is recommending an extension of up to 90 days for a designated percentage of clients. Glaesman responded that is staff's recommendation but acknowledged that it will be difficult from an enforcement standpoint. Holtberg commented that based on information from the Task Force, there were cases where time limits did not work, but the providers do a good job on deciding who needs the extension. DeVine agreed there is a need for an extension and a percentage at the discretion of the provider seems the best option. DeVine moved to recommend to the City Council approve of the extension of the maximum length of stay permitted for residents of temporary shelter facilities to 90 days. The motion was seconded by Radaich. Chirhart questioned if the Task Force considered combining the percentage extension with the professional services requirement to provide greater protection for the City from the creation of flop houses. Glaesman pointed out that the church of the week program falls under the TSF provision. Requiring that program to bring in a counselor or psychologist would place an undue burden on them. He added that there could be a provision to exclude that program from the professional services requirement. Andzenge asked if the need for an

extension is unique to the Salvation Army. Glaesman answered that there are a limited number of facilities that are subject to the TSF definition; and in turn, the impact of the change and the current limitation is also limited. Goerger noted that the motion to amend the LDC did not reference the extended length of stay. DeVine clarified that her motion was to amend the LDC to allow 10% of the current residents of TSFs to stay at the facility up to an additional 45 days or a maximum of 90 days, with the extension being at the provider's discretion. Anderson stated that he would prefer not to include the percentage in the motion. He would prefer that the length of stay be limited to 45 days but that an extension could be granted at the discretion of the provider. Glaesman commented that the Task Force discussed whether an amendment should be for an extension of the time limit for all residents. However, the service providers objected to that provision. Thometz stated that the service providers wanted a percentage. Chairperson Anderson was concerned that the percentage could present a problem. DeVine asked if offering professional services is a standard operating procedure. Holtberg said it is his understanding that offering professional services for clients is the standard operating procedure for both the Salvation Army and Anna Marie's. Karla Rolfzen of the Salvation Army clarified that the clients are required to participate in case management as is the case with Anna Marie's. Chairperson Anderson stated that he would like the percentage provision re-evaluated in a year or two. The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of the 2012 Planning Commission Schedule: Holtberg moved to approve the 2012 Planning Commission schedule. The motion was seconded by Thometz and carried unanimously.

Other Business: Glaesman stated that there are two items that may be on the December 13 agenda, depending on the number of items on the agenda. The first is the Capital Improvements Program (CIP). He asked the Commission if they would prefer to go on a bus tour of the projects or if a virtual tour with aerial photography would be acceptable. The second item would be a meeting with the St. Cloud Arts Commission as they are now part of the Community Development Dept. Holtberg said it would be difficult for him to dedicate a half day to participate in a bus tour and therefore,

avored the virtual tour. Andzenge said he would prefer the bus tour. Anderson asked who would be available for the bus tour. Radaich said he prefers the detail of the virtual tour.

Holtberg stated that the new bridge is open on Veteran's Dr. as well as the University Dr. roundabout and both work well. DeVine commented that she would prefer that the CIP and the meeting with the Arts Commission be dealt with at separate meetings due to the extensive discussion that usually occurs regarding the CIP. Chirhart said he prefers a noon meeting for the CIP. Glaesman said he will set up a noon working session meeting to discuss the CIP.

Adjournment: There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Emil Radaich, Secretary