

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ST. CLOUD PLANNING COMMISSION

A meeting of the St. Cloud Planning Commission was held on January 10, 2012, at 6 p.m. in City Hall Conference Room 1. Members present were Anderson, Andzenge, Chirhart, DeVine, Holtberg, Radaich and Thometz. Council representative Goerger was also 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 January 10, 2012, as part of the official record.

Approval of minutes from the December 13, 2011 Planning Commission meeting.

Holtberg seconded the motion, and it carried by a vote of 5-0-2 (DeVine and Thometz abstaining on approval of minutes as they were not present at the December meeting).

Authorize Sale/Disposal of St. Cloud Economic Development Authority

Assets/Properties: Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, explained that the properties were acquired by the City of St. Cloud from the HRA as part of the 2011 transfer of economic development responsibilities from the HRA to the City. The properties are zoned either commercially or industrially in accordance with the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan. Glaesman noted that the EDA Board is required to hold a public hearing on the terms of the sales.

Radaich moved to authorize the marketing and sale of the EDA's available development properties. DeVine seconded the motion. Glaesman stated that the motion, if approved, would be a standing approval. Chirhart asked if the same approval is required by the City Council, and Glaesman said it is. Chirhart commented that he does not support the City Council giving blanket approval for sale of all properties. Glaesman stated that the resolution creating the EDA granted all the statutory authority provided by the law, including sale of property. He believes that this item will generate some

discussion when it comes before the City Council. In many cases, sales will involve a public incentive package which will require City Council action. DeVine asked if sales required City Council approval when the properties were owned by the HRA. City Council representative Goerger responded that the City's approval was required when sales involved incentive packages such as TIF dollars, Job Z, etc. Glaesman added that the City Charter addresses the City's public properties. When the properties were controlled by the HRA, the HRA had the statutory authority to approve the sales. Chirhart asked how new properties coming under EDA authority in the future will be handled. Glaesman answered that the Charter requires Planning Commission approval of acquisitions as well. The motion carried unanimously.

Discussion of Placemaking Concepts: Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, pointed out that placemaking was discussed during the meeting between the Planning Commission and the Arts Commission in December. The Planning Commission viewed a video regarding creative placemaking and its importance in the community. Glaesman noted the video discussed how placemaking does not have to be expensive. Radaich asked if the Arts Board has seen this video, and Jennifer Penzkover, Arts Director, answered that they have. She stated that she was present when Minneapolis received their placemaking grant. Glaesman suggested that the Commission consider where placemaking fits in the Planning & Zoning Department's 2012 work program. Chirhart questioned the City's position on streets artists and street musicians. Glaesman pointed out that the City Council approved an amendment to the St. Cloud Code of Ordinances several months ago which opened up the downtown sidewalks to greater passive and active uses. Holtberg asked if placemaking is addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. Glaesman explained that placemaking was indirectly addressed through community gateways, downtown design standards for both public and private spaces, the West and East St. Germain St. design guidelines, the river element, etc. Anderson asked if the City could have a common definition of placemaking. Glaesman responded that he would describe placemaking as "a unique sense of place." Holtberg inquired if the Park Board has discussed placemaking. Anderson answered that as the Planning Commission representative on

the Park Board, he noted that they discussed Lake George and St. Cloud State running the boat house. The Board talked about how they could continue to work with SCSU to leverage other bodies of water like the Mississippi. The possibility of building a boat house at Wilson Park was discussed and how to take advantage of what is unique to St. Cloud. Glaesman said that he and Jennifer Penzkover need to create momentum for placemaking.

Discussion of Planning & Zoning Department's 2012 Work Program: Glaesman asked that the Commission prioritize the items listed in the 2012 Work Program. Last month, the Commission requested staff to draft cost estimates and the time needed to review the Comprehensive Plan (CP) and the Joint District Plan (JDP) which are both almost 10 years old. Glaesman stated that several sections of the CP are in need of being updated. Updating all sections would cost roughly \$380,000 and would take 5,000 or more hours to complete. If the JDP is to be used as a guiding tool for the CP, the approximate cost for the JDP update would be \$250,000+ and 4,100 hours of work. Glaesman pointed out that some other jurisdictions are updating their CPs without a regional vision. He added that he does not believe this is the time to update the JDP. However, several sections of the CP, e.g., demographics, facilities and transportation plans, could be updated in-house. The current plan is still a reliable guide for the next couple years. Chirhart stated that the 2003 CP provides a good base line to build upon for the updated plan. Glaesman stated that land use would require the largest number of hours. Holtberg asked if Development Fund dollars can be allocated over a two year time period for the CP update. Glaesman answered that it could be distributed over a two year time period. He clarified that the estimated dollar amounts reflect the cost for the City to hire outside consultants. City Council representative Goerger asked if the CP update would cost \$384,000 in consultant fees in addition to 5,500+ hours of staff time. Glaesman clarified that the 5,500+ hours would be the number of hours contracted out with staff in a support role. Anderson stated that he would consider the "Tax Forfeit and Serviced Vacant Lot Strategy" a high priority. Glaesman commented that is almost completed. Anderson asked if many of these properties are low density single family home zoning, and Glaesman replied that they are primarily single family lots. Anderson

then asked if the strategy includes how the City will handle requests to rezone those single family zoned lots to higher density for apartments. Glaesman stated that staff is looking at reuse of neighborhoods and using property for public purposes. Goerger stated that it is difficult to decide on priorities because the reality of accomplishing them and the time involved is unknown. Glaesman asked that the Commission select several priorities, and staff will assess the amount of time that would be necessary to accomplish them and whether they can be done in house or require expenditure of Development Fund monies. Chairperson Anderson asked for a summary of which items are already underway. Glaesman responded that projects underway are the Healthy Neighborhoods Partnership Round 4, the Downtown Riverfront Plaza, and tax forfeit and serviced vacant lot strategy. Redistricting must be done, and the University Dr. corridor study must be completed. Goerger questioned whether the George Friedrich Park Master Plan is time sensitive due to the potential for the University Dr. extension. Glaesman answered that it not time sensitive relative to University Dr. because the corridor study is no longer an environmental assessment. However, there have been concerns about certain activities taking place in the Park that have had a detrimental effect on wildlife, and some of the historic features have continued to be degraded. Goerger asked if the Park Dept. has a financial interest in providing some funding for that Park Master Plan. Glaesman stated that the Development Fund is the most likely source of funding. He asked that the Commission not consider funding when establishing priorities. Chirhart suggested that staff list its priorities for the Commission to consider. Glaesman stated that the wayfinding plan and the George Friedrich Park Master Plan would be the top two priorities. Holtberg asked if the 5th Ave. corridor road revisions are especially important considering the money that has been invested on 5th Ave. redevelopment in recent years. Glaesman answered that Planning staff will play a supporting role in that project. Engineering is formulating a conceptual design and cost estimate which will come forward as part of the CIP. DeVine asked about the status of GIS Visualization Technology. Tammy Campion, Senior Planner, stated that the first step in 3D visualization is the pictometry update at an estimated cost of \$25,000. The updated pictometry will apply to all departments; however, the 3D visualization applies

primarily to planning and utility work. Glaesman stated that additional dollars would need to be requested for that update as the \$30,000 annually authorized by the Commission is for daily GIS operation. DeVine said she would prefer to move that item up on the priority list. Glaesman stated that some of the future studies/initiatives; i.e., the public participation plan and the community gateway monument plan, are also very important. Anderson said he would like a cost estimate for upgrading all server technology. Glaesman said he will look into that cost. Radaich supported the priorities as outlined by staff. Anderson suggested a new section be included in the Joint District Plan relative to collaboration of services or cost sharing which may encourage other jurisdictions to participate in the update. Glaesman stated that has been attempted by other means. He added that there is an entire chapter in the JDP dedicated to regionalization and cooperation.

Discussion of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Process for Program Year

2012: Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, stated that it is important that the Planning Commission have a core understanding of CDBG, that the Commission confirm the process that would lead up to the Planning Commission recommendation to the City Council on how this year's CDBG funds would be spent, and that the Commission review the pre-applications that have been submitted. Glaesman explained that the purpose of CDBG funding is to assist persons of low and moderate income (80% of the area median income). He explained that 70% of the expenditures must benefit low and moderate income (LMI) persons. Campion added that St. Cloud usually attains 94-95% assistance for LMI persons.

Glaesman stated that this year's process differs from last year's because last year was the City's first year in administering the program. The proposed process would be presentation by program year 2012 applicants at the February Planning Commission meeting (10 minute presentation per applicant), followed by the Planning Commission public hearing in March, and the City Council public hearing in April. DeVine asked if the details of each request would be included in the February packet. Campion answered that the details could be distributed to the Commission prior to the mailing of the February packet. Andzenge asked if there would be an opportunity for the Commission

to ask questions of the applicants, and Glaesman answered that there would be. Holtberg supported the proposed process. Glaesman stated that the allowed presentation time could be reduced to 5 minutes if the Commission wishes. Chirhart asked if staff is expecting any additional applications as he will not be present at the February meeting. Campion responded that there will be no new applications as applicants were required to have a pre-application meeting prior to submitting their pre-applications. Therefore, no final applications could be submitted without a pre-application meeting. Radaich stated that he believes a 5 minute presentation would be an acceptable limit as long as applicants are also able to make a presentation at the City Council public hearing. Radaich asked how many of the projects that were approved by the Planning Commission last year were also approved by the City Council. Campion answered that all were approved by the City Council because the Commission forwarded two options. However, the City then received notification from HUD that the funding amount had been reduced. As a result, Campion stated that one public service activity was completely eliminated and believed that the Boys & Girls Club activity was reduced. Campion indicated that this year's preliminary estimate for funding is approximately \$505,000+. However, after deducting administrative costs as well as a previous commitment to the Human Rights Office, there will be a balance of approximately \$342,000 in uncommitted funds. Chirhart commented that it was his recollection that last year there was a significant difference between the Planning Commission's recommendation and the Administration's recommendation on allocation of monies. Radaich stated that based on the economy and a lower tax base, some of the funding was used for infrastructure improvements for buildings, etc. but still benefitted the LMI persons. Chairperson Anderson said he believes a 5 minute presentation limit is ample if the Planning Commission has received the application materials at least a week prior to the meeting. The Commission concurred with the 5 minute presentation limit. DeVine asked Campion to include a follow-up on last year's allocations.

Adjournment: There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Emil Radaich, Secretary