

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE ST. CLOUD PLANNING COMMISSION

A meeting of the St. Cloud Planning Commission was held on June 12, 2012, at 6:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers. Members present were Anderson, Andzenge, Chirhart, DeVine, Holtberg, and Radaich. Council Chairperson Libert was present as Council representative Goerger was not in attendance. Members of the Arts Commission present were Deblieck, Drazenovich and Garven.

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

**Consent Agenda:** Chairperson Anderson noted that the April minutes have not yet been completed and have therefore, been removed from the consent agenda. DeVine moved to approve the consent agenda as follows:

Acceptance of staff reports for June 12, 2012, as part of the official record.

Andzenge seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Discussion with the St. Cloud Arts Commission Regarding Placemaking Plan:** Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, explained that the City Council discussed work program priorities at a recent study session and placemaking was well received. The purpose of placemaking is to make urban spaces more desirable. He noted placemaking plans from other cities were included in the packet. The plans vary in cost; but the consistent elements of the plans were events and branding, business, arts and culture, public and private spaces, and traffic. Placemaking has been found in various St. Cloud plans since 1996. Glaesman asked for discussion on what placemaking elements should be assessed, what elements have been planned and completed as well as those not completed, and budget and scope of work for the upcoming analysis. He stated that \$7,500 is allocated under the community priorities process; the Arts Commission is willing to make a

commitment from its budget; and hopefully, approval by the Planning Commission of a Development Fund expenditure. DeVine asked about the budget. Glaesman answered that is uncertain until the scope of work is decided. Garven stated that the Arts Commission talked about placemaking priority at their meeting tonight and emphasized the importance of trade-outs. They also discussed wayfinding and how things are displayed. Holtberg asked about Poetry in Sidewalks. Glaesman said that is an example of a placemaking element that doesn't have to be expensive. Deblieck commented that placemaking fuses many elements together. Drazenovich said consideration must be given to where people are being directed and where is the City's center. She noted that so many things are already coming into place such as the banners on 5<sup>th</sup> Ave., Lake George, the Library, and the Convention Center. Chirhart commented that there have been many plans, but not a cohesive effort. He believes the Planning Dept. has the ability to know what should be done. Glaesman responded that the Planning Office can facilitate the process, but may need to hire an outside group. Jennifer Penzkover, Arts Coordinator, stated that she believes Project for Public Spaces (PPS) in New York City would be a valuable asset for the City, and their fees are fairly reasonable. DeVine suggested that input from the City and the public is necessary prior to hiring an outside company. She believes it should be viewed as the big picture rather than individual assets and projects. Penzkover noted that Bellingham, WA used this firm, and their demographics are similar to St. Cloud's demographics. PPS worked with the City staff and trained them to complete the project, but served as an ongoing resource. Anderson inquired if the recommended projects would be incorporated in the next Comprehensive Plan, and Glaesman answered that they would. Radaich asked what the fee would be for PPS assistance. Penzkover said it is her understanding that they customize their services to the needs of each City. Glaesman stated that costs can be negotiated with PPS and other companies to compare services and fees and suggested an RFQ. Radaich believed that an outside company could probably tie together all the entities involved, e.g. City Council, Planning Commission, Downtown Council, Heritage Preservation Commission, etc. Holtberg agreed that an outside source would be valuable. Drazenovich stated that the wayfinding element is very important. Deblieck

questioned whether the first step is to seek a consultant to bring the groups together or whether some groundwork needs to be done prior to seeking outside help. Penzkover stated that a consultant could help bring everyone together with a common direction. Andzeng stated that placemaking starts with a sense of identity, e.g., sustainability, quality of life, cultural environment, etc. He asked with whom that process should start. Glaesman stated that individual components have been brought before the Planning Commission and City Council. For example, the urban design guidelines were well received by the Planning Commission, but were not ultimately adopted as part of the LDC. He said he believes the Planning Commission and City Council should commission the study. Anderson expressed concern that implementation of a placemaking plan may be cost prohibitive. Deblieck commented that an Arts & Cultural Plan was adopted several years ago. Although there was very little funding available, innovative ways were found to make changes without significant cost with great partnerships being formed. As an example of partnerships being formed, Garven stated that the Northeast/Wilson Park neighborhood is looking at establishing a gateway. She said she contacted several City departments and received very positive feedback and cooperation. DeVine suggested that the City get some bids and then have another discussion; Garven concurred. Radaich said he believes outside help is necessary to show us how to proceed. Penzkover pointed out that placemaking is ongoing.

**Review of the 2012 Community Development Block Grant Action Plan:** Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, stated that the 2012 CDBG action plan has been approved by the City Council. The City has not yet received its final confirmation of entitlement funds; however, the estimate is at \$514,870. Chirhart asked if the funding designation for the MTC was contingent on the MTC receiving State funding. Glaesman answered that was a condition, and the MTC did receive State funding. Holtberg inquired if staff received feedback from the applicants about the process, and Glaesman answered that staff has not had any negative feedback. DeVine commented that she would like the City Council to have more review time prior to making its decision. Anderson commented that he sent the Planning Commission members a link to the City of Rochester's action

plan. He thought that was a good format and suggested that St. Cloud might look at incorporating the same format in its action plan. Anderson asked how much time and expenses are devoted to the CDBG program and whether the funding for program administration is adequate. Glaesman explained that the program administration funding does not cover the City's cost. He explained that the Program Administration funding is based on a percentage of the City's entitlement allocation. DeVine stated that the process this year is much improved since the last year which was the first year that the City took over the CDBG program administration from the HRA.

**Review of Healthy Neighborhoods Partnership Program Round 4 and 2012 Community**

**Survey:** Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, stated that there is a connection between input of the Community Survey, the Healthy Neighborhoods Partnership Program (HNPP), and the Planning Commission's work program. Holtberg asked staff to address the HNPP meeting that was held in May. Glaesman explained that overarching tasks that applied to all neighborhoods were discussed as well as neighborhood specific discussions. DeVine said that meeting demonstrated the continuing passion for neighborhoods. Holtberg asked about the common thread among the neighborhood groups that is or will be included in the work program. Glaesman responded that the main concerns are code enforcement and rental properties; therefore, it would be appropriate to once again discuss Neighborhood Best Practices. Libert commented that he attended the neighborhood meetings, and core issues were basically the same. Anderson suggested that discussion on neighborhood issues and progress on them be placed on the Planning Commission agendas. Holtberg stated that he believes the HNPP is very valuable and thanked people who have contributed to the program. Glaesman suggested that people can stay informed by going to the City's Neighborhood Services website and the Neighborhood Coalition's website. He pointed out that Moorhead had a similar program for the business community and hopes to expand the HNPP type program in St. Cloud into other areas as well.

**Stormwater Management Plan – Amendment:** Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, stated that specific elements of the Stormwater Management Plan have been acted upon by the Planning

Commission. Lisa Vollbrecht, Assistant Public Utilities Director, stated that the main focus of the Stormwater Management Plan is rainwater and what will be done with it to meet future regulations. She stated that the Plan looks at the physical assessment of the City, the uniqueness of the City, drainage areas, etc. The Comprehensive Plan was considered relative to development in the area and tying regulatory elements into the water quality. Consideration must be given to whether current infiltration standards included in the LDC will meet future regulations and requirements. Vollbrecht stated that consideration was given to incorporation of the SWMP into the CIP projects. The Plan allows opportunities to apply for grants for identified projects. Chirhart stated that the assessment indicates four impaired waters in the St. Cloud area and asked Vollbrecht to elaborate on those. Vollbrecht explained that impairments come and go, but currently the impaired waters are the Mississippi River, Sauk River, Lake George (has been on and off the list), and Neenah Creek. Chirhart stated that the report does not indicate total maximum daily loads for the impaired waters; and therefore, questioned how it can be determined that these waters are impaired. Vollbrecht responded that they must first be measured to see if they are impaired followed by the TMDLs (Total Maximum Daily Loads). Holtberg asked if places that consistently flood are addressed in the implementation plan. Vollbrecht answered that storm water quality as well as quantity have been addressed in areas that are known to have flooding issues. Holtberg inquired if runoff from adjoining cities affects St. Cloud's plan. Vollbrecht answered that it does not affect St. Cloud's plan. The Plan is based on the City of St. Cloud's pipes in the ground. Radaich moved to approve the SWMP. The motion was seconded by Chirhart and carried unanimously.

**Other Business:** Chairperson Anderson stated that the Vice-Chair position needs to be filled due to the resignation of Mary Jo Thometz. Andzenge offered to serve as Vice-Chair. Chirhart moved to appoint Andzenge as Vice-Chair. The motion was seconded by Radaich which carried unanimously.

Holtberg noted that each Commission member received a letter from a concerned citizen regarding Co. Rd. 75/33rd St. So. improvements. Glaesman stated that neighborhood meetings will

be held to gain input prior to hiring a design consultant. Chirhart asked if the new Transportation Committee will review the proposed improvements and citizen input. Glaesman answered that Committee has not yet been officially formed, but suspected that Committee would be involved in the process.

DeVine asked for an update on the development process study being done by Zucker Systems. Glaesman stated that the consultants have met with City staff, boards and commissions and a number of outside groups. It is expected that the City should receive their report in approximately a month.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

---

Emil Radaich, Secretary