



**City of Jordan
City Planning Commission
September 27, 2011
Special Meeting**

Members Present: Chairman Rolf Hafslund; Council Representative Mayor Pete Ewals; Jeanne Marnoff; John Watkins

Staff Present: Senior Planner Joe Janish, City Attorney Annette Margarit, City Administrator Ed Shukle

Others Present: Kitty Burton, Noah Bly, Frank Dunbar, Steve Dunbar, and others.

1.0 Call to Order.

Chair Hafslund called the Planning Commission to order at 7:04 pm.

2.0 Sketch Plan Review CDA Senior Housing/Library/Pharmacy/Clinic

Janish indicated that the Scott County CDA has acquired property within the Whispering Meadows Development in order to construct a mixed use senior housing project. This project would consist of 50 dwelling units, an 8,000 square foot library, 5,000 square foot clinic and proposed 2,000 square foot pharmacy.

The project would consist of two buildings on four lots at the intersection of Creek Lane South and Seville Drive. The land will be subdivided into two lots. Additionally a registered land survey will be used to allocate parking and electrical utilities.

Janish provided an overview of the comments from staff related to the Sketch Plan:

Public Works:

- Looping of water main from Creek to Seville.

Fire:

- Would like to see a second access from Seville. This will have to be reviewed due to the slopes on the property to see if it is possible. At this time the applicant indicated the slope is too steep for a fire truck.
- Location of Hydrants.

Administration:

- A separate group is working on the interior of the Library. The Planning Commission does not have the responsibility to review this information.
- No comments received.

Police:

- No comments received.

Engineering:

- From the meeting between the developer and City staff on 9-9-11, we understand the dashed line on the south side of property at the base of the large slope is a proposed subsurface underdrain. This under drain is proposed to drain into the Creek Lane system to the east. Based on the available capacity of the storm sewer system on Creek Lane, this under drain should be designed to drain to the Seville Drive system without use of the Creek Lane storm sewer. This may be done through the proposed storm sewer network proposed for this development.
- The proposed cul-de-sac turnaround at the west end of the development must be sufficient in size to allow full turnaround by a standard fire truck. The developer should supply an AutoCAD file to the City Engineer to verify sufficient turning radii for fire trucks is provided.
- We recommend the developer conduct a traffic analysis along Creek Lane to determine the necessity and feasibility of adding a turn lane and bypass lane. This analysis must be done by a licensed professional engineer specializing in such studies. The results of the analysis must be submitted to the City Engineer for review. If required, the developer would be responsible for design and installation of these lanes.

Grading & Utility Sketch Plan Review:

- A Preliminary Grading Plan meeting the requirements of City Ordinance 12.30 Subd. 4 must be submitted prior to approval of the preliminary plat.
- A Preliminary Street & Utility Plan meeting the requirements of City Ordinance 12.30 Subd. 5 must be submitted prior to approval of the preliminary plat.
- A 2:1 (H:V) slope is proposed along the toe of the large slope along the south side of the development. This slope exceeds the maximum allowable slope of 3:1 (H:V) for areas that are not to be maintained (i.e. mowed). If this area is to be maintained after development, the maximum allowable slope is 4:1 (H:V).
- A stability analysis should be conducted on the slope in coordination with the development of the final grading and utility plans. Braun Intertec has done previous analyses on this particular slope for similar developments.
- The proposed storm sewer layout should be modified to outlet to the existing structure located approximately 150 feet west of the currently proposed outlet connection. It would be necessary to remove the existing 12" RC storm pipe stub out and connect directly to the existing structure. The proposed system should discharge to structure 19 in the record drawings for the Whispering Meadows development previously distributed to the developer's engineer (BKBM).
- Roof drains should be connected directly to the proposed storm sewer system.
- An easement should be provided over the proposed sanitary sewer services to each building.
- An easement should be provided over the proposed 8" watermain loop.
- An easement should be provided over the proposed storm sewer collection system.
- An easement should be provided over the proposed underdrain system at the toe of the southern slope.
- An easement should be provided over the proposed access lanes, road, and cul-de-sac.
- *The memo is also attached identifying the comments.*

Finance:

- Assuming city will charge the fees (water, sewer, storm and building inspections) like any other business, including on the library.

Planning:

- Create a mixed use PUD (PMD) as an overlay district.
- Amendment to the Highway Commercial zoning code to allow for Residential Housing/Senior Housing within the Highway Commercial Zone (perhaps as part of a PUD), or find that the use is complimentary to the functionality of the development and the other uses found therein.
- The city may consider higher density for housing projects which provide affordable housing options, consistent with the City's Comprehensive plan.
-
- Setbacks and standards may vary for PUD's. The standard setbacks are:
 - Front Yard 20 feet minimum, 150 feet maximum
 - Side Yard 15 feet or half the height of the building – which ever is greater
Corner lot at 20 feet
 - Rear Yard at 20 feet
- There is no specific requirement relating to percent commercial vs. percent residential, however the Planning Commission and Council need to find that the mixed use PUD uses are complementary to the development and other uses.
- The project is proposing a 4 story building the code allows for a 3 story.
- A signage plan is needed as part of the Preliminary and Final PUD plans.
- As part of the PUD a shared parking plan would be enacted. It is expected that during peak clinic/pharmacy times (during the week day) senior housing visitors would be low.
 - Senior housing requires 1 parking stall per unit with sufficient space for an additional .2 parking spaces per unit.
 - Clinic requires 1 space per 200 square feet. This clinic would need 25 stalls.
 - Pharmacy is not listed within the code however Retail store and service establishment requires 1 space per 200 square feet. This means this proposed pharmacy would need 10 stalls.
 - Libraries require 1 space per 300 square feet of gross floor area. This means 27 parking stalls.
 - **TOTAL PARKING NEEDED:**
60 (senior housing including .2 stalls per unit) + 25 (clinic) + 10 (pharmacy) + 27 (Library) = 122 stalls (needed). The applicant is proposing 50 enclosed residential parking stalls and 75 surface stalls. A total of 125 parking stalls are provided by the applicant.

Frank Dunbar provided an overview of the project highlighting the features of the buildings and what would be located within each structure.

Planning Commissioners questioned the applicant and allowed for comments from the audience related to the project. The comments and questions included:

- Commissioners questioned if the second access was not feasible what would the fire department do?
- Developer noted that a portion of the hillside between the structure and Seville would be Prairie grass.
- Questions were raised about if the structures would have "fiber" to them, drive by lane, and gardening area for residents. Depending on the results of a traffic study a drive by lane might be

needed, fiber would be installed, and gardening is possible, but in past projects the interest vanished for the garden.

- Commissioners questioned about pedestrian access and if markings would have to be more prominent?
- Questions arose about lighting, pedestrian/non-motorized plans, bike racks, and landscaping, were raised. The developer noted that many of these are in process and not provided at this level of detail.
- Staff provided an overview of written comments by a commissioner not in attendance.
 - The comments related to providing an entrance only from creek with exit only onto Seville. The Developer noted the 26 feet in elevation raises many issues.
 - Comments related to having the pharmacy hopefully open later hours to help serve the community.
 - Comments related to the code amendment for housing in Highway Commercial.
- Concern for a global stability analysis being provided.
- Commissioners did provide support for the project and noted it would be beneficial to look into review code or providing the ability within the PUD for the housing aspect along with a 4th story as part of the project.

Motion Watkins, seconded Marnoff to provide the Planning Commission Comments and audience comments to the City Council as it relates to the applicants proposed project. Motion approved unanimously.

3.0 Variance Request: Commercial Highway Lot Width; 210 Eldorado Drive

Janish indicated Mrs. Burton had applied for a variance and minor subdivision. The Planning Commission conducted a Public Hearing on September 13, 2011 and continued discussion of the topic to tonight's meeting.

The Planning Commission reviewed information from a past request along with the original building permit information provided by the applicant for the variance and minor subdivision. The City Attorney provided a legal opinion that the property did not meet the warrants for a variance request due to the property already being put to a reasonable use, since a structure was placed on the property, along with other findings.

The Planning Commission was having a difficult time in attempting to meet the requirements related to the variance and during discussions with the applicant. The Planning Commission noted that in order to split the lots a variance would have to be granted since the requirements for the lot width had increased in August of 2010. Members discussed other ways in which it might be possible to construct a second structure on the lot, with the Common Interest Community (CIC) seeming to be the most beneficial to the applicant. Staff noted that if a motion to deny was approved the property could not seek a variance or split request for six months. The Planning Commission and applicant noted that this should be a good compromise in order to meet the intent of the property owner. The applicant did comment she would need to review this concept with her attorney, but would have the withdrawal letter to staff this evening.

Motion Watkins, seconded Marnoff to table item 3 and 4 pending the receipt of the withdrawal letter from the applicant based on the applicant looking into creating a CIC on the property versus seeking a variance and lot split. Motion approved unanimously.

4.0 Minor Subdivision: 210 Eldorado Drive

Tabled pending the withdraw request by the Applicant due to the same reasons as the Variance Request.
Please see motion above.

5.0 Adjournment.

Motion Marnoff, seconded Watkins to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:06 p.m. Motion unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Janish
Senior Planner