

The meeting was held remotely via Zoom due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chair Kopitzke called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM
2. **ROLL CALL** – Present: Chair Kris Kopitzke, Kuchen Hale, Doug Parker, Roger Bowman Sally Doherty, & Justin Sykora, Christian Dawson. Absent were James Langan & Scott Patten. A quorum was present.
ALSO IN ATTENDANCE – Council member Wroblewski, City Administrator Ron Moore
3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** –
Commissioner Sykora will abstain from discussion regarding item 6A.
Motion/Second Sykora/Hale To approve the agenda for the November 2, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. Roll call: all aye, Passed 7-0.
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –
A. October 5, 2020
Motion/Second Kopitzke/Doherty To approve minutes of the October 5, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. Roll call: all aye, Passed 7-0.
5. **REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS** - None
6. **PUBLIC HEARINGS** –
A. Pamela D. Neary Rev Trust application for minor subdivision for lot line rearrangement at 1033 Indian Trail Path.
Chair Kopitzke opened the public hearing at 7:07 PM
Administrator Moore provided an overview. Project is moving lot lines not creating any new lots. Adds northern portion of property to land owned by Belwin.
Applicants stated this allows Belwin to have access to shoreline for preservation.
No public comments were received.
Motion/Second Hale/Dawson to close public hearing. Roll call: all aye, passed 6-0-1 (Sykora abstain).
Public Hearing closed at 7:12 PM

Motion/Second Doherty/Dawson to recommend to City Council approve the minor subdivision application at 1033 Indian Trail. Roll call: all aye, passed 6-0-1 (Sykora abstain).

B. FOC subdivision sketch plan for 63 acres of land located in SE quadrant of Hudson Road and Manning Ave.
Chair Kopitzke opened the public hearing at 7:19 PM.
Administrator Moore stated that this is a sketch plan for subdivision in industrial zone, creating 7 commercial lots.
City Planning Consultant Bob Kirmis was present to provide information and answer questions.
Brad Bechel, property owner along south side, had the following comments:
 - The stormwater run-off from the proposed lots 5, 6 and 7 flows to the south, so needs to be managed to avoid negative impacts on the residential properties to the south.
 - Because the backs of the buildings will be facing south, he would like the back portion of the buildings to have quality exterior finishes and there should be substantial screening along the south boundary of the property.
 - He suggested looking at the initial development application for the property that was proposed in the mid-2000's to review the Army Corps of Engineer's comments regarding run-off and the floodplain.No other comments were received.

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107

Motion/Second Parker/Doherty to close public hearing. Roll call: all aye, passed 7-0.

Public hearing closed at 7:32 PM.

Sykora noted that a large portion of this is in flood plain. Need to be careful not to add impervious surface. Parker stated we need to balance environmental protections. Placement for septic on north needs to be looked at.

Hale noted there is standing water on the south side of this area every spring. Agree that biggest concern is the water quality and floodplain, and how to mitigate.

Bowman stated that we have denied driveways across 18% slope in the past, there is one proposed here. Concern about some of the old trees, also water and sewer may be across the road but cannot come into Afton without a change in the comprehensive plan.

Doherty stated that we typically discourage cul-de-sacs. She is supportive of the business here, but is not in favor of approving variances.

Chair Kopitzke stated they did a good job saving many of the trees here, cul-de-sac design seems to help preserve.

Hale asked if streets need to be wider for commercial use on a cul-de-sac?

Administrator Moorse stated there are different standards, will be determined by type and volume of traffic expected.

Chair Kopitzke asked that they provide a good screening plan.

Jim Gasparrini stated that one of the proposed tenants is planning a solar farm on two of the lots. Every effort will be taken to provide natural screening to protect the view to the north. Flood plain prohibits connecting the roads in a loop.

The following is a summary of the feedback the Planning Commission provided regarding the sketch plan.

- Due to the wetlands and floodway on the property, protecting the water quality and managing the stormwater run-off is a top priority
- The proposed eastern cul-de sac crosses a portion of an area with 18% slopes
- The preservation of trees and replacement of trees that need to be removed is important
- A plan for substantial screening to the south is important

7. NEW BUSINESS –

A. Concept Plan for Open Space Preservation Subdivision with shared driveways

Chair Kopitzke noted that shared driveways are currently prohibited in our ordinances.

Administrator Moorse provided background – shared driveways were discussed as possible alternative option when reviewing PLCD language, as a way to preserve large lots and areas of open space. This concept plan is for 2 shared driveways serving large lots that lack frontage to public roads in the ag zone.

Doherty stated this is a way for land to be divided without a full PLCD. However, could create too many small lots.

Parker average lot size 20 acres, make 20 acres minimum size.

Bowman stated that this is an alternative that current owners could use without developers.

Sykora asked if they would have deed restrictions?

Administrator Moorse replied that deed restrictions could be changed; conservation easement could be held by Belwin and cannot be changed. Would cover entire parcel to prohibit subdivision.

Hale stated that many current landowners are aging and may have children and would like to pass it down, ordinance are so restrictive they can't do that. Not allowing generational land, or division on retirement. Forcing people of average income out of our city.

Chair Kopitzke stated this seems to allow for reasonable split.

Hale stated we need to take close look at this, perhaps bring lot size down.

Dawson stated we cannot restrict to just family. Like the opportunity to preserve large areas of land.

Chair Kopitzke stated that 3 lots per quarter-quarter section restriction is still in place.

- 108 Parker noted there can be problems in event of fire with long driveways.
109 Hale stated that in the past, issues with owners of shared driveways came to the city for resolution.
110 Sykora currently Afton is financially unobtainable. This could allow for smaller (5 acre) lots for less cost.
111 Bowman this is an additional alternative that may fit certain situations, opening options.
112 Parker asked how this would work if Belwin is not interested in conserving these?
113 Sykora stated this type of monitoring is within their capabilities.
114 Further discussion was held and the Planning Commission agreed the shared driveway concept could be another
115 method of facilitating large lot development under the following conditions:
116
 - a maintenance agreement is required for the driveway
 - a multi-party legal way to prevent further sub-division is required
 - the number of lots allowed on a shared driveway is limited
 - a park dedication is required
 - a minimum driveway width is required based on the number of lots to be served.

- 121
122 The following is a summary of the feedback the Planning Commission provided regarding the sketch plan:
123
 - The Planning Commission was generally supportive of the concept
 - The specific goals a values to be achieved by the concept should be clarified
 - The concept should not be allowed on cul de sacs that already contain the maximum number of lots.
 - A definition of “shared driveway” needs to be developed, i.e. a private driveway serving 2 to 3 lots.
 - A driveway maintenance agreement with a conflict resolution process that does not include the City should be required
 - A conservation easement that prohibits further subdivision should be required
 - The requirement of 300 feet of frontage on a public road would need to be waived
 - The concept does not make the open space available to the public
 - The Commission discussed other options for the use of this concept that would allow smaller lots. One example is a qtr-qtr section with one 30-acre lot and two 5-acre lots. This would meet the Ag zone density requirement and the Comprehensive Plan’s density goal of one lot per ten acres.
 - The Commission would like to continue its review of this concept, and has asked staff to prepare a draft ordinance amendment that reflects their comments.

137
138
139 **8. OLD BUSINESS –**

- 140 A. Update on City Council actions
141 Council member Wroblewski provided a summary of the September City Council meeting.
142

143 **9. ADJOURN**

144 **Motion/Second Hale/Doherty To adjourn. Roll call: all aye, Passed 7-0.**

145
146 Meeting adjourned at 9:07 pm.
147

148
149 Respectfully submitted by:

150
151 JY
152 Julie Yoho, City Clerk

153
154
155 To be approved on December 7, 2020 as (check one): Presented: _____ or Amended: _____
156
157