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Chairperson Joseph Stumph called the Regular Meeting of the Vadnais Heights Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on February 26, 2019.

ROLL CALL

Joseph Stumph, Chairperson    Present
Dave Anderson    Absent
Linda Bigelbach    Present
Edward Caillier    Absent
Brian Carnes    Present
Evan Cordes     Present
Martin Jokinen    Present
Curt Cooper, First Alternate   Present
Jerry Moynagh, Second Alternate  Present

Also present: Nolan Wall, Planning/Community Development Director; Jeff Melcoch, Cable Producer.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Bigelbach, it was

“RESOLVED, to approve the February 26, 2019, Regular Meeting Agenda.”

Ayes – 7  Nays – 0

The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Carnes referred to two corrections needed to the minutes: 1) Line 91 change to who made the reference as he did not recall making the statement and

“Commissioner Carnes commented on the length of time it takes for transit projects,…; and 2) Line 100 “…that while he feels there may be a need for this type of service, the cost is astronomical…”

Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Carnes, it was

“RESOLVED, to approve the minutes of the November 27, 2018, Regular Meeting as amended with technical changes to lines 91 through 101.”
Ayes – 7  Nays – 0

The motion carried.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Chairperson Stumph opened the floor to the public at 7:05 p.m. for questions and comments on items not on the agenda.

No one wished to address the Commission, Chairperson Stumph closed the meeting to the public at 7:05 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Case 19-001: Outfront Media LLC. Variances for Billboard at 3364 Rice Street

Planning/Community Development Director Wall said the applicant is requesting four separate variance requests to the property to construct a new billboard on the subject property.

Planning/Community Development Director Wall said Chapter 38, Article VI, Sec. 38-700 of the City Code allows billboards on certain property in compliance with applicable standards. Wall then outlined the applicant’s variance that is to request a height variance from 35 feet to 50 feet that the applicant feels is necessary to allow for greater visibility over the future bridge ramps. He shared several graphics depicting the proposed location with the new ramps that would create difficulty to be compliant to the City Code height standards.

Planning/Community Development Director Wall said the applicant was also requesting a 66-foot building setback due to Country Drive being rerouted leaving the available land 21,000 square feet less which will create difficulty with a new billboard meeting the setback. He stated the proposed location is as far back as possible but there is only a small area left from the Ramsey County right-of-way.

Planning/Community Development Director Wall then explained the air space occupation variance where the billboard would occupy airspace over or above a driveway or parking area and how relocation was constrained due to relocation of Country Drive, County right-of-way, the parking lot expansion itself, building location and the proposed billboard’s orientation. Staff does believe that four of the proposed parking stalls could be removed to increase green space.

Planning/Community Development Director Wall outlined the requested wetland setback variance of 281 feet. He shared that the buffer covers the entire subject property and said the last variance was based on the former billboard. He said that staff believes a 15-foot higher billboard in the same general location as the current one will not have any additional negative impacts. He shared details of the billboard with one side being a dynamic face and the other static then shared photos of existing billboards for comparison.
Planning/Community Development Director Wall reviewed building setbacks and stated both adjacent property owners, Ramsey County and Caribou Coffee, voiced support of the variance requests. Wall said that staff are recommending approval of the variance requests: height to 50 feet with added architectural treatments around the pylon; building setback to 33.4 feet; air space approval for the driveway but denial of the parking area request with the requirement to remove parking stalls directly under the billboard; and the wetland setback variance to 219 feet.

Commissioner Carnes asked to review photos of any billboards in the City that fully comply with the Ordinance. Planning/Community Development Director Wall said billboard regulations have changed over time and that many do not fully comply.

Commissioner Carnes asked what the economic benefit would be to the City to approve the variances and questioned why codes were established if variances are continually approved. He said while he understood there was a billboard in this location before maybe the location should be changed and asked why parking was not recommended under the billboard. Commissioner Jokinen said the reason was for the potential of snow and ice falling from the structure.

Commissioner Cordes asked if this land would be annexed to Little Canada in the future. Planning/Community Development Director Wall responded that staff spoke with the City of Little Canada about that possibility and while they are not interested at this time it is possible based on the roundabout completion in the future as it will include a leg of Country Drive that will have to be addressed with regards to maintenance, plowing, etc.

Commissioner Cordes inquired about the schedule, as Little Canada does not allow new billboards. Planning/Community Development Director Wall replied construction would occur this year so plans for landscaping, sidewalk connections and plowing will need to be determined fairly soon.

Commissioner Carnes asked if the height request and graphics were based on actual bridge heights or speculation and asked about the possibility that they will need the billboard even higher. Planning/Community Development Director Wall said the request was based on the best information they have to date and that 50 feet would provide the visibility the applicant needs.

Commissioner Moynagh asked if there is any other potential use for that land or is it land locked and is this the only option for use of the property. Planning/Community Development Director Wall said Ramsey County is expecting to sell the property to Caribou Coffee for parking expansion. It is a very small piece of property that does not have much viability and right-of-way access is very limited and said that using it for a billboard is probably the highest and best use. He noted billboards are allowed in the zoning district along Interstate 694 but that it just does not comply with several of our standards and that is why they are requesting variances.

John Bodger and Scott Christensen, Outfront Media, shared how this was a great example of the tenant, the property owner, Ramsey County and the City working together. They said the billboard has been there since 1986 and they are just working to relocate the
billboard. They stated they concurred with the staff report and understand the conditions
to remove the parking stalls.

Chairperson Stumph opened the public hearing at 7:31 p.m.

No one wished to address the Commission, Chairperson Stumph closed the public hearing at
7:31 p.m.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Jokinen, it was
“RESOLVED, to recommend approval of the Variance requests as presented by staff, based
on the following findings of fact:

1. The proposed billboard replaces a former non-conforming billboard removed to
facilitate construction of a public roadway improvement project.

2. The proposed billboard is a permitted accessory use within the C-2 District and is
compliant with the Comprehensive Plan.

3. Several unique circumstances exist that create practical difficulties for the
applicant to construct the proposed billboard on the subject property in
compliance with certain applicable City Code standards, including:
   a. Limited freeway visibility due to the location of the proposed ramps/bridges
      for the Rice Street/I-694 interchange reconstruction project and proposed
      billboard orientation;
   b. Reduction in size of the subject property due to required right-of-way
      acquisition;
   c. Location of the existing building on the property to the south and potential
      parking lot expansion project; and
   d. Location of the existing wetland complex to the south/east.

4. The proposed billboard will not negatively affect the character of the surrounding
   area.

5. Several other existing billboards along the I-694 corridor in other communities
   exceed 35 feet in height.

Subject to the following conditions:

1. Sign and Building Permits shall be submitted for administrative review/approval,
prior to any signage being installed on the subject property.

2. The applicant shall comply with all applicable State Statutes and City Code
   performance standards for construction and operation of the proposed billboard.

3. Parking stalls directly underneath the proposed billboard shall be prohibited, to be
   reviewed for compliance by the Community Development Department as part of
   any future parking lot expansion project or other future use of the subject
   property.

4. The applicant shall conceal the sign support column with an approved
   architectural treatment that is consistent with the colors and/or materials of the
   adjacent building, to be reviewed and approved by the Community Development
   Department.

Commissioner Cordes said that it seems premature to him, the entire corridor will be
redone in the next year, may give land to Little Canada, speculating on bridge height, and
they may be back in a year asking for another variance and that he would rather wait, and
do it right once rather than doing it wrong. He said he would vote to table or say no at
this time and come back when bridge is complete and we know if its land within the City
of Vadnais Heights.

Commissioner Carnes said the Code needs to be reviewed to avoid having to issue so
many variances. He said while it may not be fair to this applicant that we say no when
we gave another billboard a variance. He said he understands that the billboard has been
there for 33 years and while the applicant has received a lot of revenue from it but
squeezing it into this small space may not be the best solution based on the current City
Code.

Commissioner Bigelbach said that she would also be willing to table the item to allow for
bridge completion and decide whose land it is.

Chairperson Stumph inquired about whether the City of Little Canada had any input if the
property were to be sold. Planning/Community Development Director Wall stated tabling
the item is not recommended as Council needs to take action, they can't table things for
an entire construction season. The Commission could deny the request which would
allow Council to consider the request at their next meeting.

Commissioner Cordes asked if the variance was denied at this time could the applicant
come back for another variance. Planning/Community Development Director Wall said
there were some time restraints on applying for a variance if a variance was denied but it
would be up to the Council, adding that the applicant could withdraw their request and
reapply instead of having a denial on the record that might have some sort of time
constraint.

Commissioner Moynagh said he would like to see the barrier size first before considering
the variance request.

Commissioner Jokinen asked when construction would occur. Mr. Bodger said they plan
to construct this summer and said the variance application is based on the fact that some
of the Caribou Coffee land will have to be condemned to make the loop. He noted that
Ramsey County signed-off on the application.

Commissioner Cooper said it would have been good to have Ramsey County present to
answer questions. Planning/Community Development Director Wall said the County
owns the property and the renderings show the proposed interchange and confirmed the
County supported the variance on the property they currently own and will do the land
transfer with a right-of-way swap and acquisition. He stated that while these are separate
actions, they do come together in this application.

Commissioner Jokinen said he has no objection in proceeding and that he is comfortable
supporting the request as requested and he sees no reason to delay consideration for the
applicant. He is not in favor of tabling it. Commissioner Cooper agreed.
Commissioner Cordes said there is too much uncertainty and expressed concern regarding Ramsey County’s due diligence and unintended consequences. He stated his intent is to vote no and the Commission should tell the Council that this request is premature.

Commissioner Carnes said that he too will vote no.

Ayes – 3 (Stumph, Cooper, Jokinen) Nays – 4 (Bigelbach, Carnes, Cordes, Moynagh)

The motion failed.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Bigelbach, it was “RESOLVED, to recommend denial of the Variance requests based on being premature given construction and possible change in City ownership of that property and that City zoning laws may not even apply.”

Ayes – 4 (Bigelbach, Carnes, Cordes, Moynagh) Nays – 3 (Stumph, Cooper, Jokinen)

The motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Elect Chairperson

Upon motion by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Carnes, it was “RESOLVED, to elect Commissioner Cordes as Chairperson for 2019.”

Ayes – 7 Nays – 0

The motion carried.

B. Elect Vice Chairperson

Upon motion by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Cordes, it was “RESOLVED, to elect Commissioner Jokinen as Vice Chairperson for 2019.”

Ayes – 7 Nays – 0

The motion carried.

C. Appoint Economic Development Authority Representative and Alternate

Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Carnes, it was
“RESOLVED, to appoint Commissioner Cooper as Economic Development Authority Representative for 2019.”

Ayes – 7  Nays – 0

The motion carried.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Carnes, it was

“RESOLVED, to appoint Commissioner Moynagh as Economic Development Authority Representative Alternate for 2019.”

Ayes – 7  Nays – 0

The motion carried.

D. Appoint Garceau Corner Task Force Liaison and Alternate

Planning/Community Development Director Wall said the Garceau Corner Task Force resulted from a series of conversations over the past two years with the goal of cleaning up this property and reviewing options. He said the City is ready to have a proactive community engagement process to create a vision for this site so the Task Force is comprised of a range in membership, including City Council, non-neighbors, local real estate professionals, businesses and stakeholders in order to present different perspectives for an equitable conversation. Planning/Community Development Director Wall said the intent is to bring in market representatives to educate the Task Force members and that open houses and information will be shared online for resident updates.

Commissioner Bigelbach asked if other cities have had success utilizing the Task Force concept for property development and she asked if the meetings will be open to the public. Planning/Community Development Director Wall replied that other cities have used this type of process and the same was done for Koehler Road, adding that the public meetings will allow for information and input without having a specific project being proposed and will help the community feel more comfortable about the process. He noted that there is a webpage set up with information on the Task Force.

Commissioners Bigelbach, Jokinen, and Chairperson Stumph shared their interest in being appointed to the Task Force.

Commissioner Bigelbach shared that she was a 39-year resident of the City and knows the community well and believes she could be an asset to the group.

Commissioner Jokinen said he was a former city administrator and understands redevelopment projects, some with pollution concerns and the need to address this contaminated site.

Upon motion by Commissioner Carnes, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, it was
“RESOLVED, to appoint Commissioner Bigelbach as Garceau Corner Task Force Liaison for 2019.”

Ayes – 5  Nays – 1 (Jokinen)  Abstained – 1 (Cordes)

The motion carried.

Chairperson Stumph withdrew his interest in being appointed.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Carnes, it was

“RESOLVED, to appoint Commissioner Jokinen as Garceau Corner Task Force Alternate Liaison for 2019.”

Ayes – 7  Nays – 0

The motion carried.

E. Accept Annual Expense Allowance

Upon motion by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Carnes, it was

“RESOLVED, to accept the annual expense allowance for 2019.”

Ayes – 7  Nays – 0

The motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

REPORTS

A. Council Liaison

Council Liaison Youker said she was pleased to be there and thanked the Commission for allowing her to attend, adding she had nothing to report.

B. Planning Commissioners

None.

C. Staff

Planning/Community Development Director Wall stated that the Comprehensive Plan was submitted to the Metropolitan Council at the end of 2018 and have reviewed it and returned it to the City with comments which are mostly text revisions. He said staff was
currently working through the revisions and while technically incomplete he did not anticipate any portion would need to be brought back to the Commission for review.

Planning/Community Development Director Wall thanked Chairperson Stumph for his work as Chair the past two years. He noted that during the time he was chair the Planning Commission adopted a new City Code and worked through two fairly contentious proposals. He stated he appreciated Chairperson Stumph’s leadership during this time as chairing is not an easy job and he thanked him for his service to the community.

NEXT MEETING

The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on March 26, 2019.

ADJOURN MEETING

Upon motion by Commissioner Carnes, seconded by Commissioner Cordes the meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Sorensen, TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.
Memorandum:

TO: Chair Cordes and Planning Commission Members

FROM: Nolan Wall, Planning/Community Development Director

DATE: March 26, 2019

SUBJECT: Planning Staff Report Case 19-002: Planned Unit Development District Amendments

Recommended Commission Action
Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the proposed amendments contained in DRAFT Ordinance 733 and provide direction on any additional revisions.

No recommendation to the City Council is required at this time. A formal public hearing will be noticed for the April 23 regular meeting.

Description of the Request
The City is proposing amendments to Chapter 38, Article III, Division 15 of the City Code concerning the Planned Unit Development (PUD) District.

Discussion
The City is using its legislative authority when considering action on a City Code amendment request and has broad discretion; the only limitations are that actions must be constitutional, rational, and in some way related to protecting the health, safety and general welfare of the public.

Action Timeline
There is no applicable action timeline in this case due to the request being city-initiated.

Background
While processing recent applications, staff has identified several potential amendments to the PUD standards and procedures. Due to the limited land available for development/redevelopment in the community, the PUD process will continue to be utilized as a regulatory tool to encourage flexibility that supports high-quality development. The proposed amendments aim to ensure an equitable and transparent review process that promotes additional community engagement.

Analysis
DRAFT Ordinance 733 contains the following major proposed amendments (see attached):

Section II
- Clarification on density flexibility allowance (lines 35-36).
- Explicitly stating that the underlying zoning district standards should be used as a threshold for review (lines 45-46).
Both proposed amendments clarify the existing interpretation and administration.

Section III
• Elimination of specific setback standards and allowance for flexibility consideration based on the underlying zoning district standards, including certain considerations (lines 91-102).
• Elimination of building height standards and allowance for flexibility consideration based on the underlying zoning district standards, in compliance with existing CUP standards (lines 180-183).

The existing PUD District requirements and standards section includes stricter regulations for setbacks and building height than is allowed under the PUD Overlay District and CUP processes. The intent and administration of the PUD standards has always been to encourage flexibility. The existing additional standards are unnecessary and conflict with the intent and purpose provisions.

Section IV
• Clarification that PUD Overlay flexibilities are based on the applicable underlying zoning district, including proposed uses (lines 201-202 and 215-216).
• References to the same PUD District performance standards for PUD Overlays (lines 242-250).

Section V
• Open House requirement for PUD applications – not for PUD Overlays (lines 280-287).
• Concept PUD Plan requirement – formerly optional (lines 289-315).
• Reclassification of “Detailed Development Plan” to “Final PUD Plan” (lines 317-344).

This section includes significant policy changes affecting the review process for PUD Districts – not PUD Overlay Districts. The current practice of “optional” concept plan review by the Planning Commission and City Council is not equitable and requires subjective interpretation/administration by staff.

The proposed amendments would require an applicant to host an open house and go through concept plan review before proceeding to the final plan review process. As a result, the entire review process is lengthened significantly. However, the benefit is that it creates an equitable process that promotes additional community engagement by offering more opportunities to improve a proposed project.

Public Hearing Notice
According to Chapter 38, Article II, Section 38-35(c) of the City Code, concerning zoning amendments, a public hearing notice must be published and mailed to any affected property owners within 350 feet at least ten (10) days prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

A public hearing notice will be published in advance of the April 23 Planning Commission meeting.

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the proposed amendments contained in DRAFT Ordinance 733 and provide direction on any additional revisions prior to next month’s public hearing.

Action Requested
No formal action is required at this time.

Attachment(s):
• DRAFT Ordinance 733
• Chapter 38, Article III, Division 15
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 38, ARTICLE III, DIVISION 15 OF THE ZONING CODE, CONCERNING THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The City Council of the City of Vadnais Heights does hereby ordain:

I.

Division 15 (Planned Unit District) of the City Zoning Code is hereby amended to read as follows (strikethrough indicates deletions; underline indicates additions):

DIVISION 15. - PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (PUD)

II.

Article III, Chapter 38, Division 15, Section 38-483 (Intent and purpose) of the City Zoning Code is hereby amended to read as follows (strikethrough indicates deletions; underline indicates additions):

(a) As an alternative to conventional zoning and development approaches and processes, the planned unit development zoning district (PUD) procedures are here set forth in order that the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare be furthered in an era of increasing urbanization; to encourage innovations in residential, commercial, and industrial development and renewal; so that greater opportunities for better housing and recreation, shops and industrial plants conveniently located to each other may extend to all citizens and residents of the city; to reflect changes in the technology of land development; to encourage a more creative approach in the utilization of land in order to accomplish a more efficient, aesthetic, and desirable development which may be characterized by special features of the geography, topography, size or shape of a particular property; to meet the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan and other adopted plans; and to provide a compatible and stable environment in harmony with that of the surrounding area.

(b) The planned unit development PUD zoning district may include any developments having one or more principal uses or structures on a single parcel of ground or contiguous parcels, provided that the total area is five acres or larger. The PUD shall consist of a harmonious selection of uses and grouping of buildings, parking areas, circulation and open spaces, and shall be designed as an integrated unit, in such manner as to constitute a safe, efficient, and convenient urban area. Under the provisions of this district, the city council has the right to allow deviations from any standards in this chapter, including use. In general, the underlying zoning district standards shall be used as a threshold to establish a baseline review of a proposed PUD district.
Article III, Chapter 38, Division 15, Section 38-484 (General requirements and standards for parcels of five acres or more) of the City Zoning Code is hereby amended to read as follows (strikethrough indicates deletions; underline indicates additions):

Sec. 38-484. – PUD district general requirements and standards, for parcels of five acres or more.

(a) Ownership. The tract shall be a development of land under unified control at the time of application, planned and scheduled to be developed as a whole. However, no authorizations or permits shall be granted for such development unless the applicant has acquired actual ownership of or executed a binding sales contract for all of the property comprising such tract. For purposes of this chapter, ownership shall include a lease of not less than 50 years' duration. The term "single ownership" includes ownership of portions of such development by two or more wholly-owned subsidiaries of a single owner, or by such single owner and one or more of its wholly-owned subsidiaries.

(b) Conformance with comprehensive plan. The proposed PUD planned unit development zoning district shall be generally consistent with the city current comprehensive plan. Density standards may be flexible, as in section 38-484(n).

(c) Lot area standards regulations.

(1) The minimum total land area shall be no less than five acres, except as allowed by section 38-485 for a PUD overlay district.

(2) Unusual physical features of the property itself or of the surrounding neighborhood are such that development under the standard provisions of the residence districts would not be appropriate in order to conserve a physical or terrain feature of importance to the neighborhood or community.

(d) PUDs involving multiple housing types. A residential PUD may provide for a variety of housing types in any one of the basic residential zoning districts. The total number of dwelling units allowed in a development shall be determined by either: the area standards of the zoning district in which the proposed development is to be located, or the density specified by the planning commission and approved by the council, consistent with the intent of the city's land use plan. A plan may provide for a greater number of dwelling units per acre than would otherwise be permitted by the regulations applicable to the site, but if the density or intensity of land use exceeds by more than ten percent that permitted by the regulations otherwise applicable to the site, the applicant has the burden to show that such excess will not have an undue and adverse impact on existing public facilities and on the reasonable enjoyment of neighboring property. The planning commission and city council, in determining the reasonableness of the increase in the density or intensity of land use, shall consider the following factors: the location, amount and proposed use of common open space, the location, design and type of dwelling units, and the physical characteristics of the site.

(e) Front, rear and side yard building setbacks regulations. Building setbacks from all property lines which form the perimeter of the total property in the PUD, or from all interior and exterior dedicated street right of way lines or from the paving of any private interior circulation streets shall be 20 feet or the height of the building, whichever is greater, for residential structures, and 20 feet or the height of the building, whichever is greater, for commercial structures.
proposed setbacks within the PUD may be reduced from the required setback standards within the underlying zoning district under the following considerations:

(1) Adequate space remains to install an appropriate landscape buffer, if determined necessary.
(2) The height of the building does not negatively affect sunlight expose or air access on the adjacent properties and/or uses.
(3) The overall site and/or building design is enhanced.
(4) The site conditions present unique challenges and/or constraints.

(f) Multiple buildings on a single lot. More than one building may be placed on one platted or recorded lot in any PUD. Areas for single-family detached dwellings or other housing types providing privately-owned lots must shall comply with chapter 32, pertaining to subdivisions, in all respects not specifically noted in this chapter as appropriate variances or waivers.

(g) PUDs involving one housing type. A PUD which that only involves one housing type, such as all detached or all attached units, shall not be considered as inconsistent with the stated purposes and objectives of this chapter and shall not be the sole basis for denial or approval.

(h) Appearance and compatibility. Architectural style of buildings shall not solely be a basis for denial or approval of a plan. However, the overall appearance and compatibility of individual buildings to other site elements or to surrounding development will be primary considerations in the review stages of the planning commission and city council.

(i) Plans for PUDs in city review. No building permit shall be issued granted for any building on land for which a plan for a PUD is in the process of city review or which does not conform to the approved final plan.

(j) Staging of development.
(1) Any PUD plan proposed to be constructed in stages shall include full details relating thereto, and the city council may approve or modify, where necessary, any such proposals.
(2) The staging shall include the time for beginning and completion of each stage. Such timing may be modified by the city council on the showing of good cause by the developer.
(3) The landowner or developer shall make such easements, covenants, and other arrangements and shall furnish such performance bond(s) as may be determined by the city council to be reasonably required to ensure performance in accordance with the plan and to protect the public interest in the event of abandonment of the plan before completion.

(k) Streets, utilities, services and public facilities. The uniqueness of each proposal for a PUD requires that specifications and standards for streets, utilities and services shall be subject to minor modifications from the specifications and standards established in this and other city ordinances governing their construction. The city council may therefore waive or modify the specifications or standards where it is found that they are not required in the interests of the residents or of the entire city. The plans and profiles of all streets, utilities and services shall be reviewed, modified, if necessary, and approved by the city engineer, fire chief, and building official inspector, prior to the final approval of the PUD plan by the city council. All PUD projects shall be served by public or community water and sewer systems.

(l) Open space provision. Land area will be set aside for public and private open space and recreational use according to the following provisions:
(1) Land area (or cash in lieu of land) shall be dedicated to the city for public park use according to the formula established in the section 32-217 current park land dedication ordinance of the city. The location of such dedicated land must be acceptable to the city council. Plans involving non-residential uses in the industrial district, cash in lieu of land may require cash in lieu of land dedication be required.

(2) Plans involving residential uses, in addition to the dedication of land for public open space and recreational use, a minimum of ten percent of the total site area may shall be set aside for the private recreational use of the site's residents at the city council’s discretion.

(m) Operating and maintenance requirements for PUD planned unit development common facilities. In the event that certain land areas or structures are provided within the PUD planned unit development for private recreational use or as service facilities, the owner of such land and buildings shall enter into an agreement with the city to ensure the continued operation and maintenance to a predetermined reasonable standard. These common areas may be placed under the ownership of one of the following, depending upon which is more appropriate:

1. Dedicated to public where a community-wide use would be anticipated.
2. Landlord control.
3. Landowners association, provided all of the following conditions are met:
   a. The landowners association must be established.
   b. Membership must be mandatory for each owner and any successive buyer.
   c. The open space restrictions must be permanent, not for a given period of years.
   d. The association must be responsible for liability insurance, for common areas and the reasonable maintenance of exterior residential and other facilities.
   e. Landowners must pay their pro rata share of the cost and the assessment levied by the association that can become a lien on the property in accordance with state law.
   f. The association must be able to adjust the assessment to meet changed needs.

(n) Density (residential). The number of dwelling units may be flexible relative to the existing zoning classification and/or comprehensive plan. Increased gross and/or net densities may be allowed for:

1. Dedicating more than the minimum for public open space.
2. Particular distinctiveness and excellence in siting, design, and landscaping as determined by the city council.
3. In no event will population densities be greater than that which would be detrimental to the public health, safety, and general welfare.

(o) Building height standards. Any proposed building within the PUD may exceed the maximum height restrictions in the underlying zoning district under the same considerations as in section 38-622. A building’s setback from property adjacent to the planned unit district site shall approximate its height, with a maximum of 45 feet.

(p) Landscaping. Landscaping or fencing shall be provided according to a plan that contains complete information as required by section 38-39 and is approved by the planning commission and city council.

(q) Utilities. All utilities, including electricity and telephone, shall be installed underground.

(r) Uses. A PUD district may contain uses that are not allowed within the underlying zoning district(s).
IV.

Article III, Chapter 38, Division 15, Section 38-485 (Planned unit development overlay district) of the City Zoning Code is hereby amended to read as follows (strikethrough indicates deletions; underline indicates additions):

Sec. 38-485. - Planned unit development overlay district.

(a) **Intent and purpose.** The PUD overlay district is intended to allow for consideration of reasonable flexibilities from the applicable underlying zoning district standards. This section shall apply to a land area of less than five acres and must meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Oddly-shaped parcels which create development difficulties;
2. Parcels that are underutilized, such as aged buildings or obsolete arrangement of buildings or lots create a need for redevelopment opportunity;
3. The site has special physical features such as slopes, trees, and wetlands;
4. The site possesses an opportunity to make improvements or reduce access points and improve community connections allowing for preservation of site features; or
5. The proposed development must be consistent with the intent of the comprehensive plan. Mixed-use proposals will be considered consistent, provided that if the guided use is included in the development.

(b) **General requirements and standards.** Land areas of less than five acres may qualify for a conditional use permit for a PUD overlay district if the proposed use(s) are allowed within the applicable underlying zoning district. The city council will consider the following criteria and make a finding that the development will achieve a majority of the following:

1. The property is adjacent to or across the street from property which has been developed under the provisions of this chapter and will contribute to the amenities of the neighborhood.
2. The natural features of the site are preserved.
3. Creative rearrangement of lots or buildings can be accomplished.
4. The development relates to and is integrated with the immediate surrounding properties.
5. Pedestrian connectors are maximized.
6. Sustainable development is supported and enhanced.
7. Surface water management and the provision of utilities is enhanced.
8. **At a minimum,** the proposed lot area contains two parcels, under separate ownership with a joint application.
9. Current screening and amenities are in place to protect neighboring properties, or the site is capable of supporting screening and amenities that protect adjacent properties.
10. The development will provide for consolidation of properties to eliminate or reduce access drives onto public streets and highways.
11. The development promotes shared party access drives and improved pedestrian access.
12. The development provides shared and improved water quality improvements.
13. Public water and sanitary sewer systems are made more efficient.
14. The proposed development is environmentally friendly in that it includes green products and planning considerations.
15. The planned development is compatible with the area in both architectural and landscape design.
(c) Additional requirements and standards.

(1) Setbacks. Flexibilities for the underlying zoning district standards shall be considered under the same conditions as in section 38-484(e).

(2) Density. Flexibilities from the underlying zoning district standards and/or comprehensive plan shall be considered under the same conditions as in section 38-484(n).

(3) Building height. Flexibilities from the underlying zoning district standards shall be considered under the same conditions as in section 38-484(o).

(4) Procedure. PUD overlay district applications shall be processed in accordance with section 38-43.

V.

Article III, Chapter 38, Division 15, Section 38-486 (Procedure for planned unit development zoning district or planned unit development overlay district approval) of the City Zoning Code is hereby amended to read as follows (strikethrough indicates deletions; underline indicates additions):

Sec. 38-486. - Procedure for PUD planned unit development zoning district or planned unit development overlay district approval.

(a) Zoning district applications. PUD planned unit development zoning district applications shall be processed in accordance with section 38-37, in addition to the required procedures included in this section.

(b) Overlay district applications. Planned unit development overlay district applications shall be processed in accordance with section 38-43.

(cb) Meeting with city staff. The developer shall meet with the development review committee/city planner to discuss the development concept, the review and approval process, and the submittal requirements.

(dc) Application. An applicant for a concept or final PUD plan shall submit the proper application forms made available by the city, including all required materials and applicable fees. The developer shall make application for approval on a form provided by the city and accompanied by the fee according to the license, permit, and application fee schedule set forth by the city council. Applications for both approval shall provide submission materials for site plan applications pursuant to sections 38-39 and 38-43.

(d) Open house. Prior to planning commission review of a concept PUD plan, the applicant shall conduct an open house meeting in accordance with the following process:

(1) Submittal of a complete application form, including all required fees.

(2) Notice of the open house shall be provided to all properties within 350 feet of the subject property. The city shall have the authority to require the notice area to be expanded beyond the minimum distance, as determined by staff, at no additional cost to the applicant.

(3) The applicant shall prepare an open house summary upon conclusion of the meeting to accompany the concept and final PUD applications.

(e) Concept PUD plan review by planning commission (optional).
(1) Planning commission Informal review. Upon completion of the open house and receipt of a complete application, the planning commission shall review the concept PUD plan. When the city staff agree that the concept plan has been suitably refined, an informal review by the planning commission may be scheduled at its next regularly-scheduled meeting. The concept PUD plan should indicate proposed land uses, general circulation patterns, general building massing, and the general approach to special site conditions or problems. The commission shall not make any formal recommendations, but shall comment as to whether it feels the concept PUD plan is in general conformance with the city comprehensive plan. It will also inform the applicant developer of the positive features and preliminary concerns within the concept PUD plan, what features or design elements should be considered in the detailed development final PUD plan, and what exceptions or zoning regulations it may be willing to allow in exchange for certain publicly-beneficial design or planning features.

(2) Concept plan review by City council review. It is not required that the city council shall review the concept PUD plans at its next regularly-scheduled meeting following review by the planning commission. However, when working on a site with a high degree of municipal sensitivity, or when it is anticipated that the reaction of the council may likely be substantially different from that of the commission, the developer or city staff may request a concept plan review by the city council. The scope of review and comment by the city council shall be the same as that by the planning commission. The city council shall not take any formal action to approve or deny the concept PUD plan application. The discussion, including any feedback and/or direction offered, shall be considered action under the applicable state statutes regarding review timelines. The concept PUD plan review process shall not be binding on the city as part of any subsequent final PUD plan process. The applicant may choose to address the comments received under the concept PUD plan review process as part of a subsequent final PUD plan.

(3) Notice of review. Notification of a concept PUD plan review process shall be given in the same manner as a final PUD plan, as in section 38-486(f)(3).
notified in writing of such action, including conditions of approval and periodic review, approve,
disapprove, or table by motion the development proposal. Conditions may be applied to the
approval of the plan, or a periodic review of the approval may be required.

(3) Notification of a final PUD plan review process shall be given in the same manner as for
rezoning applications, as in section 38-37, including an additional public hearing before the city
council.

(g) Developer's agreement. Prior to issuing a building permit, the city council shall require the
applicant to sign a developer's agreement with the city which ensures that particular elements of
the final PUD detailed development plan, either proposed by the applicant or imposed by the city,
shall be carried out.

(h) Method of amending an approval.
(1) Minor changes in the location and placement of buildings or other elements of the final PUD
plan may be authorized by the city council upon staff review.
(2) Changes in structural types, in the shape and arrangement of lots and blocks, in the allocation
of open space, and all other changes which affect the overall design of the project shall be referred
to the planning commission for report and recommendation, after which the city council shall hold
a review and shall decide to either approve or deny the changes in the final PUD detailed
development plan. If such changes are authorized, the applicant shall submit a revised final PUD
plan showing the authorized changes.

(i) Denial of final PUD approval. If an final PUD plan application for a planned unit development
approval is denied, no new application for a PUD approval by the same applicant for the same site
may be filed for 60 days from date of denial, unless substantially different from the former proposal
or the applicant has addressed the reasons for denial in the approved findings of fact.

(j) Time limits. The zoning district and final PUD development plan may be approved for a certain
period of time, or a phasing plan approved by the city council with conditions including periodic
progress review. If construction has not commenced within 12 months or within the phasing
schedule as approved by the city council, then the council may, on its own initiative, commence
proceedings under section 38-37 to rezone the property back to its original classification or declare
the conditional use permit final PUD plan null and void.

VI.

This Ordinance shall take effect and be enforced from and after its passage and publication.

PASSED by the City Council of the City of Vadnais Heights, Minnesota, this ## day of
MONTH, 2019.

______________________________
Heidi Gunderson, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Kevin Watson, City Administrator
DIVISION 15. - PLANNED UNIT DISTRICT (PUD)

Sec. 38-483. - Intent and purpose.

(a) As an alternative to conventional zoning and development approaches and processes, the planned unit development zoning district (PUD) procedures are here set forth in order that the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare be furthered in an era of increasing urbanization; to encourage innovations in residential, commercial, and industrial development and renewal; so that greater opportunities for better housing and recreation, shops and industrial plants conveniently located to each other may extend to all citizens and residents of the city; to reflect changes in the technology of land development; to encourage a more creative approach in the utilization of land in order to accomplish a more efficient, aesthetic, and desirable development which may be characterized by special features of the geography, topography, size or shape of a particular property; and to provide a compatible and stable environment in harmony with that of the surrounding area.

(b) The planned unit development zoning district may include any developments having one or more principal uses or structures on a single parcel of ground or contiguous parcels, provided that the total area is five acres or larger. The PUD shall consist of a harmonious selection of uses and grouping of buildings, parking areas, circulation and open spaces, and shall be designed as an integrated unit, in such manner as to constitute a safe, efficient, and convenient urban area. Under the provisions of this district, the city council has the right to allow deviations from any standards in this chapter, including use.

(Code 1999, § 18A.010)

Sec. 38-484. - General requirements and standard for parcels of five acres or more.

(a) Ownership. The tract shall be a development of land under unified control at the time of application, planned and scheduled to be developed as a whole. However, no authorizations or permits shall be granted for such development unless the applicant has acquired actual ownership of or executed a binding sales contract for all of the property comprising such tract. For purposes of this chapter, ownership shall include a lease of not less than 50 years' duration. The term "single ownership" includes ownership of portions of such development by two or more wholly-owned subsidiaries of a single owner, or by such single owner and one or more of its wholly-owned subsidiaries.

(b) Conformance with comprehensive plan. The proposed planned unit development zoning
district shall be consistent with the city comprehensive plan.

(c) **Lot area regulations.**

(1) The minimum total land area shall be no less than five acres, except as allowed by section 38-485 for a PUD overlay district.

(2) Unusual physical features of the property itself or of the surrounding neighborhood are such that development under the standard provisions of the residence districts would not be appropriate in order to conserve a physical or terrain feature of importance to the neighborhood or community.

(d) **PUDs involving multiple housing types.** A residential PUD may provide for a variety of housing types in any one of the basic residential zoning districts. The total number of dwelling units allowed in a development shall be determined by either: the area standards of the zoning district in which the proposed development is to be located, or the density specified by the planning commission and approved by the council, consistent with the intent of the city's land use plan. A plan may provide for a greater number of dwelling units per acre than would otherwise be permitted by the regulations applicable to the site, but if the density or intensity of land use exceeds by more than ten percent that permitted by the regulations otherwise applicable to the site, the applicant has the burden to show that such excess will not have an undue and adverse impact on existing public facilities and on the reasonable enjoyment of neighboring property. The planning commission and council, in determining the reasonableness of the increase in the density or intensity of land use, shall consider the following factors: the location, amount and proposed use of common open space, the location, design and type of dwelling units, and the physical characteristics of the site.

(e) **Front, rear and side yard building setback regulations.** Building setbacks from all property lines which form the perimeter of the total property in the PUD, or from all interior and exterior dedicated street right-of-way lines or from the paving of any private interior circulation streets shall be 20 feet or the height of the building, whichever is greater, for residential structures, and 20 feet or the height of the building, whichever is greater, for commercial structures.

(f) **Multiple buildings on a single lot.** More than one building may be placed on one platted or recorded lot in any PUD. Areas for single-family detached dwellings or other housing types providing privately-owned lots must comply with chapter 32, pertaining to subdivisions, in all respects not specifically noted in this chapter as appropriate variances or waivers.

(g) **PUDs involving one housing type.** A PUD which only involves one housing type, such as all detached or all attached units, shall not be considered as inconsistent with the stated
purposes and objectives of this chapter and shall not be the sole basis for denial or approval.

(h) **Appearance and compatibility.** Architectural style of buildings shall not solely be a basis for denial or approval of a plan. However, the overall appearance and compatibility of individual buildings to other site elements or to surrounding development will be primary considerations in the review stages of the planning commission and council.

(i) **Plans for PUDs in city review.** No building permit shall be granted for any building on land for which a plan for a PUD is in the process of city review or which does not conform to the approved final plan.

(j) **Staging of development.**

(1) Any PUD plan proposed to be constructed in stages shall include full details relating thereto, and the city council may approve or modify, where necessary, any such proposals.

(2) The staging shall include the time for beginning and completion of each stage. Such timing may be modified by the city council on the showing of good cause by the developer.

(3) The landowner or developer shall make such easements, covenants, and other arrangements and shall furnish such performance bond as may be determined by the city council to be reasonably required to ensure performance in accordance with the plan and to protect the public interest in the event of abandonment of the plan before completion.

(k) **Streets, utilities, services and public facilities.** The uniqueness of each proposal for a PUD requires that specifications and standards for streets, utilities and services shall be subject to minor modifications from the specifications and standards established in this and other city ordinances governing their construction. The city council may therefore waive or modify the specifications or standards where it is found that they are not required in the interests of the residents or of the entire city. The plans and profiles of all streets, utilities and services shall be reviewed, modified, if necessary, and approved by the city engineer, fire chief, and building inspector, prior to the final approval of the PUD plan by the city council. All PUD projects shall be served by public or community water and sewer systems.

(l) **Open space provision.** Land area will be set aside for public and private open space and recreational use according to the following provisions:

(1) Land area (or cash in lieu of land) shall be dedicated to the city for public park use according to the formula established in the current park land dedication ordinance of the city. The location of such dedicated land must be acceptable to the city
council. In the industrial district, cash in lieu of land may be required.

(2) In addition to the dedication of land for public open space and recreational use, a minimum of ten percent of the total site area shall be set aside for the private recreational use of the site’s residents.

(m) Operating and maintenance requirements for planned unit development common facilities. In the event that certain land areas or structures are provided within the planned unit development for private recreational use or as service facilities, the owner of such land and buildings shall enter into an agreement with the city to ensure the continued operation and maintenance to a predetermined reasonable standard. These common areas may be placed under the ownership of one of the following, depending upon which is more appropriate:

(1) Dedicated to public where a community-wide use would be anticipated.

(2) Landlord control.

(3) Landowners association, provided all of the following conditions are met:
   a. The landowners association must be established.
   b. Membership must be mandatory for each owner and any successive buyer.
   c. The open space restrictions must be permanent, not for a given period of years.
   d. The association must be responsible for liability insurance, for common areas and the reasonable maintenance of exterior residential and other facilities.
   e. Landowners must pay their pro rata share of the cost and the assessment levied by the association that can become a lien on the property in accordance with state law.
   f. The association must be able to adjust the assessment to meet changed needs.

(n) Density (residential). The number of dwelling units may be flexible relative to the existing zoning classification. Increased densities may be allowed for:

(1) Dedicating more than the minimum for public open space.

(2) Particular distinctiveness and excellence in siting, design, and landscaping as determined by the city council.

(3) In no event will population densities be greater than that which would be detrimental to the public health, safety, and general welfare.

(o) Building height. A building’s setback from property adjacent to the planned unit district site shall approximate its height, with a maximum of 45 feet.

(p) Landscaping. Landscaping or fencing shall be provided according to a plan that contains complete information as required by section 38-39 and is approved by the planning
commission and city council.

(q) **Utilities.** All utilities, including electricity and telephone, shall be installed underground.

(Code 1999, § 18A.020)

Sec. 38-485. - Planned unit development overlay district.

(a) **Intent and purpose.** This section shall apply to a land area of less than five acres and must meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Oddly-shaped parcels which create development difficulties;
2. Parcels that are underutilized, such as aged buildings or obsolete arrangement of buildings or lots create a need for redevelopment opportunity;
3. The site has special physical features such as slopes, trees, and wetlands;
4. The site possesses an opportunity to make improvements or reduce access points and improve community connections allowing for preservation of site features; or
5. The proposed development must be consistent with the comprehensive plan. Mixed use proposals will be considered consistent, provided that the guided use is included in the development.

(b) **General requirements and standards.** Land areas of less than five acres may qualify for a conditional use permit for a PUD overlay district. The council will consider the following criteria and make a finding that the development will achieve a majority of the following:

1. The property is adjacent to or across the street from property which has been developed under the provisions of this chapter and will contribute to the amenities of the neighborhood.
2. The natural features of the site are preserved.
3. Creative rearrangement of lots or buildings can be accomplished.
4. The development relates to and is integrated with the immediate surrounding properties.
5. Pedestrian connectors are maximized.
6. Sustainable development is supported and enhanced.
7. Surface water management and the provision of utilities is enhanced.
8. At a minimum, the proposed lot area contains two parcels, under separate ownership with a joint application.
9. Current screening and amenities are in place to protect neighboring properties, or the site is capable of supporting screening and amenities which protect adjacent
properties.

(10) The development will provide for consolidation of properties to eliminate or reduce
access drives onto public streets and highways.

(11) The development promotes shared party access drives and improved pedestrian
access.

(12) The development provides shared and improved water quality improvements.

(13) Public water and sanitary sewer systems are made more efficient.

(14) The proposed development is environmentally friendly in that it includes green
products and planning considerations.

(15) The planned development is compatible with the area in both architectural and
landscape design.

(Code 1999, § 18A.030)

Sec. 38-486. - Procedure for planned unit development zoning district or planned unit development overlay
district approval.

(a) **Zoning district applications.** Planned unit development zoning district applications shall be
processed in accordance with section 38-37.

(b) **Overlay district applications.** Planned unit development overlay district applications shall
be processed in accordance with section 38-43.

(c) **Meeting with city staff.** The developer shall meet with the development review
committee/city planner to discuss the development concept, the review and approval
process, and the submittal requirements.

(d) **Application.** The developer shall make application for approval on a form provided by the
city and accompanied by the fee according to the license, permit, and application fee
schedule set forth by the city council. Applications for both approval shall provide
submission materials for site plan applications pursuant to sections 38-39 and 38-43.

(e) **Concept plan review by planning commission (optional).**

(1) **Informal review.** When the city staff agree that the concept plan has been suitably
refined, an informal review by the planning commission may be scheduled at its next
regularly-scheduled meeting. The concept plan should indicate proposed land uses,
general circulation patterns, general building massing, and the general approach to
special site conditions or problems. The commission shall comment as to whether it
feels the concept plan is in conformance with the city comprehensive plan. It will also
inform the developer of the positive features and preliminary concerns within the
concept plan, what features or design elements should be considered in the detailed development plan, and what exceptions or zoning regulations it may be willing to allow in exchange for certain publicly beneficial design or planning features.

(2) **Concept plan review by city council.** It is not required that the city council review concept plans. However, when working on a site with a high degree of municipal sensitivity, or when it is anticipated that the reaction of the council may likely be substantially different from that of the commission, the developer or city staff may request a concept plan review by the city council. The scope of review and comment by the council shall be the same as that by the commission.

(f) **Detailed development plan/preliminary plat.**

(1) **Submission of plan.** Based upon comments received regarding the concept plan, and working with the city staff, the developer shall prepare a detailed development plan. This shall include a preliminary plat if land subdivision is proposed. The list of materials for submission shall be pursuant to the council-approved site plan application checklist pursuant to sections 38-39 and 38-43(b).

(2) **Notice of review.** Notice of detailed development plan review shall be given in the same manner as for rezoning applications, section 38-37, or conditional use permit approval applications, section 38-43.

(3) **Review by planning commission of detailed development plan.** The applicant shall submit the plan to city staff according to the schedule as approved by the city council. The planning commission shall review the detailed development plan in the same manner as it reviews a site plan approval application.

(4) **Review by the city council of detailed development plan.** The city council shall review at a public hearing the detailed development plan within 60 days after the planning commission has made its recommendation. In its review, the council shall consider the same impacts and features as did the commission. It may approve, disapprove, or table by motion the development proposal. Conditions may be applied to the approval of the plan, or a periodic review of the approval may be required.

(g) **Developer’s agreement.** Prior to issuing a building permit, the city council shall require the applicant to sign a developer’s agreement with the city which ensures that particular elements of the detailed development plan, either proposed by the applicant or imposed by the city, shall be carried out.

(h) **Method of amending an approval.**

(1) Minor changes in the location and placement of buildings or other elements of the plan may be authorized by the city council upon staff review.
(2) Changes in structural types, in the shape and arrangement of lots and blocks, in the allocation of open space, and all other changes which affect the overall design of the project shall be referred to the planning commission for report and recommendation, after which the city council shall hold a review and shall decide to either approve or deny the changes in the detailed development plan. If such changes are authorized, the applicant shall submit a revised plan showing the authorized changes.

(i) Denial of PUD approval. If an application for a planned unit development approval is denied, no new application for a PUD approval by the same applicant for the same site may be filed for 60 days from date of denial.

(j) Time limits. The zoning district and development plan may be approved for a certain period of time, or a phasing plan approved by the city council with conditions including periodic progress review. If construction has not commenced within 12 months or within the phasing schedule as approved by the city council, then the council may, on its own initiative, commence proceedings under section 38-37 to rezone the property back to its original classification or declare the conditional use permit null and void.

(Code 1999, § 18A.040)

Secs. 38-487—38-510. - Reserved.
Memorandum:

TO: Chair Cordes and Planning Commission Members

FROM: Nolan Wall, Planning/Community Development Director

DATE: March 26, 2019

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Work Plan

Recommended Commission Action
Review DRAFT 2019 Work Plan and discuss an implementation strategy.

Background
The Planning Commission’s role is inherently reactive, as the main responsibility is to review proposed development and code amendment applications and make recommendations to the City Council. In the past, the Planning Commission has established an annual work plan to take a more proactive approach on a variety of land use/zoning issues.

Staff is proposing that the Planning Commission establish a proposed work plan for 2019 to present to the City Council for their consideration and direction. Some issues may be timelier than others and the intent is complete any required work within the current department budget and based on staff workload.

Attached is a DRAFT work plan for discussion.

Attachment(s): DRAFT 2019 Work Plan
1. Review Potential Zoning Code Amendments
   A. Planned Unit Development District
   B. Steep slopes
   C. Park dedication
   D. Billboards/signs
   E. Density (gross vs. net)
   F. Water Management Overlay District
   G. Subdivision Ordinance

2. Bi-Annual/Annual Joint City Council Meeting
   A. Present proposed work plan
   B. Get direction on additional goals

3. Economic Development Initiatives
   A. Current policies & programs
   B. Surrounding cities’ policies & programs
   C. Recommend additional policies & programs
   D. TIF 101
   E. VHEDC coordination
   F. Economic Development Authority

4. Housing Initiatives
   A. Current policies & programs
   B. Surrounding cities’ policies & programs
   C. Recommend additional policies & programs

5. Evaluate Redevelopment Areas
   A. Study constraints
   B. Identify funding or budgeting priorities