



4141 Douglas Drive North • Crystal, Minnesota 55422-1696

Tel: (763) 531-1000 • Fax: (763) 531-1188 • www.crystalmn.gov

**CRYSTAL CITY CODE REVIEW
TASK FORCE**

**FEBRUARY 25, 2016
7:00 p.m.
CONFERENCE ROOM A, CITY HALL**

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

1. Call meeting to order
2. Resignations from Task Force – Jon Bohlinger, Nicholas Meyer
3. Review December 3, 2015 and January 28, 2016 Meeting Notes
4. Review Task Force comments
 - a. Review comments: Chapter 5, Sections 515.45 - .57
5. Discuss assignments and homework due Monday, March 14
6. Next meeting – Thursday, March 24, 2016
7. Adjourn – 9 p.m.

Jon Bohlinger resignation from CCRTF.txt

From: Anne Norris
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 3:40 PM
To: Anne Norris
Subject: FW: City Code Review Task Force Assignment

From: Jon Bohlinger
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 1:53 PM
To: Anne Norris
Subject: Re: City Code Review Task Force Assignment

Hi Anne,

I need to resign, I'm sorry. Life picked up. My apologies.

Jon Bohlinger

Nicholas Meyer resignation from CCRTF.txt

From: Anne Norris
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 3:39 PM
To: Anne Norris
Subject: FW: City Code Review Task Force Assignment

From: Nicholas Meyer
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 5:04 PM
To: Anne Norris
Subject: RE: City Code Review Task Force Assignment

Hello Anne,

In reviewing my commitments for this new year, I must step down from the task force.
Please send
my regrets to the team.

Regards,
Nicholas Meyer

CITY CODE REVIEW TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTES DECEMBER 3, 2015

Task Force Members Present: Kirsten Anderson, Bonnie Bolash, Jerry Bolash, Tom Krueger, Carolyn Maristany, Candace Oathout, Jennifer Pohl, Andrew Richter and David Seffren.

Also present: Councilmember Jeff Kolb, City Attorney Troy Gilchrist and City Manager Anne Norris.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Comments from Chair Richter and Attorney Gilchrist

Chair Richter asked the status of the Task Force recommendations for Chapters 1 and 2. Attorney Gilchrist is bringing proposed changes for Council consideration on December 15. Task Force recommendations on Chapter 3 will be presented to the Council in early 2016.

October 22, 2015 Meeting Notes

Motion by Task Force Member Oathout and seconded by Task Force Member Maristany to accept the October 22, 2015 meeting notes as presented. Motion carried.

Review Comments – Chapter 5, Sections 515.01 - .21

Section 515.01, Subd, 1-4 – The Task Force agreed that this section needed to be simplified and shortened.

Section 515.01, Subd. 6 – The Task Force reminded staff this section should be reviewed along with other City Code provisions regarding fines and penalties and updated as needed.

Section 515.01, Subd. 8 – The Task Force agreed the definition of “non-conforming” needs to be included in definitions. The Task Force suggested 515.01, Subd. 8, e) and g) be combined for greater clarity. The Task Force agreed 515.01, Subd. 8 h) needs to be reworded and simplified.

Section 515.01, Subd. 9 – The Task Force agreed this section should be relocated to another section and delete the first part of the sentence.

Section 515.05, Subd. 2 & 3 – The Task Force requested this section be restructured and consolidated to minimize repetition. Clarify Subd. 3(j) to make it less wordy and concern was expressed over the permit expiration periods in this section.

Section 515.09 – The Task Force recommended that this section be rewritten and rearranged – Attorney Gilchrist indicated the rearranging of sections would occur after the review of Section 515 is complete and the further restricting once all of the sections have been completed.

Section 515.13, Subd. 1 – The Task Force agreed this section should be removed.

Section 515.13, Subd. 4 a) – The Task Force suggested simplifying this section and use diagrams to help with clarification.

Section 515.13, Subd. 6 – The Task Force recommends rephrasing to “installed and/or maintained.” Expressed concern over the word “acceptable”.

Section 515.13, Subd. 8 a) and c) – The Task Force recommends these sections be combined.

Section 515.13, Subd. 9b) – The Task Force recommended this section be clarified.

Assignments and Homework

The homework is to review Section 515.25 – 515.41. Comments are due Monday, January 18, 2016. The next meeting of the Task Force is Thursday, January 28, 2016.

Adjournment

Chair Richter adjourned the meeting of the City Code Review Task Force.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

CITY CODE REVIEW TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTES JANUARY 28, 2016

Task Force Members Present: Bonnie Bolash, Jerry Bolash, Tim Buck, Tom Krueger, Carolyn Maristany, and Jennifer Pohl.

Also present: Councilmember Jeff Kolb, City Attorney Troy Gilchrist and City Manager Anne Norris.

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. A quorum was not present, but members agreed to raise the issue of approving and ratifying the recommendations from this meeting at the next Task Force meeting.

Comments from Attorney Gilchrist

Attorney Gilchrist reported on his presentation of the Task Force recommendations for Chapter 3 and is working on the suggested changes for Council action consideration in February.

Review Comments – Chapter 5, Sections 515.17 - .41

Section 515.17, Subd. 1 – The Task Force agreed the purpose either should be removed completely or moved to an appendix.

Section 515.17, Subd. 4 – There was discussion about curb cut regulations being simplified, made consistent and making sure residents do not lose what they already have when streets are reconstructed. It was pointed out that the term driveway was unnecessarily defined multiple times.

Section 515.17, subd. 5 – There was a discussion over garages and parking requirements. Concern was expressed over possibly being forced to have a garage (vs. a carport). Questions were raised about how the required number of parking spaces was determined and concern that not all business uses were addressed.

Section 515.21- The Task Force agreed that the findings and purpose are unnecessary, historical references should be removed, that the definitions should be relocated consistent with earlier Task Force discussion, and that the narrative in Subd. 4 should be simplified.

Section 515.25 – The Task Force discussed how the purpose provision should be deleted and that this section could be relocated (e.g., merged with the next section).

Sections 515.33, .37. and .41- Overall, the Task Force discussed the need to reformat these sections and use charts rather than repetition. The Task Force also noted removing the purposes and including as definitions if they are needed at all. In Subd. 3, the Task Force agreed the home occupation discussion needs to allow 1 person that doesn't live on the premises to be part of the home occupation.

Section 515.33, Subd. 3 – A question was raised as to the origin of the 1,000 sq ft limit on all detached accessory buildings. A desire was expressed to allow more impervious surface and for the Council to consider allowing tiny houses as a way of addressing multigenerational housing needs.

Section 515.33, Subd. 7 – The Task Force asked if the exceptions in this section could be stated once instead of being repeated four times (one of which missed flagpole).

Section 515.33, Subd. 8(a- d) – The Task Force agreed that any discussion of sidewalks need to be compliant with ADA standards, such as to minimum and uniform widths.

Section 515.37, Subd. 1 – The Task Force questioned whether the purpose statement is needed.

Section 515.37, Subd. 4 g) – The Task Force agreed language should be added such as “substantially similar to” the uses listed to broaden the list of allowed uses.

Section 515.41 – The Task Force recommended the use descriptions be updated as needed (such as sanatorium).

Assignments and Homework

The homework is to review Section 515.45 – 515.57. Comments are due Monday, February 15, 2016. The next meeting of the Task Force is Thursday, February 25, 2016.

Adjournment

Vice Chair Maristany adjourned the meeting of the City Code Review Task Force.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

CITY CODE REVIEW – EDITORIAL AND CLARIFYING COMMENTS
CHAPTER 5
Section 515, Chapters .45 - .57

Section	Nature of Comment	Comment	Author
515.45 – 53	Format	I would combine all three of these sections and put what can be put into table format. I would simplify the definitions of each zone by saying C-2 encompasses all of the C-1 uses as well as... I-1 encompasses all of the C-2 uses as well as... Finally, I would include a pictorial zoning map in the 515 zoning code. I imagine things are not rezoned all that frequently. When they are rezoned it is also a good time to look at the zoning code anyway just to ensure that it reads properly. Also there is a lot of overlap among these sections so things I noticed in one section apply to the other sections as well.	Carolyn Maristany
515.45, Subd. 2 b	Edit	Modify for “same or similar” language, unless some reason why the uses are that narrowly defined	Jen Pohl
515.45 Subd. 3d	Simplify	Can be simplified to read rear yard only	Carolyn Maristany
515.45, Subd.4a-3	Simplify	This statement is repeated throughout this segment...find a way to condense versus repeat multiple times	Jen Pohl
	Clarify 4a	Is it double 515.45 subd. 7c or something else?	Carolyn Maristany
515.45 Subd. 4b	Clarify	Are libraries included in that list?	Carolyn Maristany
515.45 Subd. 4d	Clarify	I’m confused about having this because the only differences between a C-1 and C-2 district are hours of operation, movie theaters and car repair 5 and 6 can they be combined since 515.05 subd,. 30 a is	Carolyn Maristany

		conditional use permits and 520 is site building review?	
515.45, Subd. 4h	Edit	“Limited to the following”... same or similar language Wondering if it has to be so specific or if it can be worded to be more inclusive to more business types	Jen Pohl Carolyn Maristany
515.45 Subd. 7	Simplify/format	Is there a way to condense the setbacks across all commercial districts into a table or other format?	Jen Pohl
515.49 Subd. 2e	Clarify	Conflicts with Subd 4n (thinking about NTB on Broadway)	Carolyn Maristany
515.49 Subd. 2l	Clarify	Wondering why you can’t have mostly repairs stores (e.g. TV repair or electronic repair, etc.)	Carolyn Maristany
515.49 Subd. 3a	Clarify	Just wondering if underground parking should be specifically named in 515.17 (off street parking) because 515.17 reads more as street level parking. Just for clarification so there is no ambiguity.	Carolyn Maristany
515.49 Subd. 4a	Clarify	Does not have side set back restrictions like 515.45	Carolyn Maristany
515.49 Subd.4d-5	Simplify/format	Thinking a table for the various commercial zones with hours of operation might work here too	Jen Pohl
	Clarify	d. Park and rides. I’m not sure that LRT would meet l)...5)iii) LRT will not be able to run 24/7 due to this (Cedarwood apts and ones across 81 are within the 250 ft. district)	Carolyn Maristany
	Format	d, j, k, l, m, n and o have the same separation/hours of operation restrictions would consider combining	Carolyn Maristany
515.49 Subd. 4l-4&5	Clarify	Why must it be part of a shopping center, but a free standing building isn’t allowed? Thinking of something like where Noodles & Co is versus being in that strip mall...	Jen Pohl
	Clarify	l and m: Wonder why the location is so specific and not just	Carolyn Maristany

		limited to zoning area. Also wondering how gas pumping fits into this since that occurs 24/7.	
515.49 Subd.4 m-1	Comment	Fueling stations: Why the geographic restrictions? How does the station on 42 nd and Zane fit this?	Jen Pohl
515.49 Subd. 4 n	Clarify	How is minor vehicle repair defined?	Jen Pohl
	Clarify	4n3. Reads like everything needs to be in a garage instead of having cars that are waiting for service or have been serviced can be in a parking lot.	Carolyn Maristany
515.49 Subd. 4 o 1	Clarify	Again, restrictions for car sales locations...isn't there one on 34 th and Douglas?	Jen Pohl
	Clarify	Not in Subd. 2 so would assume not permitted in this zone.	Carolyn Maristany
515.49 Subd. 6b	Simplify	Height limitation exceptions...I think we looked at this elsewhere in code	Jen Pohl
515.49 Subd. 7c	Formatting	Numbers are written instead of in numerics, would make consistent with the rest of the document.	Carolyn Maristany
515.49 Subd. 7e	Clarify	Clarify #3	Jen Pohl
515.49 Subd. 2f	Formatting/Edit	Can we just reference 515.21 instead of having the full paragraph?	Carolyn Maristany
515.53 Subd. 4h1	Clarify	Again, looking at physical location restriction. I think B & R violates this, but has been at that location forever, so not sure if it was compliant with a prior version of the code, etc.	Jen Pohl
515.53 Subd. 4j	Clarify	Not listed in Subd. d2	Carolyn Maristany
515.53 Subd. 4m	Clarify	Do we need both 8 & 9?	Jen Pohl
	Clarify	Why must it abut a RR? 5/6 does this area include the main facility and parking or just the impounded cars?	Carolyn Maristany
515.61	General question	What does PD stand for? Is this mixed use? Where is the PD district in Crystal?	Carolyn Maristany

515.61 Subd. 1	Clarify	Clarify what the criteria are that we're measuring these different aspects on or what the base comparison is.	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 3d	Clarify	What is extraordinary benefit to the community and who defines it?	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 3e	Clarify	I'm confused which standard is used if the PD combines residential and commercial uses	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 3f	Format/clarify	Confusing would do a pictorial representation. I assume that standard districts take precedence over a PD, but within a PD do residential areas trump industrial or does it not matter?	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 3i	Clarify/edit	What are tot lots? Playgrounds? Last sentence after or-should be removed. If the PD is too small and there is not a duplicative near by outside the PD isn't that saying that this isn't a good place for a PD that meets residential standards set out in our area?	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 3k	Clarify	Does this mean that PD do not follow Section 405 on signs?	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 3 m	Comment	Makes sense to have	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 3n	Clarify	Does this make a PD like a gated community so you need PD board approval before you can get something done? If a PD is being proposed, but has not been approved does that mean that residents cannot do basic house maintenance like siding, windows, etc?	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 4	Clarify	Would there be checks on the PD to make sure they are meeting benchmarks? So if they are not or if the area is causing detrimental effects to surrounding zoning areas the city can step in and revoke the PD status?	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 4 4)11	Clarify/comment	What if before the completion of the PD there are negatives signs for the zone or surrounding zones can it be halted? This all stems from Subd 1and the PD may be great for the PD residents, but not for surrounding community residents that were there first. I just picture a quiet neighborhood but	Carolyn Maristany

		then somebody buys 2 acres in the middle and fills it with mixed use business and housing. The area now gets more traffic is brighter at night and in general noisier. I appreciate our future resident's needs, but I'm not willing to sacrifice the needs and desires of our current residents for people who aren't even here yet.	
515.61 Subd. 6	Clarify	Replace may be with must be because otherwise it sounds like it's optional	Carolyn Maristany

**SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS – CHAPTER 515
SECTIONS .45 - .57**

Section	Nature of Comment	Comment	Author
515.45 Subd. 3c	Amend	Groceries/supermarkets not listed in Subd. 2 of section	Carolyn Maristany
515.45 Subd. 7b.xii	Amend	Sidewalks not to exceed (5) feet in width – I recommend that all sections that state a maximum of 4 foot wide can be changed to 5 feet to the recommended ADA width	Bonnie Bolash
515.45 Subd. 7c.viii	Amend	Sidewalks not to exceed (5) feet in width – I recommend that all sections that state a maximum of 4 foot wide can be changed to 5 feet to the recommended ADA width	Bonnie Bolash
515.49 Subd. 7b.xii	Amend	Sidewalks not to exceed (5) feet in width – I recommend that all sections that state a maximum of 4 foot wide can be changed to 5 feet to the recommended ADA width	Bonnie Bolash
515.49 Subd. 7c.viii	Amend	Sidewalks not to exceed (5) feet in width – I recommend that all sections that state a maximum of 4 foot wide can be changed to 5 feet to the recommended ADA width	Bonnie Bolash
515.53 Subd. 7b.xii	Amend	Sidewalks not to exceed (5) feet in width – I recommend that all sections that state a maximum of 4 foot wide can be changed to 5 feet to the recommended ADA width	Bonnie Bolash
515.53 Subd. 7c.viii	Amend	Sidewalks not to exceed (5) feet in width – I recommend that all sections that state a maximum of 4 foot wide can be changed to 5 feet to the recommended ADA width	Bonnie Bolash
515.61 Subd. 5a/b	Amend	Would say reverts to original zoning and remove the rest since comprehensive plan designation would be to allow it to be a PD zone.	Carolyn Maristany
515.61 Subd. 6	Amend	I would like some language in here that PD zones are not to be used by large land owners just so they can circumvent the restrictions placed on the R and C zones. People can BS a lot of this is what I envision, but if things start severely wavering from the original “vision” I would like the City to be able to step in and “save the other zones” from the PD zone.	Carolyn Maristany