

that there is something written in the Code that regulates minimum square footage. Justin stated that with a PUD you don't have minimum lot sizes; you look at the density and then let the developer dictate how big the parcels are. There are no setbacks within those parcels and you can have many parcels lined up next to each other. You can also have a series of many single family homes that are 10 feet apart. The setbacks within those lots do not apply to the structures. The PUD lot itself would need to meet the structure setback to the adjacent property line. Within the development itself there are no setback lines. He added that as the City negotiates with the developer the City has the ability to impose setback requirements as part of the PUD approval.

One concern was that Variances could be seen as arbitrary. He stressed that you should never compare one Variance decision to another. He added that each property is unique and all Variance requests should be based on the Variance review criteria and independent of previous Variance decisions.

Burslie stated the concern about having a PUD up to a certain percentage or 40% of the property could have lots as small as 7,500 sq. ft. or in a plat that is over 10 acres is irrelevant based on the earlier discussion. He stated that it was a misconception on the minimum lot sizes. Number 5 is not applicable anymore. Ostlund questioned if it was irrelevant because what the City actually has control over is where they are placed but not the number of parcels that can be within a PUD? Burslie explained that originally it was thought that parcels within the PUD had to meet the minimum lot size requirement; which is not true. Justin clarifies that it best to work with the developer and they are usually willing to negotiate with the City because it is the City that would have to approve their plan. Smith explained to the Board that Sourcewell is also willing to review any potential developers PUD proposals to make sure that it meets our Code criteria. Burslie stated that Sourcewell would absolutely help the City walk through the process. He added that with the density typically it is figured out by the surveyor and then it is verified by the City. He stated that our PUD is a complex Ordinance however it is nice because it does give the City and the developer flexibility in building lots. Hansen stated that one issue or concern that was brought up at a previous meeting is trying to avoid seeing section 8 housing or low rent apartment buildings. Hansen stated that is why we wanted the mix of single family homes in one area and it was more of an enticement to the higher density area because we really wanted the single family homes. Ostlund agreed; it was to entice a potential investor; do the multifamily first and then have the single family homes. Ostlund clarified that after the developer submits the PUD the City has to ability to make changes and makes sure that it aesthetically works prior to approving the plan.

Justin covered the PUD minimum lot size requirements are covered in Section 109-113. The requirements range from 20,000 sq. ft. to 2 acres depending on how the property is zoned.

Burslie reviewed our current PUD Code with the Board. He explained the following:

- All PUD's must be connected to Water and Sewer or have a centralized system; not individual wells or septic systems in a PUD.
- Park dedication fees: For each new unit there would be fee paid by the developer to the City to go into the Park Fund. It states in the Code, 'Park dedication shall be required for any PUD as required by the planning commission.' Justin explained that

the fee collected is for Capital Costs and cannot be applied to staff time, maintenance, etc.

- Covenants are reviewed by the Planning Commission. The City does not enforce private covenants.
- There are certain vegetation requirements.
- The PUD can have public roads or private drives.
- The PUD's must have 50% green space. Of the total area half must be dedicated to open space or green space that is owned by the developer.

Justin reviewed the density example with the Board. The North half is zoned MFR and is 12.2 acres. It is outside the 1000 foot buffer and is considered non-shoreland. Assuming this parcel will be connected to water and sewer and that there are no bluffs or wetlands. The base density is about 53 units. How that is figured is you take 12.2 acres which is about 531,432 sq. ft. and divide it by your minimum lot size which is 10,000 sq. ft. and you get 53 residential units. The Ordinance has the ability for density increases for non-shoreland planned unit developments shall be allowed if all of the following design standards are met or exceeded:

- a. Impervious coverage shall not exceed 35 percent for the total project area.
- b. A minimum of 35 percent of the project area is dedicated to permanent open space. Open space should include all areas not suitable for development, including bluffs, steep slopes, and wetlands.
- c. All owners shall maintain ownership in common lands within the PUD, unless common land is dedicated to the public.
- d. Stormwater is managed according to the applicable standards within this chapter.

If you can meet those four criteria, you are allowed 100% density increase in the MFR district, so you can double your units. In this case you would be allowed 106 residential units. Justin explained the LDR following the criteria for that zone would result in 45 residential units. Justin added that in his opinion regulating it through zoning and not through the PUD itself is the way he would do it. The north half is zoned multifamily so you have to have multifamily; not single family in that zone. Justin reiterates that we have a good PUD Ordinance; he believes that it would work if a developer did approach the City and Sourcewell could certainly help the City through the process if that day does come. Hansen stated that it has been very helpful having Justin go through our PUD in detail with the Board. Hansen noted that Justin brought up a good point as far as how you resolve the issue of density is through the base zoning. By zoning the south half LDR it cuts in half your allowable units. The Board agreed on not making any revisions to the current PUD Ordinance and decided to not move forward with any revisions to the current PUD. Staff will look into minimum square footage allowed as regulated by the building standards. Smith thanks Justin for his time and helping to explain the PUD Code to the Board and herself, adding they will definitely take advantage of Sourcewell consulting services again.

8. Discussion on homeless shelter/transitional housing regulations

Ostlund explained that her understanding is that St. Vincent is looking at providing short term housing for people that are looking for employment, the intended stay of 4-6 weeks and no more than 3 to 4 people at a time. They are looking at the old Flix building and

would like to transition it to have 3 bedrooms 2 baths and possibly a shared kitchen. Smith explained that we do not have a City Code that regulates homeless shelters or transitional housing. Ostlund questioned if they needed to regulate this at all. Smith suggested they should and considers setting standards such as distance from schools or parks that they would be able to operate. Ostlund argued that they are not pedophiles. Smith identified how Bemidji's is regulated with distance standards. Hansen stated that he isn't sure how much that is critical given the eligibility requirements that the shelter in Pine City has and that it may not be as much as an issue to set distance standards. Ostlund stressed that she believes what St. Vincent is looking to, is that this is not intended for the chronic homeless but for people that are temporarily displaced and is looking for work. Ostlund stressed that would enable them to have an address to attain employment, get them back on their feet, etc. Smith suggested the Board read the definition of Homeless Housing, Transitional as defined by the GBAJPB. She suggests this may be something we should get ahead of and write an Ordinance to control what zones to allow it in and what criteria they should meet. Ostlund is curious to find out what St. Vincent's thoughts are on how it is to be funded, adding that a lot of times it is County funded. Smith stated that St. Vincent is working with Bi-Cap and Access North. The Board questioned how many homeless people there are in the area. Carlson stated that after being a social worker for 32 years he was never convinced that there was a lot of homelessness. Smith stated that the Pine City shelter is the only one between Twin Cities and Duluth and they had served 88 adults in 2017. Carlson added that those 88 most likely came out of one of those two cities. He added that he personally welcomes this. Ostlund has questions about the size and what their intent was in the long term. Is the intent to continue or to only stay at 3 to 4 people at a time? Had they done some type of study on whether or not there is a need for it? Hansen questioned if they could keep it full at 3 to 4 people? Ostlund stated that she believes their premise is that it is intended for someone that is looking for work and that St. Vincent is trying to uphold, uplift and get people back to where they probably were a short time before entering the transitional housing. Ostlund believes that there is a need for temporary housing and doesn't see this as a bad thing. The Board suggested referring to this discussion as temporary housing is more fitting than defining it as a homeless shelter. Hansen stated that you have to look at where you want it and where you should have it. The people that will stay in transitional housing; it is important to have a building that is within reasonable walking distance to a grocery store and the bank. Ostlund stated that the Board needs to know more from what St. Vincent is looking for. The Board agrees that they would like more information and requests that City Staff invite them to a Planning Commission meeting in order to gain more information. Carlson requested that they come to explain their program. Hansen would like to know their policy and what their short and long term plans are. Smith stated that the regulations set forth by the homeless shelter in Pine City are not affiliated with St. Vincent. They requested that I send them what I have in regards the Pine City shelter and see how it would compare to theirs. Smith verified that she can invite them to Planning Commission meeting and present to the Board what the entire scope of the temporary housing would consist of. Ostlund requested that it is made clear to St. Vincent that the Board is very receptive to the idea.

9. Acting Chair Ostlund adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.