

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tracy Davis, Jim Herreid, Suzie Nakasian, Alice Thomas, Steve Rholl, and Richard Schulte

MEMBERS ABSENT: Greg Colby

ALSO PRESENT: Betsey Buckheit, Community Development Director Brian O’Connell, City Planner Dan Olson, Recording Secretary Sandra Bremer

Rholl reported on the EDA meeting.

Buckheit gave a review of the City Council’s Goal Session from Tuesday night. The LDC is at the top of their list.

1) Discuss Wording of Praver-Gill Annexation Recommendation

Staff noted the wording that the Planning Commission drafts will be placed in the City Council staff report for the February 9, 2010, meeting.

A motion was made by Herreid and seconded by Thomas to approve the following statement to forward to City Council as to what the Commission based the decision to recommend the annexation of the Praver/Gill property: “To accomplish this the Commission encourages the Council to direct that the eventual development on the site be informed by a complete hydrological and biological work-up for both Rice and Heath Creeks, research needed to ensure that these acres are developed in a manner that accords with the principles of the 2008 Comprehensive Plan. Furthermore, in accordance with the conditions stated in Alternative 2, the Planning Commission encourages the Council to direct City Staff to work closely and cooperatively with Bridgewater Township and to engage the technical expertise of the Rice Creek (Spring Brook) Concerned Citizens Group, CRWP and other interested groups in the revision of stormwater and stream protection ordinances.” Schulte abstained as he was not on the Commission during the public hearing and recommendation. Motion carried.

2) Continue Review Process for Draft Land Development Code Focusing on the Residential Aspects of Strategies Listed in the Comprehensive Plan’s Implementation Matrix (Chapter 12)

The Commission began their review of the Implementation Matrix that was presented at the meeting by Staff in relation to residential districts. See the notes on the attached Implementation Matrix for the comments made at the meeting. It was noted there needs to be discussion regarding neighborhood compatibility standards.

It was suggested that at the next meeting they will continue the review of the matrix starting at CI 4.2 and complete this section. It was suggested to deal with the neighborhood compatibility issues in the LDC, Section 3.5.

3) Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Submitted by:

Sandra Bremer
Recording Secretary

Implementation Matrix

Community Identity	Objective / Strategy	Draft Regulation (LDC)	LDC Location	Built or Future?
CI 1	Continue to preserve Northfield's rural heritage.			
CI 1.1	Preserve the scenic quality of the rural landscape by defining the edge of the community and maintain the rural character of roadways on the edges of the community.	Section 3.6.9 has requirements for buffering between land uses (this may not really be considered to create an "edge" condition).	Section 3.6.9 and street types- Not adequate language to address a green edge between built and rural areas. Staff will check for ordinance language.	Future
CI 1.4	Ensure that all development, redevelopment and expansion be compatible with the desirable features of the natural and man-made environment.	Section 3.6.7 requires tree preservation; Section 3.10.1 in purpose statement for Subdivision regulations; 3.11.2 (H) discusses protection of natural features; Section 3.11.5 has requirements for stormwater mgmt, water quality, and erosion control. Neighborhood compatibility standards ensure that development is compatible with man-made environment.	Section 3.6.7 To be reviewed separately as applies to all districts. Define "significant trees". – Check landscape ord comments from builders and EQC. 3.5, 3.10.1 (A) (5) - looked good; 3.11.1 (H) – Need additional or stronger language that addresses building on a slope or protecting ridge lines. 3.11.5- looked good	Both
CI 3	Preserve historic sites and structures.			
CI 3.1	Work with the Northfield Heritage Preservation Commission to create a priority list for designating buildings (those that aren't already listed), structures and districts on local, state and or national historic registers.	HPC and Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the City Council for new heritage preservation sites, who then makes the final decision.	Section 5.4.6 (Type 4 review procedure) - OK	Built
CI 4	Encourage a traditional development pattern.			
CI 4.1	Guide new development to be compatible with, and/or expand, on the existing grid network (see Figure 3.3).	Requires grid or modified grid street pattern.	Section 3.11.3 (A) (2) – Figure 3.17 appears to be approving culs-de-sac. Table 3.11-3 needs to be clarified for understanding. Check 3.11.2 (L)(2) for revised language to add "or block design feature" to make provision for a block that is slightly longer than the standard if a block design option makes this necessary. Define "grid" and "modified grid" with illustrations if possible. Address the issue of intersection offsets.	Future
CI 4.2	Provide for a mix of uses to create new neighborhood centers as new development occurs.	Table 2.7-1 - This is where mixed use would be allowed in "unbuilt" neighborhoods. Is this wording sufficient?	Table 2.7-1	Future