

**Saint Paul Planning Commission
City Hall Conference Center
15 Kellogg Boulevard West**

Minutes May 30, 2014

A meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Saint Paul was held Friday, May 30, 2014, at 8:30 a.m. in the Conference Center of City Hall.

Commissioners Present: Mmes. DeJoy, Merrigan, Noecker, Padilla, Reveal, Shively, Thao, Wang, Wenc; and Messrs. Gelgelu, Lindeke, Nelson, Ochs, Oliver, and Ward.

Commissioners Absent: Ms. *Underwood, and Messrs. *Connolly, *Edgerton, *Makarios, and *Wickiser.

Absent: *Excused

Also Present: Donna Drummond, Planning Director; Allan Torstenson, Jake Reilly, Bill Dermody, and Sonja Butler, Department of Planning and Economic Development staff.

I. Approval of minutes May 2, 2014.

MOTION: *Commissioner Reveal moved approval of the minutes of May 2, 2014. Commissioner Shively seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.*

II. Chair's Announcements

Chair Wenc announced that Donna Drummond and she attended a meeting at the Saint Paul School District for their Facilities Master Plan Committee which they will be holding six future meetings about the next 10-years of planning for their buildings. They were both asked to be a part of this committee so as they have more information the Planning Commission will be informed.

III. Planning Director's Announcements

Donna Drummond reminded the commissioners if anyone was still interested in the discounted rate for APA membership checks need to be submitted within the next week or so, \$50.00 made out to the City of Saint Paul and they all will be sent in together to the APA. Turn your payment in to Sonja Butler or Donna Drummond. Also the city's comments on the Met Council's Thrive 2040 was submitted a month ago and the Met Council has recently posted responses to comments and have summarized all of the comments from various cities, other entities and private individuals who submitted comments. An email with the link to those comments will be sent out.

IV. Zoning Committee

SITE PLAN REVIEW – List of current applications. *(Tom Beach, 651/266-9086)*

Four items came before the Site Plan Review Committee on Tuesday, May 27, 2014:

- State Capitol, site improvements associates with capitol building renovation at 75 Martin Luther King Boulevard.
- Homestead Partners/Pleasant Avenue houses, prepare site for construction of 8 single-family houses at 361 Pleasant Avenue.
- Frogtown Park, site work for a new park, including earthwork, entrance road, parking, walks, landscaping at 919 Lafond Avenue. (Work does not include Frogtown Farm urban agriculture.)
- Maria Traffic Calming, improvements to Maria Street to improve pedestrian environment at 400 Maria.

One item to come before the Site Plan Review Committee on Tuesday, June 3, 2014:

- Minnesota Capitol Office Building, new office building at 80 Sherburne. (This site is in the Capitol Area. The City does not have zoning jurisdiction in the Capitol Area and so the review will be limited to aspects of the plan that impact City infrastructure such as sewers, water service, boulevard trees, streets and driveways.)

NEW BUSINESS

#14-200-064 Yia Vang – Reestablishment of nonconforming use for a chiropractic clinic. 1200 Galtier Street, SE corner at Maryland. (*Jake Reilly, 651/266-6618*)

MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved the Zoning Committee’s recommendation to approve the re- establishment of legal nonconforming use. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

#14-198-104 TNT Fireworks (1177 Clarence) – Conditional use permit for outdoor commercial sale of consumer fireworks. 1177 Clarence Street, West side of Clarence at Rose Avenue East. (*Bill Dermody, 651/266-6617*)

Commissioner Padilla stated that there is a mistake in the final resolution the “2014” should be stricken.

MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved the Zoning Committee’s recommendation to approve the conditional use permit subject to additional conditions, with the “2014” stricken from the resolution. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

#14-197-427 Internacional Auto Sales LLC – Expansion of nonconforming use to increase number of parking stalls for used car sales (17 existing spaces for used cars for sale, 29 proposed). 1265 Arcade Street, NW corner at Orange. (*Bill Dermody, 651/266-6617*)

Commissioner Padilla said that there was a letter in the packet that does not include a name or email address, and should be removed based on counsel from the City Attorney.

Commissioner Padilla made a motion to remove the letter from the public record for failure to disclose any identifying information. Commissioner Lindeke seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

Commissioner Noecker questioned the cars parked on the street and whether they were in violation of their former conditional use permit, which had a condition not to have cars parked on the street.

Commissioner Padilla explained why she voted no on this proposal at the Zoning Committee meeting. She is always hesitant to expand nonconforming uses because there is a reason why they are made nonconforming. If she were to expand a nonconforming use it would be fully in compliance, it should be a stellar citizen in the community before they are given additional rights on top of what they have. She noted one person said that there's funeral traffic, but every other testimony heard and letters submitted were about cars being left for weeks on end, and people had called the City before. There had not been any enforcement action taken, and technically the City could have instituted enforcement action in the last year based on what they've heard. She was not convinced that this application could meet the public health safety welfare test in Finding #6.

Commissioner Reveal said they were all concerned about this and one of the reasons they added the condition to make it explicit that they could not park on the street, and her problem was that there hadn't been any enforcement. And with what appeared to be a fairly lengthy history of complaints on it and the City didn't do anything, but they could have and should have. The other thing was that there was not testimony against it. If it had been more of a ubiquitous problem she would have expected to see more concern. It's an issue that the City should have dealt with sooner.

Commissioner Oliver said that this has been a problem property for a long time and he believes that the City has been involved with prior owners. The obstinacy of the prior owner is making it look like there had been lack of enforcement action, but it's not the same. Setting that aside, it does not seem to be a good reason to allow them an expansion of a nonconforming use. Expansions are not supposed to happen – it is a quirk in the zoning code that he is not comfortable with so he shares the bias in not expanding. He does not agree that it meets Condition #6 or Condition #7. Looking at the aerial photos almost in every picture there are more than 14 cars on that lot, except for one year when it was apparently shut down and there were no cars on the lot. He will be voting against this.

Commissioner Thao asked for clarification of condition #7.

Commissioner Padilla said that it's a mild redundancy. The intention was to carry a stick to say that if we're going to do this, it is clearly a condition. It extends beyond what the Zoning Administrator's normal authority is, but it just makes it clear that regardless of the issue and entity of any kind of license that they need to be in compliance.

Commissioner Thao asked if that means the conditional use permit would be removed and they would go back to the former one or the conditional use permit would be entirely removed.

Commissioner Padilla said that the City would have to come and let us know and then we would have to take an enforcement action. This is an expansion of a nonconforming use, this should

modify the underlined conditional use permit conditions and then they both would be revoked or maybe we would have to take two actions.

Bill Dermody, PED staff, said that there is a relocation process. If there is a violation of any of these conditions - including #7 - it would be forwarded to the Planning Commission and at that time the conditional use permit could be revoked completely or the conditions could be modified to whatever is decided at that time.

Commissioner Nelson said that there has been several cases over the years where they have had a conditional use permit brought back before the committee in order to hear the case with potential verification of the existing permit as part of the action that they can take as a body. So that has occurred in the past.

MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the expansion of nonconforming use subject to additional conditions. The motion carried 8-7 (DeJoy, Lindeke, Noecker, Ochs, Oliver, Padilla, Ward) on a voice vote.

Commissioner Nelson announced that the next Zoning Committee meeting on Thursday, June 5, 2014 has been cancelled.

V. Comprehensive Planning Committee

Amendment to Chapter 64-Signs – Release proposed text amendments for public review and set a public hearing on July 11, 2014. (*Jake Reilly, 651/266-661*)

Jake Reilly, PED staff, outlined the proposed text amendments to Chapter 64 – Signs of the Zoning Code. He said that the proposed amendments address three issues. The first issue is to simply update language, correct typographical errors and enhance language in order to facilitate interpretation of the code over time. The second issue addressed proposes amendments to the code that would allow signage proposed for the new ballpark in Lowertown in a similar manner to the signage allowed at the Midway Stadium facility. In addition, Comprehensive Planning Committee members asked staff to develop language to allow roof signs in B4 Central Business and B5 Central Business Service districts, subject to a conditional use permit. The third issue addressed by these proposed code amendments includes the addition of a section regarding bicycle sharing facilities. State legislation allows for bicycle racks in the public right of way, as well as for those bicycle racks to have signage on them, but the city's code prohibits advertising signage in all districts. The Nice Ride bicycle sharing facilities are partially funded through sponsorship signage, which meets the definition of advertising sign in the city's code. In order to allow these signs in all zoning districts, Section 64.422 Bicycle sharing facility sponsorship signs was added to the code and offers standards to which said signage must adhere. A fourth issue initially included in the amendment package, Legislative Code Appendix I amendments regarding advertising on transit stations and facilities, has been removed following discussion with the City Attorney's office. Mr. Reilly asked the Commission to set a public hearing on the matter for July 11, 2014.

Commissioner Merrigan said that when the committee looked at Sec. 64.414 (b) as initially proposed by staff, they changed specific height and size requirements because they thought that a one-size-fits-all approach in an already developed district might not net the desired results, but that they wanted to be able to evaluate place, size, and manner on a case-by-case basis, and

consider context. Ms. Merrigan stated that the addition of the B4 district to the staff-proposed B5 district was an attempt to try and concentrate the discussion in the downtown area where roof-top signage might be appropriate. She said there are other advisory bodies like the Heritage Preservation Commission in areas where development is occurring, particularly adjacent to the Lowertown Historic District, and the members of the committee thought that examining two districts could open things up to make things for a lively downtown. She said opening up the discussion to two districts would generate more comments during the public comment period, possibly allowing the Commission to get the kind of feedback that they would need to direct the amendments.

Commissioner Lindeke inquired as to the status of the Schmidt Brewery sign which is neither a B4 nor B5 district. He asked if there are ways to allow that type of signage in exceptional cases or when a sign has historic significance.

Mr. Reilly said that under the recommendations as proposed, roof signs in other districts continue to be legally nonconforming, such as the Schmidt Brewery sign, and new roof signs in the B4 and B5 district would have to go through a conditional use permit process.

Commissioner Lindeke stated that his understanding is that the Schmidt sign has been removed but that there is a desire that it be re-installed.

Allan Torstenson, PED staff, said that the Schmidt Brewery Sign was once a legal sign, and is now legally non-conforming, and even if it has been removed, if someone wanted to re-install the existing sign, they could apply for a re-establishment of a nonconforming use if they wanted re-install it or relight it.

Commissioner Lindeke asked if the sign has to be historical or if it could be a new one that would be similar to the original.

Mr. Torstenson said that the applicant would have to be putting back something that was there once before, so a new one could not be put there under reestablishment of nonconforming use. It couldn't be done if it wasn't once there.

Commissioner Ochs said that he agrees with Mr. Lindeke, because signs like the Schmidt Brewery and First Bank signs are iconic figures to the City of Saint Paul and many other cities have something of similar nature. He said his understanding of the spirit of this whole sign issue/arguments is to get video-type billboards and other large advertising billboards under control with some restrictions. Mr. Ochs said that he feels that the term "dynamic" is loosely defined in the code in that it could be simply scrolling time and temperature to the video screens that are seen on the Xcel Energy Center. He said that some dynamic, as in moving, signs should be acceptable. Mr. Ochs also brought up that in Sec. 64.414(c) the restrictions on roof-top signage on a tall building in the downtown district requires that the sign face an adjoining arterial street. He wanted to know who would be able to see that sign. He asked if on a five or six story building would people really look up to see that. He stated that those types of signs are meant for blocks away, or to be seen when entering the city and he does not see such a sign being very useful on a roof top facing an arterial street.

Commissioner Padilla said that dynamic signs are an issue on roof tops generally because if they are moving or scrolling or flashing they may impact traffic patterns. She concurred with Mr. Ochs

who said they are not intended for pedestrians on the street, rather they are intended for people who are blocks away. There has been this battle over the on premise/off-premise dynamic display issue for years. Only on premise signs are allowed to actually scroll or flash like the Xcel Energy Center dynamic sign whereas off premise signs are not allowed to do that and off premise signs are governed in a number of ways differently than on premise signs. Anything imagined on a roof top sign you're hoping to imagine on the building itself. The goal to have dynamic displays where they are appropriate is still allowable under these changes; this is simply a prohibition on dynamic displays on roof tops. In response to the comments regarding nonconforming signs and the long debate over legal nonconforming signs, Mrs. Padilla said that Saint Paul has an interesting code that is unlike most others in that it allows reestablishment of nonconforming uses and allows expansion of nonconforming uses. Commissioner Padilla said she likes signs and she really likes dynamic signs but she does not see them to be appropriate on a roof top.

Commissioner Noecker said that the committee suggested modifications to Sec. 64.414(b) but she does not see language about how the roof sign is going to be calculated as a portion of the total allowable sign area.

Mr. Reilly said that there was discussion about this issue, which was resolved, because there is a restriction under 64.505 for B4 and B5 districts, that the sum of the gross surface display area of all business signs on a lot shall not exceed four (4) times the lineal square feet of lot frontage of a lot. This would include roof signs (business signs on a roof), so staff didn't feel like the restriction needed to be restated in regulations pertaining to roof signs.

Commissioner Noecker agreed that roof signs aren't designed to be read by traffic on the adjoining arterial street and she is not sure what the first part Sec. 64.414 (c) means and how it would be enforced. She also inquired as to the rationale regarding a facility that fronts only one arterial street only having one roof sign versus fronting on two having two. If there is a total allowable sign area that is the ultimate limit of how much signage can be had, she asked if it mattered where on the building it is and if that should be dependent upon what type of street it faces.

Commissioner Merrigan supports Sec. 64.414 (c) as written, because the relationship to an arterial street is better than establishing no relationship at all for the placement of the roof sign. She also stated that when someone submits a package for their business signage they will determine where they want to place their signage, whether on the side of the building or on the roof of the building, and how they want to display signage. She said in a sense that we are just picking one limiting factor but the applicant will ultimately figure out that percentage and she would prefer the person or the persons developing the signage have that ability, especially given the fact that we have the opportunity to review it through a conditional use permit.

Chair Wencl reminded the commissioners that what they are doing is talking about this prior to releasing it for public hearing and that there will be time for this extra discussion to take place after hearing from the general public.

Commissioner Oliver said that there is an issue to be dealt with before it is released, which is on page 4 of the draft amendments, Sec. 64.414 (c) , where it states how many roof signs a person can have on their building as well as how many arterial streets their building fronts on. Mr. Oliver said that in looking at a copy of the code, he fails to find a definition for arterial streets

anywhere in Chapter 64. The only reference to any type of street in the chapter is in the definition area where advance speed arteries are defined.

Mr. Reilly stated that there is a portion of the Zoning Code which directs interested parties to the city's Comprehensive Plan, in which all arterial streets are defined, as are all other streets.

Commissioner Oliver said even though the code may refer to the Comprehensive Plan, it would be better, since we use it as a functional limit within the code and especially since there are a second set of definitions within the sign chapter of the code, it would clear up a lot of confusion if a definition of arterial street was included in the sign chapter of the code.

Commissioner Padilla said streets are defined in the Comprehensive Plan, which says to her that if she looked in the Comprehensive Plan, she would find how they identified each street within the Comprehensive Plan as that type of street. For example, Snelling Avenue is an arterial and that's identified in the Comprehensive Plan as arterial, Lexington Parkway is something else, etc. that makes sense that line in the code that's how we're going to place them on the map.

Donna Drummond, Planning Director, added that there is a map that shows arterial streets in the Transportation Plan of the Comprehensive Plan but that she is not sure how that relates to the definition in the code.

Commissioner Padilla replied that the map with the designations on it makes sense to her, but so does having each street type defined in the zoning code, where they are referred to.

Mr. Reilly read the code citation for street definitions to the commission. He said that in Chapter 60 – General Provisions and Definitions of the Zoning Code arterial streets are defined. The code citation is Sec. 60.221. T. which defines “thoroughfare, major” as an arterial street, and includes three types of arterials (principal, intermediate, and minor) as defined in the comprehensive plan.

MOTION TO AMEND: Commissioner Noecker moved to amend Section 64.414 (c), striking the word “arterial” in all three sentences in (c). Commissioner Ward seconded the motion. The motion carried 12-3 (Merrigan, Oliver, Wencil).

Commissioner Ochs said regarding Section 64.414 (f) “Roof signs with dynamic display” he would like the Comprehensive Planning Committee to broaden the definition of signs with dynamic display so that there could be exceptions, as well as greater definition regarding restrictions on signs with dynamic display. Mr. Ochs gave the example of First National Bank's big red No.1 on top of their building which changes color. Commissioner Ward interjected and said that is not dynamic. Ochs said that it used to turn off and on, which is considered moving and therefore under the definition of sign with dynamic display it is a dynamic sign. He inquired whether, if Schmidt's letters would light up individually, would that be considered moving and therefore dynamic? He thinks that dynamic needs further clarification so that it is better understood.

Mr. Reilly stated that something that is simply turned off and on does not make it dynamic, and potentially because the sign turns off and on, it would not be considered dynamic. However, potentially such a sign may fall under 64.405 (e) (2) where scrolling text and images are permitted, and that stable images may be changed once every 12 seconds and those with scrolling images have a rate at which they may scroll, so either way, these types of signs are regulated.

Commissioner Oliver agrees that the definition of dynamic signs is not a great definition, but it is better than all the other ones that have been tried.

Chair Wencil said that when she was on the Neighborhood Planning Committee they had many hours of discussion about what constitutes a dynamic sign.

Commissioner Padilla noted that there is a U.S. Supreme Court case on this issue going on right now, and, while it's not a local issue, the idea of what is dynamic, or flashing, or moving is not well settled. She agrees with Mr. Oliver that we have the best definition that we can get but it is not going to answer every single question and maybe we need to address that and there is not an easy answer.

Mr. Reilly added that they could also look at Section 64.405 Signs with dynamic display (e), if desired.

Commissioner Lindeke asked if there was anything in there about maintenance of signs, for example, where part of the sign is gone or half of it doesn't light up.

Mr. Reilly replied that Section 64 has a lengthy section on the maintenance of signs.

Commissioner Nelson commented that there was a description of signs as being large enough to be viewed by vehicles. He said he thinks part of the code is lacking in that regards because it is not the sign that needs to be viewed by vehicles, rather it is the lettering and what people are intended to read or understand from the sign that has to be large enough. He said there is a large body of research with regard to letter sizes, types of letters, light against dark, dark against light, and other signage design standards, and that it can be a real safety issue. He thinks that the size of the message is the most important aspect, not the size of the sign, with regard to safety in vehicles.

Mr. Nelson also listed another thing regarding safety that he was curious about, which is the state statute that was cited for the location of bicycle racks and transit shelters. He said the only place that safety was mentioned was with regard to the placement of bicycle racks in the public right-of-way, whereas in the section on bus shelters, bus benches, and things of that sort, there is no mention that they have to be placed in a manner safe for pedestrians or vehicles, other than they couldn't be within the vehicular maintenance lane. He said that a lot of times these things are getting placed in tight locations, making it difficult for people to walk and congesting pedestrian areas. He thought that it was interesting that only the bikes had to be safely stowed.

MOTION: Commissioner Merrigan moved on behalf of the Comprehensive Planning Committee to release the draft amendments for public review and set a public hearing on July 11, 2014. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

VI. Lowertown Ballpark: - Informational presentation on the site plan, design, and construction schedule by Jody Martinez, Design Manager, Parks and Recreation Department.

Jody Martinez, Design Manager with the Department of Parks and Recreation. Ms. Martinez gave an overview of the Lowertown Ballpark. She explained the design build team because the ballpark is different from most of their projects in that it is a design build process and the team

consist of the City of Saint Paul Parks Department, the Saint Paul Saints Ball Club which they will be the primary tenant, the Ryan's Company a Minneapolis based developer, and Nelson Tietz & Hoye as the owners rep. Some highlights, it is a \$63 million project; it takes 11 acres just on the edge of Lowertown and converts it to a new 7,000 seat ballpark. They expect to have about 180 events there, and about 400,000 visitors. They are working very hard on getting some solar grant funding and they taking water from the roof of the OMF building, which is right next to the ballpark taking water from part of their roof and piping it into the ballpark site to use to help irrigate the field, also they are working with (DSI) Department of Safety & Inspections to allow them to use water for flush toilets which is very innovative. And immediately adjacent to the ballpark will be an off-leash dog park which is a part of this project. There is an existing off-leash dog park on the site, they have temporarily moved it during construction but it will be moved back. The whole ballpark will be open to the public and it will not be shut down during off game days it will be open to the public so that they can go in and have lunch etc.

The funding received is \$27 million of deed grants, one million of deed loan, local bonding \$25 million and the Saints are contributing \$11 million for a total of \$63 million. Ms. Martinez showed several pictures of the ballpark and the surrounding buildings in the area on the overhead projection screen. They have been working on this for a year and they have been working on the soil remediation it was a highly contaminated site, they have started the utility relocates in 2013 and over the winter they were diligently working to finalize all of the design plans. In the spring of 2014 the concrete has been started and the steel structure, this is opening in a year so things will be moving very quickly.

Regarding tenant's signage, the Saints have not identified who they will be working with on naming rights and so forth but that will be coming forward. They have been working closely with Amy Spong in (HPC) Heritage Preservation Commission trying to get the roof top signage allowed for the ballpark. In looking at all the historic photos of the area it was prevalent.

Finally, there was an RFP out for some public art because of the State funding and their own ordinance they have a requirement for public art. Lowertown has already improved and has a lot of life more people living there, more restaurants, more bars and once the ballpark is there it is going to bring things together along with the green line opening and the Depot it's really changing the face of Saint Paul.

Commissioner Ochs said that he did not see how vehicle circulation is considered in this. Ideally you want pedestrians and people to use transit, but family from the suburbs is going to drive into town and park on the street to ride on the bus or light rail to come to the Depot or the ballpark.

Ms. Martinez said that it is not being ignored, but the first thing that needs to be done which has not been established yet is where the tailgating lot is going to be. Because that is going to drive a lot of the traffic so they have been working with various lot owners. This will be different because the Saints won't own the lot so another entity will own the lot. And once they have established the tailgating lot then they will figure out what's the signage, how are we going to move people that kind of thing, it's something they are looking into.

Donna Drummond, Planning Director, added that there was an environmental assessment worksheet done for this project and it did evaluate parking, traffic and it was determined that there was 8,000 parking spaces within a short walk of the ballpark.

Commissioner DeJoy asked how much bigger this ballpark seating is versus at the Midway Stadium.

Ms. Martinez is not sure but she guesses about 4,000 and now we're up to 7,000. She will verify this and get back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Lindeke asked if there was any discussion about traffic calming on 5th Street because 5th and 6th Streets are high speed one way streets going through downtown and his concern is that a car might drive into home plate.

Ms. Martinez said that they are working with all of the safety factors; they have bollards that will stop vehicles all along Broadway at the end of 5th.

Commissioner Lindeke is thinking more about 5th Street in general, about how to slow down traffic on 5th Street.

Commissioner Padilla asked what about cost overage who is responsible for covering additional cost over the \$63 million if there are any.

Ms. Martinez has been assured that there will not be any overages.

Commissioner Noecker said that since the ballpark will be open during the weekdays to the public are there going to be any facilities in there like restaurants or anything else that will be open to the public during that time or is it more like bring your lunch and sit on the field kind of thing.

Ms. Martinez said that particular question has not come up, but she does not think so. The discussions that they have had with the Saints so far are; as long as they are there and their offices are open that they will allow the public in. That didn't come up that they were interested in being able to purchase food. However she will bring that up at the next meeting.

Chair Wencil said that if there are 180 events and our summers are not that long.

Ms. Martinez replied that this is a year round facility, like the winter carnival. So they are anticipating use year round.

Commissioner Ochs asks what is it like working on such a large project and how much ownership does Parks and Recreation have along with the Saints in terms of how it's being designed and how it's being built.

Ms. Martinez said that she is the project manager, Chris Stark, an architect with Parks and Recreation and Nelson Tietz & Hoyer the owner's representative are at the table with the Saints and it is a great team and yes the City feels ownership.

VII. Neighborhood Planning Committee

Commissioner Oliver announced that at the last meeting they had a status report on the planning process and draft of the Shepard Davern Plan.

VIII. Transportation Committee

Commissioner Lindeke said that at the Transportation Committee’s last meeting they had an update from MnDOT about 35E. They also talked about the citywide bikeways plan public comment a presentation from Public Works. Commissioner Lindeke also announced the items on the agenda at the next Transportation Committee meeting is on Monday, June 2, 2014.

IX. Communications Committee

Commissioner Merrigan said that there was nothing to report.

X. Task Force/Liaison Reports

Commissioner Oliver reported that the Gateway Station Area Planning Task Force was scheduled to have a meeting on Tuesday, June 3, 2014, but that has been cancelled. The task force has had two productive meetings so far things are moving there is a lot of work to do and they should meet again sometime this month.

Commissioner Nelson announced that the Shepard Davern Task Force has two dates set up for their public hearing regarding zoning changes those are June 16th and June 24th at the St. Luke’s Church by the fire station in that area.

XI. Old Business

None.

XII. New Business

None.

XIII. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:06 a.m.

Recorded and prepared by
Sonja Butler, Planning Commission Secretary
Planning and Economic Development Department,
City of Saint Paul

Respectfully submitted,

Approved _____
(Date)

Donna Drummond
Planning Director

Daniel Ward II
Secretary of the Planning Commission

Planning Team Files\planning commission\minutes\May 30, 2014