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

Minutes July 8, 2011

A meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Saint Paul was held Friday, July 8, 2011, at 8:30 a.m. in the Conference Center of City Hall.

Commissioners Present:	Mmes. Halverson, Merrigan, Perrus, Porter, Reveal, Thao, Wang, Wencl, Young; and Messrs. Commers, Connolly, Gelgelu, Kramer, Ochs, Oliver, Schertler, Spaulding, Ward, and Wickiser.
Commissioners Absent:	Messrs. *Fernandez, and *Nelson. *Excused
Also Present:	Patricia James, Allan Torstenson, Lucy Thompson, Allen Carlson, Luis Pereira, Josh Williams, Ryan Kelley, Laura Eckert, and Angela Simons Department of Planning and Economic Development staff.

I. Approval of minutes June 24, 2011.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Reveal moved approval of the minutes of June 24, 2011. Commissioner Kramer seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.***

II. Chair's Announcements

Chair Commers announced that the Planning Commissioners should have received an invitation to an event in honor of Gregory Page, who has been involved with the Riverfront Revitalization work in Saint Paul for almost 30-years. There will be an event to honor his retirement on July 26th at the Riverfront Corporation office located on 6th Street between St. Peter and Wabasha from 4:30–7:00 p.m.

III. Planning Director's Announcements

Patricia James, Principal City Planner, filling in for the Planning Director, had no announcements.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING:

Chair Commers announced that the Saint Paul Planning Commission was holding a public hearing on the Solar Energy Systems Zoning Code Amendments. Notice of the public hearing was published in the Legal Ledger on June 13, 2011, and was mailed to the citywide Early Notification System list and other interested parties.

Allan Torstenson, PED staff, gave a brief presentation on the draft Solar Energy Systems Zoning Code Amendments. In 2008 Minneapolis and Saint Paul received a U.S. Department of Energy Solar America Cities grant to identify strategies that will result in solar-friendly policies, practices and regulations. There are policies in the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code that support use of renewable energy, but there is nothing specific in the zoning code about either solar panels or wind energy. Solar energy systems are treated as a permitted accessory use under the definition of accessory use in the zoning code. Solar systems mounted on a building are subject to the dimensional standards that apply to the building. A freestanding solar energy system is subject to the dimensional and locational standards that apply to accessory structures. The draft amendments do not change this approach, but would clarify and add some detail to the regulations that apply to solar energy systems. In drafting the amendments a State of Minnesota model ordinance and requirements in Minneapolis and other cities were reviewed.

In Sec. 63.110(e), Building design standards, the committee recommends deleting the word *mechanical* to make it clear that this general design standard for rooftop equipment applies to solar energy systems that are not mechanical systems, and recommends changing the word *visibility* to *visual impact*. The draft amendments would also add a section in the accessory uses part of the code. New Sec. 65.921, Solar energy system, paragraph (a), would add a requirement that building mounted systems in residential districts shall not extend above the ridge of a gable, gambrel, hip or mansard roof, and shall not extend more than twelve (12) feet above the surface of a flat or shed roof. Paragraph (b) would clarify that freestanding systems shall be treated as accessory buildings with flat or shed roofs for the purpose of maximum height, maximum lot area coverage, and location requirements, with added detail that freestanding systems in residential districts shall not exceed twelve (12) feet in height within ten (10) feet of a property line, with additional height equal to additional setback from property lines permitted to a maximum height of twenty (20) feet.

Chair Commers read the rules of procedure for the public hearing.

The following people spoke.

1. Mr. Terry Brueck, a homeowner and resident, is interested in doing a solar project in his backyard. He had applied for a permit last November and it has gotten complicated. He appreciates the consideration of adding solar to the city's sustainability initiative and said the zoning amendments should not be unduly restrictive. He suggested a distinction between setback from adjacent residential property and setback from adjacent city property. His situation is that he wants to put a solar array on the ground with sufficient clearance of his house to get solar gain in the winter and it would be up against a city property line.

2. Mr. James Darabi, a solar installer with Solar Farm, LLC, said the draft 12 foot height limit for freestanding systems would limit them to small arrays. Mr. Darabi distributed a picture with an example of what an array would look like. He explained his height calculations, and that solar electric and solar thermal systems require different tilt angles. Twelve solar electric modules might be a 2 kilowatt system, fifteen might be 3 kilowatts, and 6-7 kilowatts are needed to power a house. 45 degrees is close to the cut between winter sun angle and summer sun angle. With a pole mount system it can be tilted to 60 degrees in the winter to shed snow better and get more sun. In the summer it can be tilted back to 30 degrees to get more sun. Typical arrays would be about 12 feet high and should be off the ground a few feet (for snow, etc.) so the 12 foot height limit is too restrictive.

Commissioner Perrus noted that the proposed amendment provides for height up to 20 feet. The draft language is for a 12 foot height limit within 10 feet of a residential property line; with additional height equal to additional set back from the property lines permitted to a maximum height of 20 feet.

Mr. Darabi said that a 20 foot height limit is more reasonable.

Commissioner Kramer asked Mr. Darabi what he thinks would be a reasonable, cost effective, ideal height standard.

Mr. Darabi that he would like to do some calculations and consult with a few other solar installers. 20 feet might be workable and a few more feet might be good.

Commissioner Kramer told Mr. Darabi that he could submit additional written testimony. He asked what if the measurement was pole height and not panel height.

Mr. Darabi said that poles are usually centered on the panels, but people might mount them differently to get more height.

Commissioner Schertler asked about the potential impact of these height limits on the payback of solar installations.

Mr. Darabi said that if they limited the size of the system it might be in the ballpark of a ten to twenty percent impact on amortization of the purchase price. There are certain things in the installation process that do not change if going from 2 kilowatts to 3 kilowatts. The number of modules changes and the rack is a little different, but the labor does not change much.

3. Mr. Dan Williams, a solar installer for Powerfully Green, has done work in Saint Paul and is involved with the Eco Experience at the State Fair. He assumes that the language [in § 63.110(e) about mechanical equipment on primary building facades] does not apply to solar plumbing and solar electric runs, which are similar to Exel electric runs and downspouts done everywhere. Mr. Williams said the requirement that building mounted systems shall not extend above the ridge of a hip or gambrel roof may be overly restrictive in some cases, particularly for freestanding garages with east-west roof slopes. Solar panels work best when sloped to face south. For garages with east-west roof slopes in rear yards, some cities allow propping the panels up to face south and go above the ridge by a few inches. With the advent of electric cars more people will want car ports with solar panels. They are often located less than 10 feet from the alley and would need to be more than 12 feet high.

   Commissioner Perrus said it would be helpful for the speakers to submit their comments to the Neighborhood Planning Committee in writing before Monday, July 11, 2011.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Wencl moved to close the public hearing, leave the record open for written testimony until 4:30 p.m. on Monday, July 11, 2011, and to refer the matter back to the Neighborhood Planning Committee for review and recommendation. Commissioner Ward seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.***

V. Zoning Committee

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

Five items to come before the Site Plan Committee on Tuesday, July 12, 2011. Xcel Center Solar Panels located at 306 Eagle Parkway, pole mounted panels at Chestnut and Exchange Street; Macalester College located at 34 Cambridge Street, parking lot stormwater improvements; St. Paul Curling Club Parking Lot located at 470 Selby Avenue, parking lot reconstruction; and Midway Commons located at 1489 University Avenue, reuse existing building for retail and fast food with drive thru.

NEW BUSINESS

#11-238-977 Victoria Park II – Rezoning from I3 Restricted Industrial to T3M Traditional Neighborhood. 852 Hathaway Street area bounded by 35E, Shepard Rd, Otto, and Adrian Street. *(Lucy Thompson, 651/266-6578)*

Commissioner Kramer said that the rezoning is not related to the proposed footprint of the Nova charter school, which was discussed by the Zoning Committee as it considered proposed modifications to the Victoria Park Master Plan. The committee was unanimous in its finding that the proposed rezoning is consistent with City plans for redevelopment of Victoria Park.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Kramer moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the rezoning. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.***

#11-239-001 Victoria Part Master Plan Modification – Major modification of the Victoria Park Master Plan. 852 Hathaway Street area bounded by 35E, Shepard Road, Otto, and Adrian Street. *(Lucy Thompson, 651/266-6578)*

MOTION: ***Commissioner Kramer moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the major modification of the Victoria Park Master Plan.***

In Commissioner Nelson's absence, a letter from him was distributed to Commissioners explaining why he voted against the proposed major modifications to the Victoria Park Master Plan.

Commissioner Spaulding said that the core of the issue Commissioner Nelson raises is the view corridor down Madson Street from the existing Sholom Home to the river valley. Commissioner Spaulding questions whether it is possible to move the proposed Nova Academy building or modify its design in order to accommodate a view corridor down the original right-of-way. One of the major questions is the Planning Commission's role in reviewing a master plan. The challenge is that the configuration of the parcels under City ownership would not permit the move of the school as Commissioner Nelson suggests. There are significant building challenges based on the configuration of the parcels there. Commissioner Spaulding is open to more discussion; his view has evolved rapidly and he is optimistic that something can be done. He believes that addressing Commissioner Nelson's concerns would require a major reconfiguration of the Nova plans, either adding density upward or building a very oddly shaped building to fit the land available. Rather than modifying the site plan as Commissioner Nelson proposes, Commissioner

Spaulding suggested that interested parties continue to confer and try to reach a compromise between addressing the concerns of Sholom and meeting the needs of the school.

Commissioner Schertler said that Commissioner Nelson raises some good points. Commissioner Schertler's concern is that the Commission treat this applicant (the Saint Paul Housing and Redevelopment Authority) just as it would a private developer. He feels that Commissioner Nelson raises a good point regarding Sholom's expectations when they designed and built their buildings. Commissioner Schertler does not have enough facts to agree that there is a compelling reason to adjust the Master Plan.

Commissioner Porter's concerns echo Commissioner Nelson's and Sholom's. She wants to ensure that the Commission has given the stakeholders enough time to have input regarding the modifications and significant adjustments. She does not want to rush this process.

Commissioner Kramer said noted that the public process for this case has not been any different. People were notified, a public hearing was held. There were some community meetings, and it has had district council review.

Commissioner Wencl moved what is described in Commissioner Nelson's letter of July 7, 2011 as an amendment to the committee's recommendation. Commissioner Oliver seconded the motion.

Commissioner Merrigan said that a lot of time was spent putting together a Master Plan, and this project went through site plan review. She does not feel like the larger planning issues were part of the discussion during site plan review.

Commissioner Thao said that Commission Schertler raised an interesting point about being equitable, but, at the same time, there is no guarantee that master plans will be built exactly as planned. If exceptions were not possible, cities would never be developed.

Commissioner Schertler questioned whether time/schedule is an issue here.

Lucy Thompson, PED staff, reminded the Commission that the major plan modifications are not just about Nova. They also would amend the future land use designation of almost half of the original Victoria Park Master Plan, per a legal settlement with Exxon. Staff have been working with Nova for months to find a building configuration that does not close off two street segments. In order to do a less intrusive building footprint that only closes off one street segment, additional land would have to be purchased from Brighton. However, Brighton and Nova were not able to reach an agreement on price. It is consistent with the Master Plan to have a school in this neighborhood. Ms. Thompson also noted that moving the school footprint as suggested by Commissioner Nelson puts it on land formerly owned by Exxon, which is prohibited by the legal settlement.

The Nova building is planned to be three stories of classrooms and two stories for the gym, not the 65 feet Commissioner Nelson suggests in his letter. Ms. Thompson also thinks that a three-story and a two-story building will not block views of the river valley. Finally, Ms. Thompson stated that Nova is ready to submit for final site plan review to stay on schedule for a school opening in September 2012.

Commissioner Connolly said that it seems to him that Nova feels locked into this particular site. The alternative that Commissioner Nelson proposed is not feasible because of the lawsuit, but there are no suitable alternative locations for Nova. Ms. Thompson said that Nova should speak to its site search process.

Commissioner Young said one of the issues often discussed on the West Side is views from the bluffs and of the bluffs, particularly with the West Side Flats Master Plan. One of the things that they determined as a community was a 3-4 story building would retain views of and from the bluffs. Ms. Young asked whether there other examples of a codified view corridor or view easements in the city.

Ms. Thompson said that she does not know of any.

Commissioner Schertler questioned whether there are protected view corridors across the Cleveland Circle site across from the Xcel Energy Center. Ms. Thompson said that there were view corridors identified in the Lower Cathedral Hill Plan, but they were never adopted in the Zoning Code. In response to a similar question from Commissioner Ward, Ms. Thompson responded that protection of these views was supported in the small area plan but never codified.

At the request of Chair Commers, Commissioner Wencl restated her proposed additional condition, which reads: "A ninety foot (90') wide easement shall be provided through the site, following the original master plan's alignment of Madson Street from its intersection with Mercer Way, southeastward to the river bluff. The purpose of this easement is to maintain the view corridor that was previously provided by the 60 foot (60') public right-of-way combined with the minimum fifteen foot (15') setbacks (each side) for residential structures as originally envisioned by the adopted Victoria Park Master Plan."

Commissioner Spaulding offered an alternative to changing the proposed Master Plan modifications. He suggested that the Master Plan modifications could be sent as they are to City Council, but with an acknowledgment of this issue in the Commission's resolution.

Commissioner Merrigan asked what the height restrictions in the T3 are. Ms. Thompson responded that there is a 55-foot maximum permitted for a non-residential use, with allowance for a conditional use permit up to 75 feet. The Master Plan indicates an appropriate height of up to 52 feet for the residential uses originally proposed for this site, but 55" is permitted by right.

Commissioner Wencl expressed concern about Sholom investing in this neighborhood with certain assumptions – such as a view corridor down Madson Street to the river valley – and then those assumptions changing, especially since Sholom was one of the "pioneers" in the urban village. The Planning Commission should be thinking about staying true to the original design principles throughout the life of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Schertler stated that he is not prepared to support this amendment, which he thinks is a specific solution to a problem that is still emerging.

Commissioner Oliver stated support for the view corridor and is looking for a way to specify it. He does not think it requires an all-the-way- to-the-ground easement. Without more detailed analysis, it is difficult to say what the height limits should be through this corridor. Perhaps a

one- or two-story building section through the right-of-way would work, and should be suggested to the City Council to keep the project on track.

Commissioner Reveal asked the Planning Commission to send a strong recommendation back to staff to make a good faith effort by the time this comes up in front of the City Council to find at least one or two alternatives that would preserve the maximum site view and be acceptable to Sholom.

Commissioner Thao moved to call the question on the amendment proposed by Commissioner Wencl. The motion failed; the amendment is not adopted.

Commissioner Spaulding moved approval, with an amendment to the resolution that reflects the concerns raised by Commissioner Nelson and asks staff to work with Nova to limit the height of its building along the Madson right-of-way.

The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote with Commissioner Wickiser abstaining.

#11-143-721 City of St. Paul – Rezoning from OS Office Service to B2 Community Business. 745 White Bear Avenue North, SW corner at Reaney. *(Matt Wolff, 651/266-6708)*

MOTION: ***Commissioner Kramer moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the rezoning. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.***

#11-143-927 Nicole Cherry – Variances of parking lot and driveway set back standards for an 8-space parking lot. 745 White Bear Avenue North, SW corner at Reaney.
(Matt Wolff, 651/266-6708)

Commissioner Kramer said this lot is an existing parcel left over after the city put in turn lanes which required intersection widening to accommodate the approaches there. The variance is for the driveway setbacks.

Patricia James, PED staff said because the vehicles are going to be parked heading toward White Bear Avenue, the required setback is 7 feet, rather than the normal 4 feet. In this case there is only room for 4 feet of setback, so the applicant is requesting a variance of 3 feet for the setback along White Bear Avenue.

Commissioner Kramer said that the committee added a condition to the variance requiring the layout of the lot to be such that vehicles would be directed to exit onto White Bear Avenue rather then the neighborhood.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Kramer moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the variance subject to additional conditions. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.***

#11-235-029 Allan and Bernetta Miller – Re-establishment of nonconforming use as triplex. 998 7th Street East, SE corner at Cypress. *(Kate Reilly, 651/266-6618)*

MOTION: ***Commissioner Kramer moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the re-establishment of legal nonconforming use subject to additional conditions. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.***

#11-238-488 Traditions SP Land LLC – Conditional Use Permit for a 170-unit assisted living facility. 1554 Midway Parkway between Snelling and Arona.
(Josh Williams, 651/266-6659)

Upon a question by Commissioner Connolly, Commissioner Kramer said he is not sure of the intended use for the firehouse.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Kramer moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the conditional use permit subject to additional conditions. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.***

Commissioner Kramer announced that the next Zoning Committee meeting on July 14, 2011 has been cancelled.

VI. **Saint Paul Housing Program Update** – Informational presentation by Allen Carlson, Director of Housing, PED. *(Allen Carlson, 651/266-6616)*

Allen Carlson, Housing Director gave a power point presentation a general overview of what the housing division is and what overall activities they do within (PED) Department of Planning and Economic Development. Mr. Carlson said that the housing division has about 23 staff members and PED has overall about 75 staff members with an operational budget of a little over 2 million dollars of which the entire department operational budget is between 8.5 and 9 million dollars. Mr. Carlson showed how PED is divided up into teams there is the Home Loan fund which does the mortgage financing; rehab loans and mortgage foreclosure type counseling. There is only one person under homeless prevention activities, there's Project Services, multi-family housing team and the NSP team. Mr. Carlson showed several slides throughout his presentation pertaining to the Housing Division. The Housing Action Plan a 3-year plan which they annually update and make modifications. That plan sets specific actions that they have to undertake within the current year and the years going forward. One of the long term programs that the City has had is the Rehabilitation Loan program for home owners. Under this program they target people that are at or below 50% area median income, people with a fixed income. Also the City has a mortgage program, which every year they issue a certain amount of tax exempt single-family mortgage bonds which they use those proceeds to provide mortgage funding. It has been a very successful program over the years and this is done in conjunction with the City of Minneapolis. They have also received a grant from the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency for $75,000 and this program will be unique because it is targeted for higher income homeowners in the areas of Aurora, St. Anthony then the west midway area, west of Lexington to Prior and North of University. The concept under this program is to provide rehab loans up to $40,000 with 0% interest rate, which they would not have to be paid back for 30-years. And this is to encourage people that currently reside in those neighborhoods and want to stay in those neighborhoods and finding that all the equity that they had 5-years ago, they no longer have, but there houses do need improvements.

Another major activity of the department is multi-family housing redevelopment. Basically they are providing some type of financial assistance to multi-family development whether its homeowners, rentals, market or subsidized that would meet some type of public purpose or specific goal for the city. Another focus is on new production housing. Today where all the activity is in the development world of housing is market rate rental housing. Market advisors came out with a report that vacancy rates for rental housing is about 3% right now and downtown

is a little over 1%. And what is considered normal to allow for turn over usually about 6%, so it is a very tight market right now.

Since 2007, the Mortgage Foreclosure Prevention program has had over 4,400 clients that they have dealt with and they have been able to avert foreclosure on half of those. So it's a very beneficial program for the city. The Project Services has a staff of only 2 people and there primary responsibility is to manage all the properties that the HRA owns. The Project Services section has only two staff members and their primary responsibility is to manage all the properties that the HRA owns, which is over 300 properties. It is very expensive to maintain those properties because they are responsible for cutting the grass, shoveling the snow and do whatever needs to be done to make the properties look presentable to the neighborhoods.

Luis Pereira, PED staff talked about the current housing planning activities. As the Planning Commission heard about previously, the Consolidated Plan 2010-2014 is the City's 5-year plan required by US Department of HUD, and the Housing Action Plan, 2010-2013 is a 3-year plan that is required by the Met Council. Those are the two guiding documents in addition to the Housing Comprehensive Plan. Some current planning activities going on are: within Payne-Phalen area, two community groups are engaging in vacant building survey to indicate community priorities for the NSP3 initiative (a third installment of NSP funds). He indicated that "Corridors of Opportunity"-related projects will be moving forward. It's a large regional initiative the major source of funding for this was through HUD and the Met Council was leading the charge. "Corridors of Opportunity" will use the Twin Cities metro area's major transitways as the guiding organizing tool; Mr. Pereira pointed out that two of these corridors related to Saint Paul are the Central Corridor and the Gateway Corridor. An example of a few projects that are being funded - Minnesota Housing is leading a multi-family energy efficiency rental housing initiative. They released an RFP to target multi-family properties along Central Corridor. The RFP would support the work of a consultant to gather data fro these properties and use that data putting it into a national benchmark tool and the idea is that with greater data that will help convince some of the multi-family owners to make investments in energy-efficiency improvements. Another is the work around Gateway Corridor between Eau Claire and Downtown Minneapolis, which includes the East Side of Saint Paul and Downtown Saint Paul. This work will include community outreach/engagement activities to be funded to engage residents and business owners around possible impacts Gateway Corridor transit would have on the East Side. This community engagement initiative is broader then affordable housing, but also includes implications for community and economic development, workforce development, education, etc

Additional Central Corridor housing related planning, is an effort that PED and a variety of community partners were involved with, led by Housing Preservation Project - to come up with some recommendations for Central Corridor related to housing. Stacey Becker led a similar process after this one, out of which a draft was produced that is still being revised now. Related to that there is going to be a larger process called the Big Picture Project, also known as the Central Corridor Affordable Housing Coordinated Plan process. LISC is convening it, Central Corridor Funders Collaborative is funding it and the Cities of Minneapolis and Saint Paul are involved in helping guide the framing of that work, but there will be a variety of community partners involved. There will be three large community forums. Mr. Pereira showed a flyer announcing what the Big Picture Project is. This process is to help inform the City's work on a request that came out of the Central Corridor Zoning Study, which included a City Council resolution that requested a specific look at gentrification, affordable housing, a various zoning tools to create

affordable housing. They have stressed to LISC that they want to see some national models. Lastly they will be updating the Housing Action Plan, with 2010 outcomes, what kind of investments were made in 2010, and revised housing activity targets to include NSP3 funds.

Commissioner Ward said that people who are first time home buyers have a restriction through FHA that they can not over lap certain programs, neither Federal funds with another Federal program. And with this particular loan program that Mr. Carlson talked about if a first time home buyer attends all the classes and what not can they layer that program with this program in order to buy in that area.

Mr. Carlson said that they have a requirement that a person can not apply under any of their programs for rehab funds until they have lived in the home a minimum of 18 months, so they could not layer that. Right now under their mortgage program for first time home buyers the mortgage rate 4.25% and they also provide a down payment assistance forgivable loan for up to 2 ½ % of the mortgage amount. Also there is state money, which would have to be paid back if the house is ever sold, up to $10,000 if a house that was foreclosed or vacant was purchased. So there are some huge incentives.

Commissioner Ward said there was a listing of targeted development projects along Central Corridor and there were three specific ones on University Avenue that were considered affordable housing and to what degree is it affordable. Affordable housing means different things to many different people so what is considered affordable for this Central Corridor project.

Mr. Carlson explained that two of the properties listed that actually the HRA purchased with funds received from the Metropolitan Council and Family Housing funds, which they borrowed the money and it has to be paid back. Under their agreement with Metropolitan Council 30% of the housing units to be built on the site have to be affordable at or below households of 60% of area median income.

Commissioner Ward also asked about the Old Home site, asking if the HRA has acquired that.

Mr. Carlson said no it is up for sale and a lot of non-profit organizations have expressed an interest. So something will happen there but it is going to be very costly.

Commissioner Spaulding said when talking about Central Corridor and other parts of the City, and trying to figure out how to create mixed use communities. How is that looked at and what can be done to make sure when thinking about Central Corridor and places like that where it is important to have a fairly good mix of commercial space on the first floor and residential above.

Mr. Carlson said a prime example of that happening is the Penfield Project, where there will be a Lunds grocery store on the first floor. Mixed use projects are a very difficult thing to do because the way lenders look at financing projects, they are very comfortable with the housing component but the retail is always a big unknown from a revenue producing stand point. It is also hard to do mixed use when using the city's tax exempt bond allocations. Under the federal law only less then 10% of the project can be commercial. And there will be all kinds of creative ideas coming up on how to achieve that, but from a planning perspective and a housing perspective this really needs to be emphasized this mixed use concept.

Mr. Pereira added that this Big Picture Project will start to address that a bit, looking at housing

finance, policy, and regulations.

VII. Comprehensive Planning Committee

Commissioner Merrigan had no report.

VIII. Neighborhood Planning Committee

Commissioner Wencl had no report.

IX. Transportation Committee

Commissioner Spaulding had no report.

X. Communications Committee

Commissioner Thao had no report.

XI. Task Force Reports

None

XII. Old Business

None

XIII. New Business

None

XIV. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Recorded by
Laura Eckert and Angela Simons
And prepared by
Sonja Butler, Planning Commission Secretary
Planning and Economic Development Department,
City of Saint Paul

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Drummond
Planning Director

Approved 8-5-2011
(Date)

Anthony Fernandez
Secretary of the Planning Commission

PED\Butler\planning commission\minutes\July 8, 2011