

Meeting Minutes
New Prague Planning Commission
Wednesday, February 22, 2012

1. Call Meeting to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Planning Commission Chair Bob Gilman with the following members present: Bob Gilman, John Roos, Dan Meyer, Dave Bruzek and Jay Nuhring. No members were absent.

City Staff Present: Ken Ondich – Planning Director.

2. Approval of January 25, 2012 Regular Meeting Minutes

It was moved by Roos seconded by Bruzek to approve the January 25, 2012 regular meeting minutes as submitted. Motion carried (5-0).

3. Old Business

None.

4. New Business

A. Performance Measurement Survey Results

Planning Director Ondich presented the staff report. He stated that the City had participated in a Performance Measurement Survey from November 1st through December 16th, 2011 which covered a variety of topics. He stated that the topics relevant to the Planning Commission were being forwarded for their review and comment back to the City Council, should they have any comments to report. The specific sections reviewed by the Planning Commission included “How would you rate the overall appearance of the city?”, “How would you describe your overall feeling of safety in the city?”, “How would you rate the overall quality of city recreational programs and facilities?”, and finally “How would you rate the overall quality of services provided by the city?”.

Chair Gilman asked what streets north of Main Street would be reconstructed.

Planning Director Ondich stated that for 2012 it would include all of 2nd Street between TH21 and Columbus Ave. N. as well as 2nd Ave. NW and 1st Ave. NW from Main to 2nd Street. He stated that other streets north of Main would be done in the next few years.

Commissioner Meyer asked about tax incentives for encouraging businesses to move into New Prague.

Planning Director Ondich stated that there are certain incentives that the City has available and that the EDA and City Staff has been much more proactive on layout out those options than in the past.

The discussion of hanging baskets and the existing ground planters downtown took place. It was noted that the possible addition of hanging baskets and the placement of more plants might make people think less about vacant buildings and lots downtown that were noted in the survey.

Planning Director Ondich stated that the planters are a volunteer program coordinated by the Chamber for the past few years. He stated that the City may not be opposed to additional volunteer coordinated beautification efforts which would not place a burden on the City's budget.

The Planning Commission suggested the City help promote the adopt a planter idea more than it has in the past.

The Planning Commission also discussed that the City should advertise the fact that they have a local electric utility with generation capabilities which might be a selling point for some businesses.

The Planning Commission accepted the results of the survey as information.

B. Residential Roofing Materials Discussion

Planning Director Ondich presented the staff report. He stated that Commissioner Nuhring requested that discussion take place regarding allowable residential roofing materials within the City. He stated that one home in particular was noted to have possibly been roofed with "agricultural grade" aluminum roofing. The question to be discussed is if the city has any materials standards for using residential or commercial grade roofing or any other standards. He noted that the City simply follows the 2007 Minnesota State Residential Code which does allow metal roofing panels with certain specifications. He added that he had inquired with other cities regarding their roofing material requirements and had only heard back from a few. He stated that the cities of Hutchinson and Savage do not have restrictions on the type and appearance of residential roofing materials that could be used. He stated that Shakopee "by practice" but not by ordinance do not allow "corrugated" metal roofs, but rather do allow "standing seam" metal roofs. He stated that he had included some pictures and informational materials in the packet regarding roofing requirements from the 2007 Minnesota State Residential Code as well as some pictures and information explaining the difference between corrugated metal roofs and standing seam metal roofs. He stated that since the report was printed that he had heard from the Cities of Watertown which does allow metal roofs without exposed fasteners, the City of Belle Plaine which allows only factory finished metal roofs and finally Lonsdale allows for steel shingles only and not metal panel roofs.

Commissioner Nuhring stated that he believes there is a big difference in the appearance of the standing seam metal roofs versus the corrugated roofs.

Commissioner Gilman stated that there is also a huge cost difference between the two options. Commissioner Gilman asked if pole buildings were allowed in the City in residential areas.

Planning Director Ondich stated that currently they are allowed as long as they meet setbacks and the state building code requirements.

Commissioner Bruzek stated that he had driven by the particular home with the corrugated roof and didn't think it looked as bad as he thought it might.

Commissioner Meyer asked if there would be a difference in the valuation of the homes of those with asphalt roofs versus those with metal roofs.

Planning Director Ondich stated that he would have to check into the question.

Commissioner Gilman stated that he did not believe that the City should determine if one metal roof is better than another metal roof if it meets the applicable building codes.

Planning Director Ondich stated that he was still receiving research responses back from other cities and would forward the end results for the Planning Commission to review sometime in the future.

5. Miscellaneous

The following miscellaneous items were reviewed as information only:

- A. Annual Business Audit – Planning Director Ondich updated the Planning Commission with the Annual Business Audit which was presented to the Council earlier in the month.
- B. Monthly Business Update – Planning Director Ondich updated the Planning Commission with a report that was presented to the EDA earlier in the month.
- C. Comprehensive Plan Update – Planning Director Ondich stated that in the packets he had included a copy of the RFP that was issued to planning consulting firms for the updating of the Comprehensive Plan.

6. Adjournment

A motion was made by Bruzek, seconded by Meyer to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 PM. Motion carried (5-0).

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth D. Ondich
Planning Director