

- 4.1 PUBLIC HEARING: Cable Franchise Renewal Ordinance** Janine Hill, Communications Administrator and Brian Grogan, Moss & Barnett gave an overview of the franchise renewal ordinance. The City and Comcast have a franchise agreement for Comcast to use the City's rights-of-way to provide its services to subscribers. The current agreement effective date was January 1, 2015, with a term end of December 31, 2024. The agreement was for 10 years, and it was fully executed February 18, 2015. This ordinance terminates the agreement before February 18, 2025 with the new agreement being effective February 1, 2025.

Public hearing open. One speaker present, Bobby (inaudible last name), expressed frustration with Comcast and services provided. He stated that there is a lack of competition for cable and internet services.

Motion by Moua, seconded by Dallessandro to close the public hearing. Motion carried 6-0.

Motion by Lowman, seconded by Moua to approve **Ordinance No. 2025-1** amending Chapters 1 and 20 of the City Code, thereby designating uncodified ordinances as special ordinances, renewing the grant of a cable television franchise to Comcast to operate and maintain a cable system in the City, and creating Appendix D of the City Code for uncodified special ordinances. Motion carried 6-0.

AND

Motion by Lowman, seconded by Moua to adopt **Resolution No. 2025-6**, a Resolution Authorizing Summary Publication of Ordinance No. 2025-1, amending Chapters 1 and 20 of the City Code, thereby designating uncodified ordinances as special ordinances, renewing the grant of a cable television franchise to Comcast to operate and maintain a cable system in the City, and creating Appendix D of the City Code for uncodified special ordinances. Motion carried 6-0.

5. ORGANIZATIONAL BUSINESS

- 5.1 Study Item: Co-Living/SRO Standards Review** Nick Johnson, Planning Supervisor and Emily Hestbech, Planner discussed new use definitions and standards for Co-Living/single room occupancy (SRO) housing types. Staff sought general feedback about recommended Code changes related to SRO and Co-Living uses, as shown in Exhibit A.
- Council gave staff guidance and direction. General consensus was to move forward. Planning commission will get this in March of 2025, and City council in April of 2025
- Dallessandro and the Mayor asked for a recap and analysis of progress and status of various projects (ADU, SRO, missing middle) and how they all work together for Council in April.
- 5.2 Small Business Programming Update** Holly Masek, Port Authority Administrator and Barb Wolff, Assistant Port Authority Administrator provided a presentation on expanded small business programming in the City and shared updated recommendations on the previously scoped Small Business Center.
- Bloomington has developed multiple programs to support small businesses, including Elevate Hennepin and the Open to Business program. The city offers financial assistance through grant programs and low-interest loans for small businesses. Bloomington has partnerships with organizations like the Minnesota Small Business Development Center



Planning Commission/Housing and Redevelopment Authority Concurrent Meeting
Tuesday, December 17, 2024
Council Chambers
Bloomington Civic Plaza
1800 W. Old Shakopee Rd.
Bloomington, MN 55431
6:30 P.M.
Webex Virtual Meeting

CALL TO ORDER Chair Vicki Hoogheem & Aubrey Albrecht called the concurrent meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Planning Commissioner Present: Commissioners A. Albrecht, P. Koktan, D. Curry, A. Isse, and K. Cunningham

Planning Commissioner Absent: Commissioners J. McGovern and D. White

HRA Commissioners Present: Commissioners V. Hoogheem, J. Mueller, R. Wooten (present on Webex), B. Doblinger, C. Moua, and S. Isse

HRA Commissioners Absent: Commissioner J. Carter

Staff Present: Sarah Abe-HRA Administrator
Nick Johnson-Planning Supervisor
Glen Markegard-Planning Manager
Emily Hestbech, Planner
Mike Palermo, HRA Assistant Administrator
Maricruz Hernandez, HRA Program Specialist I
Melissa Manderschied, City Attorney (present on Webex)

DISCUSSION

ITEMS

Item 7.1

Study Item - Co-Living/SRO Standards Review Part II

Johnson and Hestbech presented a second round of discussion about co-living standards. Staff has advanced an initial draft of concept changes to the City Code for feedback and discussion. Building off this draft, key remaining questions will be presented that could inform a final version of an ordinance to be considered at subsequent public hearings. More information about the next potential steps are provided in a subsequent section of the staff report.

Staff has made substantial progress on a draft ordinance, shown in Exhibit A. The key elements of the draft ordinance are as follows: Definitions Staff made several changes to definitions. First, the definition of “Family” was changed by replacing the existing with a new definition that allows for up to six people with minor children in their care living in a dwelling unit. Staff compared family definitions from nine cities around the metro area. This definition came from the City of St. Paul, who had previously changed their definition after an extensive study was completed in 2020 on the potential effects of the change. There are multiple potential benefits to changing this definition. These potential benefits include: • Bloomington adopting a more expansive conception of what constitutes a family or household, which is supported from an equity perspective; and • Increasing the availability and utilization of housing. It should be noted that staff will continue to execute property maintenance inspection activities, as well as conduct routine inspections as part of the City’s Rental Housing Program. These activities are run by the City’s Environmental Health Division in the Community Development Department. Second, staff created definitions for “Co-Living Unit” and “Co-Living Development”. These definitions were created based on examples from 18 cities around the country, including suburbs surrounding Chicago, Philadelphia, Washington D.C., Seattle, and Portland, which are regions with higher rates of co-living or SRO development. The common thread between the definitions of these communities is that a co-living unit at the least contains a bedroom but may or may not also include a private bathroom and/or kitchen. Lastly, staff edited the definition for “Congregate Living Facility” to specifically exclude co-living developments so that there were not overlapping definitions. While co-living could be considered a form of congregate living, exclusion is necessary for the purposes of not having use standards for congregate living facilities be applicable to coliving developments. More work is needed to resolve potential confusion between these use types. In addition, staff is still refining the definition of Co-Living to ensure that it is clearly differentiated from multi-family dwelling. Given different performance standards applicable to these two uses, it is important that the difference is clear and durable from a legal perspective.

Parking requirements for co-living developments are proposed to be 0.5 spaces per one co-living unit. Staff arrived at this figure based both on parking requirements of other researched communities and similar development types sourced in the Parking Generation Manual issued by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Requiring 0.5 spaces per co-living unit would be on the more restrictive side of the range of communities researched. Without doing more extensive research for each community profiled, it is difficult to determine how they compare from a parking demand standpoint. Factors including but not limited to the level of transit service, amount of dedicated bike/ped infrastructure, and macro travel behavior data can all inform a use-based parking requirement. It should be noted that staff is not recommending an enclosed parking requirement per unit for co-living. Multi-family dwellings are required to have one enclosed space per dwelling. Given that co-living developments are viewed as a tool to deliver opportunities for

housing that is more affordable and offer shorter leases than multi-family, staff would not recommend requiring enclosed parking. Such a requirement would significantly increase development costs for this housing type and make conversion of office or hotel sites to co-living more difficult. Parking requirements for co-living within a single- or two- family dwelling is the same as existing parking requirements at single- and two-family dwellings. These housing types are required to have two spaces per dwelling, one of which must be enclosed or in a garage. This approach is similar to the parking requirement for accessory dwelling units (ADUs), which simply requires that the associated single-family dwelling comply with City Code. In addition to baseline parking requirements, it should be noted that the City has maximum allowances for motor vehicles parked outside of a garage at a residence – four cars. This standard is found in § 12.03(29), and can effectively manage potential nuisance characteristics at these sites.

7.2 Housing
Discussion – Open
Opportunity for
Commissioners to
Share Thoughts
and Ask Questions

Take aways from the discussion included that there are enormous opportunities, enormous needs, and limited resources, sincerity in everyone’s comments and taking this seriously, being mindful. Others expressed that the discussion generalized consensus of how we should spend dollars and given all the ideas staff will add in their own expertise and knowledge of how the funds can be spent. While some understand this is not an easy problem to solve. It’s a start and that it’s exciting

ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Commission/Housing and Redevelopment Authority Concurrent meeting was adjourned at 7:45 pm.

Maricruz Hernandez, HRA Meeting Minute Secretary