

**MINUTES
CITY OF LONSDALE
REGULAR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Voting Members: Jim Freid, Joe Kodada, Dave Dols, John Duban, and Ben Sticha
Council Representative: Scott Pelava

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

City Planner Benjamin Baker, City Administrator Joel Erickson, and Police Chief Jason Schmitz

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dols called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm in the Council Chambers at 415 Central Street West.

2. AGENDA

Dols asked if anyone had any additions or deletions to the agenda.

A motion was made by Duban and seconded by Kodada to approve the agenda as presented. Vote for: Freid, Kodada, Dols, Duban, and Sticha; Against: None. Vote: 5-0. Motion carried.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Freid and seconded by Sticha to approve the Minutes from the November 17, 2016 Regular Meeting as presented. Vote for: Freid, Kodada, Dols, Duban, and Sticha; Against: None. Vote: 5-0. Motion carried.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Review PUD/Rezone Request for 6 Lots in Willow Creek and 8 Lots in Harvest Pond from R-2A to PUD-WCHV

Dols read the public hearing notice and opened the hearing. The Planning Commission reviewed the Staff Report and attached information including: location maps, proposed zoning maps, Ordinance 2016-271, and the associated Planned Unit Development Agreement. Baker went through the detailed Staff Report, which detailed information on the subject property location, property owners/applicants, request, zoning, land use, and utilities/drainage. Baker explained that the applicant was looking to convert twin-home lots into single family detached dwellings with reduced side yard setbacks and increased design standards, similar to the 2015 PUD/Rezone request in Willow Creek Heights 3rd Addition. Baker stated that due to concerns with aesthetic consistency and the side-yard setback impact on current property/home owners, that City Staff was only recommending that the 6 lots along 16th Avenue SE be rezoned to PUD and not the 8 lots along Ash Street NE because they were intermixed among existing twin homes. Dols asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak on the matter.

Lanny Haglund, 827 Ash Street NE, stated that the proposed detached homes along Ash Street NE, was not a good fit in the Harvest Pond neighborhood, because squeezing in villa homes with reduced setbacks would impact existing home owners and potentially cause more blight/nuisance issues.

Applicant Tom Walters asked the Planning Commission to consider allowing his request for single-family detached homes in both Willow Creek Heights and Harvest Pond, because the Ash Street NE twin-home lots have been difficult for his company to sell. He said that sharing a twin-home roof, dealing with insurance companies, and not having an active Home Owners Association diminish potential land purchasers.

Dols asked if anyone else wanted to speak on the proposed land use request. No one responded to the invitation.

A motion was made by Duban and seconded by Freid to close the public hearing. Vote for: Freid, Kodada, Dols, Duban, and Sticha; Against: None. Vote: 5-0. Motion carried. The public hearing closed at 6:45 pm.

6. GENERAL BUSINESS

a. Consider Approval of a PUD/Rezone Request for 6 Lots in Willow Creek and 8 Lots in Harvest Pond from R-2A to PUD-WCHV

Baker stated that a public hearing was held earlier in the meeting. He stated that the applicant and one neighbor spoke on the issue. Baker said that no other written or verbal comments were received. Freid stated that it makes sense for the 16th Avenue SE request to be approved, but not the Ash Street NE lots. Kodada stated that the Ash Street NE rezone request would impact neighboring property owners. Duban stated that it would be foolish to fit in single-family detached homes among the existing twin-homes.

A motion was made by Kodada and seconded by Freid to recommend approval of a PUD/Rezone request for only the 6 lots along 16th Avenue SE, in Willow Creek Heights, with the conditions noted in the Staff Report. Vote for: Freid, Kodada, Dols, Duban, and Sticha; Against: None. Vote: 5-0. Motion carried.

b. Review and Discuss Potential Regulations for Residential Off-Street Parking of Vehicles and Recreational Vehicles/Equipment

Baker stated that the City was in the process of creating a realistic ordinance for residential off-street parking and storage. He noted that the issue was already discussed at previous meetings in September and November. He said that the City's goal is to have a completed ordinance sometime between late-winter and early-spring. Baker said that the issue was recently highlighted in the local newspaper article, and he stated that the City has related reports and presentations posted on its website. Baker explained that it is tough to create an ordinance that everyone will be happy with because of the extreme difference in views on property rights and community attractiveness. He also provided a brief overview on current off-street parking regulations. In an effort to create discussion and gain feedback on proposed ordinance regulations, Baker went through a 29-slide presentation, which: 1) showed pictures of off-street parking/storage, 2) explained the goals of the ordinance update, 3) listed proposed regulations, 4) classified large and small RVs, and 5) addressed parking pads, setbacks, and screening. During the presentation, Planning Commissioners and audience members asked questions and provided comments:

One resident stated concern over if his pontoon would be allowed or not. Baker said that watercraft/trailers would be considered seasonal, and allowed from April 1st – Dec. 1st.

Joe Krammer, 400 Singing Hills Drive SE, stated that he is in favor of blight enforcement. He questioned why many owners of recreational vehicles don't figure in the cost of off-site storage before such a purchase. Krammer said that smaller lots do not have the capacity to hold larger RVs or multiple numbers of vehicles, and he suggested that the City may want to consider regulations based on lot size. Krammer agreed that blight issues tend to be relative.

Andy Tuma, 233 3rd Ave NW, stated that he lives in the older part of town where there isn't much driveway distance between the back-of-curb and his garage, and he wondered how he is supposed to fit his recreational vehicles on his driveway without encroaching into a proposed 10 ft. front yard setback. Tuma asked about impervious surface requirements, and Baker explained why required green space is important for drainage.

Monty & Melissa Atkinson, 452 Grand Ave SW, asked for clarity on what can be parked on driveways/parking pads and what setbacks were being proposed. Baker and Erickson explained the proposed regulations.

Ernie Koktavy, 510 Main Street North, said that he has a large 35 ft. long RV that is parked in his front driveway most of the summer. He said that due to his narrow lot size, that he doesn't have a way to store the large RV on the side or rear of his property. He asked the City to be flexible with its enforcement of off-street residential parking in the older parts of town.

In regard to a question about allow a resident's 9,000 lb. commercial vehicle being parked at home; Erickson said that although the City has received some complaints about large work trucks, that it was not the City's intention to take anyone's livelihood away. Pelava said that large commercial vehicles can damage curbs and driveways.

After discussing how large recreational vehicles should be classified and counted, Pelava suggested creating a unit calculation based on length. He also stated that the term recreational vehicles could easily be confused with RVs, and he recommended using different terminology.

Dan Schmitz, 515 3rd Ave SW, asked about setbacks and storing his boat and 5th wheel camper year round. Erickson said that the biggest question isn't whether recreational vehicles should be allowed, but where they should be located on a given residential property.

A resident asked if canoes would be counted as a recreational vehicle. Although he stated that the proposed regulations seem reasonable, he voiced his support for the rights of property owners trying to store items on their own land. City staff said that canoes were not discussed and that a determination would be made at one of the next meetings.

Kim Jorgensen, 528 Cottonwood St NE, asked if the City would make her pave her newly installed gravel parking pad. Baker explained that the City would not go back retroactively to enforce some off-street parking rules, once the new ordinance is adopted in 2017.

Brent Kane, 409 1st Avenue NE, stated that he was concerned that he may lose the ability to store items on a recently constructed garage-side parking pad due to the newly proposed regulations. Kane said that everyone has stuff that they need to store, and he suggested that outside parking/storage should be allowed if residents keep their parking areas and property looking nice.

The Planning Commission talked about how blight/nuisance regulations and enforcement keep the town attractive and help maintain property values. Dols said it was the goal of the Planning Commission to clean up the current ordinance language for the sake of clarity, compliance, and enforcement. He said that they will try to be fair and make the best decision for everyone, and he stated his appreciation for everyone who attended the meeting and provided comments on the subject.

c. Consider Approval of a Minor Subdivision in the Lonsdale Business Park

The Planning Commission reviewed a plat map, site plan, and survey showing a proposed lot split in the Lonsdale Business Park. Baker explained that the Council approved a revised purchase agreement at their December 8, 2016 meeting for Dispatch Trucking. He said that the City will be responsible for platting the new lot. Baker stated that the proposed new lot meets the standards for the I-2 Zoning District.

A motion was made by Kodada and seconded by Duban to recommend approval of a minor subdivision in the Lonsdale Business Park. Vote for: Freid, Kodada, Dols, Duban, and Sticha; Against: None. Vote: 5-0. Motion carried.

7. MISCELLANEOUS

None

8. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Kodada and seconded by Duban to adjourn the meeting. Vote for: Freid, Kodada, Dols, Duban, and Sticha; Against: None. Vote: 5-0. Motion carried. The meeting ended at 8:16 pm.

Respectfully Submitted:

Benjamin Baker, City Planner