



CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS

NOTICE OF MEETING
PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes - Final Planning Commission

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CITY HALL - 420 N. Pokegama Ave.
Grand Rapids, MN 55744

Thursday, May 4, 2017

4:00 PM

Council Chambers

Call To Order

Call of Roll

- Present** 5 - Commissioner Mark Gothard, Commissioner Charles Burress, Commissioner Paula Johnson, Commissioner Michelle Toven, and Commissioner Sue Zeige
- Absent** 2 - Chairperson Lester Kachinske, and Commissioner Susan Lynch

Setting of Agenda - This is an opportunity to approve the regular agenda as presented or add/delete an agenda item by a majority vote of the Commissioners present.

Approved As Presented

Approved As Presented

Approve the minutes of the April 6, 2017, 4:00 pm regular meeting.

Approved as Presented by Commission

General Business

Consider a recommendation to the City Council regarding the vacation of a portion of unnamed platted right-of-way adjacent to Lot 7, Plat of Elm Park.

Mr. and Mrs. Karl Gaalaas submitted a valid petition on February 27, 2017 requesting the vacation of the following described portion of unnamed public right-of-way That part of unnamed public street which lies between Lot 7, Elm Park and Lot 48, Elm Acres, and LYG southwesterly of the southeasterly extension of the SW boundary of Audrey Lane, as dedicated in the Plat of Elm Park, Grand Rapids, according to the recorded plat thereof, Itasca County, Minnesota. The right-of-way vacation request, if approved, would provide the Gaalaas property with more usable yard area, as well as a reduced setback requirement on the north side of the property.

The staff review committee, consisting of the Public Works Department, Engineering Department, Community Development Department, Fire Department, Police Department, and the Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission has reviewed the vacation request, and as described in the attached email correspondence, supports the petitioned vacation, contingent on the following items being addressed:

1. *The City retaining the utility easement over the area of right-of-way to be vacated.*
2. *The Public Works Department has requested that the easement be structured to allow for unimpeded access to the storm water infrastructure for maintenance purposes.*

Motion by Burress, second by Johnson that, based on the findings of fact presented here today, and in the public's best interest, the Planning Commission does hereby forward to the City Council a recommendation to approve the vacation of public right-of-way described as;

That part of unnamed public street which lies between Lot 7, Elm Park and Lot 48, Elm Acres, and LYG southwesterly of the southeasterly extension of the SW boundary of Audrey Lane, as dedicated in the Plat of Elm Park, Grand Rapids, according to the recorded plat thereof, Itasca County, Minnesota.

Contingent on the following stipulations:

- **The City retaining the utility easement over the area of right-of-way to be vacated.**
- **The Public Works Department has requested that the easement be structured to allow for unimpeded access to the storm water infrastructure for maintenance purposes.**

With the following considerations:

1. **Is the street right-of-way needed for traffic purposes?**
The right-of-way is not and has not been needed for traffic purposes.
2. **Is the street right-of-way needed for pedestrian purposes?**
The right-of-way is not needed for pedestrian purposes. There, to date, has not been a need to develop an access to the lake in this area. Additionally, there is a public access in the SE corner of the lake.
3. **Is the street right-of-way needed for utility purposes?**
The right-of-way is needed for utility purposes, as determined by the staff review committee, thus a utility easement will be retained over the area to be vacated.
4. **Would vacating the street right-of-way place additional land on the tax rolls?**
Vacating the right-of-way will put additional land on the tax rolls.
5. **Would vacating the street right-of-way facilitate economic development in the City?**
Vacating the right-of-way would facilitate economic development in the City, if the adjacent home is added on to.

The following voted in favor thereof: Gothard, Toven, Burress, Zeige, Johnson. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

Consider a recommendation to the City Council regarding the vacation of a portion of platted alley right-of-way within the plat of Kearney's 1st Addition to Grand Rapids.

Dr. Larry Schlauderaff submitted a valid petition, co-signed by the Community Presbyterian Church, on April 4, 2017 requesting the vacation of the following described public right-of-way: The unvacated portion of the west/east alley LYG south of and ADJ to Lot 13, Block 36, Kearney's 1st Add. to Grand Rapids, Itasca County, Minnesota.

As stated within the attached Public Vacation Application, the alley, requested for vacation, serves primarily as the driveway to the Schlauderaff residence, and dead-ends at the east end of the property. Prior to the 2009 parking lot improvements and building addition at the Community Presbyterian Church, the alley served as a driveway for both the Schlauderaff residence, and the assistant Pastor's residence, which was located on the south side of the alley, and was removed for the church site improvements.

There were no concerns or objections regarding the petitioned right-of-way vacation from the remaining members of the staff review committee which consists of the Public Works Department, Engineering Department, Community Development Department, Fire Department, Police Department, and the Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission.

**Motion by Burrress, second by Johnson that, based on the findings of fact presented here today, and in the public's best interest, the Planning Commission does hereby forward to the City Council a recommendation to approve the vacation of public right-of-way described as:
The unvacated portion of the west/east alley LYG south of and ADJ to Lot 13, Block 36, Kearney's 1st Add. to Grand Rapids, Itasca County, Minnesota.**

Contingent on the following stipulation(s):

- **The City retaining an access easement over the entire area to be vacated.**

With the following considerations:

- 1. Is the street right-of-way needed for traffic purposes?**

The alley right-of-way is not needed for traffic purposes, as it is only being use as a private driveway.

- 2. Is the street right-of-way needed for pedestrian purposes?**

The alley right-of-way is not needed for pedestrian purposes, as the alley terminates at the end of private property.

- 3. Is the street right-of-way needed for utility purposes?**

The alley right-of-way is not needed for utility purposes, just access to existing utilities in the vacated N/S alley in the center of the block, thus an access easement shall be retained over the portion of vacated alley.

- 4. Would vacating the street right-of-way place additional land on the tax rolls?**

Vacating the alley right-of-way will put a minimal amount land on the tax rolls

- 5. Would vacating the street right-of-way facilitate economic development in the City?**

Vacating alley right-of-way could potentially facilitate additional economic development on the property.

The following voted in favor thereof: Johnson, Zeige, Burress, Toven, Gothard. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

Public Input

Miscellaneous\Updates

Adjourn

Adjourn