



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, August 1, 2019

4:00 PM

Council Chambers

Call To Order

Call of Roll

Present 7 - Commissioner Susan Lynch, Chairperson Molly MacGregor, Vice Chair Patrick Goggin, Commissioner Mark Gothard, Commissioner Lester Kachinske, Commissioner Ted Hubbes, and Commissioner Betsy Johnson

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.

Approval of Minutes

Approve the minutes of the July 9, 2019, 4:00 pm meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Goggin, second by Commissioner Lynch to approve the minutes of the July 9, 2019 regular meeting. The following voted in favor thereof: Gothard, Hubbes, Goggin, MacGregor, Kachinske, Lynch, Johnson. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

Public Hearings

Conduct a Public Hearing to consider a variance petition submitted by Mr. Chris Stanley & Mr. Derek Stanley (Sawmill Works), d.b.a. Anderson Glass Company, Inc.

Mr. Chris Stanley & Mr. Derek Stanley have applied for two variances, which if granted, would allow for the construction of an 822 sq. ft. building infill addition to their commercial warehouse building (Anderson Glass Company) located at: 816 NW 4th Street.

Due to a roof system failure this past winter (and necessary repair) in the north half of the fabrication/warehouse building, the Stanley's would like to the opportunity to infill, or square off, the northeast corner of the building during its replacement by adding 822 sq. ft., which would also include the reconfiguration of the interior warehouse space.

The applicants, within the variance petition, cite the numerous existing buildings along the Hwy. 2 west corridor which have less the minimum required setback or 0 ft. building setback, and that additionally, during the necessary replacement of the north half of the warehouse building, the 822 sq. ft. infill addition to the building would

accommodate more efficient use of their warehouse space, as reasons for the variance request.

The infill addition to the warehouse building during its partial replacement, as proposed, would require the Planning Commission's approval of two variances.

1. Section 30-512 Table 17C-2 of the Municipal Code, which lists District Development Regulations for Principal Structures within shoreland districts, and establishes a 30' front yard setback for principal structures within SGB (Shoreland General Business) zoned districts.

2. Section 30-458(c)1, which addresses alterations to nonconforming structures: "Nonconforming uses of structures which do not meet the site development and design standards (division 7 of this article) and/or the off-street parking and loading requirements (divisions 8 and 9 of this article) shall be allowed to be structurally altered or replaced provided there is no further violation of these requirements than lawfully exists at the time of such alteration or replacement".

Motion by Commissioner Kachinske, second by Commissioner Goggin to open the public hearing. The following voted in favor thereof: Johnson, Lynch, Kachinske, MacGregor, Goggin, Hubbes, Gothard. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

Chris Stanley of Anderson Glass, because of the collapse of the building and the need to rebuild they would like to have the additional warehouse space.

Derek Stanley of Anderson Glass, all of the property owners to the east have been notified and none of them have issues with the addition.

Motion by Commissioner Lynch, second by Commissioner Goggin to close the public hearing. The following voted in favor thereof: Gothard, Hubbes, Goggin, MacGregor, Kachinske, Lynch, Johnson. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

The Commissioners reviewed the considerations for the record:

1. Is this an "Area" variance rather than a "Use" variance?

This is an area variance.

2. Does the proposal put property to use in a reasonable manner?

Why/Why not-

Yes, it is increasing the use and cleaning the building up.

3. Is the owner's plight due to circumstances which are unique to the property and which are not self-created by the owner?

Why/Why not-

It is not self created, it was built prior to the current zoning ordinance.

4. Is the variance in harmony with the purposes and intent of the ordinance?

Why/Why not-

Yes, it allows for reasonable expansion.

5. Will the variance, if granted, alter the essential character of the locality?

Why/Why not-

No, most of the buildings have the same setbacks.

6. Is the variance consistent with the comprehensive plan?

Why/Why not-

Yes, part of the comprehensive plan is to improve the Hwy 2 corridor.

Motion by Commissioner Lynch, second by Commissioner Goggin that, based on the findings of fact presented here today, and in the public's best interest, the Planning Commission does hereby grant the following variances to Mr. Chris Stanley & Mr. Derek Stanley (Sawmill Works), d.b.a. Anderson Glass Company, Inc. for the property legally described as: W 84' OF LOTS 1-3 & LOTS 4-6 LESS E 58.75' & LOTS 7-12 BLK 27 & ALL THAT PART OF VACATED 9TH AVE W LYG W OF LOTS 7-12 BLK 27, GRAND RAPIDS SECOND DIVISION, ITASCA COUNTY, MINNESOTA;

- to allow a one-time waiver of the requirements of Section 30-512 Table 17C-2 and Section 30-458(c)1.b of the Municipal Code for the construction of a 822 sq. ft. addition to be added during the replacement of the north half of the existing warehouse/fabrication building, which would encroach 30 ft. into the required 30 ft. front yard setback for principal structures, as depicted in the variance application submitted by Mr. Chris Stanley & Mr. Derek Stanley.

With the considerations provided by the Commissioners.

The following voted in favor thereof: Johnson, Lynch, Kachinske, MacGregor, Goggin, Hubbes, Gothard. Opposed: None, passed un

General Business

Consider a recommendation the City Council regarding the preliminary development plan and phase I final development plan for Common Interest Community #33 Lakewood Estates First Addition Planned Unit Development, as submitted by Horseshoe Properties LLC. and Central Builders LLC.

A preliminary development plan and phase I final development plan entitled Common Interest Community #33 Lakewood Estates First Addition was submitted by Dr. Dan Margo, on behalf of Horseshoe Properties LLC. and Mr. Dean Piri, d.b.a. Central Builders LLC. and filed with the City on June 6, 2019.

The total area of the subject property is 5 acres, and the tract is legally described as: Lots 5-10, Block 3, Plat of Lakewood Heights. The subject property is located within an R-3 (Multi-Family Residential- medium density), with the exception of the eastern most lot, which is within an R-1 (One-Family Residential) zoning district. Proposed uses within the PUD are that of nine single-family residential homes, which would cooperate in "an association" for lawn care and snow removal services

Prior to the June Planning Commission meeting, staff reviewed the preliminary plat/sketch of Lakewood Estates First Addition PUD, and presented the following initial observations:

1. *Section 30-703(a)3 stipulates that a PUD conveys no right to the use of land other than is permitted by the underlying zoning district. The PUD proposes one-family residential units, and, with single-family detached listed in Table 1, Section 30-512 as a use that is permitted by right in R-3 & R-1 districts, there is no overall issue with the planned proposed use.*

2. One of the listed intents/benefits of using the PUD process is preservation of open space and natural features. The proposed layout plan depicts the clustering of units 5-8, sharing a common driveway, and individually connecting to a single sanitary sewer and water extension. As proposed, this layout preserves 45% of the site for open space, which appears to be consistent with the intent of the PUD process.

3. Through the PUD process, new utility easements shall be granted to the City, with feedback provided from the Staff Review committee. *Easements dedicated within the plat of Lakewood Heights Addition, will be vacated through the PUD process.

Commissioner Lynch had questions for the petitioner. Dr. Dan Margo addressed the Planning Commission. After the bids came in for the site work the project as proposed is no longer feasible. Dr. Margo presented another option for the lots that he is pursuing. City Attorney Sterle recommended the Planning Commission table the PUD request.

Motion by Commissioner Kachinske, second by Commissioner Lynch to table the PUD request submitted by Dr. Dan Margo. The following voted in favor thereof: Johnson, Lynch, Kachinske, MacGregor, Goggin, Hubbes, Gothard. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

Public Input

Miscellaneous\Updates

Mr. Trast provided an update on the Comprehensive Plan.

Adjourn

Motion by Commissioner Lynch, second by Commissioner Goggin to adjourn the meeting at 4:44 p.m. The following voted in favor thereof: Gothard, Hubbes, Goggin, MacGregor, Kachinske, Lynch, Johnson. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.