

Lanesboro Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, December 18th, 2019 6:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers

Present: Jason Resseman, Jason Harvey, Richard Wolfgramm, Steve Snyder and Michael Seiler

Absent: None

Visitors: Kara Maloney, Bonita Underbakke, Brian Malm, and Scott Taylor

Commission Member Resseman called the Public Hearing to order at 6:00 p.m. The Hearing was to review the application for a zoning amendment for the Lanesboro Public Utilities future Wastewater Treatment Facility Site. Engineer Brian Malm presented a review of the application. With no comments from the audience, Member Resseman closed the hearing at 6:05 p.m.

Commission Member Resseman called the Regular Planning & Zoning Meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

- A. Agenda:** Member Seiler moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Member Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried all in favor.
- B. Consent Agenda:** Member Snyder motioned to approve the Consent Agenda as submitted. Motion seconded by Member Harvey. Motion carried all in favor.
 - 1. Minutes of the regular meeting, November 21st, 2019

Regular Business:

- A. Lanesboro Public Utilities, Zoning Amendment Application:** Member Resseman motioned to approve the zoning amendment request based on the following requirements being met as per the application:
 - 1. Is the variance in harmony with the purposes and intent of the ordinance?
 - a. The purpose and intent of the setback requirements in the ordinance is to avoid placement of buildings directly abutting property lines and to provide reasonable and consistent spacing from roadways and between adjacent buildings of varied use. Although the proposed layout does not meet the required front yard setback, the provided setback of 21.5-ft is still well within the range of existing front yard building setbacks in the area, which range from 34-ft setbacks to 10-ft encroachments, as shown on Figure 3, and would not be unreasonable or inconsistent. Therefore, the setback as proposed is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance.
 - 2. Is the variance consistent with the comprehensive plan?
 - a. The City of Lanesboro's comprehensive plan was last updated in 1998. The future land use plan included in the comprehensive plan indicates no changes in proposed land use for the proposed project area. There are no other provisions in the comprehensive plan that a reduction in front yard setback in the project location would be inconsistent with. Therefore, the proposed variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan.
 - 3. Does the proposal put property to use in a reasonable manner?

a. The proposed facility is a wastewater treatment plant. According to Chapter 151.28, paragraph (B), processing facilities and government buildings are permitted uses in Industrial Districts. The wastewater treatment facility is a series of government buildings forming a processing facility designed to treat wastewater prior to discharge to the Root River. Therefore, it is considered a permitted use in this location. In addition, the proposed facility is adjacent to other existing industrial uses, including the City's existing wastewater treatment facility and the Lanesboro Sales Commission cattle sales facility. The use of the site is reasonable given that it is a permitted use in the current zoning and is similar/identical to the adjacent uses.

4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner?

a. The entire property is within the FEMA 100-year floodplain (Flood Fringe District), and the eastern portion of the property is located within the FEMA floodway (Floodway District) for the Root River. The City's DNR approved floodplain ordinance allows development within the Flood Fringe District provided that the facility is constructed at or above the Regulatory Flood Protection Elevation (RFPE). The ordinance would not

allow the construction of wastewater treatment facility buildings within the Floodway District.

Therefore, the eastern portion of the site is not available for building placement. If the eastern portion of the property were available, there would be additional room for building placement on the property and the front yard setback variance would not be needed. These are unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner.

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

a. As discussed in Question 3 above, the proposed facility is a permitted in the current zoning and is adjacent to other existing industrial uses, including the City's existing wastewater treatment facility and the Lanesboro Sales Commission cattle sales facility. As discussed in Question 1 above, the provided setback of 21.5-ft is still well within the range of existing front yard building setbacks in the area, which range from 34-ft setbacks to 10-ft encroachments, as shown on Figure 3. Therefore, the granting of a variance reducing the front yard setback from the required 50-ft to the proposed 21.5-ft will not change the essential character of the locality. In addition, we also note that the facility design is proposed to include a decorative screening wall to address aesthetic concerns expressed by the neighborhood, a plan view of which is shown on Figure 4. The screening wall will be specifically designed to fit the essential character of the locality.

Member Harvey seconded the motion. Discussion was had to clarify the set back amounts and for which portion of the property. Motion carried with member Resseman, Harvey, Snyder, and Seiler voting in favor. Member Wolfgramm voted no.

B. Application for Lot Split – Wagner: Member Seiler motioned to approve the lot split application as submitted. Member Wolfgramm seconded the motion. Motion carried all in favor.

C. Application for Lot Split – Hardwick: Member Snyder motioned to approve the lot split application as submitted. Member Seiler seconded the motion. Motion carried all in favor.

D. Continued Business

a. **102 Parkway Avenue South:** Member Resseman reviewed the concerns, and reported on his meeting with the property owner. Members further discussed the options for erosion control measures, noting this should be completed no later than May 15th. Additionally, members noted the need for the cleanup of any sediment that does fall onto the public right of ways.

Administrator Peterson will work with Attorney Manion to complete a letter to be sent to the property owner stating the requirements to bring the parcel into compliance, as well as a letter to the neighboring property owner.

Comprehensive Plan Update:

- A. Community Engagement Plan:** Administrator Peterson will work with Jane Kansier of Bolton & Menk, along with the YEP program, and communicate this information with the school. Discussion was had regarding the survey. Peterson will send out the survey and ask all members to comment on what should or should not be a part of the survey. At the January meeting we will decide on how and where this survey should be shared.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, January 15th, 2020, at 6:00 p.m.

Adjourn: Member Wolfgramm moved to adjourn at 6:55 p.m. Motion seconded by Member Resseman. Motion carried all in favor.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michele Peterson
City Administrator/Clerk