

CITY OF MOTLEY
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES
July 23, 2013, 5:30 PM

1. Call to Order

O'Regan called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Planning commission: Pat O'Regan, Nancy Nieken, Amy Hutchison and Steve Johnson, Rob Sampson (arrived at about 6:25pm).

Absent: None

Staff: Terri Smith, Clerk/Treasurer

Hometown Planning: Ben Oleson

3. Public Hearings

Mr. Bickford, applicant was not yet in attendance. The item was tabled until later in the meeting.

4. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda.

None

5. Open Forum

There were no persons present wishing to speak.

6. Approval of Minutes

A motion and a second was made to approve the June 25, 2013 Planning Commission minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Planning and Zoning Administrator's Report

None.

8. Public Hearings (tabled from previously in the meeting)

(Applicant Bickford was still not in attendance)

O'Regan asked if there was any public comment.

Bill Skeesick asked for clarification of the proposed setback to the south. Discussion followed that it was unclear without a survey. It appears to be either 4 ft or 5 ft beyond what it should be at.

Tony Roberts asked for clarification as to the setback of the proposed building to the north. Discussion followed that it was unclear without a survey. The proposal is to be about 3 ft to the north line.

Skeesick noted a concern that he owns the property to the northwest of the Bickford property that he has invested in his rental properties there and he wants to make sure that there is ingress/egress via the "alley" that crosses the west portion of the property. He noted it has been used that way for fifty years.

Roberts noted that the sewer and water runs down that area.

Smith showed the original plat and that there is not an easement on the original plat.

Skeesick said he does not have a problem with the proposal, except that he wants the "alley" to stay.

Roberts asked about encroachment on the alley and how snow removal would be done given the limited space. Skeesick agreed that this is a good question.

Roberts noted a concern with whether the water runoff from the proposed buildings would be managed so as not to affect his property to the north as well as onto the city street or highway.

Johnson noted the snow removal was a good concern. He felt it should be tabled for a survey and the questions of snow removal and encroachment on the alley.

Oleson noted the letter received from the Minnesota Department of Transportation. Oleson summarized the concern regarding traffic circulation that he discussed with MnDOT staff and how they are suggesting the removal of the entrance onto the Highway and possibly moving the east Eledredge entrance further to the west.

Skeesick said if those two entrances are closed, it will move all the traffic to the west entrance. He is concerned that there will be a lot of traffic off the alley and his rental properties will be stigmatized and he may have difficulty renting the properties.

Oleson discussed the potential for blocked traffic with autos with trailers turning onto Eledredge or exiting the property.

A female member of the public noted that there is a lot of traffic congestion already, especially on the weekends.

Oleson said MnDOT's comments are concerns and recommendations, but it appears that the issue of closing or moving entrances is up to the city.

Oleson noted that the ordinance requires stormwater management when over 50% impervious coverage and no storm sewer exists. He noted there is storm sewer on the highway, but not on the city street.

Skeesick said the runoff is either going to go north or south given the rooflines as proposed and that the storm sewer is on the east.

O'Regan questioned whether any adjacent properties have been surveyed. Skeesick and Roberts indicated their properties have not been surveyed. Further discussion followed regarding where Roberts has been told his property line is by past landowners.

Johnson suggested the larger building could be reduced in size from 22 feet to maybe 15 feet to create more space from the north property line and the west.

O'Regan suggested that the application be tabled until Mr. Bickford is in attendance to address all the issues that have been raised and to provide a survey.

Discussion followed regarding stormwater requirements. Oleson noted that if the City determines that the lot is not served by storm sewer since the only sewer is on the state highway, a stormwater plan would be required by the ordinance.

(Mr. Bickford entered the meeting)

O'Regan asked Bickford if he was aware of the MnDOT concerns and suggestion to close the right-of-way. Bickford said that was the first he had heard of it. There was further discussion about the other concerns mentioned in the MnDOT letter.

Bickford said there was a trap already on the property for stormwater that he would like to leave on the property.

O'Regan noted the previously expressed concerns about snow removal and where it could be pushed. Bickford said he would have to think about that.

Roberts noted his previous concern about water runoff running onto his property. Bickford said it would be good if there were storm sewer. O'Regan said he didn't think the City wanted more storm sewer in that area.

Oleson mentioned the need for a survey. Bickford said he had spoken with a surveyor about coming out.

Further discussion about the property lines, stormwater, traffic levels and impact on neighboring properties.

Nieken made a motion to table the application until the August 27 meeting for a survey to be completed, seconded by Hutchison. Johnson asked that the survey be sent to the Council as soon as it is received. Motion passed unanimously.

Skeesick asked if it was necessary for him to come to the August meeting or if his concerns would carry through. O'Regan said the concerns expressed tonight would be considered in the next meeting.

9. Other Business

a. Discussion – Planning Commission/Board of Adjustment Policy

Oleson presented the draft Planning Commission Policy that had been previously developed and that it has not changed from the version that was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission about a year ago. He noted that the Council had indicated they wanted this to be

Hutchison asked it is the same as had been started when she started on the Planning Commission. Oleson said the initial conversations were in March 2011 and it was recommended for approval in March 2012.

O'Regan said he would like more time to review the draft. He noted a concern that the policy express what it takes to make a quorum.

Sampson said he believes it was presented to the Council as a recommendation for approval at least twice, but has not yet been acted upon. He asked Smith if she had spoken to the City Attorney about what constituted a quorum given that only 5 of the 7 members of the Planning Commission have been appointed. Smith noted the Attorney indicated a quorum would be a majority of the appointed members.

Oleson indicated he could change the language in Section 7 to state that only a majority of the appointed members was necessary for a quorum. The Commission directed Oleson to do so.

Further discussion about how this policy could help define roles and how things work.

Johnson made a motion that the Commission recommend to the Council that the City Clerk be required to attend the Planning & Zoning meetings, should Smith accept that position, seconded by Nieken. Further discussion that if Smith accepts the position, she would be expected to attend regularly. Further

discussion that Oleson would be expected to take minutes of meetings that he attends. Motion passed unanimously.

Nieken made a motion to table the draft policy for additional time to review, seconded by Johnson. Motion carried unanimously.

b. Discussion – Ordinance Amendments required by recent changes to state law

Oleson noted that the Planning Commission had previously drafted an ordinance update to reflect the changes made to state law regarding variance review criteria. He noted that this draft is in the staff report and has not been changed since it was last discussed more than a year ago.

Oleson noted he was asked to look at other changes the Legislature might have made. He noted the only other possibility was regarding how property values are calculated for park dedication purposes. Discussion followed about whether the City had a park dedication ordinance or not.

The consensus of the Commission was to table this item for further research on the changes in state law regarding park dedication and how it relates to the City's current ordinances.

c. Discussion – Options/Ideas for Comprehensive Plan update process

Oleson noted he was asked to present some budget/work plan options for a Comprehensive Plan update process.

Oleson handed out a summary of three options and noted that he made sure they all involved significant opportunities for public input and that the City should note if it has suggestions for changes to the process if they so desire.

The consensus of the Commission was to review these options and discuss further at a future meeting.

d. Training Session – Planning Commission Orientation

Oleson provided a training session "Planning Commission Orientation"

A motion and second was made to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ben Oleson
Hometown Planning